

UNIVERZITA KARLOVA V PRAZE
Fakulta sociálních věd
Institut mezinárodních studií

PROTOKOL O HODNOCENÍ BAKALÁŘSKÉ PRÁCE
(Posudek vedoucího)

Práci předložil(a) student(ka): **Kateřina Partlová**

Název práce: **Role USA v postamerickém světě dle Kissingera a Zakarii**

Vedoucí práce (u externích vedoucích 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 discusses the real and ideal role of the United States in an international context since the end of the Cold War by comparing the ideas of Henry Kissinger and Fareed Zakaria. The aim of the work is to compare the position of the United States with regard to the new world order that has emerged thanks to the growing strength of other global actors.

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

As far as I can see, there are no major problems with the argumentation and I am satisfied. I must, however, make a minor comment. Neither Jana Sehnáková nor Jan Váška are medical doctors as far as I know, so they should not be referred to as MUDr.

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

I think that the presentation and referencing are fine.

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

Kateřina Partlová has opted to write her B.A. dissertation on the role of the United States in the post-American world. She focuses on the ideas of Henry Kissinger and Fareed Zakaria. It was a pleasure to supervise Kateřina's work and she made great progress. The work contains an Introduction, three main chapters, and a Conclusion. I will offer my thoughts on each section in the following paragraphs.

The Introduction first offers a very detailed overview of the content of each chapter. The only mistake I can see is the use of the title MUDr to refer to some people, who obviously are not medical doctors. Then Kateřina compares the biographies of Kissinger and Zakaria emphasizing Kissinger's experience as a practitioner and Zakaria's as a theorist and media commentator. In the last part of the Introduction, she offers definitions of a number of terms associated with international relations theory. I think that the Introduction is well conceived.

In Chapter 1, Kateřina discusses the evolution of the United States' role in the world from the end of the Cold War until the present day. She begins by providing a brief historical prelude explaining the events that preceded the collapse of Communism. Then she delves into Kissinger's and Zakaria's interpretations of the changes that took place in the world order. In a balanced manner, Kateřina compares and contrasts the ideas of both scholars on balance of power and the global order. While Zakaria believes in multipolarity involving the United States and a number of emerging economies, including China, Kissinger limits his notion of multipolarity to an emphasis of the bipolar relationship between the United States and China. The remaining similarities and differences between the ideas of Kissinger and Zakaria are emphasized as are both men's criticisms of the foreign policy decisions particularly of the George W. Bush and also the Donald Trump presidential administrations. Kissinger and Zakaria also disagree on the definition of American exceptionalism and its consequences. The last aspect of the chapter deals with the responsibilities associated with being a "global leader." Kateřina scrutinizes the differing approaches of

Kissinger and Zakaria to this issue, and she concludes that, under the Trump administration, American leadership is absent. This chapter is good in that it recounts the views of Kissinger and Zakaria.

An analysis of Kissinger's and Zakaria's thoughts on the Middle East represents the content of Chapter 2. The account of recent historical events is accurate. Kateřina expresses her opinion that Kissinger's ideas concerning the region are better formulated and more deeply rooted in history than those of Zakaria, whose notions are more superficial and based on recent events. The discussion of Kissinger's comparison of the Western system and the Islamic system is on the mark. Kateřina then contrasts Kissinger's and Zakaria's assessment of the conflicts in Afghanistan and Iraq. Both scholars have expressed criticism, but for different reasons. Kissinger says that the United States should learn from the specific mistakes it made in both wars, whereas Zakaria claims that the United States should question legitimacy of U.S. policy first and foremost. The chapter ends with a discussion of the Iranian nuclear program and the dangers it poses. Kissinger is adamant that the Iranian nuclear program must be stopped. Zakaria attempts to logically trace the origins of the issue and claims that the Americans should seek Russian assistance. Overall, this chapter is very informative.

Chapter 3 scrutinizes the opinions of Kissinger and Zakaria on China and Chinese civilization. As in the other cases, Kissinger and Zakaria differ in their assessments. Zakaria sees China as a challenge, whereas Kissinger sees rivalry that should be transformed into partnership for the sake of peace. Zakaria sees the main difference in the competing Washington Consensus and Peking Consensus. Zakaria sees China and the West mutually influencing one another (primarily in the economic sense) and Kissinger, on the contrary, criticizes the presumed superiority of Western civilization and warns against Western efforts to make China fit into the Western system in spite of the vast cultural difference. The differing ideas of both scholars are explained in detail and there is agreement that China has been shaped by Confucianism in contrast to American individualism. When it comes to the Chinese Belt Road Initiative, Kateřina compares and contrasts the thoughts of Kissinger and Zakaria. In addition, an important study concerning potential Chinese strategic and economic aims is cited and discussed. Kissinger's major hope is that the United States and China can achieve some form of partnership for the sake of the stability of the global order. This chapter is aptly written.

The Conclusion recapitulates the main points presented in the body of the dissertation. Kateřina again emphasizes that Kissinger's scholarship is much more in-depth because it is intended for practitioners of international relations, whereas Zakaria writes for a general audience. Zakaria claims that the United States has lost its superior position in the world due to the policies of the Trump White House. Kissinger is much more restrained. Both realists agree in multilateralism, but differ as to the meaning of the term "multilateralism." I think that the Conclusion does a good job of informing the reader of the similarities and differences in Kissinger's and Zakaria's thinking.

This treatise meets the requirements for a B.A. dissertation. I recommend a classification of B contingent on Kateřina's oral defense.

5. OTÁZKY A PŘIPOMÍNKY DOPORUČENÉ K BLIŽŠÍMU VYSVĚTLENÍ PŘI OBHAJOBĚ (jedna až tři):
Are Kissinger and Zakaria the foremost authorities on American foreign policy today? Why or why not?
Please explain some other perspectives.

6. DOPORUČENÍ / NEDOPORUČENÍ K OBHAJOBĚ A NAVRHOVANÁ ZNÁMKA
(A-F): B depending on the oral defense

Datum: 18 August 2020

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.