

UNIVERZITA KARLOVA V PRAZE
Fakulta sociálních věd
Institut mezinárodních studií

PROTOKOL O HODNOCENÍ BAKALÁŘSKÉ PRÁCE
(Posudek vedoucího)

Práci předložil(a) student(ka): Márk Karácsony

Název práce: The impact of the war in Ukraine on the political discourse around the 1956 revolution in Hungary

Vedoucí práce (u externích vedoucích uveďte též adresu a funkci v rámci instituce): Tomáš Weiss

1. OBSAH A CÍL PRÁCE (stručná informace o práci, formulace cíle):

Márk Karácsony asks an interesting question in his thesis, namely how the Russian invasion in Ukraine changed the Hungarian discourse around the 1956 revolution and its commemoration. The objective of the thesis is clearly defined.

2. VĚCNÉ ZPRACOVÁNÍ (náročnost, tvůrčí přístup, argumentace, logická struktura, teoretické a metodologické ukotvení, práce s prameny a literaturou, vhodnost příloh apod.):

While the thesis asks a relevant question and seems to employ relevant concepts and methods at the first sight, it suffers from several crucial problems. First of all, there is a mismatch between the constitutive parts of the thesis: There are several theoretical concepts introduced but they are not explained, there is no discussion of how they relate to the choice of the empirical material and to the studied factors. There is a mismatch between the research question and the second of the two proposed hypotheses, that are not discussed later in the thesis anyway.

The discussion of the concepts is shallow and confusing. The author refers to relevant researchers who framed the debate on memory politics but does not explain what the debate actually contains and how it relates to the thesis. There are confusing claims that make no sense, such as “In contemporary Hungary memory is manifested mostly in memory politics” (p. 15) and “A key component for memory politics is having an actual memory of the event...” (also p. 15), and suggest that the author has not grasped the actual meaning of the concepts he uses.

More importantly, there is no structured analysis provided. While the thesis promises critical discourse analysis, there is no such thing in the thesis. There is no explanation of how and why the empirical data was selected. It is unclear what factors are subject to the attempted comparative case study. There is no discussion of how the sources of the discursive shift could be identified or where they should be searched for. As a consequence, some parts of the text bear no relation to the topic or to the logic of the text, such as the passage about Francis Fukuyama’s work on p. 16.

In the end, the crucial weakness of the thesis is its total lack of evidence-based argumentation. This is a constant problem throughout the text, such as the claim that “Socialists (sic!) parties across the world have a long tradition of close ties to Russia, and the Hungarian MSZP was no exception.” (p. 26) or “Since [...] 2022, Hungarian Ukrainophobia and Russophilia had influenced every stance of the country.” (p. 29). More importantly, however, there is almost no work with sources in chapter 4 “Analyses and findings”, which is full of bold statements that are just author’s impressions and beliefs but are presented as a result of an analysis. In places, it borders on conspiracy theories, such as the expectation of “a coordinated effort to increase Moscow’s negotiation position” (p. 34) and the claim that moderate position “covertly benefits a concrete side” (p. 35).

3. FORMÁLNÍ A JAZYKOVÉ ZPRACOVÁNÍ (jazykový projev, správnost citace a odkazů na literaturu, grafická úprava, formální náležitosti práce apod.):

The text is readable but at the expense of unsuitable language. It is full of emotionally loaded expressions that are not based on any evidence or analysis, e.g., “they started dipping their toes in the waters of history perversion” (p. 17). (That, by the way, goes against the main theoretical framing of the whole thesis, which is the understanding that history is constantly re-interpreted for political purposes.) Expressions that steer the text towards op-ed, rather than analytical academic text, e.g., “national radio Kossuth, providing a safe space for [Orbán’s] demagoguery with no confrontations” (p. 29). The text consistently uses “capitol” instead of “capital”.

Formally, the thesis is without major problems. Just the list of sources is not structured logically. The section “primary sources” only includes two primary sources, the rest are secondary sources.

4. KONTROLA ORIGINALITY TEXTU

Prohlašuji, že jsem se seznámil/a s výsledkem kontroly originality textu závěrečné práce v systému:

Theses Turnitin Ouriginal (Urkund)

Komentář k výsledku kontroly:

There is a high match because this is a second submission of a previously failed thesis. However, this is original work.

5. STRUČNÝ KOMENTÁŘ HODNOTITELE (celkový dojem z bakalářské práce, silné a slabé stránky, originalita myšlenek, naplnění cíle apod.):

The overall impression is quite bad. Despite good start, the thesis does not show the ability of the author to work with empirical material, conduct a disciplined analysis and distinguish between evidence and opinion unequivocally. As a result, the goals are not achieved in a persuasive manner.

This is the second attempt of the author to submit this thesis. I have supervised only the second attempt, but the author stopped communicating and consulting having not agreed with my suggestions.

6. OTÁZKY A PŘIPOMÍNKY DOPORUČENÉ K BLIŽŠÍMU VYSVĚTLENÍ PŘI OBHAJOBĚ (jedna až tři):

Why is critical discourse analysis a suitable method for answering your research question? What would such analysis require?

How did you decide which factors are relevant to explain the shift in Viktor Orbán's interpretation of the 1956 revolution?

How did you choose which factors need to be compared between the memory politics around 1956 commemorations before and after the Russian invasion in Ukraine?

7. DOPORUČENÍ / NEDOPORUČENÍ K OBHAJOBĚ A NAVRHOVANÁ ZNÁMKA (A-F):

I recommend the thesis for defence. However, I suggest that the thesis is graded **E** and allowed to pass **only in case of an excellent defence**.

Datum: 17 May 2024

Podpis:

Pozn.: Hodnocení píše k jednotlivým bodům, pokud nepíšete v textovém editoru, použijte při nedostatku místa zadní stranu nebo příložený list. V hodnocení práce se pokuste oddělit ty její nedostatky, které jsou, podle vašeho mínění, obhajobou neodstranitelné (např. chybí kritické zhodnocení pramenů a literatury), od těch věcí, které student může dobrou obhajobou napravit; poměr těchto dvou položek berte prosím v úvahu při stanovení konečné známky.