

REPORT ON THE MASTER THESIS

IEPS – International Economic and Political Studies, Faculty of Social Sciences, Charles University

Title of the thesis:	The social Inequality and Green Energy: The case of India
Author of the thesis:	Shoumyadeep Rakshit
Referee (incl. titles):	Janusz Salamon, Ph.D.

Remark: It is a standard at the FSV UK that the Referee's Report is at least 500 words long. In case you will assess the thesis as "non-defendable", please explain the concrete reasons for that in detail.

SUMMARY OF POINTS AWARDED (for details, see below):

CATEGORY	POINTS
<i>Theoretical background (max. 20)</i>	19
<i>Contribution (max. 20)</i>	20
<i>Methods (max. 20)</i>	16
<i>Literature (max. 20)</i>	16
<i>Manuscript form (max. 20)</i>	13
TOTAL POINTS (max. 100)	84
The proposed grade (1-2-3-4)	1

You can even use a decimal point (e.g. giving the grade of 2.5 for 60 points).

Comments of the referee on the thesis highlights and shortcomings (following the 5 numbered aspects of your assessment indicated below).

1) Theoretical background:

The main strength of the thesis is its innovative interdisciplinary approach to the challenge of social inequality in the contemporary Indian context which required explanation of a wide range of concepts and theories (economic, political, sociological, ethical and religious). While in most cases the explanation is adequate, in some cases the discussion could be clearer. However, given that the interdisciplinary character of the thesis was bound to be make it very demanding, the overall presentation of the theoretical background can be judged as impressive.

2) Contribution:

Judging by the standard appropriate for Master theses in social sciences, the contribution of this thesis is considerable, since it suggests an economically, politically and socially plausible solution to the problem of deep socio-economic inequalities in India. The main argument of the thesis takes into account a wide range of considerations without which the proposed focus on the opportunities inherent in the practical imperative of Green Energy might appear to be unrealistic. Initial "diagnosis" (identification of the chief causes of the socio-economic stratification of the Indian society and its constancy primarily with the religiously grounded caste mentality) is matched with the "cure" (which envisages a gradual progress towards greater equity that might be achieved without presupposing unrealistically that the attitudes shaped by the caste mentality are unlikely to disappear overnight given the current fundamentalist tendencies strengthened by the current rule of the nationalist party rooted in the Hindutva ideology). The choice of the two theories of justice (M. Walzer's complex equality and A. Sen's capability approach) that are clearly most appropriate for clarification of the vision of equality that might be aimed at in India contributes to the sense that the main proposal of the thesis is a serious and pragmatically viable policy recommendation that might be utilized by the Indian central and local governments.

3) Methods:

The qualitative analysis of the inequality in India and the application of the relevant philosophical concepts is on the whole satisfactory, although certain confusion of the narrative resulting from the

inter-disciplinary character of the work does make the analytic part of the work appear to be less than perfect.

4) Literature:

While the literature related to the political, ethical and religious aspects of the work is satisfactory, the reference to only one source: IRENA (which makes verification of its data impossible) may be considered a weakness of the thesis. However, as I understood, the availability of the relevant data that might be considered trustworthy because confirmable by a number of organizations collecting and analysing such data is limited in India for political and other reasons.

5) Manuscript form:

The reader has a clear sense that the manuscript form of thesis is marked by the rush which accompanied the effort to finishing the work on time. The result is unnecessary editorial mistakes (for example, on p. 46) as well as apparently omitted elements which the author probably intended to include (the table on p. 51 looks like in need of a necessary explanatory comments).

DATE OF EVALUATION: August 31, 2017

Janusz Salamon

Referee Signature

The referee should give comments to the following requirements:

1) THEORETICAL BACKGROUND: Can you recognize that the thesis was guided by some **theoretical fundamentals** relevant for this thesis topic? Were some important theoretical concepts omitted? Was the theory used in the thesis consistently incorporated with the topic and hypotheses tested?

Strong Average Weak
20 10 0 points

2) CONTRIBUTION: Evaluate if the author presents **original ideas** on the topic and aims at demonstrating **critical thinking** and ability to draw conclusions based on the knowledge of relevant theory and relevant empirical material. Is there a distinct **value added** of the thesis (relative to knowledge of a university-educated person interested in given topic)? Did the author explain **why** the observed phenomena occurred? Were the policy implications well founded?

Strong Average Weak
20 10 0 points

3) METHODS: Are the **hypotheses** for this study clearly stated, allowing their further verification and testing? Are the theoretical explanations, empirical material and **analytical tools** used in the thesis relevant to the research question being investigated, and adequate to the aspiration level of the study? Is the thesis **topic comprehensively analyzed** and does the thesis not make trivial or irrelevant detours off the main body stated in the thesis proposal? More than 10 points signal an exceptional work, **which requires your explanation "why" it is so**.

Strong Average Weak
20 10 0 points

4) LITERATURE REVIEW: The thesis demonstrates author's full understanding and **command of recent literature**. The author quotes relevant literature in a proper way and disposes with a representative bibliography. (Remark: references to Wikipedia, websites and newspaper articles are a sign of **poor research**). If they dominate you cannot give more than 8 points. References to books published by prestigious publishers and articles in renowned journals give much better impression.

Strong Average Weak
20 10 0 points

5) MANUSCRIPT FORM: The thesis is **clear and well structured**. The author uses appropriate language and style, including academic **format** for quotations, graphs and tables. The text effectively refers to graphs and tables, is easily readable and **stimulates thinking**.

Strong Average Weak
20 10 0 points

Overall grading scheme at FSV UK:

TOTAL POINTS	GRADE	Czech grading	US grading
81 – 100	1	= excellent	= A
61 – 80	2	= good	= B
51 – 60	3	= satisfactory	= C
41 – 50	3	= satisfactory	= D
0 – 40	4	= fail	= not recommended for defence