



Ústav světových dějin FFUK

Master's Thesis Review

Student's name and surname: Joao Pedro Rocha Joaquim

Title of the thesis: Museums and Agriculture in Cold War Europe: The Establishment of the Association Internationale des Musées d'Agriculture

Reviewer's name and surname: Doubravka Olšáková

1. Heuristic (please, evaluate by grade 1, 2, 3, 4 – in case of grading 3 and 4 the reviewer is obliged to formulate critical points)

1.1 Evaluation of the selection of literature and sources	1
1.2 Complexity of used sources from the perspective of the state of the art	1

Short evaluation:

Appropriate choice of literature and sources.

2. Research problem and its solution (please, evaluate by grade 1, 2, 3, 4 – in case of grading 3 and 4 the reviewer is obliged to formulate critical points)

2.1 Choice of the formulation of the research issue respects the task given to the student	2
2.2 The relevance of the goal from the perspective of research area methodology	2

Short evaluation:

The introduction is up to date, concise and outlines the main problems and issues related to the topic of MA thesis, nevertheless research objectives are addressing too many issues, thus some of them remain unanswered.



Ústav světových dějin FFUK

3. Thesis' structure evaluation (please, evaluate by grade 1, 2, 3, 4 – in case of grading 3 and 4 the reviewer is obliged to formulate critical points)

3.1 Is the structure of the thesis logical?	1
3.2 Does the thesis' structure work along the methodology and methods declared in the introduction	2

Short evaluation:

The structure of the thesis is adequately set up and respect main research axis outlined in the introduction. Some of issues mentioned in the introduction are nevertheless left out.

4. Quality of analysis and interpretation (please, evaluate by grade 1, 2, 3, 4 – in case of grading 3 and 4 the reviewer is obliged to formulate critical points)

4.1 Analysis of sources and literature	1
4.2 Interpretation of sources and literature in their interaction	2

Short evaluation:

The analysis and interpretation are appropriate and takes into account limited language skills of the author. The willingness of the author to overcome language barriers is to be appreciated. I would expect a more detailed analysis of the main source: the AIMA.

5. Quality of the text (please, evaluate by grade 1, 2, 3, 4 – in case of grading 3 and 4 the reviewer is obliged to formulate critical points)

5.1 Style and grammar	1
5.2 Use of terminology	1

Short evaluation:

No objections. _____

6. Synthetic evaluation (minimum 500 signs):

nám. Jana Palacha 2, 116 38 Praha 1
IČ: 00216208
DIČ: CZ00216208

Tel.: (+420) 221 619 203
Fax: (+420) 221 619 385

usd@ff.cuni.cz
<http://usd.ff.cuni.cz>



Ústav světových dějin FFUK

The Master's thesis is very well addressing the evolution of idea of the museum of Agriculture, since its early beginnings until the establishment of the Association Internationale des Musées d'Agriculture. Research agenda is concisely set, research objectives are clear, the overview of literature and sources is appropriate. The Cold War background is mentioned, nevertheless not really thematised which is a pity. With this respect, the sources should be richer – especially given the Soviet position and involvement into the process of the grounding of International organization. Nevertheless despite these shortcomings this is a very well searched thesis.

7. Questions and comments which should the candidate answer and discuss during the defence:

- **What was the position of Marxism-Leninism towards peasant class and how this concept shaped the understanding of agricultural museums in the countries of the Soviet Bloc?**
- **Tensions between ethnology and history of agriculture have been raised in many chapters, nevertheless have never been really explained... Could you explain main issues and problems related to parallel concepts and their evolution? What was the principal driver towards split of both approaches (especially in the case of “open museums”)?**
- **The role of the Soviet Union is mentioned, it seems that it took the form of permanent, but “invisible” control. Have you consulted any primary sources (archive sources) which addressed the issue of “forced” ideological control? Which would prove that the control was really in place? You mention John Krige's work, how would you define this kind of Soviet control?**

Suggested grade: 2

Date: May 25, 2020

Signature:

nám. Jana Palacha 2, 116 38 Praha 1
IČ: 00216208
DIČ: CZ00216208

Tel.: (+420) 221 6
Fax: (+420) 221 6