

UNIVERZITA KARLOVA V PRAZE
Fakulta sociálních věd
Institut mezinárodních studií

PROTOKOL O HODNOCENÍ BAKALÁŘSKÉ PRÁCE
(Posudek oponenta)

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*

Oponoval (u externích oponentů uveďte též adresu a funkci v rámci instituce): doc. Maria-Alina Asavei, DPhil

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

The objective of the thesis is clearly formulated, namely, to explore the discourses around the 1956 revolution in contemporary Hungary with the aim to illuminate how the war in Ukraine affected these commemorative discursive formats. The choice of the topic is relevant and in line with the current political and mnemonic developments elicited by the war in Ukraine. The structure of the thesis is convincing enough.

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

The thesis eloquently articulates *the research problem* (the Hungarian state's change of discourse and interpretations of the 1956 Hungarian Revolution after the 2022 invasion of Ukraine by Russia). The main claim is accurately stated: presently, in Hungary there is a significant adjustment in the official discourse regarding the memory and importance of the Hungarian Revolution, a replacement of the old narrative about an aggressive fight against one external actor, with a strange “pro-peace” story. The introductory part, the methodology part, and the comments on 1956 Hungarian Revolution and politics (which add nothing new to the literature on these matters) are *merely* descriptive and comprise half of the thesis, i.e., 17 pages (pp. 8-25). There is no word about Ukraine here yet. Then, there is a subchapter about the relationship between Hungary and Russia. The Hungary-Ukraine discussion is covered on roughly 11 pages (i.e., pp. 27-38). These are the pages dedicated to the main subject of this thesis, including the analysis. Out of these, some pages are dedicated to historical relations between Hungary and Ukraine, and many other pages to the ideas Viktor Orban put forth in two interviews regarding the war in Ukraine. Except some small parts of

the *last chapter*, there are no innovative contributions to the field, since the author seems only to re-write information discovered mostly in the on-line journalist related sources.

The bibliography is mostly based on articles published in newspapers or/and on political discourses. The academic literature is rather poorly integrated. The main theoretical literature is used only in the description of the literature review and the theoretical background, but rather sporadically applied in the main body of research/analysis. For example, the theories formulated by Paul Ricoeur (mistakenly written as Ricour), Charles Meyer, Tsvetan Todorov, Pierre Nora and others (considered as the main theoretical pillars of this research) are employed *only* in the theoretical review part of the thesis (and almost *inexistent* in the research body). Another example: Marcus Halbwachs' theory is used twice, once in the theoretical review of the thesis and then once more in the main research body, but it is not clear how this theory frames the thesis.

The thesis does not elaborate enough on the literature pertaining to the political opposition and its political standpoints (discourses) *vis a vis* the memory of 1956. Just to give two examples: the leading political (and social) opposition figures, the anti-communist photographer Ivan Kyncl or the well-known both anti-communist and anti-FIDESZ academic figure Janos Kis.

Critical Discourse Analysis and Historical Discourse Analysis are announced as the main methods used. Only two discourses offered by the Hungarian Prime Minister Orban are used as case studies (whose analysis is rather briefly offered by the author and not detailed enough). *I do not see very clearly how Critical Discourse Analysis is employed and to what ends.*

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

The citation style is generally consistent. The phrasing is engaging and the text reads generally well. Overall, a fine job regarding the formal aspects and language (excepting the non-academic tone, and a few typos)

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: **The thesis was checked by the Turnitin and no plagiarism was detected.**

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

Strengths: The structure of the thesis is fine, and it can be further developed. An informative & detailed historical analysis is offered by the author in the so-called “Theoretical Background” chapter, called “1.3. Viktor Orban and the raiders of the past.” The findings generally answer the research question (albeit partially).

Weaknesses: The thesis demonstrates some general and generic understanding of the theories employed and it mainly uses secondary sources to quickly discuss and quote them, instead of engaging with them in more depth and more analytically. Another weakness is that the author seems to generally prefer to use different online sources (e.g., newspapers articles) rather than *bona fide* academic studies. This option should not be necessarily negatively received but considering that the empirical events discussed are still ongoing, one could reasonably ask how an academic paper can be based especially on non-academic writings, and what its relevance in the academic world might prove to be. The conclusions should be improved, it should not be only a general overview of the article (this belongs to the introduction), but a discussion of what the results of the study are and what other further research this academic piece may generate in the future.

Overall, the thesis is not analytically written, and many statements remain unsubstantiated with evidence. This gives the impression of a piece of work more based on the author’s opinion than on primary/secondary sources.

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

1. Is there any change also in the discursive frames of the Hungarian opposition regarding the 1956 Revolution?
2. To what extent is the memory of the 1956 Revolution politicized *vis a vis* Pro and/or Against UE?

7. DOPORUČENÍ / NEDOPORUČENÍ K OBHAJOBĚ A NAVRHOVANÁ ZNÁMKA

(A-F): **Between C-D**

Datum: 27. 05. 2024

Podpis:

Pozn.: Hodnocení píše k jednotlivým bodům, pokud nepíšete v textovém editoru, použijte při nedostatku místa zadní stranu nebo přiložený 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.