

**UNIVERZITA KARLOVA V PRAZE**  
**Fakulta sociálních věd**  
**Institut mezinárodních studií**  
**PROTOKOL O HODNOCENÍ DIPLOMOVÉ PRÁCE**  
**(Posudek vedoucího)**

Práci předložil(a) student(ka): Kristýna Hladíková

Název práce: *US-China Cooperation during the Six-Party Talks between 2003 and 2009*

Vedoucí práce (u externích vedoucích uveďte též adresu a funkci v rámci instituce):

Jana Sehnálková

**1. OBSAH A CÍL PRÁCE (stručná informace o práci, formulace cíle):**

Kristýna Hladíková's thesis is a case study of the US-China cooperation with respect to the North Korean nuclear issue. The author analyzes the process of the so-called Six-Party Talks between 2003 and 2009, examines each side's interests and priorities as well as their objectives. While the Talks were often cited as an example of U.S.-China cooperation as well as a proof that China could play a role of a "responsible stakeholder", the talks did not materialize in any major breakthrough over Pyongyang's nuclear program. The author then analyzes the most problematic matters between China and the US, which made a progress difficult. The goal is to identify the biggest obstacles in reaching a consensus and making a progress in the denuclearization process, and thus challenge the general representation of the Six Party Talks as an example of successful US-China cooperation on an international issue.

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

Nuclearization of North Korea has the potential to generate tensions between the US and China and – if successful – may have profound implications not only for the overall U.S.-China bilateral relationship but for the entire region. The issue of North Korea repeatedly appears on the front pages of world newspapers and therefore the choice of this topic is very timely. Deeper understanding of the North Korean issue in Sino-American relations may lead to establishment of realistic expectations in the future discussions over Pyongyang among the Americans and Chinese. However, it is important to consider the uncertainty that is caused by the nature of North Korean regime whose behavior is almost impossible to predict.

In the first chapter, the author introduces the context of the work – mostly the general trends and dynamics in Sino-American relations following the end of the Cold War.

In the second chapter, the author then examines the negotiation over the North Korean nuclear issue prior 2000, which includes the Agreed Framework and the Four Party Talks, and then moves to Three- and Six-Party Talks. In her analysis, she proceeds chronologically through the different rounds of meetings and pays attention to main interests, expectations, and objectives of each of the involved parties. She compares the approach of the Bush administration and the Clinton administration, pointing to more hardline approach of G. W. Bush during the first term. Bush pressured China to enter into negotiations with Pyongyang, aware of the fact that Beijing – through its special relationship with Pyongyang - could bring more leverage vis-à-vis North Korea. According to the author, Bush saw China as a tool to

exert pressure on Pyongyang, pressure that would be in line with U.S. interests, as she writes on p. 23: “The US wanted the Chinese to put forward Washington’s vision of how the crisis should be resolved.” This in author’s opinion represented the major problem of U.S. approach – Washington expected Beijing to be on the same page as Washington. It soon turned out that this was not the case, that Washington’s expectations were unrealistic. Special attention is then paid to the outcomes of the Talks, such as the 2005 Joint Statement, 2007 Agreement, which were made possible by changes in Bush administration personnel as well as in China’s behavior. The author analyzes these agreements and points their shortcomings. The author then concludes that while the Talks were important in bringing China and the United States together on a mutually important issues, misreading each other’s position and different priorities vis-a-vis North Korea prevented the Talks from achieving a substantial progress as evidenced by her analysis of the 2005 Joint Statement and 2007 Agreement, which were both rather ambiguous. According to the author, „America failed to recognize from Beijing’s behavior that maintenance of regional stability triumphed Chinese priorities.“ (p. 48)

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

The author selected works by prominent U.S. scholars (Denny Roy, Bonnie Glaser, Robert Sutter) as well as plethora of primary source material. There are no major issues with language or footnotes.

