



Diploma Thesis Evaluation Form

Author: Bc. Ervín Hausvater

Title: Mungiki in Kenya: From Religious Movement to Militia

Programme/year: Politologie – Bezpečnostní studia / 2020

Author of Evaluation (external assessor): PhDr. Zdeněk Ludvík, Ph.D.

Criteria	Definition	Maximum	Points
Major Criteria			
	Research question, definition of objectives	10	10
	Theoretical / conceptual framework	30	30
	Methodology, analysis, argument	40	40
<i>Total</i>		80	80
Minor Criteria			
	Sources	10	8
	Style	5	4
	Formal requirements	5	5
<i>Total</i>		20	17
TOTAL		100	97



Evaluation

Major criteria:

- author well defines research questions and research objectives;
- author puts his research into a clearly chosen theoretical/conceptual framework which he consistently applies in the empirical/analytical part;
- author introduces dense and detailed empirical material which is solidly analysed with the use of an adequate methodology, and in connection with the established theoretical apparatus, author substantiates his research findings with sufficient argumentative persuasiveness.

Minor criteria:

- neither in the text nor in the literature review do both the announced local and foreign newspaper articles figure;
- occasional minor typing errors.

Overall evaluation:

The work deals with the original topic from both an empirical and a theoretical perspective. It is extraordinarily authorially mature and advanced. I have no major comments on it.

However, I would like to mention one aspect, purely as an incentive for authors' potential reflection or for answering questions during defense. The classification category of a particular VNSA is defined implicitly, i.e. as a follow-up to the motivation of the VNSA to act in a certain way with regard to the set objectives. That is to say that if the VNSA is to try to be successful, it cannot afford to spontaneously choose what it wants to be; it must be what easily makes it successful (if I want to overthrow the government, I will be proceeding differently than if I want to support the government; in the first case, I will be labeled by scholars as insurgent, and in the second case as paramilitia). This process can be described as proactivity. And although it cannot be automatically said that the processes of creation and transformation are the same, and that in the detected causal mechanisms "proactive" variables are completely absent, "reactive" variables have the upper hand (*the metamorphosis was rather a strategy for survival and protection of the community, pp. 50-51*). In other words, the stimuli in the case of the Mungiki group are significantly exogenous which is even in conflict with Zelinka and Janků' transformation theory of hybridization where the stimuli are rather endogenous. Can this be somehow explained?

The paper definitely deserves further elaboration and refinement, and then its publication could be considered.

The paper meets the requirements of a diploma thesis. I recommend it for defense.



**FACULTY
OF SOCIAL SCIENCES**
Charles University

Suggested grade:

A

Signature:

Zd. Ludvík, m.p.