

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

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

Práci předložil(a) student(ka): Nana Quian

Název práce: Communist History in the Czech National Historical Narrative. A Case Study of Czech Secondary Education History Textbook

---

Vedoucí práce (u externích vedoucích uveďte též adresu a funkci v rámci instituce): Ondřej Klípa

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

The thesis deals with the Czech narrative of the nation's post-war history, depicted in one of the widely used secondary school textbook. Nana carried out a thorough textual analyses of parts of the textbook in focus. The aim of the thesis is to investigate how Czech communist history is reproduced and explained to the young generations. Nana concludes that the Czech communist history in the textbook is mostly written objectively with a string of key facts, but it is still slightly selective and has set a tone of criticism and even direct hatred against communists while casting comparison, a tone of sympathy and gratitude towards the democratic powers.

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

I appreciate Nana's decision to take on such a complicated task. Despite her limited knowledge of Czech, she was able (with the help of her colleagues) to grasp most of the semantic nuances of the text. Her analyses evolve in a logical and well-structured way, following a timewise perspective. Nana studied and applied also theoretical literature, such as by Jerzy Topolski or Paul Ricoeur.

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

Except for some typos and other minor errors (repeated words...), Nana's writing style is smooth and fluent. The text has all necessary components to meet the standards of the master thesis. I would only recommend adjusting the reference style to some of the standard ways used in academia.

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

The thesis is a brave endeavor to delve into such a sensitive issue in a foreign country and a foreign language which Nana is not familiar with. Not even mentioning the fact that her analyses came into the ongoing "Historikerstreit" over the nation's communist past. In accord with Nana, I also perceive the textbook slightly biased. Through small details, it tacitly strengthens a normative perception of communism, depicting it, to put it simply, as "evil" in comparison with the predecessor and successor regimes. Nevertheless, most of the cases Nana uses are not particularly telling in this respect. I cannot avoid the feeling that Nana is in many cases too "strict" and that she overemphasizes alleged inadequacy of some expressions. Taking all the scholarship on the beginning of state-socialist regime in the 1940s/50s into account, for instance, I really do not know how should "alternative" or more "objective" description of that period look like. For example, I see the word "absurd" with regard to accusations in show trials quite fit because they were – according to available historical sources – "absurd", as the Communist Party itself later admitted in some cases. The same applies to expressions such as "believed" or "expected" regarding some non-communist politicians because – again – they did believe or expect something that in the end did not happen (same as the communist believed and expected something that did happen). Interestingly, I find in the textbook other problematic parts that Nana did not mention. For these reasons, the thesis might look not very persuasive for someone who is properly trained in the pos-war Czechoslovak history.

5. SPOLUPRÁCE S VEDOUCÍM PRÁCE (komunikace s vedoucím práce, schopnost reflektovat připomínky, posun od původního záměru apod.)

Nana consulted her thesis intensely, especially in the latest stage of her research. The talks lead, inter alia, to a significant change of her research topic.

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

1/ In your thesis, you questioned the term “totalitarian” in the context of the early communist regime in Czechoslovakia. How would you define this period (late 1940s, early 1950s) using (any) typology of political scientist?

2/ When talking about “Slánský” trial, you explained the anti-Semitic hint in the textbook as the way the authors aimed to equalize Communism with Nazism. I did not find that direct linkage in the respective part of the textbook. What was the reason anti-Semitism was employed by then communist leaders against their former “comrades” who were sentenced to death?

3/ You criticize quotations of historical documents (such as a Beneš’s speech, the Two Thousands Words...) in the textbook. Considering the didactical purpose of the textbook which learning through documents clearly helps, what would you suggest as a countermeasure to make the textbook more balanced in this regard?

7. DOPORUČENÍ / NEDOPORUČENÍ K OBHAJOBĚ A NAVRHOVANÁ ZNÁMKA

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

C-E, depending on the defense

Datum:

Podpis:

---

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.