

UNIVERZITA KARLOVA
Fakulta sociálních věd
Institut mezinárodních studií

PROTOKOL O HODNOCENÍ DIPLOMOVÉ PRÁCE
(Posudek oponenta)

Práci předložil(a) student(ka): **Rachel Primasová**

Název práce: **Fenomén korupce jako nástroj populismu v Mexiku: případ A.M. López Obradorovy rétoriky v prezidentské kampani 2018**

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):

The aim of the work is to investigate whether the rhetoric of A.M. López Obrador concerning corruption in the 2018 Mexican presidential campaign was just a populist strategy to gain power.

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 and the structure of the dissertation is most appropriate. I like the explanation of theory and methodology and I am likewise impressed with the sources.

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

Formal aspects of the dissertation are fine. However, I would have liked to see numbered chapters. However, this is a matter of preference and in no way detracts from the overall quality of the work.

4. KONTROLA ORIGINALITY TEXTU

Prohlašuji, že jsem se seznámil/a s výsledkem kontroly originality textu závěrečné práce v systému:

[] Theses [] Turnitin [] Ouriginal (Urkund)

Komentář k výsledku kontroly:

Everything is in order.

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

Rachel Primasová has written her Master's dissertation on A.M. López Obrador's presidential campaign in 2018 and his emphasis on corruption as an election issue. The work is a discourse analysis that is firmly grounded theoretically and methodologically. Insofar as structure is concerned, the treatise is divided into an Introduction, a theoretical chapter, an empirical chapter, and a Conclusion. I will offer some brief comments on each part of the dissertation in the ensuing paragraphs.

In the Introduction, Rachel explains the reasons for her selection of the topic. She points out that the Czech public knows little about Mexican politics and is correct in her assertion that this work fills in some gaps in the existing Czech academic literature. The work is placed in the context of theories of populism and both qualitative and

quantitative approaches are utilized. In addition, the content of both main chapters is well summarized. My general impression is that the Introduction clearly informs the reader of what to expect in the remainder of the dissertation.

Rachel states in the chapter on theory the following hypothesis: “The topic of combatting corruption is used in Mexico to attract popular support.” Once in power, politicians tend to lose interest in fighting corruption. The author’s assessment that this represents opportunistic populism is sound. As mentioned earlier, Rachel utilizes qualitative and quantitative methods and goes to great lengths to justify the theories and sources utilized. Leading works are evaluated. Most significantly, corruption is approached as being part of the Mexican political culture. This chapter clearly demonstrates Rachel’s grasp of the relevant theories and guides the reader into the next section.

The empirical chapter focuses more closely on López Obrador’s campaign and the clever use of corruption in his overall strategy to gain votes. López Obrador achieved a resounding victory by emphasizing chronic poverty, social inequality, economic stagnation, the increase in violence in society, and corruption scandals. These issues resonated with Mexicans frustrated by the unfinished state of the expected political transformation of the country. In a section pitting promises against actual deeds, Rachel provides examples of post-electoral efforts to combat corruption that ultimately came to naught. In particular, attention is devoted to a referendum called by López Obrador over a law involving prosecution of former Mexican presidents. Opinion polls indicate that, on the one hand, most Mexicans believe that López Obrador has been trying to combat corruption, but, on the other, a similar percentage of citizens believe that there exists a double standard of sorts in deciding which cases to prosecute. It would seem that López Obrador’s main supporters are on the left side of the political spectrum. The data from a number of American and international organizations are quite illustrative because they indicate that the battle with corruption is largely failing. Rachel indicates that corruption exists as well in López Obrador’s administration largely in the form of nepotism. She then elaborates on three specific forms of corruption in the Mexican context beginning with the letter C, namely *cochupo*, *clientelismo*, and *camarilla*. *Cochupo* involves bribing the media to under-report scandals. *Clientelismo* means “services” provided by someone in power to somebody else. *Camarilla* refers to a group that clandestinely influences the decision-making processes of those in power. Rachel cites examples demonstrating the existence of each of the three Cs in López Obrador’s presidential administration. In this chapter, Rachel clearly indicates that López Obrador clearly has made little sincere effort to deliver on his campaign promises regarding corruption.

The Conclusion recapitulates the main points raised in the two main chapters and reiterates that López Obrador employed the issue of corruption to win the presidential election, but that his half-hearted gestures to improve the situation while in office demonstrate that the president has no real interest in making good on his campaign promises.

This dissertation is of outstanding quality. I recommend a classification of A or B contingent on a successful oral defense.

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

Given the endemic state of corruption in Mexico, can any president stop corruption? Why or why not?

Has not the time arrived for Mexico to replace its political system? Please explain.

7. **DOPORUČENÍ / NEDOPORUČENÍ K OBHAJOBĚ A NAVRHOVANÁ ZNÁMKA**

(A a B výborně, C a D velmi dobře, E dobře, F nevyhověl): **A or B contingent on a successful oral defense**

Datum: **7 June 2022**

Podpis:

Pozn.: Hodnocení píše k jednotlivým bodům, pokud nepíšete v textovém editoru, použijte při nedostatku místa zadní stranu nebo přiložený 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.