

UNIVERZITA KARLOVA V PRAZE
Fakulta sociálních věd
Institut mezinárodních studií

PROTOKOL O HODNOCENÍ BAKALÁŘSKÉ PRÁCE
(Posudek oponenta)

Práci předložil(a) student(ka): **Martin Š. Romočuský**

Název práce: **Edvard Beneš a Wenzel Jaksch. Důvody nevydařené spolupráce**

Oponoval (u externích oponentů 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): **The aim of this work is to analyze the relationship between Edvard Beneš (Czechoslovak president) and Wenzel Jaksch (leader of the exiled Sudeten German Social Democratic Party) in London during World War II and why the two men failed to reach agreement on the post-war future of the Sudeten Germans.**

2. VĚCNÉ ZPRACOVÁNÍ (náročnost, tvůrčí přístup, argumentace, logická struktura, teoretické a metodologické ukotvení, práce s prameny a literaturou, vhodnost příloh apod.): **The B.A. dissertation is written well and contains sound and valid argumentation based on excellent sources.**

3. FORMÁLNÍ A JAZYKOVÉ ZPRACOVÁNÍ (jazykový projev, správnost citace a odkazů na literaturu, grafická úprava, formální náležitosti práce apod.): **I am impressed by the accurate referencing and bibliography. There do not seem to be any problems with the formal presentation.**

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

Overall, this B.A. dissertation is an excellent one. It consists of an Introduction, four main chapters, and a Conclusion. The author (Mr. Romočuský) makes it clear to the reader early on what he wishes to convey and there is no unnecessary beating around the bush. As stated above, the referencing is fine and the consulted literature is appropriate.

In the Introduction, Mr. Romočuský informs the reader of what he wishes to accomplish in the body of the dissertation. Additionally, he provides a very good critique of the literature dealing with the subject.

Chapter 1 discusses the flight into exile of President Beneš in 1938 and the beginnings of organized Czechoslovak exile activities. Likewise, the beginnings of the Sudeten German anti-fascist exile are traced to the occupation of the rest of Bohemia and Moravia by the Germans in March 1939. This part of the treatise accurately portrays events up until the summer months of 1939.

Chapter 2 represents both a depiction and an analysis of the early dealings between Beneš and Jaksch. The motives and limitations of both men are scrutinized and it is emphasized that the situation was heavily dependent on external circumstances, especially the course of the war.

In Chapter 3, Mr. Romočuský discusses the strengthening of Beneš's position after the fall of France in 1940 and the ensuing provisional British recognition of the Czechoslovak Government. The growing anti-German mood in Britain and among oppressed Czechs at home also worked to Beneš's advantage. After Hitler's assault on the Soviet Union (22 June 1941), full international recognition was granted to the Czechoslovak Exile Government.

Chapter 4 details the impact of the Heydrich assassination and associated German reprisals on the negotiations between Beneš and Jaksch in 1942. That same year, the British renounced the Munich Agreement and agreed in principle with the transfer of German minorities out of East-Central Europe. Though negotiations between Beneš and Jaksch continued, Beneš had no great need to reach any agreement with Jaksch as Munich had been renounced and the principle of transfer of minorities approved. Indeed, the negotiations failed and no understanding between Beneš and Jaksch was ever arrived at.

In the Conclusion, Mr. Romočuský correctly states that, from the outset, Beneš and Jaksch had different ideas concerning the future. Jaksch worked on the premise that the Munich Agreement was

valid and harbored ideas about an anti-Hitler revolution in Germany and a German-dominated Mitteleuropa. Beneš, on the other hand, wished to undo the Munich Agreement, restore Czechoslovakia (principle of juridical continuity), and reduce the number of Germans in Czechoslovakia. At first, Beneš was even willing to consider territorial concessions to achieve a reduction in the German population. However, wartime events (which exacerbated anti-German sentiment) and objections from the Czech domestic resistance made any concessions on Beneš's part unnecessary. After Beneš achieved the renunciation of the Munich Agreement and recognition of the principle of transfer of population, he had no need to reach agreement with Jaksch.

This dissertation satisfies requirements. I recommend an EXCELLENT classification.

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

Did the split within the Sudeten German Social Democratic exile, which occurred in October 1940 have much significance in the overall outcome of the Beneš-Jaksch negotiations? Please explain.

Are the Beneš-Jaksch negotiations a good example of wartime diplomacy? Why or why not?

6. DOPORUČENÍ / NEDOPORUČENÍ K OBHAJOBĚ A NAVRHOVANÁ ZNÁMKA

(**výborně**, velmi dobře, dobře, nevyhověl): **I recommend an excellent mark.**

Datum: 14 January 2014

Podpis:

Pozn.: Hodnocení pište 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.