



## Diploma Thesis Evaluation Form

Author: Kseniia Miliutina

Title: Analysis of Russian policy on the development of Artificial Intelligence in the military

Programme/year: ISSA 2022

Author of Evaluation (supervisor/external assessor): Mgr. Vojtěch Bahenský, Ph.D.

Criteria	Definition	Maximum	Points
<b>Major Criteria</b>			
	Research question, definition of objectives	<b>10</b>	4
	Theoretical/conceptual framework	<b>30</b>	20
	Methodology, analysis, argument	<b>40</b>	30
<i>Total</i>		<b>80</b>	54
<b>Minor Criteria</b>			
	Sources	<b>10</b>	10
	Style	<b>5</b>	4
	Formal requirements	<b>5</b>	5
<i>Total</i>		<b>20</b>	19
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>100</b>	73



## Evaluation

### Major criteria:

The thesis tackles an interesting subject of technological innovation in the AI and autonomous systems in its intersection with the Russian national defence industries and the military. The thesis uses a respectable array of literature and sources to investigate the state of play regarding autonomous systems and the Russian defence industry, both in the long term and in the period after the onset of the sanctions and relative international isolation in response to the invasion of Ukraine.

The chief problem of the thesis stems from unclear and shifting aims of the research throughout the thesis and consequent limits (lack) of methodology, focus and cohesion. While the introduction promises vaguely “analysis” indicating a more descriptive goal of the research, much of the thesis is theoretical in nature. Many chapters are not clearly connected with the topic (AI and autonomous systems) and theoretical concepts are not always consistently utilized throughout the thesis as tools for analysis.

It is a shame that clear research questions are only found in the first paragraph of the conclusion. The conclusion is, in many respects, the strongest part of the thesis, as it strongly focuses on answering the questions and manages to find a common thread linking somewhat disparate theoretical chapters.

One more shortcoming of the thesis (although a minor one) is that the theoretical chapters do not include a clear literature review on what was already written on the topic of military use of AI in Russia, as it would possibly help differentiate the contribution of the author from already existing insights in the literature.

### Minor criteria:

On minor criteria, there are very few problems with the thesis. Using a picture as a direct quote of a source is not the best practice and appears somewhat lazy (p. 21). On page 69, there is a presumably unfinished quote that has no end and no accompanying reference. Overall structure of the thesis is good, but structure of paragraphs within chapters is at times confusing for the reader, especially in case of Soviet MIC chapter. Language editing could have helped the style and precision of the thesis, as it at points strays from the academic language or is somewhat tricky to understand, but overall quality and legibility is both passable and adequate.



**FACULTY  
OF SOCIAL SCIENCES**  
Charles University

Overall evaluation:

The thesis clearly shows the effort invested by the author into its creation. It provides some interesting insights of both descriptive and causal nature, although its conclusions about the limits of Russian capabilities to pursue technological advances in the AI domain could not be considered a major breakthrough. Unfortunately, the thesis is let down by the lack of a clear research question that would serve to focus the author's efforts. This produced a somewhat incoherent piece of research, which nonetheless conforms to basic expectations about the master thesis.

Suggested grade: C

Signature: