

UNIVERZITA KARLOVA
Fakulta sociálních věd
Institut mezinárodních studií

PROTOKOL O HODNOCENÍ DIPLOMOVÉ PRÁCE
(Posudek oponenta)

Práci předložil(a) student(ka): **Vladimír Špína**

Název práce: **Místo paměti: Irské národní muzeum a komemorace velikonočního povstání ve výstavě *Proclaiming a Republic***

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

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

In about 100 pages, the thesis deals with the historical narratives of the Irish national uprising in 1916 from the viewpoint of an exhibition presented at the Irish National Museum from 2016 to 2020. Drawing from references in museum studies and memory studies, notably the concept of *Place of Memory* by French historian Pierre Nora, the author describes the historical narratives that structures the different panels of the exhibition. He tries to understand the extent to which the exhibition participates to the renewal of Irish national myth of independence, providing, with new historiographical elements, a refreshed knowledge (what the Author call counter-hegemonic narrative) on this particular moment of Irish-British History. (p.2 & p.30).

To do so, the author follows the discursivity of the exhibition and questions its function in term of identity and myth making.

The work is organized in 5 sections, the first introduces the subject, the conceptual anchorage and the methodology. The second situates the object (actor, location, history or event), the three others describe the form and the content of the exhibition.

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

The work is supported by an extensive literature in the field of museography, memory and national identity formation. This anchorage is well presented in the state of the arts. It matches perfectly with the subject. If these readings help the author to situate the subject in the research's field, the analytical conceptual anchorage (SANE-Sites, Agents, Narratives, and Events) chosen to frame the analysis is not convincing as this frame and the way it is used in this particular work is not analytical, properly speaking, but rather a contextualization of the subject. The work is primarily a critical ethnography of the exhibition and a discourse analysis of the exhibition's narrative. The author recognizes the weakness of choosing SANE as an analytical frame as he recalls in p.3: tento výzkum se zabývá primárně konečným produktem – tedy výstavou takovou, jaká byla v muzeu skutečně instalována (...). In this respect, it would have been more appropriate to anchorage at first and primarily the proposal to references on the museography of history and mass violence with a specific focus on ethnographic works done on museum's exhibitions. Fortunately, and thanks to a consistent and solid state of the arts, this awkward choice does not impact the quality of the ethnography of the exhibition as well as its discourse analysis.

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

As I am not a Czech native speaker, I won't comment on the style, but saying that the essay is easy to read, clear and well documented. The references are well mobilized and properly used in the text and in the footnotes. From a formal point of view, the general impression is very good.

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

The overall impression of the work is very good. Nonetheless, two weak points must be noticed:

At first, I didn't understand the matter with the so called „research criteria“ (Section 1) in the research protocol, since they are a contextualization of the exhibition and a factual presentation of the actors, of its location and a brief history of the Museum in the British and Irish context. A research, to be labelled scientific, must follow certain criteria's that are, to name a few: a research question, a hypothesis, a conceptual anchorage, and a methodology. But there is no such a thing as a „research criteria“ understood as research devices. This said, the contextualization of the research is informative and serve well the analysis that follows.

Second, the reader faces several repetitions as the narrative of the exhibition is recalled in three different sections that are supposed to highlight three different social functions: identity (section 3), myth making (section 4), and interpretation (section 5). I believe another structuration of the narrative's analysis could have been possible to enable a more accurate articulation of national myths and identity formation.

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

The musealization of violent moments in contemporary history and its diverse manifestations in social memories has been the subject of an extensive reflection in Europe since the late 1990's and the beginning of the 2000's, notably, in Germany (with the permanent exhibition of German History in Berlin), in France (With the City of the History of Immigration), or in Belgium (with Museum of European History), showing thus a post-national understanding of national narratives. Indeed, historical museums have become a place of encounter between the most recent historical works and personal and collective testimonies that express the diversity of experiences and interpretations that call for critical view on the formation of national myths. To which extent does the exhibition „Proclaiming a Republic“ participate to this European trend of historical museums understood as public institutions aiming at easing the mutual understanding of conflictual pasts, notably in European transnational context ?

6. **DOPORUČENÍ / NEDOPORUČENÍ K OBHAJOBĚ A NAVRHOVANÁ ZNÁMKA**

(A a B výborně, C a D velmi dobře, E dobře, F nevyhověl):

A or B according to the defense.

Datum: 27.1.2020

Podpis: P. Bauer PhD.

Pozn.: Hodnocení píše 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.