

POSUDEK BAKALÁŘSKÉ DIPLOMOVÉ PRÁCE

Po vyplnění posudek vytiskněte, vyberte navrhovanou známku, podepište a odevzdejte na sekretariát IPS!

AUTOR/KA PRÁCE:

Příjmení: **Janoušková**

Jméno: **Johana**

NÁZEV PRÁCE: **Executive Privilege v politickém systému USA**

AUTOR/KA POSUDKU:

Příjmení: **Labendz**

Jméno: **Jacob Ari**

Pracoviště: IPS FSV UK

TYP POSUDKU: Vyberte typ posudku

1. VZTAH SCHVÁLENÝCH TEZÍ A VÝSLEDNÉ PRÁCE^{*)}

		Odpovídá schváleným tezím	Odchyluje se od tezí, ale odchylení je vhodné a v práci zdůvodněné	Odchyluje se od tezí a odchylení není vhodné a v práci zdůvodněné	Neodpovídá schváleným tezím
1.1.	Cíl práce	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
1.2.	Metoda práce	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
1.3.	Struktura práce	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

^{*)} Označte vybrané hodnocení.

KOMENTÁŘ (v případě hodnocení ve sloupcích 3 a 4 musí autor posudku slovně formulovat hlavní výtky pro jednotlivé podbody; max. 1000 znaků).

Ms. Janoušková adapted her chapter structure intelligently. Her originally proposed fifth chapter encompassed what one would normally find in a conclusion. It made sense for her to use it as such in the final project. No additional conclusion was necessary from a formal perspective. The project accomplished all of its intended goals and also moved beyond them thoughtfully. It testifies to significant preparation and a continued strong focus in execution.

2. HODNOCENÍ FORMÁLNÍCH KRITÉRIÍ TEXTU

		Hodnocení známkou ^{*)}
3.1	Logičnost struktury práce	1.5
3.2	Vnitřní provázanost výkladu	1.5
3.3	Ucelenost výkladu	1
3.4	Úroveň poznámkového aparátu a odkazů	1
3.5	Dodržení citační normy	1
3.6	Jazyková a stylistická úroveň práce (pokud je opakovaně porušována platná kodifikace pravopisné normy, hodnotte stupněm 4!)	1
3.7	Oprávněnost a vhodnost příloh	1

3.8	Celková úprava textu (přehlednost textu, vyváženost struktury práce, logická provázanost, grafická podoba textu)	1.5
-----	--	-----

^{*)} Vyplňujte číslicí na škále 1 – 2 – 3 – 4 (výborné – velmi dobré – dobré – nedostatečné)

KOMENTÁŘ (v případě hodnocení 3 a 4 musí autor posudku slovně formulovat hlavní výtky pro jednotlivé podoby; max. 2000 znaků).

The project was well structured and technically executed. (To be fair, I am unfamiliar with Czech citation norms but it looked sufficiently robust and consistent to be considered positively.) Ms. Janoušková could have done without her description of how different administrations functioned internally (p. 8-9), as it did not have much relevance to the rest of her discussion. This paper would also have been stronger—despite being quite good—had Ms. Janoušková indicated from the beginning that her research had led her to ask new questions about the relationship between contemporary party politics and the theory and practice of executive privilege. Only in a few instances did I feel that Ms. Janoušková could have spent more time explaining the very complicated concepts that she has mastered, such as the differences between various conceptions of the American Presidency ("stewardship," "Unitary," and "Imperial").

3. HODNOCENÍ ODBORNÉHO CHARAKTERU PRÁCE

		Hodnocení známkou ^{*)}
2.1	Relativní úplnost zpracované literatury ke zvolenému tématu	1
2.2	Pochopení zpracované literatury a informačních zdrojů k tématu	1
2.3	Schopnost aplikovat metodologické postupy vhodné pro zvolené téma	1
2.4	Argumentace a úplnost výkladu	1.5

^{*)} Vyplňujte číslicí na škále 1 – 2 – 3 – 4 (výborné – velmi dobré – dobré – nedostatečné)

KOMENTÁŘ (v případě hodnocení 3 a 4 musí autor posudku slovně formulovat hlavní výtky pro jednotlivé podbody; max. 1000 znaků).

Ms. Janoušková utilizes a complex set of literature, which she understands, applies, and explains well.

She focuses on executive privilege in cases not related to security. She should have indicated the stakes are of leaving that out of the question, especially as this paper has to do with the limits Presidential power.

The case studies show that limits exist on the use of executive privilege. Ms. Janoušková demonstrates how imbedded such things are in party politics. This raises the question of whether or not power is to be sought in the very areas that she researches. Ms. Janoušková's ultimate conclusion would have been stronger had she taken this into account and raised further questions (41). To her credit, she does indicate a shift in politics, from concern with executive privilege towards a more reactionary politics of preventing leaks, paired with more disclosures of info—both tied to the digital age.

Obama's 1st term began in 09 (39).

USA has Attorney Generals, not Min. of Justice.

4. SHRNUJÍCÍ KOMENTÁŘ HODNOTITELÉ (celkový dojem z výsledné práce, její silné a slabé stránky, původnost tématu a myšlenek apod.; max. 1500 znaků)

I was extremely pleased with this paper from which I learned a lot. Aside from the very minor structural flaws indicated above and one typographical error, the paper was well conceived and well executed. Ms. Janoušková clearly delimited her area of research and chose an appropriate scope (i.e., avoided issues of national security). With two case studies, she pointed to the complexity of the question she sought to answer and showed change over time in American politics. Importantly, Ms. Janoušková also demonstrated the impossibility of thinking about executive privilege (and its checks and balances) in isolation from both party politics and larger theories of the nature of the Presidency. For this to have been a perfect paper, Ms. Janoušková would have reflected more about how these things might make her rethink her original question. This would not at all have meant writing a different paper, but pointing towards possible research in the future. To that end, some attention could have been paid to the actual costs to Presidents G.W. Bush and Obama for invoking, preserving, or failing to preserve executive privilege. (See my question about the role of the US Attorney General below.) Though it is not pertinent here, I would be interested to hear how Ms. Janoušková thinks the digital age will change the politics around executive privilege. She notes Obama's shift in focus to stopping leaks and also releasing more information. How might such technical changes transform the terms of our political debates and their meanings?

5. OTÁZKY, K NIMŽ SE PŘI OBHAJOBĚ DIPLOMANT MUSÍ VYJÁDŘIT

5.1	To what extent may we consider the theory and practice of executive privilege outside of the context of contemporary party politics? What does this mean for how we think about "checks and balances" in the USA? (Consider, perhaps, why Attorney Generals suffer repercussions instead of Presidents.)
5.2	You characterize George W. Bush as post-imperial but also note that he successfully defended a unitary executive, thus preserving his powers of secrecy. Are these two points not in tension (when national security is not discussed)?
5.3	The decision not to consider executive privilege in the context of national security helped you to set up a manageable and well executed project. How might your conclusion have been different had you considered cases of national security as well?

6. NAVRHOVANÁ ZNÁMKA

vyberte známku ze seznamu:

výborně

Komentář k hodnocení, je-li navrhovaná známka nejednoznačná:

ZDŮVODNĚNÍ V PŘÍPADĚ NEDOPORUČENÍ (max. 700 znaků):

Komentář ke zdůvodnění v případě nedoporučení:

Datum: 30.05.16

Podpis: _____