

UNIVERZITA KARLOVA V PRAZE
Fakulta sociálních věd
Institut mezinárodních studií

PROTOKOL O HODNOCENÍ BAKALÁŘSKÉ PRÁCE
(Posudek vedoucího)

Práci předložil(a) student(ka): **Martin Štěřba**

Název práce: **Analýza neefektivity americké zahraniční pomoci na Haiti v oblasti infrastruktury po roce 2010**

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 dissertation discusses the effectiveness (or lack thereof) of American aid to Haiti after the devastating earthquake of 2010 based upon development theory.

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

The topic is indeed a challenging one. The student's approach, argumentation or use of sources are satisfactory.

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

Overall, I am pleased with the presentation, referencing, and use of language.

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

Martin Štěřba has chosen US aid to Haiti after the earthquake of 2010 and its respective effectiveness or ineffectiveness as the subject of his BA dissertation. He uses development aid theory as the basis for his findings. I find the work straightforward and easy to follow. In all, the work consists of an Introduction followed by a methodological session (Chapter 1), five main chapters (Chapters 2-6), and a Conclusion. I will briefly comment on each part of the treatise in the next paragraphs.

In the Introduction and chapter on methodology (Chapter 1), Martin clarifies his main aim, which is to analyze the effectiveness of US aid to Haiti in the aftermath of the 2010 earthquake. His hypothesis is that the assistance was ineffective to a certain degree because of the poor utilization of financial resources, poorly conceived projects, overly ambitious goals, etc. Martin analyzes three specific US aid projects and uses development aid theory to point out shortcomings and thus prove the accuracy of his hypothesis. He also discusses the types of sources consulted. One thing that is missing is a brief review of the specific literature and which specific sources were most helpful to him. However, this does not detract from the general good quality of the work.

Chapter 2 represents an assessment of American foreign policy towards Haiti prior to 2010. Martin recapitulates past events well and assesses the complicated relationship between the United States and Haiti. The less than flattering Duvalier years are scrutinized as is the positive effort on the part of the United States to use American economic and military resources to promote Haitian democracy in the 1990s. This chapter serves its purpose and gently guides the reader into the main topic of the dissertation.

In Chapter 3, Martin gets into the actors involved in US development aid and he focuses on USAID. He emphasizes the pitfalls associated with the manner in which USAID operates and distributes assistance. The first difficulty was with the uncoordinated way aid was distributed via NGOs. The second problem was the absence of agreement between the American and Haitian authorities' conception of how matters should proceed. The last major issue was the overreliance on American suppliers and lack of joint planning with the Haitian government. Martin then portrays the structure of the American aid, which was divided into four projects. The first dealt with the administration of the water supply along with the renewal of agriculture and the distribution of foodstuffs. The second involved educational reform and expansion. The third was to expand access to financial services. The fourth and final product dealt with

health care. Martin discusses the successes and failures of each project in detail. I think that this chapter provides the reader with a general idea as to the successes and shortcomings of the USAID approach to the provision of assistance.

Theories of development assistance form the subject of Chapter 4. Martin presents a number of theories and differentiates between humanitarian (short-term) and development (long term) aid. The four pillars that should form any assistance project are independence, neutrality, impartiality, and humaneness. Another in-depth section deals with the issue of sustainability. The ten factors involved in sustainability are as follows: participation and ownership, training, coordination with local governmental policy, financial sustainability, local organization and administration, understanding local societal, gender, and cultural customs, appropriate selection of technology, environmental awareness, and external political and economic conditions. This chapter is useful to the lay reader whose understanding of the complicated nature of development aid is most likely limited. Moreover, Chapter 4 maintains the attention of the reader and motivates the reader to continue reading.

Martin discusses the post-2010 situation in Haiti and USAID projects in Chapter 5. He begins with the USAID role in rebuilding Haiti's infrastructure. USAID infrastructure projects involved the construction of a port, an industrial park, and residential accommodation for those who were left homeless in the earthquake's aftermath. As Martin notes, none of the projects were completed on schedule. He offers detailed explanations that account for the failures. I have no problem with this chapter.

In Chapter 6, Martin argues that his hypothesis on the ineffectiveness of US aid to Haiti has been confirmed. He points out a number of specific flaws, but the most important issue is that USAID projects met neither USAID criteria nor the definition of development aid Martin selected.

The Conclusion (Chapter 7) recapitulates the main points made in the individual chapters and Martin goes to great lengths not to criticize the attempts made by USAID in Haiti. However, the evidence has led him to conclude that USAID assistance to Haiti after 2010 was ineffective.

My feeling is that this is a good BA work. However, there are instances of repetition and, as I mentioned above, the review of sources could have been more thorough. I recommend a classification of B or C depending on Martin's the quality of Martin's oral defense.

5. OTÁZKY A PŘIPOMÍNKY DOPORUČENÉ K BLÍŽŠÍMU VYSVĚTLENÍ PŘI OBHAJOBĚ (jedna až tři):
How has US assistance changed since the period when the Haiti projects were realized?

Has anything improved or deteriorated in US provision of development assistance since then? Please explain.

6. DOPORUČENÍ / NEDOPORUČENÍ K OBHAJOBĚ A NAVRHOVANÁ ZNÁMKA
(výborně, velmi dobře, dobře, nevyhověl): B or C depending on the quality of the oral defense

Datum: Prague, 13 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.