



# Report on the part of the final state examination Record of the thesis defence

Academic year: 2022/2023

**Student's name and surname:** Kelig Chappuis  
**Student's ID:** 49127492

**Type of the study programme:** Master's (post-Bachelor)  
**Study programme:** International Master in Security, Intelligence and Strategic Studies (IMSIS)

**Study ID:** 722494

**Title of the thesis:** Peace through Knowledge - Understanding the last decade of United Nations Peacekeeping Intelligence  
**Thesis department:** Department of Security Studies (23-KBS)  
**Language of the thesis:** English  
**Language of defence:** English  
**Advisor:** Georgios Glouftsios  
**Date of defence:** 21.09.2023    **Venue of defence:** Praha  
**Attempt:** regular

**Course of defence:** The student wrote on intelligence processes in UNPKOs. He explained that his initially idea was to merge the two concepts, from which he was discouraged, which encouraged him all the more. He based his approach on the open-source perspective on intelligence literature. He first wanted to understand what intelligence meant for UNPKOs and second whether it could be studied from the open-source perspective. His approach was two case studies, one major case study and then a study of official document analysis. The student acknowledged that this diverged a bit from his original idea, which could have cause some limitations, but overall was also an interest take. The student followed by focusing on his first research question, describing the most important of his analysis, emphasizing a practice-v-theory dynamic. Following that, the student chose to highlight of his findings, stressing especially his merging of case study and document analysis. The student stopped himself as he found out the time was up and moved to the reviews: (first reviewer) conceptualization and literature review - not properly specified, same with the conclusion - the student explained how his choices could be justified. What he disagreed with was the suggestion that some parts of the discussion could be cut. Also there was a critique that the student did not explain well how the document analysis was executed, with which the student agreed. Turning to the other reviewer: not enough specification of the concepts and a lack of discussion on political tensions of the empirics. The student recognized some of the comments but for the most part argued that more context would not have benefited the work overall. There was also the charge that the case study was not the best representative example, with which the student partially agrees and suggests it is because his research design changed during the process. One

committee member asked to which extent there was interaction between the host state and the intelligence, as well as the French forces on the ground in the mission. The student first said that there was unfortunately not enough data on the first part but offered some comments on the latter part. The committee thanked the student and announced her successful completion of the defense.

<b>Result of defence:</b>	excellent (B)	
<b>Chair of the board:</b>	prof. PhDr. Emil Aslan, Ph.D. (present)	.....
<b>Committee members:</b>	Marcin Kaczmarek, Dr. (present)	.....
	Sarah Leonard (present)	.....