

UNIVERZITA KARLOVA
Fakulta sociálních věd
Institut mezinárodních studií

PROTOKOL O HODNOCENÍ DIPLOMOVÉ PRÁCE
(Posudek oponenta)

Práci předložil(a) student(ka): Pavel Novota

Název práce: Women on the Periphery: The Invisible Empire Reborn

Oponoval (u externích oponentů uveďte též adresu a funkci v rámci instituce):

Lucie Kýrová, MA, Ph.D.

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

The presented master's thesis examines the position and role of women in the so-called Second Klan (KKK) in the 1920s. The author analyzes the women's reasons for joining the Klan, the foundation of an auxiliary organization, the Women of the Ku Klux Klan (WKKK), and their work within this organization and for the Klan proper. The goal of the work is to show that the foundation and existence of the women's auxiliary organization points in itself to tensions and ambivalence within the radical movement and to estimate to what degree the existence and work of these women legitimized the KKK.

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

The author presents his arguments clearly. The work is logically organized, with the chapters following the various aspects and themes of the examined topic. Attempting to uncover the history and significance of women in the KKK is a challenging topic due to limited availability of primary sources. To do so, the author utilizes a combination of available primary and secondary sources and transparently addresses the difficulty the nature of some of these sources (for example oral interviews, daily press, propaganda materials) represents for the work. These limitations often force the author to only stipulate his arguments, but his educated guesses are based in the available data. Since this work deals with question of gender, gender studies approach and consideration of gender-power structures within society in general and radical movements specifically would have helped the author to better formulate and explain his subject.

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

The thesis is written in a very clear language with only occasional mistake (a typo or a missing article here and there). The author correctly follows the Chicago style of citation in footnotes, only occasionally he misses commas (before pagination) and switches the position of a title and author.

Given the topic, focus, and scope of this work, the keywords should include terms such as gender, gender relations, women's history, and radical social movements. The fact that these are missing suggests the author himself may not have fully realized the larger issues this case study speaks to (more on this in the following comments).

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

The author fulfils his aims to analyze women's reasons for joining the KKK and their push for the establishment of the auxiliary WKKK. He shows how this development reflects the tensions within the

organization as well. Further, he satisfactorily describes the women's work for the organization, providing specific examples to show the importance of it for the legitimization of the Second Klan. As a case study, the work presents comprehensive description and analysis of the inner workings of the KKK and WKKK. However, the topic is not firmly set within the context of the society of the time, which detracts from the author's arguments and explanations of the motivations and attitudes of the KKK members. The author considers developments in the 1920s to be a general knowledge (p. 13) and therefore he opts out of talking about them. This is a huge problem. The author should know that the ideal reader, for whom he is supposed to write, is an intelligent and educated person, but not an expert on the presented topic. He cannot assume that everyone knows everything about the 1920s, even within academic circles. The author did not need a whole chapter on the 1920s (as he claims he would), he only needed to bring up relevant developments (necessary background) and link them to his arguments within the text.

For example:

* When talking about the fear of "others" and immigration / anti-immigration attitude of the KKK, the author should have provided information on the numbers, countries of origin, and fluctuation of immigration at that time, chronologically linking the emergence of the Second Klan and its immigration attitudes to actual historical developments. This would have helped the author to show the real / perceived threats the KKK claimed immigrants posed to their society

* The author repeatedly talks about the KKK's view on "traditional family," "traditional women's role," and "traditional womanhood," which the organization felt were threatened. Firstly, "traditional" should be in quotation marks as it in fact does not represent any specific tradition, rather a perceived and idealized gender relations the Klan promoted. Secondly, the threats to those values are not adequately explained. If the author added discussion on the changes in the 1920s society, namely those concerning women, his arguments and analyses would have been clearer and more persuasive – rise of professional working women with disposable income, changes in (female) fashion, etc. Only once he mentions the Klan's distaste for "flappers," to them a generation of women with lax morals" (p. 69), but immediately moves on. More information and fuller analysis of the women in the 1920s and the changing society, would present a more comprehensive discussion. A missed opportunity for sure.

Another shortcoming of the work is the lack of a clear formulation of its importance. Why is it important to understand the Klan women, their motivation and work? What does this thesis help us to understand beyond the KKK of the 1920s? The "So what?" question. The author comes close at times throughout the text (for example in his last chapter when he briefly parallels the Second Klan with the Klan of today), but never really states the contribution of this work to our knowledge. And yet, this work has a lot of potential – better understanding of the role of fear of the "other" and propaganda in radical movements beyond the KKK of the 1920s; better understanding of the position and work of women and gender relations in such radical movements (historically and today), etc. The author should clearly state, why someone needs to read his work; what larger issues this work speaks to.

A somewhat minor weakness is the fact that the author delegates many of his primary and secondary source quotations (and information) to the footnotes, instead of leaving them in the text. The result is an argument in the text, but actual evidence proving said argument buried in a footnote. A better organization and use of such quotes would strengthen the writing and presentation of argument/evidence (for example pp. 29 ft#7, 30 ft#79 and 80, 31 ft#82 and 85, 32 ft#90, 33 ft#93, 38 ft#123, 39 ft#130, etc.).

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

How can this study help us to better understand the far-right, Neo-Nazi, and other radical movements in the United States today? How similar or dissimilar are they? In your answer, consider issues such as the role of fear, ideas about women's place in society, and women's involvement and work in such movements.

6. DOPORUČENÍ / NEDOPORUČENÍ K OBHAJOBĚ A NAVRHOVANÁ ZNÁMKA
(výborně, velmi dobře, dobře, nevyhověl):

I recommend this MA thesis for defense. Depending on the author's satisfactory explanation of the posted questions and shortcomings of the work, I suggest a mark of výborně (B) or velmi dobře (C).

Datum: September 11, 2018

Podpis:

Pozn.: Hodnocení pište 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.