

REPORT ON THE MASTER THESIS

IEPS – International Economic and Political Studies, Faculty of Social Sciences, Charles University

Title of the thesis:	Neo-Eurasianism: Russia's national idea or a dangerous doctrine of the 21 century?
Author of the thesis:	Tatiana Fetischeva
Referee (incl. titles):	Mgr.Martin Riegl, PhD.

Remark: It is a standard at the FSV UK that the Referee's Report is at least 500 words long. In case you will assess the thesis as "non-defendable", please explain the concrete reasons for that in detail.

SUMMARY OF POINTS AWARDED (for details, see below):

CATEGORY	POINTS
<i>Theoretical background (max. 20)</i>	13
<i>Contribution (max. 20)</i>	12
<i>Methods (max. 20)</i>	16
<i>Literature (max. 20)</i>	13
<i>Manuscript form (max. 20)</i>	16
TOTAL POINTS (max. 100)	60
The proposed grade (1-2-3-4)	2-3

You can even use a decimal point (e.g. giving the grade of 2.5 for 60 points).

Comments of the referee on the thesis highlights and shortcomings (following the 5 numbered aspects of your assessment indicated below).

1) Theoretical background:

The author has framed her research in theories of Euroasianism and Neo-Euroasianism which are analyzed and applied throughout the thesis. I do miss an inclusion classical geopolitical theories. I decided to award 13 points for this aspect of the thesis.

2) Contribution:

The author has chosen relevant and important topic which falls into geopolitics – Russia's Neo-Euroasianism as one of the Russian geopolitical schools in the beginning of the 21. century. The main contribution of the reviewed thesis is author's ability to fulfill main aims, particularly to examine the concept of Neo-Eurasianism and peculiarities of Eurasian geopolitical school.

The author set up following goals:

- to examine the genesis of the Eurasian ideology;
- to consider the specifics of the evolution of Eurasian concept of geopolitics in Russia;
- to study the features of the Eurasian doctrine on the example of Russia's internal as well as external policies;
- to analyze the ideological basis of the project of Eurasian Union;
- to consider key figures of Russian politics.

It may be argued that Mrs. Fetischeva managed to answer her research question – explicitly to explain the very basic meaning of Neo-Euroasianism, main proponents of the above mentioned geopolitical school and its impact on Russian internal as well as external policies.

On the other side, the submitted paper does not provided truly detailed insight into the researched topic although the author's research is undoubtedly topical and definitely contributes to the political science knowledge. The author's contribution to understanding of researched topic and its academic

value remains average and most of conclusions are a bit flat, therefore I decided to award 12 points for this aspect of the thesis.

3) Methods:

The author based her research on empirical research using the empirico-analytical approach. The paper also uses such a scientific abstraction, systems analysis, modeling method, deduction, description, comparison and generalization. I decided to award 16 points for this aspect of the thesis.

4) Literature:

The author of the submitted thesis showed her ability to critically analyze sufficient amount of sources (including primary documents, monographs and internet one). The author has succeeded in collecting theoretical as well as empirical sources. What I find a bit deficient is a lack of classical geopolitical works of 19th and 20th century's geopoliticians. Generally list of sources might have been much more excessive. I decided to award 13 points for this aspect of the thesis.

5) Manuscript form:

The reviewed thesis fulfills all criteria of the diploma thesis required by Faculty of Social Sciences. The whole thesis complies with a demanded scope of 50 pages. Despite of minor shortcomings (misspellings) I do not have any major deficiencies regarding the formal aspect of the thesis.

Also the structure of the thesis is logically structured into five chapters including introduction and conclusion. Therefore I find the thesis sufficient from the methodological, theoretical and research perspective and recommend it to be defended. The manuscript form itself is rather average so I decided to award 16 points.

DATE OF EVALUATION:

Referee Signature

The referee should give comments to the following requirements:

1) THEORETICAL BACKGROUND: Can you recognize that the thesis was guided by some **theoretical fundamentals** relevant for this thesis topic? Were some important theoretical concepts omitted? Was the theory used in the thesis consistently incorporated with the topic and hypotheses tested?

Strong Average Weak
20 10 0 points

2) CONTRIBUTION: Evaluate if the author presents **original ideas** on the topic and aims at demonstrating **critical thinking** and ability to draw conclusions based on the knowledge of relevant theory and relevant empirical material. Is there a distinct **value added** of the thesis (relative to knowledge of a university-educated person interested in given topic)? Did the author explain **why** the observed phenomena occurred? Were the policy implications well founded?

Strong Average Weak
20 10 0 points

3) METHODS: Are the **hypotheses** for this study clearly stated, allowing their further verification and testing? Are the theoretical explanations, empirical material and **analytical tools** used in the thesis relevant to the research question being investigated, and adequate to the aspiration level of the study? Is the thesis **topic comprehensively analyzed** and does the thesis not make trivial or irrelevant detours off the main body stated in the thesis proposal? More than 10 points signal an exceptional work, **which requires your explanation "why" it is so**.

Strong Average Weak
20 10 0 points

4) LITERATURE REVIEW: The thesis demonstrates author's full understanding and **command of recent literature**. The author quotes relevant literature in a proper way and disposes with a representative bibliography. (Remark: references to Wikipedia, websites and newspaper articles are a sign of **poor research**). If they dominate you cannot give more than 8 points. References to books published by prestigious publishers and articles in renowned journals give much better impression.

Strong Average Weak
20 10 0 points

5) MANUSCRIPT FORM: The thesis is **clear and well structured**. The author uses appropriate language and style, including academic **format** for quotations, graphs and tables. The text effectively refers to graphs and tables, is easily readable and **stimulates thinking**.

Strong Average Weak
20 10 0 points

Overall grading scheme at FSV UK:

TOTAL POINTS	GRADE	Czech grading	US grading
81 – 100	1	= excellent	= A
61 – 80	2	= good	= B
51 – 60	3	= satisfactory	= C
41 – 50	3	= satisfactory	= D
0 – 40	4	= fail	= not recommended for defence