

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

Práci předložil(a) student(ka): **Iva Štverková**

Název práce: The Role of the US in NATO: How Did It Change After 9/11 under Bush Administration

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):

Iva Štverková establishes several goals of her thesis. First, she aims to „to discover the reasons which led the Bush administration to bypass the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and instead to prefer a ‘coalition of willing’“ in carrying out the military operations in Afghanistan and Iraq. Further, the author also examines whether the decision to “go it alone” was reflecting public opinion or whether it was a decision made within the Bush’s White House. In addition, the author examines whether Europe is still considered an important ally for the United States in the 21st century. The author also looks at foreign policy making in the U.S. government.

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

In the first chapter, the author provides a comprehensive overview of international relations theories and their approach towards international organizations. The logic behind this analysis is to provide an understanding of “the motivation behind entering and participating in an international institution, and specifically in an international security organization“ (p. 7). The author critically evaluates each of the theory’s trust in international institutions to influence or change state’s behavior. The goal of the analysis should be a better understanding of the U.S. position toward NATO. The overview of different theories, while interesting, is however only partially linked to the major goal of the thesis, i.e. the explanation of U.S. approach to NATO.

The author also includes a general description of the U.S. foreign policy decision making process. While well-written, this subchapter is too general and it is not clear how it is linked to the topic of the paper. It could have easily been omitted.

In the following chapter, the author discusses the impact of the end of the Cold War on the vision for the future of NATO. “There was not only a discussion about the future of NATO but also about the direction of the U.S. foreign policy,” the author points out on p. 17. She then focuses on the foreign policy making of the G. W. Bush’s administration: examines his key goals before and after 9-11, looks in detail into the internal operation of the Bush’s closest circle of advisors and pinpoints some of the key problems that complicated Bush’s foreign policy making. The author also describes Bush White House’s cooperation with Congress.

In the second chapter, the author looks at the specifics of George W. Bush’s national security policy making and his attitudes to international institutions. On p. 22, she writes that “Bush adopted neo-realist approach to international relations... and realism and its offshoots do not consider international institutions to be significant.” What follows is an analysis of U.S. attitudes towards NATO in the post-Cold War era. The author tries to summarize the discussion about the possible roles and goals of the Alliance as well as those opinions which called for dissolution of the Alliance.

In the last, third chapter, the author analyzes NATO's reactions to the events of 9/11, including the first-ever activation of Article V, and the reasons why President Bush and his team decided not to use the offered assistance. Further, the author analyzes the basic principles of the so-called Bush doctrine, which was enunciated in the 2002 National Security Strategy, and the reasoning behind the military operation in Iraq. The author is critical towards Bush (p. 42): "The foreign policy strategy of Bush administration undermined the U.S. efforts on international scene in the last five decades when the U.S. representatives had been attempting to gain international legitimacy through placing constraints on its own power and thus creating favorable international environment prone to cooperation and peaceful settlement of conflicts." In here, I would have appreciated a bit more detailed analysis of the discussion among European NATO members with respect to U.S. decision to start military operations in Iraq – the author mentions the disagreements only partially. It would be beneficial to look in detail at the attitudes of key NATO members, such as Germany or France. In the following subchapter, the author argues that "as Washington decided for military operations in Iraq, Bush began to recognize the value of NATO and it begun to see its possible role in Afghanistan" (p. 43), which eventually led to more inclusive U.S. foreign policy and attempts by Bush to mend relations with NATO/European allies.

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

The text is well-written - there are only a few typos, missing words, and occasional stylistic issues. I personally would not refer to a Republican-controlled Congress as "one-party rule" (p. 19). War Powers Resolution was passed in 1973, not in 1974 as the author claims on p. 13.

Some paragraphs could have been split into two, as they address several different topics – this is more evident in the last chapter where the author considers possible partners for the U.S. outside of Europe. Personally, I would also rearrange some of the chapters so that the structure of the text is more logical – e.g. the chapter dedicated to overview of the U.S. attitudes to international organizations or to the debate on the U.S. approach to NATO in the period following the end of the Cold War could have been placed before the chapters dedicated to Bush's approach.

The author is to be commended for a good theoretical overview of international relations' theories as well as their treatment of international organizations. However, this overview could have been better linked to the rest of her text.

As far as sources are concerned, I would expect a master's thesis student to divide sources into primary and secondary groups. At the same time, I would expect a much larger body of literature – the author refers to only five books that deal with the topic of NATO.

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

Iva Štverková's thesis provides an interesting, yet relatively well-known analysis of Bush Administration's approach towards NATO. I believe that some of the subchapters are not very relevant for the studied topic – e.g. the subchapter that looks at the general level of decision-making in U.S. politics. Similarly, while the analysis of the Bush Doctrine is interesting, it is not very much connected to the debate about NATO and its attitudes towards the military engagement in Iraq. In here, I would have appreciated more discussion on the intra-NATO debates about the merit of military operation in Iraq. Generally, rearranging/omitting some of the subchapters would have made the text more coherent. Personally, I would have also changed the title of the thesis since it is rather misleading – the author does not really look at

the U.S. role in the NATO, she rather looks at the changes in U.S. foreign policy following 9/11 and areas of cooperation (and refusal to cooperate) between the U.S. and NATO during military operations in Afghanistan and Iraq. In the final chapter of the thesis, the author makes an observation that Europe is a natural ally for the United States – however, it is not clear how this is related to NATO since NATO involves non-European members and some European countries are not members of NATO.

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

- Why did Bush opt for neo-realist approach to international relations?
- Would you consider the U.S. role in NATO normalized at the end of Bush administration?
- What was the role of the U.S. in NATO during the Bush era – e.g. with respect to budget, strategic planning, jointness and force integration etc.

6. DOPORUČENÍ / NEDOPORUČENÍ K OBHAJOBĚ A NAVRHOVANÁ ZNÁMKA

(výborně, velmi dobře, dobře, nevyhověl):

Iva Štverková's thesis fulfills requirements for a master's thesis. I propose the final grade **very good (2)**.

Datum: 18. června 2017

Podpis: Jana Sehnálková

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.