



**UNIVERZITA KARLOVA  
V PRAZE**

**Prrektorka pro evropskou problematiku**

**“Goliath Versus Goliath: EU Democracy Promotion in the Eastern  
Neighbourhood and Russia’s Alternative Agenda”**

**Assessment**

**Bogdana DEPO**

The author’s aim in writing her thesis was as claimed at the Introduction to explain why the EU did not succeed in achieving the democratization agenda in the countries of Eastern Neighbourhood. The research question is identified but no thesis examined. The author is referring to a clash between liberal democracy and realism. The axis of analysis contains three dimension: normative, economic and security. The timeline is set between the years 1991 and 201x.

In the theoretical part the author is introducing the term ‘democracy promotion’ for which she is using an unofficial paper of the Council of Europe (p.10). The definition is very vague and does not give a clear picture of complexity of the problem. The question of the relationship between transformation and the accession is not tackled. The process of democratisation forms its part. I also miss an explanation between the perceptions of a liberal democracy but most of all realism, which is referred to in the Introduction and considered to be of two main clashing concepts.

One sub-chapter is devoted to the analysis of literature relevant to the topic of the development of the Eastern European countries after the split of the Soviet Union. New terms were introduced such as Europeanization or External Governance and new topics included.

The second chapter is devoted to Fukuyama and his statement about a victory of liberalism and democracy. After that the author is quoting recent works of Fukuyama and points out the change of his attitude. The term 'realism' is defined at the bottom of a page 40 but it is not clear of the definition is quoted or developed by the author and in which sense and if is related to the theories of International Relations. Further in the text the term is changed into autocracy promoter. Three dimensions are introduced: normative, economic and security based. Methodology is tackled in the Sub-chapter 2.6. The method selected is a Case Study, Qualitative Content Analysis and Political Discourse Analysis.

The three main chapters of the book are a chronological description of the development in three above mentioned dimensions divided in the years 1991 – 1997, 1998 – 2003 and 2003 – 2008. Maps and tables illustrating the development accompany the description of events at these periods. The text is enriched by the interviews with some actors involved in the process.

The comparative Case Studies are introduced and involving Armenia, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Georgia, Moldova and Ukraine. Comprehensive study is based on a broad basis of facts and analysis.

In the conclusion the author is summarizing the content of individual chapters. Five general conclusions aim to explain the research question. I consider the Conclusion 3 (page 235) as the most relevant.

The list of sources is very impressive. I suggest that the division between primary and secondary sources and distinguishing different types of primary sources would help in better orientation.

I recommend the acceptance of the Dissertation as a doctorate worthy performance.

I suggest Promotionsordnung 2008 Cum Laude.

Lenka Rovna

Prof. PhDr. Lenka Anna Rovná  
Jean Monnet Chair *Ad Personam*  
Vice Rector for European Affairs  
Charles University  
Ovocný trh 3  
Prague  
Czech Republic  
[lenka.rovna@ruk.cuni.cz](mailto:lenka.rovna@ruk.cuni.cz)