

UNIVERZITA KARLOVA V PRAZE
Fakulta sociálních věd
Institut mezinárodních studií

PROTOKOL O HODNOCENÍ BAKALÁŘSKÉ PRÁCE
(Posudek oponenta)

Práci předložil(a) student(ka): **Julie Chmelíková**

Název práce: **Politická orientace a kontinuita zahraniční politiky v Brazílii: Srovnání zahraniční politiky Fernanda Henrique Cardosa a Luly da Silvy ve vztahu k USA**

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 B.A. dissertation is to determine whether the election of Lula da Silva influenced the continuity of Brazilian foreign policy towards the United States.
2. VĚCNÉ ZPRACOVÁNÍ (náročnost, tvůrčí přístup, argumentace, logická struktura, teoretické a metodologické ukotvení, práce s prameny a literaturou, vhodnost příloh apod.): I have no problem with the topic, which is demanding. The work demonstrates evidence of research and the argumentation is sound and valid.
3. FORMÁLNÍ A JAZYKOVÉ ZPRACOVÁNÍ (jazykový projev, správnost citace a odkazů na literaturu, grafická úprava, formální náležitosti práce apod.): I have found no major problems with presentation or citation of sources.

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

Julie Chmelíková has devoted her B.A. dissertation to the issue of Brazilian foreign policy towards the United States. More specifically, she poses the question of whether the election of Lula da Silva as president had an impact on the continuity of Brazil-United States relations. The work contains an Introduction, four main chapters, and a Conclusion. A number of tables are present in the text as well. In the next paragraphs, I shall comment upon individual section of the dissertation.

In the Introduction, Julie states her research aim (stated above) and she clearly outlines the overall structure of the dissertation. As she writes, the study is a comparative one. She provides a brief overview of the available literature as well. I think that the Introduction is informative and of appropriate length.

Chapter 1 discusses in detail the notion of autonomy. The term is defined and expanded upon in the Brazilian context. Three types of autonomy are mentioned, namely autonomy through distance, autonomy through participation, and autonomy through diversification. President Cardoso favored autonomy through participation, whereas President Lula da Silva preferred autonomy through diversification. Julia makes it clear that autonomy in the Brazilian context cannot be applied to other Latin American countries. This chapter is fine.

Julie analyzes the Brazilian political system in Chapter 2. The system tends more towards the presidential when it comes to foreign policy. When Lula da Silva won the presidency in 2002, he continued in his predecessor's (Cardoso's) style of presidential diplomacy. The chapter is good in that it shows the change from protocol to presidential diplomacy and how this gave more power to the president, power that had previously been reserved for the foreign ministry.

Chapter 3 deals with Brazilian relations with the United States. Under Lula da Silva efforts were made to strengthen international norms through participation in international organizations and diversifying Brazil's interests. Autonomy through participation gave way to autonomy through diversification. Individual sections deal with the United Nations, presidential visits to other countries, the support of democracy in South America, and security issues. Also, the timing of Lula da Silva's presidency (the George W. Bush years) played a role. This chapter is quite comparative, which adds greatly to its quality.

In Chapter 4, Julie discusses economic cooperation between Brazil and the United States. Under Lula da Silva, China became Brazil's most important trading partner. Brazil also helped to form groups like BRIC, which symbolized a new openness to non-traditional trading partners.

In the Conclusion, Julie states that Lula da Silva's presidency represented discontinuity in the economic sphere, but continuity in the political relationship between Brazil and the United States. No great leftist revolution in Brazil transpired and its prosperity was aided, not hindered by the multilateral approach.

This work is nicely written and the structure is very good. I recommend an **excellent mark**.

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

1. How do you see Brazil's role in the world today?

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

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

Datum: 5.6.2015

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.