

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

<b>Thesis title:</b>	The Limits of the Left-Libertarian Legitimation of Property
<b>Student's name:</b>	Lukas Baderschneider
<b>Referee's name:</b>	Tomáš Halamka

Criteria	Definition	Maximum	Points
<b>Major Criteria</b>			
	Contribution and argument (quality of research and analysis, originality)	<b>50</b>	45
	Research question (definition of objectives, plausibility of hypotheses)	<b>15</b>	12
	Theoretical framework (methods relevant to the research question)	<b>15</b>	14
<i>Total</i>		<b>80</b>	71
<b>Minor Criteria</b>			
	Sources, literature	<b>10</b>	10
	Presentation (language, style, cohesion)	<b>5</b>	5
	Manuscript form (structure, logical coherence, layout, tables, figures)	<b>5</b>	4
<i>Total</i>		<b>20</b>	19
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>100</b>	90

**Reviewer's commentary according to the above criteria** (min. 1800 characters including spaces when recommending a passing grade, min. 2500 characters including spaces when recommending a failing grade):

The author puts forward a very ambitious and complex normative argument refuting libertarian political thought. The whole endeavour is (especially for the standard of the BA level) philosophically very demanding and consists of several consecutive steps. I am happy to say that the thesis generally does a good job in tackling the difficult task it took upon itself. First of all, I would like to appreciate the depth and quality of analysis and argument in several of the discussed subtopics. The thesis works with an impressive amount of relevant primary and secondary literature, which the author obviously understands, works with critically and for the benefit of the argument. The author clearly demonstrates the ability to make an advanced and sophisticated academic argument and shows a strong passion for philosophical inquiry as such. Although the long main argument has its ups and downs, I find it generally convincing, carefully thought-through and well-made. I appreciate not only the ambition of the project, but also the amount of energy and effort put into the depth of the argument. The hard work of the author translated into a very interesting thesis introducing a well-argued and multi-layered contribution. Furthermore, it is also good that the author sometimes explained difficult philosophical concepts through daily life examples, trying to make complicated philosophical abstractions more tangible. Nice touch!

On the other hand, it is my impression that the whole project was too broad for a BA thesis. It deals with too many side issues before it engages with its declared main topic. The “preparatory” phase of the argument dealing with the philosophical underpinnings and meta-problems includes several sidetracks that are not always necessary for the main argument. As a result, the thesis gets too long and the title of the thesis does not reflect the actual focus of most of the text. But more importantly, the complex build-up of the thesis complicates the clarity of the main argument and the drive of the flow of the text. The visibility of the main line of argument is further complicated by the omission of a standardised BA thesis introduction. The chapter called Introduction is written as an almost standalone academic mini-essay. It does not clearly explain the rationale behind the structuring of the thesis, nor does it include a literature review that would place the thesis within the existing debate. The thesis also does not explain why precisely Nozick, Hobbes and Buchanan were selected for the closer analysis instead of other possible choices and why the three authors featured in this non-chronological order. Similarly, the use of several of the sources throughout the text seems to be kind of selective. For example, Rawls jumps into the argument on several occasions and then disappears again as quickly as he appeared. All these things could be fine if the rationale behind the respective author’s choices was properly explained. The introductions to individual chapters are mostly missing altogether, which makes it even harder for the readers to see where exactly do they find themselves in the chain of the main argument (that however requires a great deal of awareness of how the individual (sub)chapters relate to each other).

To sum it up, this is a well-researched thesis with a lot of consideration and effort put into it, delivering a complex philosophical argument with a level of sophistication far exceeding the BA level. However, the way the argument is delivered is problematic at times. In my opinion, it would have worked better if the grandiose scope of the thesis was narrowed down. That would have allowed the main line of argument to be more focused and crafted in a more reader-friendly way, including explanation of logic behind some of the key decisions.

**Proposed grade: A/B**

**Suggested questions for the defence are:**

What was the rationale behind the structure of the thesis?

How exactly does the thesis view the relation between the social contract theory and libertarianism?

What’s the role of Rawls in the overall argument of the thesis?

**I recommend the thesis for final defence.**

---

***Referee Signature***

Overall grading scheme at FSV UK:

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