

UNIVERZITA KARLOVA V PRAZE
Fakulta sociálních věd
Institut mezinárodních studií

PROTOKOL O HODNOCENÍ BAKALÁŘSKÉ PRÁCE
(Posudek vedoucího)

Práci předložil(a) student(ka): **Sára Žáková**

Název práce: **Státní převrat jako prostředek získání moci Huga Cháveze a formování socialismu 21. století**

Vedoucí práce (u externích vedoucích uveďte též adresu a funkci v rámci instituce):

doc. PhDr. Francis Raška, PhD.

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

The work focuses on Venezuela between 1992 and 1998 and maps the road to power of Hugo Chávez and the tools employed to make him more popular. One of the key moments were the two coup attempts of 1992. The concept of the state coup is defined and applied to the Venezuelan situation.

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 demanding one and the student spent much time in consultations with me, I am satisfied with the argumentation, logical structure, application of theory and methodology, as well as with the sources consulted.

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

I find no major problems with presentation or use of language.

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

Sára Žáková has selected the phenomenon of Hugo Chávez and his socialism for the 21st century as the topic of her Bachelor's dissertation. The theme is both challenging and relevant given the fact that Chávez's successor, Maduro, continues along the same path as his mentor, Chávez. Sára has divided the treatise into an Introduction, five main chapters, and a Conclusion. The referencing is consistent and contains the needed information. In the ensuing paragraphs, I will offer my comments on the individual parts of the work.

In the Introduction, Sára clearly states her research question, which is: Why did Hugo Chávez become so popular and achieve power in spite of the fact that the 1992 attempts at a coup d'état were suppressed? The work is a case study, in which Sára attempts to apply the significance of the state coups for Chávez's popularity and that of his notion of socialism for the 21st century. The content of the individual chapters is explained and the relevant sources are discussed in an analytical manner. I think that the Introduction is fine.

Chapter 1 deals with the issue of a state coup differs from a revolution. Sára presents the definition of state coup from a political science point of view and she also defines revolution. I am impressed by the number of references to good sources and I like the way she contrasts a state coup from a revolution. In addition, she elucidates the conditions or steps required for the emergence of a state coup. The chapter provides the theoretical framework for the remainder of the dissertation.

The history of Venezuela's political evolution prior to 1992 forms the basis of Chapter 2. Sára furnishes a good summary of Venezuela's history and she correctly emphasizes the dependence of the economy on the oil industry. The growing problems from 1979 onwards with social inequality and overall economic difficulties caused by a drop in the global price of oil are well elucidated. I have no problem with this chapter.

In Chapter 3, Sára provides a detailed biographical sketch of Hugo Chávez, his background, and the motivations behind his politics. Failing in his initial ambition to become a professional baseball player, Chávez chose a military career instead. He became acquainted with people from the leftist FALN, which had in the 1960s engaged in armed struggle against the Venezuelan government. Chávez remained in the

army and participated in the abortive uprisings of 1992, later became president, and, before his death, selected bus driver Nicolás Maduro as his successor. Though brief, this portrait of Chávez does provide the reader with some knowledge of what motivated this man of simple background to become a subversive insurrectionary element in Venezuela.

Chapter 4 discusses how events transpired between the unsuccessful coup attempts of 1992 and Chávez's electoral triumph in the presidential election of 1998. Sára discusses how Chávez appealed to poor Venezuelans during the coup attempts of 1992, how he and his fellow putschists were pardoned and released from prison by President Rafael Caldera (an associate of Chávez), who had succeeded the president against whom Chávez had rebelled, namely Carlos Andrés Pérez, in an election called after Pérez's removal from office due to corruption charges. Deteriorating economic conditions in Venezuela resulted in Chávez's 1998 electoral victory. I think that this chapter discusses well the political circumstances in Venezuela during the given period.

Finally, in Chapter 5, Sára provides an overview of the transformation of Venezuela under Chávez's presidency. Chávez replaced the 1961 constitution with a "Bolivarian" one, which described the Venezuelan fifth republic as a country based on "law and justice." The parliament was changed from a bicameral body into a unicameral one and power was concentrated in the hands of the president. Also, term limits on the presidency were abolished. The socialism of the 21st century was proclaimed by Chávez, who strongly criticized globalization and neoliberalism. Likewise, the economy came under greater state regulation and the participation of foreign oil companies was greatly limited. Foreign policy was aligned closer to that of Cuba. This chapter accurately depicts events in Chávez's "Bolivarian" Venezuela.

In the Conclusion, Sára writes that the unsuccessful state coups cannot be said to be the main factor that resulted in Chávez's 1998 presidential victory even though it definitely was one factor. Chávez's speech prior to his death recalled the coup attempt of 4 February 1992 as the start of the journey that resulted in the success of the "Bolivarian" revolution.

Sára Žáková's work meets the requirements for an acceptable B.A. dissertation. There are some minor mistakes and I think it is unfortunate that in the English-language summary, she refers to 4 December 1992 instead of 4 February 1992. I recommend a classification of VERY GOOD (C).

5. OTÁZKY A PŘIPOMÍNKY DOPORUČENÉ K BLIŽŠÍMU VYSVĚTLENÍ PŘI OBHAJOBĚ (jedna až tři):
If the coup attempts of 1992 were merely a factor leading to Chávez's political success, what then was the main factor? If the Venezuelan economy would not have been in such dire shape in 1998, is it likely that Chávez would not have come to power?

6. DOPORUČENÍ / NEDOPORUČENÍ K OBHAJOBĚ A NAVRHOVANÁ ZNÁMKA
(výborně, velmi dobře, dobře, nevyhověl): C

Datum: 9 May 2021

Podpis:

Pozn.: Hodnocení píše 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.