



## Diploma Thesis Evaluation Form

Author: Virginia Maraglino

Title: Old Space vs New Space: New Players between Space Economy and Space Warfare

Programme/year: International Security Studies with specialisation in Security, Technology and Society/ 2023

Author of Evaluation (supervisor/second reader): Mgr. et Mgr. Jakub Pražák

Criteria	Definition	Maximum	Points
<b>Major Criteria</b>			
	Research question, definition of objectives	<b>10</b>	8
	Theoretical/conceptual framework	<b>30</b>	20
	Methodology, analysis, argument	<b>40</b>	29
<i>Total</i>		<b>80</b>	57
<b>Minor Criteria</b>			
	Sources	<b>10</b>	8
	Style	<b>5</b>	3
	Formal requirements	<b>5</b>	3
<i>Total</i>		<b>20</b>	14
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>100</b>	71



## Evaluation

### Major criteria:

The thesis discusses how military applications of space are being impacted by the increasing commercialization of space, demonstrated in the case of Ukraine – a timely and well-chosen topic that offers space for important and relevant analysis.

However, considering the thesis topic, the literature review could emphasize the dynamics and development of space actors (i.e., also Old Space vs New Space discussion). Similarly, the theoretical framework is underdeveloped in some respects. For instance, the author asserts that *“liberal governments may advocate for space-related weapons control and disarmament treaties, counting the influence of private firms, and they may lobby for transparency measures to increase trust among space actors”*. Nevertheless, it omits debate on why this should not be the case for other governments and thus also neglects the distinction between authoritarian and democratic regimes from the theoretical perspective. The literature review and theoretical framework are thus somewhat shallow with limited added value.

The methodology could be more specific and explain how the author proceeds with analysis to answer the research question (that is only vaguely answered in the conclusion). The author could also be more precise in terminology and some formulations. For example, the author claims that *“evaluating these **safety** issues will assist in identifying the overall dependability and resilience of commercial space technologies in military applications”* while referring to **security** issues. Unfortunately, these seemingly little details/nuances in the thesis result in less convincing arguments.

Finally, though the analysis substantially benefits from the conducted interviews (which was otherwise one of the thesis merits), the arguments could also be better supported by/confronted with the existing academic literature, which would contribute to more convincing conclusions and analysis that is subsequently sometimes slightly superficial.

**Minor criteria:** The style and formal requirements have some deficiencies that degrade the overall impression. For instance, the author uses informal language and formulations such as *“when you look at a commercial company...”* or *“...it is fundamental to consider whose military you are talking about...”* that do not follow academic standards. Moreover, as mentioned, the author works with limited academic literature and official documents. Nevertheless, although the list of literature could be more exhausting, the sources are supported by conducted interviews that adequately complemented secondary sources.



**FACULTY  
OF SOCIAL SCIENCES**  
Charles University

**Assessment of plagiarism:** The thesis is appropriately referenced, and anti-plagiarism software did not recognize any notable similarities with other works.

**Overall evaluation:**

The author focused on a timely and highly relevant topic with considerable analytical merit. Also, it is notable to highlight the interviews as an appropriate methodological approach. However, the mentioned shortcomings impair the overall impression. During the defence, the student should clearly answer the research question (since it was not sufficiently explicitly discussed in the results) to confirm the understanding of the topic and explain how the results fit into a theoretical debate. Nevertheless, despite my seemingly considerable criticism, the student should defend the thesis successfully.

**Suggested grade: C**

**Signature:**