

BACHELOR'S THESIS EXAMINER REPORT
PPE – Bachelor's in Politics, Philosophy and Economics
Faculty of Social Sciences, Charles University

Thesis title:	The influence of geopolitics and philosophy on each other. Particularly explored through the lens of Communism and its impact on Great Britain and Russia.
Student's name:	Yelizaveta Frolova
Referee's name:	Martin Riegl

Criteria	Definition	Maximum	Points
Major Criteria			
	Contribution and argument (quality of research and analysis, originality)	8	
	Research question (definition of objectives, plausibility of hypotheses)	9	
	Theoretical framework (methods relevant to the research question)	5	
<i>Total</i>		22	
Minor Criteria			
	Sources, literature	2	
	Presentation (language, style, cohesion)	2	
	Manuscript form (structure, logical coherence, layout, tables, figures)	0,5	
<i>Total</i>		4,5	
TOTAL		26,5	

Plagiarism-check (URKUND) match score:

The thesis was checked by URKUND software and there is no indication of rules violation.

Reviewer's commentary according to the above criteria:

The thesis deals with an innovative idea of analyzing a linkage between the mutual influence of geopolitics and philosophy. It presents a concrete "case study" of communism and geopolitical thought and practice in the United Kingdom and the Soviet Union. The author declares an objective to prove whether there is a link between philosophy (communism) and geopolitics (UK and USSR), or how the first influence the latter in other words. To achieve the above-mentioned objective, the following hypotheses are tested: " 1) geopolitics influence the development of philosophical ideas; however, those ideas do not right away change/influence geopolitics: and (2) communism was not adopted in Great Britain as it was in Russia due to significant cultural differences that include, but are not limited to, society, the role of the church (religion as a whole), historical background, and geopolitical stance that affected an overall development of these countries. While I appraise the very ambitious and innovative goal, there are many problematic aspects of the paper. Unfortunately, I must state I was not given a chance to consult the paper. This was especially frustrating as the

author reached out to me one day before the due date, which happened for the third time in a row.

Sadly, this negatively affected the final outcome of the thesis. Formal aspects are far from perfect. Double full stop in the first sentence of an abstract, very messy table of contents says a lot. The overall structure of the thesis gives very mixed impressions. Instead of a standard structure comprising theoretical and “empirical part”, the author jumps from the introduction (1 page long approx.) to a few paragraphs on methodology (which rather describes the content rather than the methodological approach). Not to mention the fact, that by application of the descriptive method, the author would only hardly achieve the declared objective. So instead of having a proper theoretical framing, developing robust methodology, and conceptualization of key concepts, the author jumps to discussion on communism and geopolitics (here the list of “schools of geopolitics” seems to be a random selection), not really a reflection which traditions influence both the UK (geostrategy) or the USSR. It’s not to say there are no interesting facts presented, but the thesis lacks strong arguments, and the conclusions presented are intuitive and not based on solid argumentation. It also shows several problematic statements (e.g. the UK lost control of colonies and other controlled territories, what is a definition of controlled territory?). Further, the term Britain is wrongly used as a synonym for the United Kingdom, and several similar terminological flaws appear in the text. The author should explain the meaning of the term geopolitical stance (p. 3). I know the term geopolitical code, but not the stance.

The last significant problem is a list of bibliography:

- 2nd entry (Black) / Vol. 4 vol 4).
- 3rd entry (Blumberg), why is the jstor link copied? Students can freely access full versions of articles
- Disraeli / publishing house is missing
- Jones / which is a doi link included?
- Moss publishing missing
- For articles pages are missing
- But what really struck me was a reference to Britannic for kids (Scramble for Africa, p. 4).

For all above-given reasons, I do not have the feeling the paper was really completed.

Proposed grade (A-B-C-D-E-F): F

Suggested questions for the defence are:

I (do not) recommend the thesis for final defence.

Referee Signature

Overall grading scheme at FSV UK:

TOTAL POINTS	GRADE	Quality standard
91 – 100	A	= outstanding (high honor)
81 – 90	B	= superior (honor)
71 – 80	C	= good
61 – 70	D	= satisfactory
51 – 60	E	= low pass at a margin of failure
0 – 50	F	= failing. The thesis is not recommended for defence.