

Pré-rapport du mémoire de M2
Pre-report of the Master's thesis
Édition/Édition (2018—2020)

Étudiant(e)/Student :

Prénom, Nom / First Name, Family Name : **João Pedro Rocha Joaquim**
Titre du mémoire M2 / Title of the Master's thesis :
**Museums and Agriculture in Cold War Europe:
The establishment of the Association Internationale De Musées d' Agriculture**

Mobilité / Mobility :

Veillez souligner les établissements !/ Please, underline the institutions !

Eötvös Loránd Tudományegyetem, Budapest (ELTE)

École des Hautes Études en Sciences Sociales de Paris (EHESS)

Università degli Studi di Catania (UNICT)

Univerzita Karlova, Prague (CUNI)

Université Laval, Québec (UL)

Directeurs de recherche / Supervisors¹ :

Prénom, Nom / First Name, Family Name : **Judit Klement**
Titre /Title : **associate professor**
Université/University : **ELTE**

Évaluation/Evaluation:

Veillez consulter le tableau de conversion ci-dessous !/ Please, consult the grade conversion chart below !

Note dans l'établissement / Grade at the institution: **5 (ELTE)**
Note dans le 2eme établissement / Grade at the 2nd institution: **A (CUNI)**
(Note dans le 3eme établissement / Evaluation – grade at the 3rd institution:)
Note TEMA+ / TEMA+ grade: **Excellent**

Pré-rapport / Pre-report :

max. 4500 caractères espaces inclus/max. 4500 characters including spaces

¹ Le pré-rapport est écrit par le 2eme directeur (ou par le 2eme et 3eme directeurs) qui ne participe pas à la soutenance et inclut des questions à aborder lors de la soutenance./The pre-report is written by the 2nd supervisor (and in case the 3rd supervisor too), who does not personally take part in the defense and it includes questions to be addressed to the student during the thesis defense.

The thesis of João Joachim fully meets the requirements of an MA-thesis. He has assigned a clear central problem on the subject of agricultural museum practice, and he can detail and analyse successfully this problem. There is no doubt that he earns a grade 5. The chosen topic is so complex and exciting, by the way, that a doctoral dissertation can be prepared based on it. So, my remarks are aimed not only at this master thesis but also at the possibility of a future work being developed. The main merit of the thesis is that the central problem was identified in such a way that the analysis was not significantly hindered by language barriers. The author argues well for the importance of a transnational perspective and rightly keeps this aspect in mind for each topic discussed, mostly defending with it the fact why he is not talking more deeply about local specificities.

From the methodological point of view, I missed the explanation of the method used to process the journals (review of all issues, content analysis, etc.), and the author did not present the journals deeper in the thesis (how many issues were published each year, the length of an issue/volume, etc.). In terms of content, it would have been interesting to put more emphasis on what changes took place in Europe in the second half of the 1960s. Although the author refers to the peculiarity of the age, “the ideologically changed atmosphere” is not explained or analysed. Nor does he include the significance of this in the analysis, he merely refers to it concerning the temporal placement.

A really exciting question is the different ways of museum processing of the agricultural theme: the open-air museum, the universal museum and the special museum. This runs through the text as a point of view, right. However, the author does not analyse the specific reasons for the presence of different museum forms in a given country. The procedure is understandable, such an analysis could have spread the transnational perspective. I also accept as a possible general explanation that the open-air museum will soon appear where the traditional peasant world will soon begin to disappear due to modernization. At the same time, I think the differences can be traced back to many reasons, such as which discipline had what weight and importance in the given country and how this changed over time.

In the case of Hungary, for example, the history of the agricultural museum begins with the millennium exhibition and was founded in 1907. At an early start, I believe, not only the fact has a significance that Hungary was an agrarian country, but also the political, economic, scientific weight of the aristocracy that lived on agriculture and managed on large estates. An open-air museum will not be in Hungary for long, however, the country had an ethnographic collection, which operated as part of the country's largest and most significant museum, the Hungarian National Museum, from 1872 onwards. An independent Ethnographic Museum was established only in 1947. The open-air museum was opened in 1967 as the Village Museum Department of the Ethnographic Museum, and in 1972 it became an independent institution. The third, last and successful wave of collectivization in Hungary—after which the traditional peasant world began to disappear at a rapid pace—certainly played a role in the start of the open-air-museum in 1967.

The impact of differences in collectivization in Eastern Europe is also not stressed. I would be interested, for example, in the case of Poland, where attempts to collectivize was unsuccessful. By the way, collectivization took place in Hungary in three waves, not in two: 1949–53, 1955–56, 1959–1961, and only the last one was complete and successful.

In my opinion, the place of agricultural museums in scientific or public culture sphere depends not only on the macroeconomic significance of agriculture in the given country but also on the representatives, who represent the cause of the museum and how much scientific policy weight he has. The author is also well aware that the actors are important. Although the author knows this, his analysis in this area does not go deep, does not synthesize, interprets the individual actors concerning each other, or as part of a network in the given country or on the transnational field.

Finally, a formal remark: The author does not integrate well his illustrations into the text. The rich illustration is not an integral part of the narrative.

In summary, João Joachim is a promising student who completed his TEMA + studies with a very commendable thesis.

Questions :

On what factors depends the fact how and how much does a museum of agriculture participate in the transnational field of museum presentation of agriculture? Please explain what elements are important in the transnational role of a museum of agriculture of a given country.

31 May 2020
 Date

Judit Klement
 Signature

TEMA+ Grade conversion table

ELTE (Hungarian)	EHESS (French)	UNICT (Italian)	CUNI (Czech)	UL (Canadian)	Notes TEMA+
5	16-20 (pas de 19 et 20)	30 (A, Excellent)	A	95-100 (A+, 4,33) 90-94 (A, 4,00) 85-89 (A-, 3,67)	Très bien/Excellent
4	14-15	27-29 (B, Very Good)	B	80-84 (B+, 3,33) 75-79 (B, 3,00) 70-74 (B-, 2,67)	Bien/Good
3	12-13	23-26 (C, Good)	C	66-69 (C+, 2,33) 63-65 (C, 2,00) 60-62 (C-, 1,67)	Assez bien/ Amply sufficient
2	10-11	21-22 (D, Satisfactory) 18-20 (E, Sufficient)	D, E	55-59 (D+, 1,33) 50-54 (D, 1,00)	Passable/ Satisfactory/ Almost sufficient
1	0-9	1-17 (F, FX)	F	49 et moins (E, 0,00)	Insuffisant/ Insufficient