

## REPORT ON THE MASTER THESIS

GPS – Geopolitical Studies, Faculty of Social Sciences, Charles University

<b>Title of the thesis:</b>	The Road to Sorrow: From State Crime to State Apology
<b>Author of the thesis:</b>	<b>Miguel Molina Tobar</b>
<b>Referee (incl. titles):</b>	<b>PhDr. Michael Romancov, Ph.D.</b>

**Remark:** It is a standard at the FSV UK that the Referee's Report is at least 500 words long. In case you will assess the thesis as "non-defendable", please explain the concrete reasons for that in detail.

### **SUMMARY OF POINTS AWARDED** (for details, see below):

<b>CATEGORY</b>	<b>POINTS</b>
<i>Theoretical background (max. 20)</i>	18
<i>Contribution (max. 20)</i>	17
<i>Methods (max. 20)</i>	17
<i>Literature (max. 20)</i>	19
<i>Manuscript form (max. 20)</i>	18
<b>TOTAL POINTS (max. 100)</b>	<b>89</b>
<b>The proposed grade (A-B-C-D-E-F)</b>	<b>B</b>

### **Comments of the referee on the thesis highlights and shortcomings (following the 5 numbered aspects of your assessment indicated below).**

#### **1) Theoretical background:**

The author declares that he will anchor his work in the Image Repair Theory, developed by Benoit and cited by Edwards and Shaw (2011) which seems to be logical and entirely satisfactory.

#### **2) Contribution:**

The author chose a new, original and provocative topic that he managed to process at a very high level. The results he has reached are clearly interesting, and the arguments he has come up with are logically grounded.

#### **3) Methods:**

The choice of cases examined seems to be logical. However, I am not sure how exactly the cases that happened at another time, and caused by other actors, can be compared. The case of Guatemala and Salvador can undoubtedly be compared, but the Armenian genocide, in my opinion, is another case. I am afraid that the size of the crime is just one, and unfortunately not a decisive factor.

#### **4) Literature:**

The work is based on a sufficient number of literature and other relevant information sources.

#### **5) Manuscript form:**

The text is processed carefully, and the author's writing is comprehensible. The resources used have been properly quoted and the work therefore fully complies with the standards applied to texts of this type.

**DATE OF EVALUATION: 04.02. 2018**

---

***Referee Signature***

**The referee should give comments to the following requirements:**

**1) THEORETICAL BACKGROUND:** Can you recognize that the thesis was guided by some **theoretical fundamentals** relevant for this thesis topic? Were some important theoretical concepts omitted? Was the theory used in the thesis consistently incorporated with the topic and hypotheses tested?

Strong                      Average                      Weak  
20                              10                              0                      points

**2) CONTRIBUTION:** Evaluate if the author presents **original ideas** on the topic and aims at demonstrating **critical thinking** and ability to draw conclusions based on the knowledge of relevant theory and relevant empirical material. Is there a distinct **value added** of the thesis (relative to knowledge of a university-educated person interested in given topic)? Did the author explain **why** the observed phenomena occurred? Were the policy implications well founded?

Strong                      Average                      Weak  
20                              10                              0                      points

**3) METHODS:** Are the **hypotheses** for this study clearly stated, allowing their further verification and testing? Are the theoretical explanations, empirical material and **analytical tools** used in the thesis relevant to the research question being investigated, and adequate to the aspiration level of the study? Is the thesis **topic comprehensively analyzed** and does the thesis not make trivial or irrelevant detours off the main body stated in the thesis proposal? More than 10 points signal an exceptional work, **which requires your explanation "why" it is so**.

Strong                      Average                      Weak  
20                              10                              0                      points

**4) LITERATURE REVIEW:** The thesis demonstrates author's full understanding and **command of recent literature**. The author quotes relevant literature in a proper way and disposes with a representative bibliography. (Remark: references to Wikipedia, websites and newspaper articles are a sign of **poor research**). If they dominate you cannot give more than 8 points. References to books published by prestigious publishers and articles in renowned journals give much better impression.

Strong                      Average                      Weak  
20                              10                              0                      points

**5) MANUSCRIPT FORM:** The thesis is **clear and well structured**. The author uses appropriate language and style, including academic **format** for quotations, graphs and tables. The text effectively refers to graphs and tables, is easily readable and **stimulates thinking**.

Strong                      Average                      Weak  
20                              10                              0                      points

**Overall grading scheme at FSV UK:**

TOTAL POINTS	GRADE	Czech grading
91 – 100	<b>A</b>	= excellent
81 - 90	<b>B</b>	= good
71 – 80	<b>C</b>	= satisfactory
61 - 70	<b>D</b>	= satisfactory
51 - 60	<b>E</b>	
0	<b>F</b>	= fail (not recommended for defence)