

UNIVERZITA KARLOVA V PRAZE
Fakulta sociálních věd
Institut mezinárodních studií

PROTOKOL O HODNOCENÍ BAKALÁŘSKÉ PRÁCE
(Posudek oponenta)

Práci předložil(a) student(ka): **Karolína Kvačková**

Název práce: **Plán Kolumbie v kontextu americké War on Drugs a War on Terror**

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):

The dissertation is devoted to Plan Colombia, which was initiated in 2000. The goal of Plan Colombia was to provide U.S. assistance to Colombia in prosecuting drug traffickers and destroying drug production facilities. Since 9/11, a discussion has ensued as to whether this initiative has not been misused for other purposes, namely the War on Terror.

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

I think that the topic is tackled well. The work has a clear, logical structure and is well referenced. There are also a number of illustrative tables and graphs.

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

The treatise is presented well and I have no problem with either the footnotes or the bibliography.

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

Karolína Kvačková has written her B.A. dissertation on Plan Colombia within the context of the U.S.-led War on Drugs and War on Terror. The study contains an Introduction, five main chapters, and a Conclusion. The overall direction is clear. In the following paragraphs, I shall critique each individual section of the dissertation.

In the Introduction, Karolína explains the relevance of the topic and she gives the reader an idea as to what should be expected in the rest of the dissertation. In addition, Karolína informs of other scholarship and analyzes the most important works. The Introduction is satisfactory, but I would have liked to see it divided into subsections.

Chapter 1 represents an historical overview of United States-Colombian collaboration. In the first section, Karolína examines the precursors to Plan Colombia. She discusses how the murder of Colombian presidential candidate, Luis Carlos Galán, in 1989 changed the outlook of the George H.W. Bush Administration concerning Latin America and drugs. The Andean Regional Initiative took the War on Drugs directly to the source, namely Colombia, Peru, Ecuador, and Bolivia. Despite succeeding in killing Pablo Escobar, the Andean Regional Initiative achieved little, as Karolína points out. This chapter is well written and provides the historical context for the initiation of Plan Colombia.

The political context forms the subject of Chapter 2. Colombian President Andrés Pastrana was the spiritual guru behind Plan Colombia. Pastrana developed a cordial relationship with American President Bill Clinton and they developed a strategy, which was meant to stabilize Colombia. The main American interest was to neutralize Colombia's drug production. President Pastrana, on the other hand, believed that economic and security assistance from the Americans was the key aspect. President George W. Bush likewise developed a cordial relationship with Pastrana's successor, Álvaro Uribe. Due to the events of 9/11, Uribe's tough anti-Communist stance was music to President Bush's ears. Plan Colombia was strengthened with a renewed emphasis on security. The strategy changed from being merely anti-drug to being anti-terrorist in nature.

In Chapter 3, both the Colombian and American aims with regard to Plan Colombia are scrutinized. Plan Colombia included four major components. First, the War on Drugs and fight against organized crime was emphasized. In order to achieve this, the production of drugs needed to be reduced by half, the police needed to be reinforced, security and defense forces required modernization, and regular training of the

police and army needed to occur. The second component involved economic and social revitalization. This required better working conditions, increased compensation for damaged associated with prosecuting the War on Drugs, a free trade zone, and building social networks. The third component involved strengthening democracy and democratic institutions. The fourth (and final) component involved disarming hostile groups, their demobilization, and subsequent reintegration. Karolína correctly states that this interpretation of Plan Colombia bore the markings of a developmental assistance program. As mentioned above, the American goal was largely to reduce the production of drugs in Colombia. The strategy involved securing economic stability, contributing to the reform of the legal system and national security, offering farmers incentives to cultivate crops other than coca, improving schools, healthcare, and social programs, and enhancing democratic development. This chapter is of excellent quality. Chapter 4 delves into the nitty-gritty of financing and implementing Plan Colombia. Here, Karolína demonstrates how financial resources earmarked for the program were used and she basically states that Plan Colombia proved to be successful at enhancing Colombia's security. The statistics presented in tables are quite impressive.

In Chapter 5, Karolína analyzes the measures employed in the fight against drugs and so-called narco-terrorists. She rightly states that destroying coca production was a major priority. She then discusses the level of success and presents a sober analysis. Insofar as development and economic assistance are concerned, programs administered by USAID met with mixed success.

Karolína concludes the treatise by stating that Plan Colombia became more a counterinsurgency program than a counternarcotics one. Greater stability was achieved, but the initial stated counternarcotics aim was not really achieved.

This dissertation is of excellent quality. I recommend a classification of excellent (A).

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

Can you think of a better way to make programs similar to Plan Colombia succeed in the fight against drugs, as well as the struggle against insurgents?

6. DOPORUČENÍ / NEDOPORUČENÍ K OBHAJOBĚ A NAVRHOVANÁ ZNÁMKA

(výborně, velmi dobře, dobře, nevyhověl): **A**

Datum: **3 June 2018**

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.