



Posudek na diplomovou práci

Autor/ka práce: Olexsandr Lutsenko

Název práce: **Russian Hybrid Warfare in Ukraine: the Annexation of Crimea and the Donbas War**

Obor/Rok: MV/2021

Autor posudku (vedoucí/oponent): Magda Leichtová, PhD

Kritéria	Definice	Max. bodů	Získané body
Hlavní kritéria			
	Výzkumná otázka, formulace problému	10	8
	Teoretický konceptuální rámec	30	20
	Metodologie, analýza argumentace	40	20
<i>Celkem</i>		80	48
Vedlejší kritéria			
	Zdroje	10	5
	Styl	5	5
	Formální kritéria	5	4
<i>Celkem</i>		20	14
CELKEM		100	62



Slovní hodnocení:

Hlavní kritéria:

Disclaimer: Given the thesis is written in English, I took notes and drafted this review in English. Now, looking at the Czech-written form fields, I am confused, but I will proceed with my initial plan. I apologize for any inconvenience.

Alex and I, we were slightly late when finalizing the thesis, and as the result, I did not get to final version of the text before it was submitted, which will reflect on the evaluation a bit.

While I enjoyed some portions of the text, I was a bit disappointed with some aspects of it. First to its strengths: I appreciate that Alex was able to provide a quite fairly balanced overview of the Ukrainian crisis. It is an extremely delicate task to do, and Alex has succeeded on this front. I also generally liked the idea of approaching the hybrid warfare from the constructivist perspective.

Unfortunately, and this is the single biggest issue I have with the text, the promised analysis has not been done. After a lengthy historical and empirical overview we do not get to any form of discourse analysis, analysis of narratives, or any other constructivist-style analysis of the topic, despite the proposed hypotheses require us to do so. Even if there is a slight focus on the role of ideas in the chapter 2, it is not enough to represent more than a basis for a following research, which, unfortunately, does not follow. I remember what we discussed at the beginning – when we planned for the structure and goals of the thesis and, unfortunately, instead of two constructivism-inspired case studies (Donbass and Crimea) of Russian influence over the historical memory, identity, and sense of belonging, we are reading another (quite nicely done) description of events.

There are no obvious mistakes in the text content-wise, as stated above, it is actually quite balanced and comprehensive description of Russo-Ukrainian crisis, but it is not an analysis which would contribute much to better understanding to thesis' hypotheses.

Vedlejší kritéria:

I have no problems with style, also sources are properly quoted, and I think they are sufficient to the text as it looks now. The only problem is that these are not the sources which should be used to investigate the proposed hypotheses. It is difficult to follow narratives and identity changes from events-focused secondary literature, without opinion polls and primary sources, or at least materials primarily dealing with ideas and narratives. I suspect, that the body of literature which the author collected, is partially responsible for the content, as he worked with what was available, rather than searched for what would have been needed.



**FAKULTA
SOCIÁLNÍCH VĚD**
Univerzita Karlova

Celkové hodnocení: Despite my critical remarks above, I would still like to emphasize qualities of the submitted text, which manages to navigate intricate international issue in a sober and quite balanced fashion. That itself testifies, that Alex has some important skills of future researcher. It is only pity that he did not employ his talents in favour of deeper analysis.

Výsledná známka: C

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to be 'L. Č. S.' or similar, written on a light blue background.

Podpis: