

UNIVERZITA KARLOVA V PRAZE
Fakulta sociálních věd
Institut mezinárodních studií

PROTOKOL O HODNOCENÍ DIPLOMOVÉ PRÁCE
(Posudek oponenta)

Práci předložil(a) student(ka): Tomáš Juhaš

Název práce: France and the reform of the Eurozone – From Sarkozy to Hollande

Oponoval (u externích oponentů uveďte též adresu a funkci v rámci instituce): Paul Bauer

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

The master thesis proposes to discuss a very political aspect of the reform of the Eurozone before and after the election of François Hollande at the French presidency with a special focus on the European Council of June 2012. The author tries to understand why the newly elected president didn't manage or „changed his approach“ (or point of view) toward the renegotiation of the European Fiscal Pact in favor of a state's „pro growth“ economic policy.

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

To answer to this question, the author draw from the „field theory“ of Pierre Bourdieu and its application into the „eurocracy subfield“ (for instance the European Council of June 2012), and argues the hypothesis that the weak position of François Hollande within this specific field might explain why he shifted from his promise of less austerity.

The principal sources included official statements, conclusion and other output of European Council, intergovernmental agreements, legislativ acts etc.

Second, the author used media sources in French and English.

Concerning the structure, the thesis opens with a theoretical chapter, outlining the several approaches that might be used for the subject. In a second step the author presents a synthetic contextualization of the subject, from the so called „subprime crisis“ to the states debt's crisis. The third chapter brings some information concerning François Hollande's campaign and statements for a „pro growth“ policy at the European scale. The fourth and the fifth chapters present the political subfield in which the author locates the French president within the „political power struggle“. Generally speaking, the thesis follows a logical well structured argumentation.

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

The thesis is in English and well written. The primary and secondary documentation are not very extensive but quoted properly. The general formal aspect of the work is good.

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

If the general impression of the diploma is good (the author is well informed and his argumentation is convincing, but some exceptions), the work calls for some critics that touch at first the topic itself, which is unusual for a master thesis. The second remarks is adressed to the way in which the theoretical approach is used to answer to the central question.

The first comment concerns the definition of the research object. The candidate choosed a European political historical field, observed in a very short period - just before and after the French presidency election. The context is well described but the subject of the analysis is more the one of a journalistic inquiry. Furthermore, it would have been interesting to situate the very moment of the European Council of June 2012 within the

history of the subfield in order to have a better understanding of the field's working and structure. This point meets the second remark.

Despite the sophisticated and well justified theoretical proposition, the reader is left partly unsatisfied notably because of the relatively weak documentation used to produce the explanatory graphs of the field, yet at the center of the thesis. To produce the graphs and locate François Hollande within the political field, the author mobilized very brief and partial biographical information about the European leaders (see pp.43-46). I am not convinced that those information might explain in a satisfactory way the position of each European political leader in the field. A more accomplished methodological reflection would have been welcomed and help to avoid some illogicality. For instance, the reader doesn't know what is the real nature of the actors of the field: are they Nation-states or political leaders? To situate each actors, the author mixed, on the one hand, the states economic performance to evaluate the amount of capitals (in a sociological point of view) and, on the other, the experiences of the states representatives to estimate the „insider/outsider“ position. This two variable intend to show where are situated each actors of the June 2012 European council with regards to the „Power Center“ (see p.50). This point should be cleared during the defence.

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

I would like to address two questions to the candidate concerning the „field theory“ and its application in the case study:

1. The first question is related to the commentaries of point 4. and concerns the nature of the chosen actors and their localization in the graphs (p.47 and p.50). Are the actors political institutions (EU member states, head of state) or political personality? In a sociological point of view these are two different types of actors that can't be placed in the same graphs, even if the political field is relevant for both.
2. Could you bring some complementary information concerning the working of the observed subfield (for instance, the European council)? This aspect has not been clearly presented, yet central in the „field theory“.

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

Doporučuji k obhajobě. **velmi dobře**

Datum: 12.06.2015

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.