

UNIVERZITA KARLOVA V PRAZE
Fakulta sociálních věd
Institut mezinárodních studií

PROTOKOL O HODNOCENÍ BAKALÁŘSKÉ PRÁCE
(Posudek vedoucího)

Práci předložil(a) student(ka): **Michal Bokša**

Název práce: **Vliv americké zahraniční politiky na palestinsko-izraelský konflikt v letech 1989 až 1997**

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 aim of this work is to analyze the Israeli-Palestinian peace process between 1989 and 1997. The American influence was great and thus deserves to be studied. The policies of Presidents George H.W. Bush and Bill Clinton are compared.

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

This work is quite challenging. The author's approach is original. I have no problem with his argumentation, his work with sources, or anything else.

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

I have no problems with the language used or the citations or bibliography for that matter. Both tables (2 in all) included in the treatise are appropriate.

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

Michal Bokša has selected the American involvement in the Middle East peace process between 1989 and 1997 as the subject of his B.A. dissertation. He has opted to compare the policies of the George H.W. Bush and Bill Clinton administrations. From the outset, Michal consulted with me and he took my advice without resistance, which is more than can be said of some past B.A. advisees. The work is thoroughly researched and Michal argues his points well. In all, the dissertation is divided into an Introduction, three main chapters, and a Conclusion.

In the Introduction, Michal clearly spells out the aim of the dissertation, which is to compare the Middle East policies of the Bush and Clinton administrations. He stops in 1997 because no significant progress occurred during Clinton's second term in office. The fact that mainly foreign (non-Czech) literature has been consulted is emphasized by Michal and he states which publications were most helpful to him.

Chapter 1 represents an analysis of the Bush era and its role in the Middle East peace process. The crucial role played by James Baker as Secretary of State is mentioned as is that played by Dennis Ross. Pressure was placed on both the Israeli government and the Palestine Liberation Organization and its leader, Yasser Arafat. The result was the Madrid peace conference. Israeli politics were at first a problem because of the obstinate and obstructive character of Likud prime minister, Yitzhak Shamir. Well, the Bush administration made it rather clear that Shamir's approach was not helping matters and, in the summer of 1992, Shamir was defeated by Labour Candidate, Gen. Yitzhak Rabin, who moved quickly to shore up the peace process. President Bush was defeated in his bid for a second term in the election of November 1992 and the peace process would be left to his successor, Bill Clinton. This chapter is well written.

Chapter 2 represents an assessment of the policies of President Bill Clinton towards the Middle East. To a large extent, Clinton picked up where the Bush administration had left off. In 1993, negotiations between the Israelis and Palestinians took on a more active scale in what would become known as the Oslo Peace Process. After lengthy negotiations, Rabin and Arafat would have a "Kodak moment" on the White House lawn where they would shake hands and begin more specific, earnest negotiations. The process underwent ups and downs because of increased terrorist activities by Palestinians not under Arafat's control (Hamas) and acts of terror perpetrated by Jewish settlers unwilling to leave the occupied West Bank. In November 1995, Yitzhak Rabin was assassinated by one such Jewish radical (Yigal Amir) and Shimon Peres became prime minister. Though Peres sought to continue the peace process, his efforts were losing support of the Israeli public which ousted him in the

general election (even though by a razor-thin margin). Once again, the Likud returned to power and the new prime minister, Binyamin (Bibi) Netanyahu was not keen on the entire Oslo peace process. Though Netanyahu recognized the Oslo peace process, he was not enthusiastic about the prospect of a lasting peace given heightened terrorism and questionable good faith on the part of the Palestinians. As Michal's treatise does not devote space to Clinton's second term, I shall stop here. The chapter is factually correct, well argued, and properly presented.

In Chapter 3, Michal undertakes to compare the respective policies of George H.W. Bush and Bill Clinton. The first thing Michal does in this chapter is to differentiate between "active" and "passive" American policy towards the Middle East during both the Bush and Clinton administrations. Initially, Bush's policy towards the Middle East was passive and, therefore, largely unsuccessful. After the first Gulf War of 1991, the Bush administration shifted gears and adopted a much more active policy. Once the Madrid talks began, the Bush administration reverted to passivity in its involvement. The Clinton administration tended to be rather passive and the Palestinian side felt that Clinton was pro-Israeli. Indeed, the administration was passive in its approach and it was more the interests of the negotiating parties to achieve (or not achieve) progress that influenced the outcomes. The entire second section of Chapter 3 is devoted to the matter of Israeli settlements in the occupied territories. The Bush administration was opposed to settlements and Clinton's reluctance to condemn their growth had consequences. Bush's approach led to a willingness of the Palestinians to engage in talks, whereas Clinton's vague approach had the opposite effect. This is true despite the fact that more new settlers arrived under Bush than during Clinton's first term. Then, Michal goes on to discuss the agreements and the effectiveness of both Bush's and Clinton's respective policies. The table at the end of the chapter (created by Michal) accurately sums things up.

In the Conclusion, Michal recapitulates his main points. Most importantly, he states that his initial hypothesis that Clinton's policies towards the Middle East were more effective than Bush's is not supported by the evidence. In fact, Bush's policies were more effective.

My overall impression is that this dissertation is of excellent quality and that Michal has learned much about the topic at hand. The fact that his research disproved his initial hypothesis is laudable. I recommend an **excellent** mark.

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

1. Why has the peace process been at a dead end since the Clinton years?
2. What are the chances for achieving peace in the last years of the Obama administration?

6. DOPORUČENÍ / NEDOPORUČENÍ K OBHAJOBĚ A NAVRHOVANÁ ZNÁMKA

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

Datum: 6.6.2014

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.