

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

Thesis title:	An Experiment in the Development of Novel Republican Institutions
Student's name:	Nico Mastrangelo
Referee's name:	Jakub Franěk

Criteria	Definition	Maximum	Points
Major Criteria			
	Contribution and argument (quality of research and analysis, originality)	50	47
	Research question (definition of objectives, plausibility of hypotheses)	15	14
	Theoretical framework (methods relevant to the research question)	15	14
Total		80	75
Minor Criteria			
	Sources, literature	10	10
	Presentation (language, style, cohesion)	5	4
	Manuscript form (structure, logical coherence, layout, tables, figures)	5	4
Total		20	18
TOTAL		100	93

Plagiarism-check (URKUND) match score: 7%

[NB:] If the plagiarism-check (URKUND) match score is above 15%, the reviewer has to include his/her assessment of the originality of the reviewed thesis in his/her review.

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 reviewed thesis is highly unusual and original in its very nature. Inspired on one hand by his genuine concern for the state of democracy in the United States today and, on the other hand, by the Republican tradition of political thought, the author has written what can best be described as an extended essay, which not only analyses the apparent crisis of American democracy but also provides a proposal of a solution, in the form of a design of a novel form of representative body of self-governance on a communal level, which combines features of sortition and descriptive representation.

As Nico Mastrangelo's supervisor, I must admit that initially I was highly sceptical about the prospects of his innovative BA Thesis project. At the same time, however, I was intrigued and even fascinated by the zeal bordering with obsession with which he pursued his idea. Today I can only

say that I am glad that I have agreed to act as Nico's supervisor. Throughout the process of researching and then actually writing his thesis, Nico has shown unusual dedication to his project, the progress of which we discussed on regular basis. I must admit I was amazed, how much he managed to improve the final version compared to the pen-ultimate draft, which I reviewed just a couple of weeks before the submission deadline.

As I have already noted, the reviewed thesis is highly unusual, even idiosyncratic, in its nature. It definitely does not read as a typical BA Thesis, i.e. as an attempt at a formally "standard" scholarly paper. I also must note that I am not fully content with some of its arguments or presumptions. Nico e.g. fails to fully explain the inclusion of some aspects of descriptive representation into his institutional design, or, for that matter, provide a more developed explanation for his choice of sortition, as opposed to election, as a way of selecting the members of his Hall of Commons. Overall, however, his thesis strikes me as very well written and persuasive exercise in critical thinking and political imagination. While I enjoy a reputation of being rather strict in my thesis reviews, in this case I have to propose an A grade, which the thesis in my opinion fully deserves.

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

Suggested questions for the defence are:

I (do not) recommend the thesis for final defence.

Referee Signature

Overall grading scheme at FSV UK:

TOTAL POINTS	GRADE	Quality standard
91 – 100	A	= outstanding (high honor)
81 – 90	B	= 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.