



Report on the part of the final state examination Record of the thesis defence

Academic year: 2023/2024

Student's name and surname: Benedict Sendke
Student's ID: 69691623

Type of the study programme: Master's (post-Bachelor)
Study programme: International Economic and Political Studies with specialisation in International Politics

Study ID: 783095

Title of the thesis: The Ethical Foundations of Limited Government in James Buchanan's Political Philosophy: A Critical Examination
Thesis department: Department of Political Science (23-KP)
Language of the thesis: English
Language of defence: English
Advisor: Janusz Salamon, Ph.D.
Reviewer(s): Mgr. Tomáš Halamka, Ph.D.
Date of defence: 18.09.2024 **Venue of defence:** Praha
Attempt: regular

Course of the examination: [in person] The student began the thesis defence using a PowerPoint presentation aid, presenting the research question(s) and its objectives. He then mentioned his methodological positionality before presenting the research results using Buchanan's public choice theory. The student explained the criticisms that emerged during the analytical process, with concluding remarks divided into direct and indirect distinctions and limits of contractarianism. In formal terms, the defence fluctuated between presenting and reading from the screen as the student was sitting during the defence with limited eye contact with the examination board. However, this does not affect his argument and successful defence. CU Committee: Dr Hájek brought attention to the reviewers' comments, particularly Dr Salomon's assessment. He asked the student to elaborate on the remarks. The student started by comparing libertarian thinking with classic liberal thinking, bringing author names in his argumentative line, which includes, e.g., anarchy, minimal state vs. productive state, the welfare state, natural rights, property rights, and individual rights. The student then compares and contrasts the differences and why, in his opinion, Buchanan is not a libertarian. Dr Franěk mentioned the common features of today's classic liberals and libertarians and the misconceptions around the misuse of the terms. Dr Franěk asks the student to elaborate on the use of the terms: contractualism vs contractarianism. The student elaborates on the defining characteristics of his understanding and use of the terms.

Dr Baxa and Dr Franěk make some concluding remarks on the understanding of libertarianism and classic liberalism and its interpretation.

No further questions from the CU Committee.

Result of defence:	excellent (A)	
Chair of the board:	Hájek Lukáš, Mgr., M.A., Ph.D. (present)
Committee members:	Baxa Jaromír, PhDr., Ph.D. (present)
	Franěk Jakub, Mgr., Ph.D. (present)