

POSUDEK BAKALÁŘSKÉ PRÁCE

Jméno a příjmení studenta: Zdeněk Říha

Název bakalářské práce: Great Britain and Its World Dominance Story: A Reassessment

Vedoucí bakalářské práce: Mgr. Renata Janktová, MA, PhD.

I. Cíl práce a jeho naplnění:

1. Cíl práce byl stanoven a naplněn v souladu s tématem
2. Cíl práce byl naplněn s drobnými nedostatky
3. Cíl práce byl adekvátní, ale jen částečně naplněný
4. Stanovený cíl nebyl naplněn

II. Struktura práce:

1. Logická, jasná a přehledná
2. Přiměřená
3. Uspokojivá
4. Nevhodná

III. Práce s literaturou:

1. Výborná: zvoleny a použity vhodné prameny v patřičném rozsahu
2. Velmi dobrá práce s adekvátními prameny v patřičném rozsahu
3. Průměrná práce s literaturou
4. Slabá, chybná nebo nedostačující

IV. Formální stránka:

1. Odpovídá všem stanoveným požadavkům
2. Obsahuje drobné formální chyby
3. Nesplňuje některé zásadní požadavky
4. Nesplňuje většinu stanovených požadavků

VI. Jazyková úroveň práce:

1. Výborná
2. Velmi dobrá
3. Dobrá
4. Podprůměrná

VII. Náročnost zpracování tématu:

1. Velmi vysoká
2. Vysoká
3. Střední
4. Nízká

Vyjádření vedoucí bakalářské práce:

It seems that the aim of the bachelor thesis, that is the reassessment of Britain's global dominance as an invading country, proved to be more ambitious and harder to achieve than the author had initially expected. The thesis is a response to Stuart Laycock's non-fiction book *All the Countries we've Ever Invaded: And the Few we Never Got Round To* (2012), which argues that Britain had invaded 90% of existing countries. The main criticism of the

book has targeted its poor methodology, especially the vague definition of an invasion, leaving only those "places where people from Britain haven't conducted some kind of armed operations" (Laycock, p.10) as uninvaded. It was clear that any more differentiated response to Laycock's claims had to be based on solid methodology, which in the case of the great variety of armed operations, the complex international affairs across the known history, most of them occurring before international law began to form, is a major challenge to begin with. Seeking to define his own methodology, Mr Říha recognises the complexity of the task of answering the seemingly simple question: invaded or uninvaded. He sees the problematic points and asks the right questions, but many of his answers, and hence his analytical tools and outcomes, are highly debatable. In my opinion, some of the confusion comes from the fact that the methodology was produced "on the go", without a prior study of the basics of international law and international relations practices as well as the general history of the British Empire. The most problematic point is that his final decisions on the individual cases are too often made on the grounds of the art and time of succession, which proves highly misleading, instead of the essence of the actual actions in the territories discussed. The analytical part revisits all continents and most countries of the world, dealing in more detail with ambiguous cases compared to the obvious ones. Each continent section is closed with a map presenting its findings. In the final concluding part, the results of the enquiry are synthesised, using graphs and a map, to present the final percentage figure and compare it with Laycock's proposal. On the whole, the thesis presents an impressive amount of research and critical engagement, even if flawed at times. Considering the variety of sources used, the referencing is very good, with occasional inconsistencies in citations. The text is written in good English, with occasional grammar and punctuation issues and typos. In places, the author tends to assume a conversational tone, not dissimilar to Laycock's, which should be avoided in any future academic text. Finally, I must say that, as a supervisor, I greatly appreciated Mr Říha's enthusiasm for and engagement with the subject.

Práce splňuje základní požadavky kladené na tento typ prací, a proto ji doporučuji k ústní obhajobě.

Navrhovaná známka: velmi dobře

Otázky k obhajobě:

1. The book was criticised, among others, for its jovial, satiric tone, which allegedly trivialised the historic actions and the subject matter itself. What is your view on this?
2. How important are reassessments of past actions happening in times of different moral and ethical understandings and lacking adequate legal frameworks and consensuses? Can you compare the benefits and risks?

Podpis vedoucí bakalářské práce:.....

Datum: 27.7. 2022