

**UNIVERZITA KARLOVA V PRAZE**  
**Fakulta sociálních věd**  
**Institut mezinárodních studií**

**PROTOKOL O HODNOCENÍ BAKALÁŘSKÉ PRÁCE**  
**(Posudek vedoucího)**

Práci předložil(a) student(ka): Jakub Vaňásek

Název práce: Arménská genocida a její vliv na současnou Arménii

Vedoucí práce (u externích vedoucích uveďte též adresu a funkci v rámci instituce): Adrian Brisku, PhD, KRVS, IMS, FSV

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

The thesis deals with the questions of the causes and nature of the Armenian genocide and its impact on contemporary Armenia. Mr. Vaňásek provides a sweeping historical account and a brief analysis of contemporary situation in Armenia to address these questions.

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

The scope and the research questions tackled in this thesis do indeed make for a challenging work for Mr. Vaňásek. To some extent, he manages to do that but with noticeable shortcomings. To begin with, though the structure of the thesis is quite clear, it does not make much sense why Mr. Vaňásek devotes only one chapter to the analysis of the contemporary Armenia. In addition, Mr. Vaňásek despite the fact that he mentions explicitly the definition and the emergence of the concept of genocide, recounting historical examples from world history and relies on numerous sources to construct his account, does not discuss systematically the state of the art in the academic scholarship on the genocide, and particularly how it is discussed in contemporary Armenia and Turkey, the scholarship on collective memory and international relations. Mr. Vaňásek also did not manage to explain what approaches he used to analyse his thesis. Nevertheless, Mr. Vaňásek makes use of a commendable number of sources including the two interviews (which needed a careful analysis) he conducted with publicly active Armenian citizens, but they could have been more, thus helpful in giving a more detailed analysis of the impact of Genocide in contemporary Armenia.

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

I am not able to comment with authority on his use of academic Czech. But his academic English still needs quite a lot of work. Nonetheless, Mr. Vaňásek does a good job in properly citing directly and indirectly the sources of the literature.

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

The main take from this thesis, in addition to the critical points made above, is that more work was needed to be done to have turned it into a very good thesis. Mr. Vaňásek does indeed argue clearly that there this an impact of the memory of genocide in contemporary Armenia but does not underscore that the greatest impact is in the Turkish-Armenian relations. The strongest side of this thesis a clear understanding that of the genocide Mr. Vaňásek relays in in the thesis but does not follow through in his second part of the thesis. Another weakness of this thesis is its lack of originality. This could have been avoided if Mr. Vaňásek had managed to provide a map of the state of the art of the scholarship on the subject matter and subsequently found an interesting angle from which you could have pursued your thesis.

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

How would you describe methodologically your approach to the thesis? In what ways did the Genocide influenced and influences the Nagorno-Karabakh conflict? What are the debates among contemporary Armenian historians (in Armenia and Diaspora) on the Armenian Genocide?

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

Datum: 21.05.19

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.