UNIVERZITA KARLOVA V PRAZE
Fakulta sociálních věd
Institut mezinárodních studií

PROTOKOL O HODNOCENÍ BAKALÁŘSKÉ PRÁCE
(Posudek vedoucího)

Práci předložil(a) student(ka): **Šimon Seemann**
Název práce: **Nekonečná válka: Komparace tří administrativ amerických prezidentů ve válce v Afghánistánu**

Vedoucí práce (u externích vedoucích uveďte též adresu a funkci v rámci instituce):
doc. PhDr. Francis Raška, PhD.

1. OBSAH A CÍL PRÁCE (stručná informace o práci, formulace cíle):
This dissertation analyzes and compares the policies of the George W. Bush, Barack Obama, and Donald Trump Administrations regarding the Afghan conflict based on analysis of the available literature.

2. VĚCNÉ ZPRACOVÁNÍ (náročnost, tvůrčí přístup, argumentace, logická struktura, teoretické a metodologické ukotvení, práce s prameny a literaturou, vhodnost příloh apod.):
The topic is challenging and I have no problem with the argumentation, structure, or methodology. Sources are properly consulted.

3. FORMÁLNÍ A JAZYKOVÉ ZPRACOVÁNÍ (jazykový projev, správnost citace a odkazů na literaturu, grafická úprava, formální náležitosti práce apod.):
There are no major issues with the formal aspects of the treatise apart from a few typographical errors.

4. KONTROLA ORIGINALITY TEXTU

Prohlašuji, že jsem se seznámil/a s výsledkem kontroly originality textu závěrečné práce v systému:
[ ] Theses [ ] Turnitin [**xxx**] Ouriginal (Urkund)
Komentář k výsledku kontroly:
There do not seem to be any issues concerning the originality of the work.

5. STRUČNÝ KOMENTÁŘ HODNOTITELE (celkový dojem z bakalářské práce, silné a slabé stránky, originalita myšlenek, naplnění cíle apod.):
Šimon Seemann has opted to focus on the policies of three presidential administrations towards Afghanistan. He consulted a plethora of relevant literature and worked hard on the topic, which is by no means an easy one. The work contains an Introduction, four main chapters, and a Conclusion. I find the graphs most helpful. In the next paragraphs, I will offer my comments and criticisms of each section of the treatise.

In the Introduction, Šimon places the Afghan conflict in its historical context and as a focal point in the war on terror. He discusses the comparative nature of the work, outlines the content of the main chapters, and discusses the sources he consulted. Šimon provides readers with a clear idea of what to expect in the body of the dissertation.

Chapter 1 is devoted to the presidential administration of George W. Bush and his security policy. The events of 9/11 were a gamechanger for the Bush White House, which announced the War on Terror very shortly thereafter. Šimon aptly recapitulates events and cites from the National Security Strategy of the United States on numerous occasions. The American attitude at this time was that countries needed to choose whether they support the United States or not. Additionally, plans for the reconstruction of Afghanistan are explained in detail. Overall, the chapter represents a balanced assessment of the Bush Administration's activities in Afghanistan.

In Chapter 2, Šimon discusses Barack Obama's ascent to the presidency and how Obama's 2008 campaign promised a different type of foreign policy. Unlike Bush, Obama was keener to involve allies and to bring in China, Russia, and India. Also, Obama distrusted Pakistan. The conflict came to be referred to as a War of Necessity. Increased emphasis was placed on diplomacy and easing tensions so that US troop numbers could be reduced. Just as in Chapter 1, the author does a fine job here.

Chapter 3 is a discussion of Donald J. Trump's one-term presidency and his approach to Afghanistan. In contrast to his predecessors, Trump did not believe in democracy promotion in Afghanistan and he seemed determined to extricate US military forces as soon as possible. In the end, Trump signed a peace deal with the Taliban without the Afghan government and, on the basis of this agreement, his successor, Joe Biden, withdrew remaining US troops from Afghanistan despite the fact that the Taliban violated a number of the agreement's provisions. This chapter goes above and beyond the call of duty.

A comparison of the three presidential administrations and their policies towards Afghanistan forms the subject of Chapter 4. Šimon delves into great detail when comparing visions, strategies, implementation of strategies, approaches to democratization, and training of Afghan forces. He is very meticulous and I likewise find this chapter to be of good quality.

In the Conclusion, Šimon recapitulates the findings of the three main chapters. His ideas are clear and succinct and his powers of comparative analysis are very sharp. He has done a good job.

My overall impression of this dissertation is positive. Šimon Seemann consulted with me on this project. The only minor criticism I need to express is the lack of thorough proofreading. The careless typographical errors should have been spotted by the author. After all, Czech is his mother tongue. Nevertheless, I recommend a classification of B depending on the quality of the oral defense.

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

1. **Could any of the strategies used in Afghanistan have worked? Please explain.**
2. **Are there any other issues that are worthy of consideration?**

7. DOPORUČENÍ / NEDOPORUČENÍ K OBHAJOBĚ A NAVRHOVANÁ ZNÁMKA (A-F): **B contingent on the quality of the oral defense.**

Datum: **15 January 2023** Podpis:

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.