



Diploma Thesis Evaluation Form

Author: Mgr. Ondřej Rosendorf

Title: Campaign to stop 'killer robots': prospects of a preemptive ban on autonomous weapons systems

Programme/year: BS, 2016/2017

Author of Evaluation (supervisor/external assessor): Doc. Dr. Nik Hynek,
PhD

Criteria	Definition	Maximm	Points
Major Criteria			
	Research question, definition of objectives	10	7
	Theoretical/conceptual framework	30	25
	Methodology, analysis, argument	40	35
<i>Total</i>		80	67
Minor Criteria			
	Sources	10	9
	Style	5	4
	Formal requirements	5	3
<i>Total</i>		20	16
TOTAL		100	83



Evaluation

Major criteria and evaluation:

This is a very ambitious thesis - both in terms of its scope and aims - dealing with regulatory/prohibitory prospects of AWS. As much as it is laudable, at least in theory and principle, for arriving to a comprehensive analysis and understanding of the given topic, it becomes the serious liability of an otherwise interesting, high-standard processing of the security topic in question. While the background section and lit-review are adequate in terms of depth, breadth and comprehensiveness, the section THEORY is far excessive (22 pages of text) and disjoint (relative paucity of interrelations between the subsections) considering that this assessment comes to the register of master's thesis, and not a phd work that the thesis resembles in its style, size, and format. One could thus say that the MA thesis suffers from over-theorization, both absolutely (ie number of pages/proportion of the text) and in terms of applicability, or rather its lack of. Defensive realism theorization is particularly underused in the empirical section and one is left wondering why so much theory – containing, except for the above, the theorisation of security dilemma, and then mainly theorisation of state preferences, their institutional activity, and agreement seeking in the international system/IO, is served by the author for understanding of the topic. The work is also going beyond the expected size of MY thesis in the programme. Surprisingly given this over-ambitious attempt which has good analytical and methodological moments throughout but does not work so well as a single piece, the summarizing part of the conclusion is reduced to 2 paragraphs (the remaining 3 are related to identification of future research).

Minor Criteria

Suggested grade: B

Signature:

Nik Hynek