



Diploma Thesis Evaluation Form

Author: Jan Stehlík

Title: Prepared for the Worst: Counter-terrorism in the Visegrad

Programme/year: 2017

Author of Evaluation (supervisor): dr. Radko Hokovský

Criteria	Definition	Maximum	Points
Major Criteria			
	Research question, definition of objectives	10	10
	Theoretical/conceptual framework	30	25
	Methodology, analysis, argument	40	30
<i>Total</i>		80	65
Minor Criteria			
	Sources	10	10
	Style	5	5
	Formal requirements	5	5
<i>Total</i>		20	20
TOTAL		100	85



Evaluation

Major criteria:

The submitted thesis provides a comprehensive analysis of counter-terrorism policies and their development in the countries of the Visegrad Group, and thus offers a substantial contribution into a relatively under-researched area. Since it reveals several noteworthy differences in the legal measures and institutional frameworks adopted by the respective V4 countries and offers an explanation thereof, it conveys an important added-value to security studies in general and to counter-terrorism research in particular. The author clearly defines his research objectives: while the primary goal of the thesis is to investigate the development of counter-terrorism (CT) instruments in the four countries over the period of 1989 to 2017, the secondary goal is to identify the potential causal factors behind the development.

The author has chosen well suited method of analysis for the secondary goal, namely that of causal-process tracing, while he bears in mind its advantages and disadvantages for the subject matter at hand. Although the author points out in the introduction that he does not intend to make strong claims about causality, he does not clearly explain and justify, how he is going to employ the key causal-process observations such as comprehensive storylines, smoking gun observations, and confessions presented in the methodological section.

Based on existing literature, he has formulated four appropriate hypotheses concerning the causal factors behind CT development:

H1: CT developed in the V4 because of a perceived threat of terrorism.

H2: CT developed in the V4 as a result of external pressure from international institutions.

H3: CT developed in the V4 as a result of international policy diffusion and learning.

H4: CT developed in the V4 as a result of internal processes and pressure from domestic actors.

As a minor imperfection can be considered rather brief review of wide literature on counter-terrorism that is not reflecting some of the research streams and debates, which could have informed the hypotheses formulation.



**FACULTY
OF SOCIAL SCIENCES**
Charles University

The analytical part provides comprehensive storylines employing wide range of primary and secondary sources regarding the development of counter-terrorism legal measures and institutional frameworks in the four respective countries. However, more systematic and structured testing of the stated hypotheses, and perhaps offering a summarising table of results would provide more clarity to the analytical process.

Minor criteria:

Concerning author's work with sources, writing style and other formal requirements, the thesis at hand can be considered as perfect, fulfilling all criteria of proficient academic writing.

Overall evaluation:

I recommend this thesis for defence.

Suggested grade:

Between Excellent (1) and Very Good (2).

Signature:

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'Rachko M...'. The signature is fluid and cursive.