

Katedra filosofie

Posudek vedoucího bakalářské práce/ Supervisor's review of Bachelor Thesis

Jméno studenta/ Student's name: Kristýna Lepinová

Název práce/ Thesis title: Moral Justification of Organ Sale

Jméno vedoucího práce/ Supervisor's name: Mgr. Kamila Pacovská, Ph.D.

Jméno oponenta/ Opponent's name: Doc. Laura Candiotta

I. Formální kritéria/Formal criteria

	ano/yes	zčásti	ne/no
1. Cíl práce je zformulován a odpovídá zadání a názvu práce. Aim formulated, corresponds to the title and initial project.	X		
2. Metody využití autorem jsou adekvátní vzhledem k cíli práce a tématu. Methods used are adequate to the aim and the topic.	X		
3. Struktura práce je logická a odpovídá zvolenému tématu. Thesis structure is logical, corresponds to the topic.	X		
4. Závěr shrnuje dosažené poznatky a formuluje přínos k řešení problému. Conclusion summarises achieved knowledge and formulates the contribution to the problem solution.	X		
5. Autor nic podstatného neopomenul (zadání, obsah, úvod, pojednání, závěr, resumé v češtině a cizím jazyce) Nothing essential is omitted.	X		

Nejproblematictější body v hodnocení okomentovat slovně

All formal criteria are met.

The thesis structure is consistent: it has for main parts, each of which considers one main argument against organ sale.

The structure of chapters themselves is clear and consistent: paragraphs follow, parts build on each other, there is a clear line of thought, culminating each time in the question directly related to the thesis' main problem. This clear orientation on the main problem and control over the structure of the text gives the thesis a unity that is rare in a bachelor thesis.

The introduction is exceptional. It is clear and engaging, it introduces the main positions on organ sale, formulates the basic question and outlines the plan of the thesis.

The conclusion summarises the results of the thesis' argumentation, it is clear and concise.

The only improvement in formalities is that both abstracts are too short and vague and do not formulate the thesis's aim.

II. Obsahová kritéria/ Content criteria

1. Práce prokazuje porozumění autora problematice. Understanding of the problem	X		
2. Opírá se o relevantní prameny a literaturu . Relevant sources and literature	X		
3. Adekvátním způsobem s nimi pracuje. Adequate work with sources	X		
4. Zpracování vykazuje rysy vlastního přínosu. Original contribution	X		

Nejproblematictější body v hodnocení okomentovat slovně

The author chose systematic approach focused on a specific problem and she mastered it very well. She shows both deep understanding of the problem and its related questions and of the literature discussed in the text. Even though she discusses specific authors and their approaches, her text always goes beyond their text, interpreting them, taking critical approach and connecting them to her main question. Two features of this exceptional thesis stand out: 1. The author mastered an admirable number of secondary literature in English. 2. There is a distinct and original contribution in the text, which is extremely rare in a Bachelor thesis that usually limits itself to relating literature.

III. Jazyková kritéria/ Language criteria

1. Práce je bez gramatických a stylistických chyb . No grammar and stylistic mistakes	X		
2. Práce je psána kultivovaným odborným jazykem . Cultivated academic language	X		
3. Student zvládl a rozumí terminologii oboru a tématu, jímž se zabývá. Terminology mastered and understood	X		
4. Student pracuje správně s odkazy a citacemi , odlišuje parafráze a vlastní myšlenky. Correct work with references and quotations, paraphrases and own thoughts marked	X		

Nejproblematictější body v hodnocení okomentovat slovně

The author chose to write in English, even if it is not her native language. In spite of that, the language is excellent, considering it is her first major academic text written in English. Terminology is mastered well and the writing is clear and precise.

The author works well with sources, both primary and secondary; references are adequate.

IV. Doplňující poznámka / Supplementary comment

Since the thesis involves original and interesting argumentation, it might be considered for publication in an academic journal (after necessary adjustments). I certainly recommend that.

V. Otázka k obhajobě/ Questions for defense

On page 16 the concept of commodification is introduced as a criticism of organ sale. What I lack is a clear argument for why it is, exactly, that human organs are not to be treated as commodities? You suggest that human beings as such are not commodities, but how does that imply that we cannot sell our dispensable parts (such as hair, blood, sperm, ovums)?

Navržená známka/Suggested grade **A**

Datum/Date 22. 5. 2022

Podpis oponenta/ opponent's signature