

UNIVERZITA KARLOVA V PRAZE
Fakulta sociálních věd
Institut mezinárodních studií

PROTOKOL O HODNOCENÍ BAKALÁŘSKÉ PRÁCE
(Posudek oponenta)

Práci předložil(a) student(ka): **Tereza Vodáková**

Název práce: **Komparace projektů National Endowment for Democracy v České republice a na Slovensku v 90. letech a jejich vlivu na lokální dění**

Oponoval (u externích oponentů uveďte též adresu a funkci v rámci instituce):
doc. PhDr. Francis Raška, PhD.

1. OBSAH A CÍL PRÁCE (stručná informace o práci, formulace cíle):

This dissertation addresses projects of the National Endowment for Democracy in the Czech Republic and Slovakia. Though Czechoslovakia was one country when the Cold War ended, in 1993 the country split into two separate states. The purpose of this dissertation is to compare and contrast the respective NED approaches in the Czech Republic and Slovakia.

2. VĚCNÉ ZPRACOVÁNÍ (náročnost, tvůrčí přístup, argumentace, logická struktura, teoretické a metodologické ukotvení, práce s prameny a literaturou, vhodnost příloh apod.):

The topic is a challenging one. I find the author's argumentation, methodological approach, and utilization of sources impressive. Likewise, the structure is both logical and appropriate.

3. FORMÁLNÍ A JAZYKOVÉ ZPRACOVÁNÍ (jazykový projev, správnost citace a odkazů na literaturu, grafická úprava, formální náležitosti práce apod.):

The formal presentation of the work is fine apart from some unfortunate typographical errors that could have been avoided with better proofreading.

4. STRUČNÝ KOMENTÁŘ HODNOTITELE (celkový dojem z bakalářské práce, silné a slabé stránky, originalita myšlenek, naplnění cíle apod.):

Tereza Vodáková has selected the projects of the National Endowment for Democracy (NED) in Czech Republic and Slovakia in the 1990s as the topic of her BA dissertation. The work is divided into an Introduction, four main chapters, and a Conclusion. The list of abbreviations provided at the beginning of the treatise and the section on methods, which forms part of the Introduction, are quite handy. In addition, the bibliography is also laudable. I will offer my comments on each part of the dissertation in the ensuing paragraphs.

In the Introduction, Tereza clearly spells out the aim of the work, which is to compare and contrast NED approaches and aims towards the Czech Republic and Slovakia, as well as to assess the influence of NED activities on the development of democracy and civil society in each country. In the section on methods, Tereza mentions that NED goals in Czech Republic and Slovakia differed and, in order to assess the impact on democratization and civil society formation, she focuses upon three areas of interest, namely pluralism, democratic governance, and, finally, education, culture, and communication. She defines each area of interest in a way that maintains the reader's attention. The Introduction is clear and provides the reader with a clear idea as to what to expect in the body of the work.

Chapter 1 is devoted to the National Endowment for Democracy. Tereza begins with the history of the NED, which was established in 1983. The idea of such an institution had been around for decades. In the 1960s, it was revealed that many American NGOs working for democracy abroad had actually been sponsored by the CIA. President Johnson wished for such organizations to become more open with trustees, grants, etc. During the Carter presidency in the late 1970s, ideas emerged that Carter's notions of democracy and human rights could be promoted following the example of West German foundations (Stiftungen). Tereza's recapitulation of the historical background is both accurate and helpful. The roles

of Congressmen Fascell and Fraser (and others) are mentioned as is the concept of the QUANGO (Quasi-Autonomous Non-Governmental Organization). During Reagan's first term, the measure NSDD-77 and the associated Project Democracy is correctly identified as being most influential in setting the aims and providing for the establishment of the NED. Tereza recalls well the debates concerning the activities of NED and their clandestine nature, which made providing transparent financial reports to the Congress and American taxpayers more difficult. Also, the role played by NED in financing dissent and other antigovernment activities in East-Central Europe (including Czechoslovakia) in the 1980s is explained well. Tereza also emphasizes the shift in focus following the collapse of Communism in East-Central Europe in 1989. This chapter is of excellent quality and smoothly guides the reader into Chapter 2.

