

Review of Bachelor's thesis – Opponent

Prague 27/05/2015

Anna Kralova wrote her Bachelor thesis on the topic « Why hasn't Internet Affected Democracy to a Greater Extent ? Electronic Democracy as the Future of Democracy in Europe. The work has the required number of pages, references, list of sources for a Bachelor thesis, and therefore fulfills the formal requirements.

The work presents a series of confusions and disappointments for a reader discovering the thinking of the author. The structure is not coherent; the title is not corresponding really to the content.

When reading such a complicated and long title, the reader is expecting many things. First of all, an explanation on why it is so evident for the author that internet should affect democracy. Then, the words "to a Greater extent" makes us expect that we will have a deep analysis on how much was internet influencing democracy (that could be enough for a Bachelor thesis in itself). Then, suddenly, a new concept is introduced, "electronic democracy", that we suppose will be defined and proved to be related with democracy in itself, and finally, the title speaks about the "future of democracy in Europe". Why not the present, and why only in Europe? New mysteries that we expect to be explained during that work. The number of questions raised only by the title already creates some fears that the author won't be able to answer to all of them.

The work is divided into 7 parts, with incoherent titles, that seems to deal with another topic. "The Athenian democracy", part 3, seems to concern rather the past than the future. If it is understood just as a way to define democracy, why isn't it inserted into the part 1, "Democracy as a Political System". The part four is subdivided in one subpart. Is it really possible to divide into one subpart? What is the purpose? The part 7.4 concerns Mongolia. Will it really help us to define the future of Europe? Or is Europe understood in such a broad sense? What is worth, the chapters are not equilibrated at all, counting sometimes around 2 page (chapters 4 and 5), sometimes 15 pages (chapter 7). The work of redaction, and plan construction was not done as it should be.

From the first part, I discover that the author is not interested in the whole democratic process, but mainly in the direct democracy (that explains the presence of Athens and of Switzerland). The choice to present the now-a-day system in Switzerland before the Athenian one is still unjustified. The comparison could make sense only as an element of definition of what is democracy (or rather how to build a direct democracy) on the long-term experience in Europe.

The part 6, "Electronic democracy", gives us a definition of the influences of the direct democracy through internet. This part is clear and convincing. But why speaking about the Arab spring, if we are interested only in the European evolution? Once again, the reader is lost.

After many efforts, I understood that the Bachelor thesis of the Anna Kralova should have only two chapters, as she aims to justify her thinking first, on defining the direct democracy (what she is trying to do from p.1 to 19), and to present internet as a tool for this direct democracy (from p. 19 to the p.38). The title should be different, (probably something like "Internet reintroducing elements of direct democracy"). The question of Europe, of the future and so on shouldn't be, probably, in the title, are they are only evocated in this work.

The work is therefore an interesting work, with a real topic, but badly structured, organized, and framed. For these reasons, I propose a mark between good and very good, depending on the result of the oral examination.