

UNIVERZITA KARLOVA V PRAZE
Fakulta sociálních věd
Institut mezinárodních studií

PROTOKOL O HODNOCENÍ BAKALÁŘSKÉ PRÁCE
(Posudek oponenta)

Práci předložil(a) student(ka): **Petra Houšková**

Název práce: **Porovnání zásahu americké zahraniční politiky do režimu v Nikaragui v 80. letech a po znovuzvolení Daniela Ortegy**

Oponoval (u externích oponentů 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 study compares the American approach to Daniel Ortega's Sandinista regime during the last decade of the Cold War with the policy adopted following Ortega's reelection in 2006.**
2. **VĚCNÉ ZPRACOVÁNÍ** (náročnost, tvůrčí přístup, argumentace, logická struktura, teoretické a metodologické ukotvení, práce s prameny a literaturou, vhodnost příloh apod.): **Insofar as the formalities are concerned, there is a mistake on the thesis page concerning the year Daniel Ortega and the Sandinistas came to power in Nicaragua. The Sandinistas achieved power in 1979, not 1985. In the body of the dissertation, there are also a number of factual errors, which detract from the quality of the work.**
3. **FORMÁLNÍ A JAZYKOVÉ ZPRACOVÁNÍ** (jazykový projev, správnost citace a odkazů na literaturu, grafická úprava, formální náležitosti práce apod.): **The grammar and usage appear to be correct and I have no problem with either the referencing or the presentation.**
4. **STRUČNÝ KOMENTÁŘ HODNOTITELE** (celkový dojem z bakalářské práce, silné a slabé stránky, originalita myšlenek, naplnění cíle apod.):
Petra Houšková has focused her B.A. dissertation on the American approaches towards Daniel Ortega's regime in Nicaragua both during the 1980s and following Ortega's reelection in 2006. The study is therefore comparative in scope. Structurally, the work is divided into an Introduction, three main chapters, and a Conclusion. The referencing appears to be consistent and correct. In the ensuing paragraphs, I will offer my comments on each individual section.
The Introduction places the issue of Nicaragua and Central America into historical context. Petra makes the point that the Americans have never been indifferent to Daniel Ortega's rule and have continued to interfere in the affairs of Nicaragua, but using different methods. A brief overview of the literature is provided and, in the methodology section, Petra spells out the content of the main chapters. I believe that the Introduction fulfills its purpose.
Chapter 1 addresses United States policy vis-à-vis Nicaragua in the 1980s. In the first paragraph, Petra describes the role of the United States in the previous Somoza regime. I must point out one minor mistake. The Somoza regime came to power in 1934, not 1939. Therefore, it lasted 45 years. Also, the Sandinistas ousted Somoza militarily in July 1979. In fact, he and his family fled the country and Somoza was assassinated in exile the following year. It is true that Jimmy Carter's advocacy of human rights as a major foreign policy priority resulted in the American withdrawal of support for Somoza's regime and that this facilitated the Sandinista assumption of power. Petra's account of the radical change in policy by the Reagan Administration is accurate and she portrays the rise of the so-called Contras, covert means used to train them, and the ensuing Iran-Contra Affair. Also, Petra discusses the Central American Peace Agreement, which called for de-escalation of conflicts, including the Nicaraguan one. She then discusses in detail the case brought by Nicaragua against the United States in the International Court of Justice following the CIA mining of Nicaraguan harbors. The ruling was in Nicaragua's favor, but the Reagan Administration decided to ignore the verdict by claiming that the ICJ did not possess jurisdiction in the case. Petra's description of events later on is accurate. However, a serious error on page 13 states that Bill Clinton succeeded Reagan. We know that George H.W. Bush

won the 1988 election and Violeta Chamorro defeated Ortega in 1990 whilst Bush was still in office. Clinton later defeated Bush in 1992. I am quite unhappy with this chapter because serious factual errors exist and not enough specific detail concerning the American interventionist policy in Nicaragua is provided.

In Chapter 2, Petra discusses American policy towards Nicaragua in the 21st century. From the outset, she emphasizes that United States officials warned that a Sandinista victory would not go unnoticed and would entail consequences. She describes the evolution of internal events in Nicaragua. Basically, Ortega and notoriously corrupt President Arnaldo Alemán reached an agreement that changed the electoral system to the effect that a second round of elections could be avoided if the party in first place would receive 35 percent of the vote and be more than 5 percentage points ahead of the party achieving the second largest number of votes. This allowed Ortega to return to power and consolidate his grip. Petra then goes on to discuss how American policy towards Nicaragua changed during subsequent administrations. The latest is the Nicaraguan Investment Conditionality Act (NICA) and Donald Trump's freezing of the assets (under American jurisdiction) of a top Nicaraguan official. I think that this chapter is somewhat better than the first one, but I feel that it lacks a clear direction.

Petra in Chapter 3 provides a comparison between American methods of intervention in Nicaragua. In the 1980s, military tactics dominated, whereas in the 21st century diplomacy and economic policy are the main American tools of intervention.

The Conclusion basically restates the content of the individual chapters and confirms that the American methods of intervention have changed.

I am disappointed with this dissertation, which would have greater potential had Petra spent more time checking facts and planning the organization. Instead, a chaotic work has been presented. I am willing to offer a mark between very good (D) and passing (E).

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

1. Considering very recent events in Nicaragua and Venezuela, can U.S. policy towards Latin America be considered successful? Why or why not?

6. DOPORUČENÍ / NEDOPORUČENÍ K OBHAJOBĚ A NAVRHOVANÁ ZNÁMKA
(výborně, velmi dobře, dobře, nevyhověl): **D** či **E**

Datum: **3 June 2018**

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.