## BACHELOR'S THESIS EXAMINER REPORT PPE – Bachelor's in Politics, Philosophy and Economics Faculty of Social Sciences, Charles University

Thesis title:	The Impact of Developing Warfare Technology on Just War Theory	
Student's name:	Anna Shabalina	
Referee's name:	Janusz Salamon	

Criteria	Definition	Maximum	Points
Major Criteria			
	Contribution and argument (quality of research and analysis, originality)	37	
	Research question (definition of objectives, plausibility of hypotheses)	13	
	Theoretical framework (methods relevant to the research question)	13	
Total		63	
Minor Criteria			
	Sources, literature	10	
	Presentation (language, style, cohesion)	4	
	Manuscript form (structure, logical coherence, layout, tables, figures)	4	
Total		18	
TOTAL		81	

## Plagiarism-check (URKUND) match score: 2%

The thesis does not appear to include instances of plagiarism.

Reviewer's commentary according to the above criteria: Anna thesis is not easy to assess since her grasp of the scholarly debate on Just War Theory (JWT) which is vast and complex is very impressive, her aspiration of contributing originally to this debate is very ambitious for a Bachelor's student, yet at the end of it all, her determination to show her methodological self-awareness is made very clear, and bringing the very recent example of war in which Autonomous Weapon Systems as a case study looks like a good idea - and yet at the end of ait all, the reader is left somewhat disappointed. The sense of disappointment comes from the fact that the entire history of JWT is traced, and the development of Autonomous Weapon Systems (AWS, especially drones) traced to our times, and indeed looking forward to increasingly more "autonomous" systems invested in the most advanced AI technology, and the war in Nagorno-Karabakh brought competently into the picture, only to make a point that might be summarised in one long sentence. The sentence might go like this: given that the functioning of the AWS may be said to be, at least to some degree, detached from the human agency, the connection with morality of the human agents (including those who launched the war) is severed, which makes the overall assessment of any conflict in which the AWS are used (also when these AWS malfunction or are imprecise and kill non-combatants or cause large scale 'collateral damage') impossible (when all other conditions of jus ad bellum and jus in bello seem to be met). Perhaps the best way to describe how I perceive the limitation of Anna's thesis

would be by saying that she doesn't do anything else with this main "point" other than just stating it, mentioning it in various places and contexts (often by quoting or making references to other authors, which is, by the way, perhaps excessively frequent making nearly the entire thesis look like an extended "literature review"). It might have been better to devote far less space to mapping the entire ongoing scholarly debate JWT (and in the case of M. Walzer, a relatively extensive presentation of his arguments, as well as the scholarly criticisms of his views), and to focus in a sustained manner on the nature of the challenge that the increasingly common use of increasingly sophisticated AWS posses to JWT. A truly original treatment of the issue might also explore some directions in which the JWT might be developed to accommodate this challenge of the use of AWS in contemporary wars. (This might be my first question I would like to put Anna at the defence: does her thesis contain some findings how the JWT be modified in order to remain a useful tool in the assessment of the morality of war in which AWS are used? What are the possible directions of the development of the JWT that would accommodate the challenge of AWS?)

I have explained the source of my sense of deficiency of Anna's thesis, but compared with many other Bachelor's theses I have read, Anna's work is good enough to merit grade B. The sources are especially impressive and in the thesis she makes it abundantly clear that she is really familiar with the current scholarly debates on the matter. The thesis is well-written, even though on occasions the scholarly jargon seems to be used to such a degree of intensity that the author seems lost and the meaning becomes obscure. In some places I had to read a sentence a number of times to reassure myself that the author is not in fact saying the opposite of what she intended to say. Here is an example: "More specifically, cosmopolitan version of JWT calls for humanitarian intervention to protect human rights and the introduction of the jus post bellum with the purpose of rehabilitating the aggressor regimes." (p. 21). So the second potential question for the defence would be: what is jus post bellum really about?

## Proposed grade (A-B-C-D-E-F): B

## I do recommend the thesis for final defence.

Referee Signature

TOTAL POINTS	GRADE	Quality standard			
91 – 100	Α	= outstanding (high honor)			
81 – 90	В	= superior (honor)			
71 – 80	C	= good			
61 – 70	D	= satisfactory			
51 – 60	E	= low pass at a margin of failure			
0-50	F	= failing. The thesis is not recommended for defence.			

Overall grading scheme at FSV UK: