

UNIVERZITA KARLOVA V PRAZE
Fakulta sociálních věd
Institut mezinárodních studií

PROTOKOL O HODNOCENÍ BAKALÁŘSKÉ PRÁCE
(Posudek oponenta)

Práci předložil(a) student(ka): **Klára Podolková**

Název práce: **Problematika britsko-amerických vztahů: válka o Falklandy**

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 the Anglo-American special relationship in the era of Margaret Thatcher and Ronald Reagan during the Falklands War.

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

The topic is both interesting and demanding. The student uses sound argumentation, good sources, and there is evidence of good utilization of theory.

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

I find no major issues with the formal aspect of the dissertation.

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:

I detect no problems.

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

Klára Podolková has elected to write her BA dissertation on the issue of US-UK relations with regard to the Falklands War of 1982. The key figures are Ronald Reagan and Margaret Thatcher. The work is divided into an Introduction, three main chapters, and a Conclusion. In the next paragraphs, I shall offer my comments on each part of the treatise.

In the Introduction, Klára provides the reader with a clear idea of what to expect in the body of the dissertation. She defines well the concept of the “special relationship” and asks what role the “special relationship” played in the events surrounding the Falklands War. In the section on methodology, Klára explains why she has divided the dissertation into chapters on theoretical, contextual, and analytical aspects. The reader is, therefore, well prepared to delve into the remainder of the text.

Chapter 1, which is theoretical, Klára tackles the concept of the “special relationship” from a number of angles. The historical background of the special relationship is discussed as is the meaning of the term “special relationship” and its manifestations according to major scholarly authorities on the subject. Obviously, the success of the “special relationship” has always depended on the relations between British prime ministers and American presidents. Klára does a good job explaining how Reagan and Thatcher revived the “special relationship”. This chapter is fine.

In Chapter 2, the contextual aspect is explained. The reader receives a history lesson on the Falklands, how the territory became British, etc. Also, British-Argentine relations before the Falklands conflict are scrutinized as is the domestic political situation in Argentina with an emphasis on the military junta. The final section of Chapter 2 is devoted to US relations with Argentina and other South American nations within the context of the Cold War. I find nothing wrong with this chapter.

Klára presents the analytical portion of her treatise in Chapter 3. The American role in mediating the Falklands conflict is emphasized. Initially, the Americans wanted shuttle diplomacy to take place, but when this proved to be a non-starter with Margaret Thatcher, the US stood by its British NATO ally. Klára demonstrates that the “special relationship” indeed played a role in the American stance towards the Falklands dispute. This chapter is of phenomenal quality.

In the Conclusion, Klára reiterates that the “special relationship” was a major factor in United States support for the United Kingdom when the latter was defending its sovereign territory in the South Atlantic from wanton Argentine aggression.

I have a very positive impression of this dissertation. Klára has indeed worked hard under the supervision of my boss and friend, Jan Hornát. Insofar as the final classification is concerned, I recommend an A or B depending on Klára’s oral defense.

**6. OTÁZKY A PŘIPOMÍNKY DOPORUČENÉ K BLIŽŠÍMU VYSVĚTLENÍ PŘI OBHAJOBĚ (jedna až tři):
Would the US have continued to support Britain if the war was to the advantage of Argentina? Why or why not?**

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

Datum: **Prague, 27 May 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.