UNIVERZITA KARLOVA V PRAZE
Fakulta sociálních věd
Institut mezinárodních studií

PROTOKOL O HODNOCENÍ DIPLOMOVÉ PRÁCE
(Posudek vedoucího)

Práci předložil(a) studentka. Bc. Eliška Honsová

Název práce: Přeshraniční spolupráce zdravotnických záchranných služeb v euroregionu Šumava

---

Vedoucí práce (u externích vedoucích uveďte též adresu a funkci v rámci instituce): Paul Bauer

1. OBSAH A CÍL PRÁCE (stručná informace o práci, formulace cíle):

The essay discusses the implementation of cross border health emergency services at the border between the Czech Republic, Austria and Germany; territories that formed after the fall of the Iron Curtain the Euroregion Šumava. Drawing primarily from new regionalism propositions and from the concept of shared sovereignty, the candidate proposes to explore the European territorial integration in practice through the practical case of cross-border emergency services. Following the hypothesis that cross-border cooperation supports transborder regional development, a deepening of the territorial integration, and the erasure of the state border. The candidate follows several questions related to the conditions in which the agreement on cross-border emergency services was negociated and to the initiative of the project itself. To do so, she presents in a first part the historical-geographical and institutional context of cross border cooperation. She then presents, the legal frame of Health emergency services, before analyzing it practices in the Czech Republic. In a last step, she maps the cross-border network of actors involved in the development of the health services and she tries to evaluate its realization.

If the work draws from academic references, the objectives clearly situate the work in the realm of practical expertise, what the author state in its introductive words.

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

The work is structured in three parts. The candidate presents in a first part the historical-geographical and institutional context of cross border cooperation. She then presents, the legal frame of Health emergency services, before analyzing it practices in the Czech Republic. In a last step, she maps the cross-border network of actors involved in the development of health services and she tries to evaluate its realization. This structure illustrates a logical progression. The conceptual approach is made of three main propositions that are relevant for the contextualization of the case and the understanding of the research subject. Starting with a Europeanisation of new regionalism reflection, the author follows with a discussion on shared sovereignty and biolopolitics derivated from Foucault proposition but applicated into European regional politics (see Joe Painter"Regional biopolitics", 2019).

Further, Eliška Honsová defined a research frame made of key notions of her research, the European territorial integration and the Regional development.

The most valuable aspect of her work is the fieldwork research she performed in Czech Republic with representatives of the region of Plzeň, with representatives of Health ermergency services in Southern Bohemia, and with diplomat and lawyers, all actors involved in the subject of transborder health emergency services. The interviews permit to gathered valuable information and complete well the presentation of the institutional and legal frame of health services at the border of three EU country members. The qualitative research focused exclusively on empirical materials gathered in Czech Republic, a limit in the research fully recognized by the author (p.25). Nonetheless, these materials give insightful elements for the study and the support of a first evaluation of the realization of this cross-border project. Further, it permits to have a good understanding of the implementation process, the limit and the practical problems of a crucial health services at the margin of state territory.

The conclusion of the work recalls the objectives of the research and underlines the main lessons of her analysis. Here again, Eliška Honsová demonstrates that she identified well the limit of the cross-border project. Moreover, she makes the effort to bind back her results with the central conceptual proposition on new regionalism which frames partly her work. Less is said on how the notions of shared sovereignty and the concept of Biopolitics helped the research. In this respect one must say that those conceptual propositions could have been more reflected in her empirical research.

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

As I am not Czech native speaker, I won't comment on the style of the author, but saying that the text is easy to read, clear in its intention. The references are well quoted. The literature review is not extensive but sufficient for the particular objective of the candidate.

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

The general impression of the essay is good. The very expertise nature of the research could have been enhanced with a more reflective critical approach of the subject. The research would benefit of a better integration of the conceptual proposition on "shared sovereignty" and "biopolitics". The reader regret for instance that these propositions, presented in the research framing were not sufficiently articulated to the general problematic. The integration of these reflection would have required a couple more months of work.

5. SPOLUPRÁCE S VEDOUCÍM PRÁCE (komunikace s vedoucím práce, schopnost reflektovat připomínky, posun od původního záměru apod.)

Eliška Honsová has been regularly consulting with me. Our discussions helped her to develop a personal and an informed reflection of her subject. Nonetheless and as mentioned in the previous section, I believe the work could have benefit much more in term of problematization and analysis if the conceptual framing would have been better integrated into her general reflection. This point has been raised during the two last consultations. Eliška Honsová make the choice for personal reasons to defend her work in the beginning of 2020,

and I have agreed with her choice even if I am convinced that this extremely interesting subject could have been further exploited.

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

Could you please stress briefly during the defense, the way in which the notion of shared sovereignty and biopolitics you discuss in your introduction, are articulated to the results of your research.

7. DOPORUČENÍ / NEDOPORUČENÍ K OBHAJOBĚ A NAVRHOVANÁ ZNÁMKA
(výborně, velmi dobře, dobře, nevyhověl): **Velmi Dobře with C**

Datum: 20.1.2020 Podpis: P.Bauer

Pozn.: Hodnocení pište k jednotlivým bodům, pokud nepíšete v textovém editoru, použijte při nedostatku místa zadní stranu nebo přiložený 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.