

BACHELOR'S THESIS EXAMINER REPORT

PPE – Bachelor's in Politics, Philosophy and Economics

Faculty of Social Sciences, Charles University

Thesis title:	Indigenous Water Rights in Queretaro: Water Justice Aligned to International Standards
Student's name:	Aldo Ivan Ramirez Ocampo
Referee's name:	Jakub Tesař, Ph.D.

Criteria	Definition	Maximum	Points
Major Criteria			
	Contribution and argument (quality of research and analysis, originality)	50	38
	Research question (definition of objectives, plausibility of hypotheses)	15	13
	Theoretical framework (methods relevant to the research question)	15	11
<i>Total</i>		80	62
Minor Criteria			
	Sources, literature	10	9
	Presentation (language, style, cohesion)	5	5
	Manuscript form (structure, logical coherence, layout, tables, figures)	5	4
<i>Total</i>		20	18
TOTAL		100	80

Plagiarism-check (URKUND) match score:

The plagiarism check have not revealed substantive overlap with existing sources. The cited sources are used properly.

Reviewer's commentary according to the above criteria:

The submitted theses deal with the competing discourses on indigenous water rights in Queretaro, Mexico. The author discusses a highly relevant topic of environmental governance and focuses on the overlapping authority of international organizations, countries, and local actors (states, communities). The author employs critical discourse analysis to provide insights into the competing narratives of international and local actors.

Research aim/question. The research question is clearly stated in the introduction. The author asks, "[h]ow do the discourses on Indigenous Water Rights articulated by international organizations compare and contrast with those advocated by Indigenous movements on the local ground?" (p. 5) However, throughout the text, the author suggests that research aims are/were broader: to "investigate how [water-related] discourses influence perceptions, policies, and practices related to water governance" (abstract), to "develop holistic solutions" of the complex problem (p. 13), or to analyze the "representation of Indigenous water rights within legal frameworks, policy

recommendations, cultural perspectives, and community engagement strategies." (p. 51) While the research question is adequately addressed, the other goals are not attempted/achieved, which is no surprise as it is hardly possible with the proposed method.

Context. The author provides essential context to the studied case, but some aspects are unfortunately missing. E.g., the geographical context is probably unnecessary, but the reader misses more details on studied movements or conventions. For example, the fact that international conventions are written by states and cannot be passed without their consent is crucial for understanding the role given to states in those conventions.

Theoretical framework. The author introduces a rich theoretical framework that engages concepts like environmental justice, intersectionality, or Foucault's governmentality. However, the framework is too broad for a bachelor's thesis, especially since the author does not specify how different concepts relate. Given the studied topic, literature on norm localization (Acharya) or politics of aspiration (Jurkovich) would be beneficial to consider. The text seems to confuse intertextuality with interdisciplinarity (p.12)

Method/analysis. The method is well chosen given the research question. The author provides relevant insight into the studied case. But, the analysis is somehow limited by several issues. First, I was surprised by the choice of studying international HR conventions. I would expect the analysis would be much richer if lower-level policy documents (strategies, reports) specific to water politics were used instead of general convention. The documents representing the Indigenous discourse are also limited, but those limitations are recognized. Second, it is unclear which analytical framework is used to analyze the documents. The tables with results provide lists of articles related to four analytical categories (p.27-28), but they do not further guide the analysis. The insights are, therefore, limited in many aspects, e.g., on the dimension of power (of discourse).

Minor criteria. The text is written and structured well, providing the reader with a clear picture of what has been done to perform the analysis. The text engages a variety of sources, which are used well in the text. There are, however, several minor formal issues:

- The last three paragraphs in section 3.2 (p. 26) repeat the previous text.
- The numbering of appendices is not coherent (uses numbers/letters in different places). Tables in the text should not be titled as appendices.
- It would be helpful to use the full names of the HR conventions in the titles of individual sections.
- The list of appendices is hard to navigate. Having their list in the content/p. 53 would be helpful, and then individual appendices starting each at a new page.
- Some bibliographic entries are not complete (missing page number, publisher, etc.)

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

Suggested questions for the defence are:

What insights have you found with respect to "discourse and power" with your method?

I recommend the thesis for final defence.

Referee Signature