UNIVERZITA KARLOVA V PRAZE
Fakulta sociálních věd
Institut mezinárodních studií

Práci předložil(a) student(ka): **Daniel Soukop**
Název práce: **American Foreign Policy towards Iran, 2006-2010**

Vedoucí práce (u externích vedoucích uveďte též adresu a funkci v rámci instituce):
Doc. PhDr. Francis D. Raška, PhD.

1. OBSAH A CÍL PRÁCE (stručná informace o práci, formulace cíle): This M.A. dissertation has three aims. The first aim is to analzye the foreign policz motivations of both the United States and Iran. The second aim is to compare the National Security Strategy of 2006 with the practical foreign policy decisions of the Bush and Obama Administrations respectively. Finally, the third aim is to analyze the shortcomings of American policy towards Iran and whether this can be rectified.

2. VĚCNÉ ZPRACOVÁNÍ (náročnost, tvůrčí přístup, argumentace, logická struktura, teoretické a metodologické ukotvení, práce s prameny a literaturou, vhodnost příloh apod.): This topic is an interesting one. It deals with the recent past and it is therefore challenging to find credible sources. The dissertation is intellectually and methodologically sound.

3. FORMÁLNÍ A JAZYKOVÉ ZPRACOVÁNÍ (jazykový projev, správnost citace a odkazů na literaturu, grafická úprava, formální náležitosti práce apod.): Daniel has written his work in English and the quality of his written English is very good. I have no problems with his footnoting, the selection of sources, and the overall presentation of the dissertation.

4. STRUČNÝ KOMENTÁŘ HODNOTITELE (celkový dojem z bakalářské práce, silné a slabé stránky, originalita myšlenek, naplnění cíle apod.):
Daniel's dissertation contains an Introduction, four main chapters, and a Conclusion. In addition, there is an extensive bibliography. Some interesting graphs and charts appear at the end of the treatise and they are helpful, not merely cosmetic.
In the Introduction, Daniel provides the reader with a roadmap of the dissertation and explains his use of qualitative analysis. Both primary and secondary sources are mentioned and the literature is effectively evaluated.
Chapter 1 analyzes United States criticism of Iran. Iran has not been a friend of the United States since the 1979 Iranian Revolution, which resulted in the abolition of the monarchy and the subsequent establishment of the Islamic Republic. He states that the Americans perceive Iran as a threat to the security interests of the United States. These interests are aptly categorized as follows: 1) America seeks stability in the Middle East, whereas Iran seeks to transform the region; 2) Washington fears the Iranian nuclear program; Iran supports numerous extremist groups, which the United States considers to be terrorist; 4) America belongs to critics of Iran's civic and human rights deficit. These aspects are examined in detail.
Chapter 2 presents the Iranian view of the world. An historical overview of Iran (formerly Persia) is provided. The Islamic Republic uses religious authority as a pragmatic way to implement its plans. Iran (a Shiite Moslem country) is a foe of Saudi Arabia, which is home to Sunni Islam. Iran has tensions with its neighbors (Iraq, Afghanistan, and Pakistan). Also, Iran is an enemy of Israel. As Daniel states, Iran wishes to be a regional leader in the area of technology development (especially military technology). Finally, Iran supports various extremist groups that are seen as terrorist by the United States and other Western countries. Daniel makes the important point that, though portrayed as irrational by the United States, the Iranian regime has the rational goal of becoming a regional hegemon again. The rest of the chapter deals with the details of U.S.-Iranian relations under various leaders, both Iranian and American. Basically, what once was a good, trusting relationship has become one based on mistrust.
In Chapter 3, Daniel discusses United States foreign policy between 2006 and 2010. He begins with the 2006 National Security Strategy. Iran is described in this document as a tyranny, an ally of terror, and a threat to the prevention of the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction (WMDs). Then the policies of George W. Bush

and Barack Obama towards Iran are contrasted. Daniel rightly claims that Obama's 2010 National Security Strategy is more linguistically refined and opens the door to negotiations, but the concerns stated and the overall negative view of Iran's activities are similar to those expressed in the 2006 National Security Strategy. In Chapter 4, Daniel offers some analysis of why United States policy towards Iran has failed. Basically, economic sanctions have not worked because the United States is not Iran's main trading partner. Various tough forms of diplomacy also haven't been effective and harsh rhetoric has only served to embolden the Iranian hardliners. There is faint hope of a change, which would come about through a gradual rapprochement along the lines of the American reconciliation with China several decades ago, better containment, Tit for Tat diplomacy, and application of American soft power.

In his Conclusion, Daniel recapitulates his main points, especially possible strategies for improving relations between the United States and Iran.

Overall, this dissertation is superb. I recommend an **excellent** mark and a possible **Dean's commendation**.

5. SPOLUPRÁCE S VEDOUCÍM PRÁCE (komunikace s vedoucím práce, schopnost reflektovat připomínky, posun od původního záměru apod.) Daniel worked hard on his dissertation and consulted various parts of the work with me. His conduct during the consultation process can best be described as **exemplary.**

6. OTÁZKY A PŘIPOMÍNKY DOPORUČENÉ K BLIŽŠÍMU VYSVĚTLENÍ PŘI OBHAJOBĚ (jedna až tři):
1. Do you foresee an Israeli attack on Iran's nuclear facilities? Why or why not?
2. Will the United States be able to afford politically greater dialogue with Iran considering Iran's hostility to Israel?

7. **DOPORUČENÍ** / NEDOPORUČENÍ K OBHAJOBĚ A NAVRHOVANÁ ZNÁMKA
    (**výborně**, velmi dobře, dobře, nevyhověl): I recommend an **excellent** classification.

Datum: 15.6.2013   Podpis:

Pozn.: Hodnocení pište 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.