

UNIVERZITA KARLOVA V PRAZE
Fakulta sociálních věd
Institut mezinárodních studií

PROTOKOL O HODNOCENÍ BAKALÁŘSKÉ PRÁCE
(Posudek vedoucího)

Práci předložil(a) student(ka): **Petr Goliáš**

Název práce: **Předpoklady pro úspěch organizovaného zločinu v Chicagu během prohibice**

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 work aims to analyze how the historical, geographical, demographic, economic, and political evolution of Chicago made the success of organized crime in that city possible.
2. **VĚCNÉ ZPRACOVÁNÍ** (náročnost, tvůrčí přístup, argumentace, logická struktura, teoretické a metodologické ukotvení, práce s prameny a literaturou, vhodnost příloh apod.):
The topic is an important one. The author's arguments are coherent and logical.
3. **FORMÁLNÍ A JAZYKOVÉ ZPRACOVÁNÍ** (jazykový projev, správnost citace a odkazů na literaturu, grafická úprava, formální náležitosti práce apod.):
This work meets all the formal qualifications for a defensible B.A. dissertation. The only problem I have is that the individual chapters are not numbered, but this is a quibble.
4. **STRUČNÝ KOMENTÁŘ HODNOTITELE** (celkový dojem z bakalářské práce, silné a slabé stránky, originalita myšlenek, naplnění cíle apod.):
Petr Goliáš has written his B.A. dissertation on the numerous factors, which led to the success of organized crime in the city of Chicago. The subject matter is interesting and I must say that Petr did consult with me. I just wonder whether this is not a matter more fit for sociology than for international studies. The treatise contains an Introduction, five (unnumbered) chapters, and a Conclusion. In the ensuing paragraphs, I shall comment upon each individual part of the work. In the Introduction, Petr explains the topic, provides a chapter overview, and a brief evaluation of the literature consulted. I must say that the Introduction is quite short, but nevertheless is satisfactory.
Chapter 1 depicts the historical evolution of crime in Chicago prior to Prohibition. Organized crime in Chicago dates back to the early 1850s when Roger Plant managed, albeit on a small scale, to dominate extortion, gambling, and prostitution in the city. Michael Cassius McDonald succeeded Plant and can be seen as the true originator of organized crime. Thanks to McDonald's close affiliation with the Democratic Party and domination of local politics. Jim Colosimo became the second and last organized crime leader in Chicago before prohibition.
In Chapter 2, Petr analyzes geographical factors. From 1889, Chicago became the second largest American city. It also became the main commercial center West of New York City.
In Chapter 3, Petr examines the demographic evolution of Chicago and how this factor contributed to an increase in organized crime. The many ethnicities living in Chicago were susceptible to all sorts of vices.
Petr delves into economics in Chapter 4. Between 1850 and 1920, Chicago was transformed from a regional agricultural city to the second largest city in the United States. Railroads, steep economic growth, and poorly controlled urban development made the city of Chicago ever busier and this, coupled with the other factors, certainly brought more people and more crime.
In Chapter 5, Petr discusses the political side of the issue. Chicago politics have always been profoundly corrupt. Officials could award lucrative contracts to friends and cronies without fear of conviction. The biggest player on the political scene was the Democratic Party.
The Conclusion summarizes Petr's main points and tells why each of the factors paved the way for organized crime during Prohibition. Criminals could exploit all factors and pursue a life of crime.

Overall, I feel that this is an acceptable, but far from outstanding B.A. dissertation. The issue that I have is that there are a number of careless spelling errors and some chapters seem to have been written rather hastily. I recommend a classification of VERY GOOD provided that Petr performs well in the oral defense.

5. OTÁZKY A PŘIPOMÍNKY DOPORUČENÉ K BLIŽŠÍMU VYSVĚTLENÍ PŘI OBHAJOBĚ (jedna až tři):
Can any parallels internationally be found today to the status of Chicago during Prohibition? Explain.

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

Datum: **Praha, 3.6.2016**

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.