

## REPORT ON THE MASTER THESIS

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

<b>Title of the thesis:</b>	<b>Fortress Europe? Evaluation of Ideas for the Future of the EU</b>
<b>Author of the thesis:</b>	<b>Jan Putensen</b>
<b>Referee (incl. titles):</b>	<b>Martin Riegl</b>

*Remark: It is a standard at the FSV UK that the Referee's Report is at least 400 words long. In case you will assess the thesis as "non-defendable", please explain the concrete reasons for that in detail.*

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

### **1) Theoretical background:**

The submitted paper present na ambitious goal when it tries to reveal the understanding the Fortress of Europe concept in selected countries. Nevrtheless the theoretical part of the thesis has been written really well and enables Jan to conduct a deep and well informed analysis of the topic.

### **2) Contribution:**

First of all I do commend originality and topicality of the paper. Although Jan has decided to analyze very difficult topic he achieved his goal with merits. The paper provides a valuable insight into right wing political parties' (or movements) understanding of the Fortress of Eurupe, which has been widely debated by politicians, media, and academia since the peak of the migration crisis. Besides that Jan provides a shift from the original use of the concept by the left to the current diskurse. Also the case studies are logically selected and provide a better understanding of narratives in Austria, Germany and Italy.

### **3) Methods:**

Methodological part of the thesis shows no major weaknesses. I do commend Jan's decision to base his research both on qualitative approach and use a Factiva database. The research question: "What kind of external border regime and immigration policies do political parties and movements in the EU want who are in favor of establishing a Fortress Europe?" is clearly defined and following sub-questions do further contribute to overall research design. Only the application of discursive analysis would deserve better application.

### **4) Literature:**

Jan has gathered enormous number of sources, including theoretical literature as well as empirical data (Factiva database and other), relevant for his case studies. Maybe more theoretical literature on the securitization of migration could appear in the paper.

### **5) Manuscript form:**

The thesis meets all formal criteria, the layout, grammar, and language are above standard, also the paper is clearly structured into six chapters. What I appreciate is a nice balance between theoretical and empirical chapters, both of them are well researched and written, more importantly the whole paper gives an impression of cohesive and comprehensive analysis of the selected problem.

**In the case of successful defense, I recommend the following grade: "A" (excellent).**

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

<b>CATEGORY</b>	<b>POINTS</b>
<i>Theoretical background (max. 20 points)</i>	20
<i>Contribution (max. 20 points)</i>	18
<i>Methods (max. 20 points)</i>	16
<i>Literature (max. 20 points)</i>	18
<i>Manuscript form (max. 20 points)</i>	19
<b>TOTAL POINTS (max. 100 points)</b>	<b>91</b>
<b>The proposed grade (A-B-C-D-E-F)</b>	<b>A</b>

**DATE OF EVALUATION:** August 7, 2019

---

**Referee Signature**