



## Diploma Thesis Evaluation Form

Author: Bindu Janardhan

Title: **Germany's Foreign Policy. Is Federal Republic of Germany still a „Civilian power“?**

Programme/year: MAIN/2021

Author of Evaluation (**supervisor**/external assessor): **Martin Jeřábek**

Criteria	Definition	Maximum	Points
<b>Major Criteria</b>			
	Research question, definition of objectives	<b>10</b>	8
	Theoretical/conceptual framework	<b>30</b>	22
	Methodology, analysis, argument	<b>40</b>	24
<i>Total</i>		<b>80</b>	<b>54</b>
<b>Minor Criteria</b>			
	Sources	<b>10</b>	5
	Style	<b>5</b>	3
	Formal requirements	<b>5</b>	3
<i>Total</i>		<b>20</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>100</b>	<b>65</b>



## Evaluation

### Major criteria:

The candidate Bindu Janardhan was late when finalizing the thesis, therefore, I did not get to final version of the text before it was submitted. It will reflect on the evaluation a bit. I welcome that the thesis addresses the topic of German foreign policy. So far explored topic, but new series of research questions could be set on Germany in the changing context of Europe and the globalized world in the last 30 years. The candidate tests the main research question “Is Germany still a civilian power?” (p. 2) on four case study topics on German foreign policy behavior (EU-Eastern Enlargement, Iraq-War 2003, German involvement to Afghanistan and German Development Policy-“A Marshall Plan with Africa”).

I would like to appreciate the theoretical background mentioned in chapter 2 especially the use of two theoretical approaches “role theory” and “civilian power concept”. Chapter 2.3 is devoted to Germany as a “civilian power” what is in line with the author’s conceptualization. Bindu Janardhan identify correctly that FRG acquired the basis of norms in the post-war period (p. 10). Detailed hypotheses (I-IV.) are well developed on page 24. I have only small problem with that exact formulation of the hypotheses that do not leave the result “open” (e. g. 3.3.1 – Hypothesis I p. 28 “... as its casual reason, and therefore Germany is a civilian power”; Hypothesis II, III, ... IV. - p. 61 ”Thus, Germany is a civilian power”). The research questions/hypotheses should not be answered just at the beginning. However, the adequate and comprehensive comparison of case study analysis is provided in the conclusion that refers to the thesis’s core concept (pp. 73-74). Bindu Janardhan responds to the hypotheses and claims the continuity of the “commitment to the normative values of civilian power” (p. 74).

The necessary research methodology (chapter 3.2) and the application-model (p. 26-27) are also included. However, the promised steps of the analysis (i-iv – pp. 26-27) has not been done consequently (limited depth of case studies). Some important details are not included, e. g. case study I – Eastern Enlargement (pp. 28-38) is not complete (compared with the other case studies). The author did not mention e. g. net contribution discussion on EU-budget, labour policy, or agriculture. These issues demonstrate the reservation of the German government of Chancellor G. Schröder towards ‘unconditional’ Eastern Enlargement and therefore could oppose the hypotheses that claims the author. The candidate could use in that case for the purpose of deep analysis also primary sources that are also available online (e. g. opinion polls, parliament debates) or more books/articles/studies that cover the second period on the German Enlargement policy 2000-2004.



**FACULTY  
OF SOCIAL SCIENCES**  
Charles University

I suspect, the author worked sometimes with sources were readily available (she uses H. Tewes correctly for the first period of German Enlargement Policy 1990-1994/1998!), rather than searched for what would have been needed (e.g. speeches of G. Verheugen, E. Stoiber, discussion on agriculture policy, DIW analysis of H. Brücker on „labour policy“ etc.).

The argument of the thesis is sometimes less understandable, there are mistakes (the candidate jumps from the analysis/definition of one topic to another) that do affect flow and comprehensibility of the argumentation; e.g. pp. 30-32 – in the core of policy analysis of the German government actions places a theoretical definition of multilateralism (Rainer Baumann), and then “switches” back to “European Agreements in 1991” mentioned on page 30 above...). On the other hand, short conclusions at the end of each case study I-IV. (e. g. pp. 59-60; pp. 68-69) help the reader to follow the author’s analysis.

**Minor criteria:**

The candidate uses relative wide range of relevant sources to the topic of German Foreign Policy, but some important analytical studies are missing (S. Bulmer, W. Paterson, V. Handl, A. Hyde-Price, G. Hellmann ...). The “Literature Review” (pp. 3-6) is correctly focused only on “role theory” and “civilian power”, it could also refer to other relevant books or important (also primary) sources used in four case studies. Data to the case studies are in general form mentioned in a chapter 3.2 to research methodology (e.g. page 27).

The style of the thesis is understandable. I have the following concern to the use of quotations. On page 8 (2nd paragraph) should be a quotation on Holsti, the same on page 10 (At „seventeen types of role concept” is missing quotation on Holsti); e. g. in the footnote Nr. 23/24 should be a quotation on concrete page; on page 12 mentions Friederick Hartmann, but in the footnote Nr. 30 quotes „Sondermann and Lerche“. In general, the use of original sources/authors is preferred to quoting other secondary literature.

In the list of sources should be a full bibliographical information (e. g. p. 82: Kirste and Maull, in “Zivilmacht und Rollentheorie” n. d., p. 286 is not sufficient!), also typos in that information – correctly „Zivilmacht und...“.

The thesis is equipped with appendixes, to German Basic Law and UN Security Council Resolutions. The appendixes could be focused also more on German positions (figures of German troops involvement etc.). The author does not show the exact source of the appendixes (full web address of these documents).



**FACULTY  
OF SOCIAL SCIENCES**  
Charles University

**Overall evaluation:**

**Despite my critical remarks above, the thesis demonstrates author's competence to understanding of the topic of German Foreign Policy. Some parts of the thesis show a good command of the relevant points of the German Foreign Policy that refers to a concept of civilian power, but arguments sometimes do not really form one unified position. However, the candidate partly manages to present adequate empirical research inspired by the theoretical approach.**

**It is pity that she did not take enough time to finalize the thesis in a perfect way, and mainly care about clear flow of arguments in the text, build shorter sentences, prosecute deep control of quotations and carefully final editing.**

Suggested grade: **D**

Signature:

August 31, 2021