

Thesis evaluation form - Master thesis evaluation

Student's Name: Bc. Polina Muratova

Study programme: EKS

Title of thesis: *Contemporary Diet Culture in the light of Michel Foucault's Analyses*

Name of reviewer (supervisor): Martin Švantner, PhD

A) Formal criteria. Rating (0-10 points): 7

Formal structure and layout of the thesis, completeness of the required parts of the thesis, grammatical and stylistic aspects, correct and consistent citation of sources.

Comments:

The text of the thesis is written in standard language, the work with sources is adequate, there are a few typos in the text, but they are rather marginal. Stylistically, text is written in the sophisticated manner, however some sentences seem a bit skeletal in places (e. g. the first sentence in the introduction), especially the Czech abstract seems to be mechanically translated from English. Sources are quoted formally inconsistent (see e. g. p. 22 etc.); there are some missing references to the pages (see e. g. p. 31).

B) Structure of the thesis. Rating (0-10 points): 7

Clear formulation of the problem, definition of the aim and its consistency with the content of the thesis, overall conception and structure of the thesis, adequacy of the procedure and continuity of the individual parts of the thesis.

Comments:

The thesis is clearly structured and I really appreciate the range of relevant secondary literature that the author has studied.

The author has succeeded in convincingly linking the theoretical and research parts, the only serious objection would be here the absence of a more convincing conclusion that would comprehensively summarize the whole work. In particular, to show more clearly in subtle detail the connection between Foucault's (and other mentioned) conceptions (as is the hermeneutics of the subject; Kantian categorical ethics; Benthamian utilitarianism...) and the considered cases under study.

Also there is a question how the author chose the cases: are they rather anecdotic illustration, or can one generalize the findings that are presented in the thesis?

What was the criteria for this selection?

What was the method that the author use for the analysis?

C) Analysis of the topic. Rating (0-10 points): 7

Identification and explanation of key terms and concepts, scope and relevance of literature used, level of engagement with the literature, adequacy of interpretation of texts used.

Comments:

I have only few comments:

In my point of view, I found a bit too simplifying the overview on the page 26:

“Practices is the scope of Foucault’s interest include clinical practices (The Birth of the Clinic); psychiatric practices (The History of Madness); discursive practices (Archaeology of Knowledge; The Order of Discourse); pedagogic practices (Discipline and Punish); normalization and surveillance practices (Discipline and Punish); “care of the self” practices or techniques of the self (various); sexual practices (History of Sexuality Vol 1); political, judiciary, or religious practices; police technologies; parrhesiastic practices or "free speech" (Discourse and Truth lectures); and Christian ascetic practices (various).”

Reminds me (especially the notion of “various”) a famous Borgesian Chinese encyclopedia in *The Order of Things*.

Considering Foucault’s detailed and precise work on Christianity, some of the author's phrases also give the impression of being too simplistic: namely, when she talks about large "blocks" such as “Christianity having influence...” (e. g. p. 28). If Foucault's work is characterized by anything, it is precisely skepticism towards such large ideological schedules and also skepticism towards the category of the "influence" and particularly towards the “influence on us”.

What is this “us”?

I have similar problems with simplification of the category of “secularity” - the author (quite adequately) follows the sociologizing aspects of Foucault's thought, so I would be more careful with such generalizations. The same reservation applies to her general conception of social networks. It begs the question of whether (and how) the content disseminated by social media is also socially/historically/culturally stratified.

Minor – philological – observation (p. 33): it is a question whether *Alcibiades* was written by Plato.

D) Originality aspect. Rating (0-10 points): 8

The author's own analysis of the problem addressed, the ability to think independently and creatively and to propose solutions, his/her own level of argumentation and formulation.

I especially appreciate the author's honest analysis of Foucault's texts, where she avoids simplifications compared to other places; I also appreciate the partial conclusions presented in the thesis.

E) Significance of the work. Evaluation (0-10 points): 8

Formulation of clear and justifiable conclusions, adequacy and completeness of meeting the objectives of the thesis, overall professional level and contribution of the thesis.

The objectives has been very well met.

Total points (0-50 points): 37

Overall rating (grade)*: Very good

Rating scale:

50-40 points: 1 - excellent

39- 25 points: 2 - very good

24- 15 points: 3 - good

14-0 points: 4 - poor

Date: 6. 9. 2021

Signature: