

UNIVERZITA KARLOVA V PRAZE
Fakulta sociálních věd
Institut mezinárodních studií

PROTOKOL O HODNOCENÍ BAKALÁŘSKÉ PRÁCE
(Posudek vedoucího)

Práci předložil(a) student(ka): **Jakub Terš**

Název práce: **Politika resetu v americko-ruských vztazích v letech 2009-2013**

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

Doc. PhDr. Francis D. Raška, PhD.

1. **OBSAH A CÍL PRÁCE:** The aim of the work is to analyze US-Russian relations between 2009 and 2013.
2. **VĚCNÉ ZPRACOVÁNÍ** (náročnost, tvůrčí přístup, argumentace, logická struktura, teoretické a metodologické ukotvení, práce s prameny a literaturou, vhodnost příloh apod.): In my opinion, the work is well organized and the argumentation is both sound and valid. I have no problem with the referencing and the bibliography is fine too.
3. **FORMÁLNÍ A JAZYKOVÉ ZPRACOVÁNÍ** (jazykový projev, správnost citace a odkazů na literaturu, grafická úprava, formální náležitosti práce apod.): There are no problems with language, grammar, etc.
4. **STRUČNÝ KOMENTÁŘ HODNOTITELE** (celkový dojem z bakalářské práce, silné a slabé stránky, originalita myšlenek, naplnění cíle apod.):
Jakub Terš has selected the issue of U.S.-Russian relations between 2009 and 2013 as the topic of his B.A. dissertation. The topic is relevant and deserves to be analyzed. Jakub consulted the thesis with me and he followed my advice. As it stands, the work is divided into an Introduction, three main chapters, and a Conclusion. The treatise is properly referenced and Jakub's points are well argued. In the ensuing paragraphs, I will comment upon each section of the dissertation.

In the Introduction, Jakub states the aim of the thesis and spells out the two questions he wishes to answer. Can the "reset" policy be considered within the framework of security and strategic culture as cooperation in the conditions of a security dilemma? Was this policy towards Russia beneficial for the United States? The work is meant to be comparative, empirical, and analytical. I think that Jakub's discussion of the literature could be more analytical and he could do a better job outlining the points of the individual chapters. That being said, I am satisfied with the Introduction.

Chapter 1 analyzes the background of the "reset" policy. 2009 marked the beginning of Barack Obama's first term as president of the United States and the Obama Administration coined the term "reset" because there was a feeling in policy circles that the relationship had been damaged by the previous administration of George W. Bush. Jakub explains the history of the Bush years and the reasons for the drifting apart of the United States and Russia during Bush's two terms in the White House.

In Chapter 2, Jakub discusses the theoretical background of both American and Russian foreign policy. Whereas Russian foreign policy is based on realism, the foreign policy of the United States under Obama has tenets of liberalism. Jakub explains both these theories using the relevant literature and he makes a convincing case.

Chapter 3 represents an analysis of the evolving national security strategies of both the United States and Russia, as well as the policies of each power towards different regions in the world. He compares and contrasts American and Russian interests and demonstrates how the perception of these interests has resulted in the formulation of policy by each country. A chronology of the most important events indicates that areas of cooperation were found as were many contentious matters.

In the Conclusion, Jakub recapitulates his main points and states that Obama's "reset" policy had historical

precedents and that the policy was not as effective and successful as the Obama Administration had hoped it would be, but that certain limited cooperation did develop. He also emphasizes that the question of whether the “reset” policy was beneficial for the United States is difficult, if not impossible, to answer. Though some progress was made in mutual relations as a result of the “reset” policy, the declared aims were by no means realized.

I am quite happy with Jakub’s B.A. dissertation. It definitely should be defended and I recommend either an **excellent** or a **very good** classification depending on the quality of Jakub’s performance at the oral defense.

5. OTÁZKY A PŘIPOMÍNKY DOPORUČENÉ K BLIŽŠÍMU VYSVĚTLENÍ PŘI OBHAJOBĚ (jedna až tři):
How have mutual perceptions changed with regard to foreign policy since 2013?

6. DOPORUČENÍ / NEDOPORUČENÍ K OBHAJOBĚ A NAVRHOVANÁ ZNÁMKA
(výborně, velmi dobře, dobře, nevyhověl): **VÝBORNĚ až VELMI DOBŘE**

Datum: V Praze dne 30. srpna 2016

Podpis:

Pozn.: Hodnocení píše 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.