#### UNIVERZITA KARLOVA V PRAZE

## Fakulta sociálních věd Institut mezinárodních studií

# PROTOKOL O HODNOCENÍ BAKALÁŘSKÉ PRÁCE (Posudek vedoucího)

Práci předložil(a) student(ka): Irina Molodkina

Název práce: Sartre and His Perception by Czech Intellectuals in 1960s

Vedoucí práce (u externích vedoucích uveď te též adresu a funkci v rámci instituce): Ondřej Matějka

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

The proclaimed main aim of the study is to analyse the influence of Jean Paul Sartre on Czech intellectuals after 1963, when he came to Prague and participated in several widely observed and commented meetings. However, a concentrated analysis of these debates and exchanges with four selected Czech personalities (Jan Patočka, František Kautman, Karel Kosík and Milan Kundera) constitutes only a relatively short part of the text (Chapter 3). It is preceded by an introductory chapter and a summary of Sartre's biography (including quite unnecessary pages about Simone de Beauvoir - because her significant influence on her lifelong partner is not related to the analysis of Sartre's exchanges with Czech intellectuals).

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

The field of study chosen by Ms. Molodkina is not entirely new, the author mentions several scholars who have already dealt with similar topics (Coeuré, Toman, Shore, Bracke, Millon etc.). The problem is that she does not explain how she approaches the existing literature and in what ways her contribution is (at least partially) original or not. Another fundamental problem is that Ms. Molodkina fails to incorporate reflection on the very rich realm of Cold War historiography analyzing intellectual exchanges between East and West. The rather heavy reliance on very outdated studies on communist Czechoslovakia (i.e. E. Táborský) also represents a weakness in her research strategy. An indisputable asset of her work, which I appreciated, is her motivation to carefully study challenging texts in three languages (Czech, French and English).

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

The formal problems with Ms Molodkina's work are too numerous and in some cases really serious. The author does not cite correctly from her sources (she almost never refers to the exact page from which she quotes). She does not use the abbreviated citation format in her footnotes. She does not distinguish between sources and literature in her bibliography. Typos, errors, and strange sentence constructions occur on almost every page of the text, making it impossible and unnecessary to mention them in this report.

### 4. KONTROLA ORIGINALITY TEXTU

| Prohlašuji, že jsem se seznámil/a s výsledkem kontroly originality textu závěrečné práce v systému: |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| [x] Theses [] Turnitin [] Ouriginal (Urkund)                                                        |
| Komentář k výsledku kontroly: 2% overall similarity which does not represent a problem              |

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

Unfortunately, this work represents a truly missed or lost opportunity. The topic and sources are interesting and partly original, and the author clearly has an undeniable ability to work with a corpus of literature in different languages. For these reasons, it is all the more regrettable that the research design was not well thought out and the resulting presentation of the text is indeed problematic even in formal terms. I partly take responsibility for the weaknesses of the research - however, Ms Molodkina contacted me only quite shortly

before the submission of the thesis, so we could not go through the process of preparing the thesis throughout the academic year, as is usually the case.

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

In her defense, Ms. Molodkina could fill in some important gaps in her thesis by placing her study in the historiographical context of research on intellectual and cultural exchange between East and West during the Cold War.

In continuity with this kind of reflection, she could also able to assess the uniqueness (?) of the quantity and quality of contacts and mutual influences between Sartre and Czech intellectuals compared to other intellectual exchanges between East and West.

## 7. DOPORUČENÍ / NEDOPORUČENÍ K OBHAJOBĚ A NAVRHOVANÁ ZNÁMKA (A-F):

The study is borderline acceptable, but based on her performance in the defense (and given Ms. Molodkina's courageous choice of difficult source material) it could pass and be graded E.

Datum: August 28, 2023 Podpis: Matějka

Pozn.: Hodnocení pište k jednotlivým bodům, pokud nepíšete v textovém editoru, použijte při nedostatku místa zadní stranu nebo přiložený 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.