In Chapter 2, post-Communist Czechoslovakia is focused upon with an emphasis on NED activities to promote democracy and the emergence of civil society. The immediate post-1989 period was characterized by NED as post-breakthrough and the organization's aims were first to "promote democracy" and then "assist democracy." NED grants were awarded along with support from other organizations and, from 1990-1993, Czechoslovakia was treated as one entity (despite the split on 1 January 1993). Tereza explains what sorts of investments were made into the three areas of interest mentioned earlier, namely pluralism, democratic governance, and education, culture, and communication. The chapter is well written and gives the reader a sense of the form American assistance took.

Chapter 3 depicts the Czech path to liberal democracy and the gradual waning of NED assistance. Most NED assistance between 1993 and 1999 was dedicated to the area of education, culture, and communication. Tereza points out that there were two reasons for the decrease in funding for the Czech Republic. As the budget for NED (for East-Central Europe) was cut, funds needed to be earmarked for specific countries that were most in need and, as the Czech Republic was on the way to liberal democracy, it was not deemed to fit the description. Also, the Czech political elite displayed less and less interest in receiving foreign assistance. The chapter is written in a very detailed way that either familiarizes the reader with the Czech 1990s or, in my case, brings back memories of a mixed period of success and failure. I have no problem with Tereza's account.

The situation in Slovakia and NED activities forms the subject of Chapter 4. Not surprisingly, more NED resources were devoted to Slovakia than to Czech Republic because of the country's lack of experience with sovereign democratic governance and the greater economic difficulties brought on by the separation from the Czechs. In the case of Slovakia, much work was still required between 1993 and 1999 in the areas of pluralism and democratic governance. Therefore, unlike in Czech Republic, much funding was required in the two areas. As in Chapter 3, Tereza provides meticulous details about the various projects and their results. Interestingly, the rise and fall of Vladimír Mečiar (nationalist prime minister with Communist secret police background) who helped split the federation together with his Czech counterpart, Václav Klaus, is scrutinized. NED funding for various civic organizations devoted to promoting awareness is largely acknowledged to have helped Slovakia move in a more democratic direction, which was symbolized by the key election of 1998. This chapter is also very informative.

In her Conclusion, Tereza recapitulates the main points made in the dissertation and contrasts developments in Czech Republic and Slovakia following the dissolution of Czechoslovakia. She notes that, in Czech Republic the public mood soured in the 1990s, whereas in Slovakia, interest and confidence in politics grew and culminated in the election of 1998. Though not the only factor, NED support certainly aided the process of raising public awareness in Slovakia. Tereza also provides some thoughts on the advantages of the NED, which does not insist on publicizing its role in every given project.

I am very impressed with this dissertation. It is obvious that Jan Hornát devoted much time to Tereza's supervision. So long as the oral defense is of the same quality as the dissertation itself, I recommend a classification of A.

5. OTÁZKY A PŘIPOMÍNKY DOPORUČENÉ K BLIŽŠÍMU VYSVĚTLENÍ PŘI OBHAJOBĚ (jedna až tři):

Is it possible that the American view that the Czech Republic had become a democracy in the 1990s was exaggerated and somewhat inaccurate? Please explain.

Has Slovakia managed to retain the democratic values that NED assistance helped to instill? Please explain.

6. DOPORUČENÍ / NEDOPORUČENÍ K OBHAJOBĚ A NAVRHOVANÁ ZNÁMKA
(A-F): **A**

Datum: **17 May 2021**

Podpis:

Pozn.: Hodnocení pište k jednotlivým bodům, pokud nepíšete v textovém editoru, použijte při nedostatku místa zadní stranu nebo příložený list. V hodnocení práce se pokuste oddělit ty její nedostatky, které jsou, podle vašeho mínění, obhajobou neodstranitelné (např. chybí kritické zhodnocení pramenů a literatury), od těch věcí, které student může dobrou obhajobou napravit; poměr těchto dvou položek berte prosím v úvahu při stanovení konečné známky.