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Comments (at least 300 words)

This is probably the best master thesis I have supervised so far. In my opinion, the author has proven academic skills beyond the master’s level. The paper is an original piece of research, well connected to the current academic debate and offering a valuable contribution to it. It shows independent thought and original approach, yet well informed by the standards in the field, to a current topic that has not been covered by anybody in this form.

The structure serves well the purpose of the paper. The argument is well developed and the conclusions are original, even if they maybe turned out not to be anyhow surprising (however, it is not the author’s fault that the reality proved not to hide anything unexpected).

The method used is appropriate, well chosen for the objectives of the paper. At the same time, the author has been aware of the method’s limitations and has adjusted the results accordingly. The research is based on robust base of primary sources.

I do not feel authorized to evaluate a native speaker’s use of language. Yet, my non-native eye has not noticed any irregularities.

Specific questions for oral defence (at least 100 words)

To what extent, do you think, is the extensive overlap between the official and media conceptualisation of the Czech Republic in the American discourse caused by the fact that there is little general knowledge of the Czech Republic in the U.S.? Should we expect different results in case of more familiar countries, such as Canada, France, or Mexico?

If different results should be expected for other countries, what does it mean for the paper’s conclusions regarding the unity of geopolitics?