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

Kristýna Hladíková brings an interesting analysis with an in-depth insight into the negotiations over North Korea and contributes to a greater understanding of this complex issue. I believe that her analysis and conclusion bring correct assessment of the goals and motivations of both China and the United States, as she concludes that while the Talks were an achievement in bringing the US and China together, which per se may work as a CBM, they, from the perspective of the U.S. failed to achieve the primary goal of the talks, i.e. the complete denuclearization of the Korean Peninsula and settlement of the North’s nuclear issue. On p. 20, the author argues that „the U.S. eventually realized that China’s interests and motives diverge much from those of the US, hence the future of the talk seems bleak.“ The author also correctly describes China’s precarious position: while it wanted to improve and preserve its international prestige, it had to carefully balance between the United States and North Korea, its ally. None of the possible scenarios were favorable to China: nuclearization of North Korea would most likely lead to increased military spending in the region and likely pursuit of nuclear weapons by Japan, South Korea – a development that would harm current balance of power, unfavorably for China. Bush’s idea of regime change or military solution to the North Korean issue (considered during the first term) would also harm China, as it would increase the influence of the United States on the peninsula, to the detriment of China that is bound to protect North Korea and fears chaos at its borders. Hence, China had to tread carefully and therefore favored incremental steps to keep the Talks going to keep the U.S. satisfied but at the same time resisting any major moves against North Korea. The author also points out the distrust towards North Korea in Washington, which influenced its unwillingness to compromise on proposals coming from Beijing. The perception of the Talks in Washington only changed with the departure from Bush doctrine (which the author does not mention) and with the realization that the U.S. was

overstretched due to conflicts in Iraq and Afghanistan, as the author points out at p. 49. The author concludes that “the Americans misjudged Beijing’s priorities within the Six-Party Talks and considerably overestimated China’s intentions.” (p. 60)

In assessment, I would point out that the author does not explicitly pronounce her research question. On p. 5, we can find its general formulation in one short sentence: “The thesis proposes that the US-China partnership during the Talks was not very effective.” Also, the author does not explicitly mention the methodology as well as theoretical framework for her work, although from the text, we can deduce that the author may most likely be using rational actor model or realist framework. I would also recommend dividing the second chapter in more chapters – it would make the text easier to read.. Otherwise, the thesis is well researched and the author refers to many of the key works by prominent experts on the topic.

I would also point out a few inaccuracies and omissions: on p. 4., the author writes that China “strongly opposed American dominant power in the northeast Asian region and was ready to resolutely challenge it. It was reflected particularly in provocative military exercises and the subsequent 1995 Taiwan Strait Crisis.” In fact, these 1995-1996 exercises were more targeted at Taiwan, which was readying for its first free direct presidential elections. In the first chapter, where the author introduces the general context and evolution of Sino-American relationship, I would appreciate a short mention of the US-China rapprochement in the 1970s.

5. SPOLUPRÁCE S VEDOUCÍM PRÁCE (komunikace s vedoucím práce, schopnost reflektovat připomínky, posun od původního záměru apod.)

The author consulted her work regularly and continuously perfected the text.

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

- On p. 32, you claim that Beijing pushed for an outcome of the Talks, because “failure would harm its international prestige”. However, on p. 34, you claim that Beijing remained reluctant. To me, this sounds rather contradictory. Can you explain?

- You observe correctly that the new Bush administration after the 2004 elections triggered an internal review and brought significant changes in foreign policy making. Is it possible that China’s decision to get more involved in the talks was triggered by a similar internal change too?

- Why did the 2007 Agreement omit the HEU?

- Could you elaborate in more detail on the theoretical framework of your analysis?

7. DOPORUČENÍ / NEDOPORUČENÍ K OBHAJOBĚ A NAVRHOVANÁ ZNÁMKA  
(výborně, velmi dobře, dobře, nevyhověl):

The thesis fulfills requirements for Master’s theses and is recommended for defense. I propose grade excellent to very good, depending on the defense.

Datum:

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.