METROPOLITAN UNIVERSITY PRAGUE

Letter of Review of Ph.D. Dissertation of PhDr. Ondřej Ditrych, MPhil.:

"A Genealogy of Terrorism in States' Discourse"

As this is a second review of a revised dissertation following the internal departmental dissertation defense, its length is limited because the author has duly taken into account most of the comments I made in the first, substantially longer, review. The fact that I have little to comment on critically is a sign of the quality of the reviewed thesis, which not only meets all standard criteria for this type of work, but which exceeds many of them on several fronts. In particular, I have to repeat that the quantity of primary sources used to support the thesis' arguments is impressive. In short, the reviewed thesis can be recommended for acceptance with distinction.

Concerning remaining points for discussion during the public defense of the reviewed thesis, I would still argue that the author could, and should, have taken more serious issue with the self-declared *Critical Studies on Terrorism* school vis-à-vis his own research agenda. Although he added a short section about this on pages 254-255, more could be said in the conclusions or introduction about the similarities and differences between the approach and findings advanced in the reviewed thesis and those presented by the authors belonging to *Critical Studies on Terrorism* listed in footnote no. 777. For example, in the introduction (pp. 8-90), the author of the thesis claims that his call for "forgetting terrorism" in order to open new "thinking space" for understanding the use of violence in international order is different from the "emancipatory ambition own to many authors in Critical Terrorism Studies, of making the world a somewhat better place." However, such ambition does not really emerge from the short *Critical Terrorism Studies* literature review provided in the thesis and the author does not explain how exactly different is his own approach.

The latter point can be also generalized into a broader criticism that was already raised during the first departmental defense of the reviewed thesis. It concerns the fact that while the thesis is strong in introducing the methodology and basics premises of Poststructuralism, it does not really offer a comprehensive literature review that would situate this rather unique approach in the larger (counter-)terrorism literature. This is not to deny that the author engages many of the findings of this literature in his thesis, but as with *Critical Terrorism Studies*, he does so in an *ad hoc*, and sometimes a bit selective, fashion to support his overall Poststructuralist arguments in chapters 3, 4 and 5, rather than in a concise "Terrorism Studies" literature review in the introduction (or in a separate chapter at the beginning of the thesis).

Overall, I recommend the reviewed thesis to be accepted and defended.

doc. Mgr. Oldřich Bureš, M.A., Ph.D.

V Praze, 11.1.2011

Metropolitan University Prague
Dubečská 900/10
100 31 Prague 10 | Czech Republic
tel.: +420 274 815 044, +420 274 821 235 | fax: +420 274 817 190 | www.mup.cz | info@mup.cz