

UNIVERZITA KARLOVA V PRAZE
Fakulta sociálních věd
Institut mezinárodních studií

PROTOKOL O HODNOCENÍ BAKALÁŘSKÉ PRÁCE
(Posudek oponenta)

Práci předložil(a) student(ka): **Martin Krebs**

Název práce: **Vliv domnělé existence „bomber gap“ na diplomacii a strategii Spojených států amerických v krizovém roce 1956 během prvního prezidentského období D.D. Eisenhowera**

Oponoval (u externích oponentů 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 BA dissertation deals with the perceived existence of a “bomber gap” on American diplomacy and strategy in the year 1956 during Dwight D. Eisenhower’s first presidential term.

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 the student’s argumentation is logical and sound. Indeed, the student has worked well with sources.

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

I found no major problems with the formal aspects of the treatise.

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:

The work seems acceptable insofar as originality is concerned.

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

Martin Krebs has elected to write his BA dissertation on the perceived “bomber gap” on the diplomacy and strategy in the crisis year 1956 during the first presidential term of General Dwight D. Eisenhower. The work consists of an Introduction, two main chapters, and a Conclusion. Both the referencing and the bibliography indicate that Martin has conducted serious research on the topic at hand. I shall offer my comments in the ensuing paragraphs.

In the Introduction, the student briefly recapitulates the origins of the Cold War and the significance of the Cold War’s early years. Insofar as 1956 is concerned, two major conflicts occurred, namely the Suez Crisis and the Soviet invasion of Hungary. The student’s hypothesis is as follows: The information and sources available to President Eisenhower concerning the alleged “bomber gap” during the Suez and Hungarian crises led to gradual changes in American policy, but did not have an impact on American reactions to the crises. The literature on the subject is critiqued and the content of the two main chapters is aptly summarized. The study is described as a diplomatic history. In my view, the Introduction informs the reader of what to expect in the body of the dissertation.

Chapter 1 bears the simple title “Wider Contexts.” Here, the student discusses the strategy and diplomacy of both the United States and the Soviet Union between 1953 and 1956. The roles of Eisenhower and Khrushchev are discussed, as are those of other officials. Moreover, the international context is emphasized in relation to the technical specifics of various programs. This chapter provides information on both the American and Soviet sides in a balanced and informed manner,

Chapter 2 represents the core portion of the dissertation. The student begins with a definition of the “bomber gap.” He explains when in 1954 this misconception emerged. The role of aerial reconnaissance over the Soviet Union is scrutinized as are the political considerations associated with the approval of new

American military strategy. Other factors include the role played by intelligence agencies (Central Intelligence Agency and Joint Intelligence Committee), as well as the roles of political economics and the military-industrial complex. Subsequently, the influence of the Hungarian events of 1956 and Suez are mentioned as are the threats coming from both the American and Soviet sides as opposed to the real actions undertaken by each.

In the Conclusion, the student summarizes his main findings and states that the main reasons for American policy during the Suez and Hungarian events were mostly the result of a change in US policy, which newly accepted Soviet positions in East-Central Europe while focusing on the containment of the spread of Communism in the Third World.

This work meets the requirements for a BA dissertation. However, the quality is very good, not superb. Therefore, I recommend a classification of B or C based on the quality of the oral defense.

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

1. Are there any other factors that deserve consideration?

7. **DOPORUČENÍ / NEDOPORUČENÍ K OBHAJOBĚ A NAVRHOVANÁ ZNÁMKA**

(A-F): B or C 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 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.