

UNIVERZITA KARLOVA V PRAZE
Fakulta sociálních věd
Institut mezinárodních studií

PROTOKOL O HODNOCENÍ DIPLOMOVÉ PRÁCE
(Posudek oponenta)

Práci předložil(a) student(ka): Eliška ČERNOVSKÁ

Název práce: Guy Erisman a jeho role v česko-francouzských kulturních vztazích v oblasti hudby

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

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

The essay proposes to understand the role of French public radio speaker, Guy Erismann, in French-Czech cultural relations. More precisely, the thesis analyzes the way in which Guy Erismann contributed to promote Czech classical music composers in France.

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

From a theoretical point of view, the author drew her reflection from public and cultural diplomacy conceptions, from the theory of soft power and from the theory of actors.

Furthermore, the author approached the subject following biographical methodology.

Generally speaking, the presentation of the methodological and theoretical anchorage make sense. While the presentation of public diplomacy approach is presented sufficiently, the actor theory (p.18-20) is rather weak, passing over all main sociological and political sciences references that make authority in the field.

The part „Aplikace teorie na výzkum“ (p.20-23), discusses back cultural diplomacy approach but again pays little attention to the theories of actors. Furthermore, in pages 22, 23, 24, the author presents several tables and one diagram unfortunately without explanations and without presenting the relevance of this conceptual tools for the research.

In addition to this, I believe the object of the research falls also into oral history since Guy Erismann was a prominent actor of Czech French cultural contact in the decennials that followed the establishment of the socialist regime of Czechoslovakia. Since the author realized several interviews with witnesses of the personal life of Guy Erismann it would have been appropriate to anchorage the research in this field.

The methodological part is not very sophisticated but adequate. One must say that biographical methodology is now attracting the attention of a lot of specialists coming from sociology, political sciences, history and literature. The increasing interest in social sciences and humanities for this methodology generates an important debate on its objectives, its social contributions and its limits.

I am fully convinced that the use of a biographical methodology is valuable regarding the research program of cultural diplomacy studies. However, it is a pity that the author didn't situate her research intentions among the ongoing discussions on this particular methodology.

Concerning the sources, the secondary literature is not extensive but appropriate. The principal value of the work lays in the field work research that has been performed thanks to her language skill. The essay is for a great extent based on the material gathered during the field work. The analysis and the conclusion are very interesting. It is nonetheless a pity and particularly frustrating for the reader that the author decided to make no use in the text of any quotations!

Concerning the structure, the essay is organized into 7 chapters. The first one dedicated to the theoretical frame, the 6 others dedicated to the biography of Guy Erismann. The cut out of the biographical structure into so many short chapters does not fully make sense and doesn't avoid a lot of redundancies. For instance, chapters 4, 5 and 6 deal „the contact with Czech music productions “of Guy Erismann. Both chapters 3 and 6 deal with the “organization of collective projects”. Both chapters 4 and 5 deal with the “mutual exchange of artists”.

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

As I am not Czech native speaker, I wont comment on the writing style, but saying that the text is easy to read and clear. The sources and the references are well quoted.

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

Despite all the comments made on the theoretical anchorage, the methodological reflexion, and the structure of the essay, the general impression is good.

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

How would you situate your work toward ongoing debates on biographical methodology?

At the end of your conclusion, you state that the place of Czech music in Czech French bilateral relations is far from being exhausted. Could you please elaborate on the potential research perspectives of the subject?

6. DOPORUČENÍ / NEDOPORUČENÍ K OBHAJOBĚ A NAVRHOVANÁ ZNÁMKA

(výborně, velmi dobře, dobře, nevyhověl): doporučuji k obhajobě a navrhuji známka C.

Datum:
8.6.2018

Podpis: Paul Bauer

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.