

CHARLES UNIVERSITY IN PRAGUE
Faculty of Social Sciences
Institute of International Studies

PROTOCOL ON DIPLOMA THESIS ASSESSMENT
(Supervisor)

Name of the student: Valeria Grishko

Title: The Arctic Region – New Arena for Cooperation or Conflict? Race for Arctic Resources

Reviewer (external reviewers including the address and position):

Karel Svoboda

1. TOPIC AND OBJECTIVE (short information on the thesis, research objective):

The thesis deals with contemporary and highly important topic of the use of the area of Arctic by the countries surrounding it. With the global warming and icebergs melting underway, the territory opens new possibilities for exploitation. However, this causes diplomatic disputes between the countries about the rights to explore and use the resources contained in the waters of Arctic. The author therefore asks, whether the territory is doomed to become a field of conflict or whether there is a chance for cooperation among the interested sides. She mentions the special role of the Arctic council as the institution where the countries involved meet and discuss their positions.

2. CONTENT (complexity, original approach, argument, structure, theoretical and methodological backing, work with sources, appropriateness of annexes etc.):

The topic is complex and generally new, especially in the Czech environment. As the processes that led to current situation in the Arctic are only going to deepen, the topic is also highly important.

The literature review is presented in the form of commented list of sources instead of explaining of the place of the thesis in current research.

The author mentions the “rational choice theory” as her theoretical background. However, this theory does not explain much, but only sets basis of the decision making of the countries. The theoretical framework should have reflected also the discussion between realist and liberal schools of international political economy. Especially when the question in the title is about cooperation or conflict.

The author uses the method of separate structured case studies. Based on them, she compares approaches of the Arctic countries. Such method has its advantages, as it helps to understand the strategies of each of the countries deeper, on the other hand, it makes understanding of more general topics (such as the UN arbitrage) harder to understand.

3. FORMAL ASPECTS AND LANGUAGE (quality of language, citation style, graphics, formal aspects etc.): As

I am not English speaking native, I will leave the language side of the thesis to the opponent. Nevertheless, there are several misprints and other mistakes that could have been avoided in the case of more careful reading (p. 4 – missing ending quotation marks, p. 22 -coustal line, p. 48 “affective economic inducements”)

The author uses Harvard type of citations, however, not correctly (Smith P., 2017)

4. SHORT COMMENTS BY THE REVIEWER (overall impression, strengths and weaknesses, originality of ideas, achievement of the research objective etc.):

I highly appreciate incorporating the role of the European Union in the analysis of the process of negotiations about the use of the Arctic territory. I have to admit that I would use different method and structuring of the thesis (not the country by country approach), but this lies in the field of possible author’s choice.

5. COOPERATION WITH SUPERVISOR (communication with the supervisor, ability to reflect comments, shift from the original idea etc.)

Generally, my impact on the result of the thesis was rather limited due to a large time span between consultations.

6. QUESTIONS AND COMMENTS THAT SHOULD BE ADDRESSED DURING THE DEFENCE (one to three):

The question is quite simple – in the near future, which do you see more likely, cooperation or conflict?

7. *(NON-)RECOMMENDATION AND SUGGESTED GRADE*
(excellent, very good, good, unsatisfactory):

I recommend the thesis for defense with the proposed grade **very good**.

Date:

Signature: