### Undergraduate Thesis Assessment Rubric

**Department of English, Faculty of Education, University of West Bohemia**

**Thesis Author:** Dana Housková  
**Title:** Nature, 911- How the World Changed  
**Length:** 35  
**Text Length:** 32

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment Criteria</th>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. Introduction is well written, brief, interesting, and compelling. It motivates the work and provides a clear statement of the examined issue. It presents and overview of the thesis. | Outstanding  
Very good  
Acceptable  
Somewhat deficient  
Very deficient | The intro provides more of a general context rather than building the author's particular argument |
| 2. The thesis shows the author's appropriate knowledge of the subject matter through the background/review of literature. The author presents information from a variety of quality electronic and print sources. Sources are relevant, balanced and include critical readings relating to the thesis or problem. Primary sources are included (if appropriate). | Outstanding  
Very good  
Acceptable  
Somewhat deficient  
Very deficient | |
| 3. The author carefully analyzed the information collected and drew appropriate and inventive conclusions supported by evidence. Ideas are richly supported with accurate details that develop the main point. The author's voice is evident. | Outstanding  
Very good  
Acceptable  
Somewhat deficient  
Very deficient | |
| 4. The thesis displays critical thinking and avoids simplistic description or summary of information. | Outstanding  
Very good  
Acceptable  
Somewhat deficient  
Very deficient | There are a few contradiction that should at least be addressed if no reconciled. |
| 5. Conclusion effectively restates the argument. It summarizes the main findings and follows logically from the analysis presented. | Outstanding  
Very good  
Acceptable  
Somewhat deficient  
Very deficient | It seem a bit weak to end on a note concerning environmental regulation. Is there any hope for justice? Shouldn't the author argue that Bush deserves to be tried as a war criminal? |
| 6. The text is organized in a logical manner. It flows naturally and is easy to follow. Transitions, summaries and conclusions exist as appropriate. The author uses standard spelling, grammar, and punctuation. | Outstanding  
Very good  
Acceptable  
Somewhat deficient  
Very deficient | The middle section on the history of Twin Towers still seems like a departure of the main issue. The quotation are often separated from the writers own prose, a problem that could have been repaired with a colon. |
The language use is precise. The student makes proficient use of language in a way that is appropriate for the discipline and/or genre in which the student is writing.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outstanding</th>
<th>Very good</th>
<th>Acceptable</th>
<th>Somewhat deficient</th>
<th>Very deficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

There are a few moments where I had to struggle as a reader to comprehend the author's points.

The thesis meets the general requirements (formatting, chapters, length, division into sections, etc.). References are cited properly within the text and a complete reference list is provided.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outstanding</th>
<th>Very good</th>
<th>Acceptable</th>
<th>Somewhat deficient</th>
<th>Very deficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Final Comments & Questions

The author is to be congratulated on her hard work and comprehensive knowledge on the subject. The first third of the thesis is particularly admirable and it explains the framework of the political/military history that leads up to 9/11. It is hard to argue that the US interventionist policy in Afghanistan, Iraq, Iran, and Saudi Arabia created the enmity that motivated and even enabled the attack on the Twin Towers and fuels the war on Terror to this day. The thesis also correctly points out that “deals” for oil are behind most of the US foreign policy decisions, indeed, these deals are transparent and sort of hidden in plain sight. Everyone can see what is going on though no official policy spokesperson will ever name them. That the US invaded Iraq for oil is not exactly a conspiracy theory but rather illustrates a realpolitik inextricable from the US position as a super power. This is equally true for crony capitalism of Dick Cheney and how Halliburton profited from the invasion of Iraq, but the assertion that George W. Bush had foreknowledge of the 9/11 attack or even personally organized it is a conspiracy theory, and I think a dangerous one, as it erodes trust and sympathy for the victims of the attack. If this is true why did Bush allow Bin Laden to escape for so long, and ultimately be discovered and brought to justice by his rival Barack Obama?

Here the author and her sources have highly circumstantial evidence, for instance a list of “top secret” dirty tricks rejected by Robert McNamara in the Kennedy administration is somehow evidence that the US is capable of killing 10,000 of its own citizens seems like a tenuous connection at best. Michael Moore’s Fahrenheit 9/11 which is one of the diploma’s prime sources makes George W. Bush out to be a flummoxed idiot who froze when action was called for. This film had a dual purpose to not only place culpability on the Bush administration for its failure to act but hopefully lose him the election. This comes into direct contradiction with the author’s depiction of the president as a master manipulator whose language betrays the fact he has foreknowledge of the attack. I find the most convincing part of the thesis on page 23-24 when the author discusses who actually profited from the 9/11 attack. The author should expect many questions question about the insider trading deals mention on these pages during the defense.

As opposed to the destruction of the US Maine, the attack on Pearl Harbor, The Gulf of Tonkin incident, all three which have been accused of fabrication as the pretext for getting the US into the Spanish American War, World War II, and Vietnam respectively, the destruction of the Twin Towers represented a loss of billions of dollars to the US economy. If the US wanted to go to war with Afghanistan or Iraq for oil (despite the lack of oil in Afghanistan) or to convince its citizens to trade freedom for security, why didn’t they pick a target with less financial importance? The attack on the Pentagon seems even less likely. Why not something of purely symbolic value like the statue of liberty? Or a target that would kill the most people, like a football stadium? While I am convinced that the US is guilty of opportunistically and unethically taking advantage of the tragedy that is 9/11, I am hardly convinced that the US was the author of this tragedy. Still the purpose of the diploma is that the author should construct an argument out of various sources and one must admit that the author has done this admirably, so despite some flaws in logic, the departure of the middle chapters, and some minor problems with titles and quotation format, I recommend the diploma receive a 1.

Supervisor/Reviewer: Brad Vice, Ph.D.

Date: 08.06.2017

Signature: [Signature]