



## Diploma Thesis Evaluation Form

Author: Natacha Cailler

Title: United we stand? European strategic culture in the fight against terrorism

Programme/year: Master in International Security Studies (MISS), 2019

Author of Evaluation (supervisor): Tomáš Karásek

Criteria	Definition	Maximum	Points
<b>Major Criteria</b>			
	Research question, definition of objectives	<b>10</b>	8
	Theoretical / conceptual framework	<b>30</b>	27
	Methodology, analysis, argument	<b>40</b>	35
<i>Total</i>		<b>80</b>	<b>70</b>
<b>Minor Criteria</b>			
	Sources	<b>10</b>	9
	Style	<b>5</b>	4
	Formal requirements	<b>5</b>	5
<i>Total</i>		<b>20</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>100</b>	<b>88</b>



## Evaluation

### Major criteria:

Natacha Cailler's thesis poses a general, theoretically oriented question, and finds a smart, well structured and empirically driven way of answering it. Inspired by recent works pondering the existence of European strategic culture, the thesis shifts the attention of the debate towards the salient issue of the fight against terrorism. In France and Germany it selects two states which in practically any constellation form the bedrock of a European approach towards security issues in general and terrorism in particular, and subjects them to richly layered analysis which attempts to uncover the similarities and difference of their underlying cultural milieus.

The analysis rests on an impressive array of primary and secondary sources whose study provided the author with a detailed understanding of the subject matter. The initial review of relevant theoretical literature provides both conceptual anchor and methodological inspiration. Concerning the latter: while the selected set of factors (popular discourse, threat perception, strategic orientation) generally makes sense, it is not clear how exactly it is derived from the sources that allegedly provide inspiration therefor. Also, while the subsequent analysis explains the difference, it is not inherently obvious how "popular discourse" and "threat perception" relate to each other (or if they do not overlap); the title of the third factor, "strategic orientation", is in fact a composite of two specific elements rather than a clear-cut phenomenon. Finally, the titles of subchapters A a C of section 1, chapter 1, largely overlap – but once again, this is perhaps more a linguistic issue as the argument within the chapter develops rather fluently.

From chapter 2 onwards the thesis presents a meticulously arranged and empirically rich analysis of the anti-terrorist systems in France and Germany from several angles and within a rigorously maintained comparative design. I would tend not to agree with the conclusion of the author which generally confirms the existence of a shared strategic culture in this dimension, but the specific arguments (French openness towards the use of force, Germany preference for a European framework) nicely summarize the main findings of the analysis.

### Minor criteria:

Already mentioned, the wide scope of the sources which were used (and are duly and frequently quoted throughout the text) represents one of the main assets of the thesis and its key to successful empirical part of the analysis. The author also needs



**FACULTY  
OF SOCIAL SCIENCES**  
Charles University

to be commended for the summarization of some of the findings in the presented tables. The attached coding tree helps affirm and explain the process of analyzing the popular discourse.

Overall evaluation:

Theoretically ambitious thesis with nice conceptual anchoring, sound (if slightly problematically founded) methodology with a rigorous comparative design, detailed utilization of abundant resources in a complex and persuasively presented analysis.

Suggested grade: **B**

Signature: