

**CHARLES UNIVERSITY**  
**Faculty of Social Sciences**  
**Institute of International Studies**

**PROTOCOL ON BACHELOR THESIS ASSESSMENT**  
**(Reviewer)**

Name of the student: Irina Molodkina

Title: Sartre and His Perception by Czech Intellectuals in 1960s

---

Reviewer: David Emler, Ph.D.

1. TOPIC AND OBJECTIVE (short information on the thesis, research objective):

Submitted bachelor thesis studies reactions of Czech authors to the philosophy of Jean-Paul Sartre. Specifically, the author analyzes texts from Patočka, Kosík, Kautman, and Kundera published after 1963 (the year of an important visit of Sartre in Czechoslovakia). The exact research question was formulated by the author: “Who did Sartre and his activity influence [among] the Czech intellectuals after 1963?” (p. 8).

2. CONTENT (complexity, original approach, argument, structure, theoretical and methodological backing, work with sources, appropriateness of annexes, etc.):

The bachelor thesis fulfills the standards of the Institute of International Studies, Faculty of Social Sciences, Charles University. The text covers an original topic, uses relevant sources, and presents a substantial amount of academic work. Theoretical and methodological foundations are somehow frail, but they correspond to an average bachelor-level thesis.

3. FORMAL ASPECTS AND LANGUAGE (quality of language, citation style, graphics, formal aspects, etc.):

Language used in the submitted text is correct, but not flawless. There is a certain number of misspellings and typos (“De Gaul” p. 13, “Metterrand” p. 14, and so on), and some phrases are difficult to understand. Citation style is also inconsistent – on the one hand, some important data is missing, on the other, the author forgets to shorten the repeated citations, etc.

4. STATEMENT ON THE ORIGINALITY OF THE THESIS

The thesis was checked by the URKUND anti-plagiarism software and does not show any signs of plagiarism.

5. SHORT COMMENTS BY THE REVIEWER (overall impression, strengths and weaknesses, originality of ideas, achievement of the research objective, etc.):

The author has done remarkable research on the selected topic – the number of sources used, and the overall length of the text are above average. She brings her take on an interesting topic; she can navigate correctly in three languages and summarize the most important ideas to the reader. Unfortunately, the author struggles with the precise definition of the research question and with the corresponding structure of the text. Extensive parts of the submitted text (such as Sartre and de Beauvoir biographies, the overall interpretation of the work of Sartre in chapter 2 or biographies of Patočka, Kosík, Kautman, and Kundera in chapter 3) are not answering the research question, therefore could be labeled as “off-topic”. The topic itself, as announced in the title and the research question, only starts at page 39. The author also claims to use “analyses of texts” (p. 8) or “textual analysis” (p. 19) as her main method, but she merely presents an unrestricted and relatively short interpretation of each studied text.

6. QUESTIONS AND COMMENTS THAT SHOULD BE ADDRESSED DURING THE DEFENCE:

- 1) Have you come across any “official” mentions about the visit of Sartre in Czechoslovakia in 1963, besides the quoted article from *Rudé Právo*?
- 2) How does the reception of Sartre in Czechoslovakia change after 1968, and 1989?

7. (NON-)RECOMMENDATION AND SUGGESTED GRADE (A-F):

I recommend the submitted text to defense. I suggest a grade of „D“, in case of an excellent defense a grade of “C”.