

IMESS dissertation						
Name/code:	Sander Roberto Maurano Filho					
Dissertation title:	Producing and Consuming the Nation: Ethnography of a Czech National Memorial					
<b>Scale: 5 - excellent, 4 - good, 3 - satisfactory, 2 - poor, 1 - very poor</b>						
	<b>5</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	
<b>ARGUMENT:</b>						
Clearly defined research question	X					No clearly defined research question
Answers research question		X				Does not answer research question
Well structured		X				Badly structured
Shows theoretical awareness	X					Shows no theoretical awareness
Conceptual clarity	x					Conceptual confusion
Empirically appropriate & robust		X				Full of empirical errors
Logical and coherent	X					Illogical and incoherent
Analytical	X					Descriptive
Critical	X					Uncritical
Shows independent thought	X					Does not show independent thought
<b>SOURCES &amp; USAGE:</b>						
Evidence of reading/research	x					No evidence of reading/research
Effective use of sources/data		X				Ineffective use of sources/data
<b>WRITING STYLE:</b>						
Clear	X					Obscure
Good punctuation	X					Poor punctuation
Grammatically correct	X					Grammatically incorrect
<b>PRESENTATION:</b>						
Appropriate length	X					Too long/short
Good referencing	X					Poor/inconsistent referencing
Good spelling	X					Poor spelling
Good bibliography		X				Poor bibliography
Deducted for late submission:	Deducted for faulty referencing:				<b>Mark*:</b> A	
Charles marker: Jiří Vykoukal	Signed:				Date: June 18, 2012	

\* Mark: A = 70+; B = 65-69; C = 60-64; D = 55-59; E = 50-54; F = fail, less than 50

**Scheme of award (assessment criteria):**

	Charles University**	IMESS
<b>Excellent</b>	Výborně [1]	A
<b>Very Good</b>	Velmi dobře [2]	B
<b>Good</b>	Velmi dobře [2.5]	C
<b>Satisfactory</b>	Dobře [3]	D
<b>Sufficient</b>	Dobře [3.5]	E
<b>Fail</b>	Neprospěl [4]	F

## CONTINUES OVERLEAF

**NOTE: Please provide substantive and detailed feedback**

Comments (at least 300 words)

Sander has selected a research focusing on "invisible" roots of national identity. In this case social scientists as well as historians do rely on "hard" facts like manifested national feeling, nationalist programmes, simply things which are "national" as much as you feel like you can touch them as "national".

Sander's dissertation took another way to see how non-declared "national" originates and is consumed in the sphere of quite unostentatious and discreet phenomena of everyday life where we would hardly go to find the "national".

To find out how it works Sander has decided to employ a double-methodology scheme consisting of a set of theories explaining production and another set of theories explaining consumption (nationalism study and ethnography). To anchor his theoretical reasoning in empirical soil he took a case study of a National Memorial at Vítkov Hill in Prague and started to study who and how and why produced "it" and who and how and why consumes it.

He works with different sort of sources, however, always is able to make clear how these sources do fit to his theoretical framework. I highly appreciate his ability to learn Czech in a way giving him a chance to conduct interviews with Czechs and work with Czech written materials, what has highly contributed to authenticity of his work.

Sander has come to the conclusion that the way of production of the National Memorial does not have an adequate reflection in the way of its consumption (it does not correspond with intentions of its creators), which work in the form of "discourses initialized by national cultural productions as well as contesting them" – I would say some discourses even do not contest "the heritage" but go their own way omitting the original idea or plan. He shows that there is a heteronomy between projects and outcomes.

As a historian I would just mention one slightly neglected fact here – analysis of production covers several decades of "development" of the National Memorial while analysis of its consumption is based on several last months and I see certain discrepancy here which should be explained.

Sources could be treated in a more careful way – Sander is using different sorts of sources, but e.g. the list of references mixes them all together, some of the proposed titles did not appear (Galandauer – more reliable than other authors), but these are rather minor things.

In general – this is a really nice piece of dissertation!

Specific questions for oral defence (at least 100 words)

1. Where are the limits of employed methodologies trying to explain topics like that (nationalism studies, ethnography)? is there a better option?
2. Is it possible to say that a high level of a non-manifested originating of national identity is possible only because the people in Prague simply absorbed Vitkov Hill to their everyday life and they perceive mostly its "public" than a "national" dimension?
3. Is it possible to say that any public place (regardless of its history) can play the same role like the Vitkov Hill?