

UNIVERZITA KARLOVA
Fakulta sociálních věd
Institut mezinárodních studií

PROTOKOL O HODNOCENÍ DIPLOMOVÉ PRÁCE
(Posudek vedoucího)

Práci předložil(a) student: Yilmaz Emre Can

Název práce: Kemalist Eurasianism: A Third Way for Contemporary Turkey in-Between the West and East

Vedoucí práce: Adrian Brisku, PhD, KRVS, IMS, FSV

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

The thesis examines the conceptual and ideological origins of the contemporary concept/discourse of 'Kemalist Eurasianism' in contemporary Turkey particularly as espoused by the small Patriotic Party.

Mr. Yilmaz's aim is to ascertain that rather than a borrowing from the Russian Neo-Eurasianism, through the conceptual history approach, 'Kemalist Eurasianism' is in fact, as the compound concept suggests, a discourse traceable in the thinking and articulations of the 'father' of the Turkish Republic, Kemal Atatürk and continued by small left-wing intellectual and political groups, ending up with the Patriotic Party.

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

This thesis is very well-structured, clearly argued, while conveying a sophisticated level of intellectual and political discussion on the theme, historically and politically and geopolitically contextualised – sometimes Mr. Yilmaz does seem show a sense of personal attachment to this discourse, as he writes in p. 39, how post-war Turkish government 'betrayed Atatürk's will' or at times as in page 70, not only does he sound as he is attached to it but makes it look like a policy paper when he writes that, even though paraphrasing the position of Patriotic Party circle', that 'Turkey should immediately return to the Kemalist principle of "peace at home and peace in the world" – in which a substantial context of modern and contemporary Turkish political and intellectual history is laid out. The methodological approach of conceptual history is clearly understood but not as adequately utilised. For instance, Mr. Yilmaz does not address directly, methodologically, how to deal with the question that Eurasianism as a concept was not articulated as such by Atatürk or the Cadreist or the YON movement. In fact, he acknowledges himself in the Chapter 1, the subtle in page 21, namely *'Kemalism: Unnamed Eurasianism'*, but does not reflect on how it fits in the methodological approach. Clearly, in the two first chapters Mr. Yilmaz shows the ideological continuity between Kemalism – in terms of understanding of nationalism, etatism, antiwesternism and an orientation towards the East, as he quotes Atatürk declaring 'Some of us might think that the Eastern nations are not ready yet for an alliance' (p. 24) – and the other intellectual and political groups in the 1930, 1960 and 1990s; but that continuity is not historically semantic. Mr. Yilmaz shows also an excellent grip of the theoretical layers of concept of nationalism and political ideology and political economy. Mr. Yilmaz does a very good job placing his research in the context of the state of the art in Turkish and English languages including a very convincing contrast between Kemalist Eurasianism and Russian Neo-Eurasianism. The thesis would have benefited from a more systematic discussion of the literature of the Turkish foreign policy. At the same time, Mr. Yilmaz uses a rich pool of secondary and primary sources to construct his account.

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

Mr. Yilmaz had a good command of academic English and cites appropriately the sources.

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

This is an original thesis in which Mr. Yilmaz demonstrates – using a conceptual history approach and primary and secondary sources – that the meaning of Eurasianism as articulated, particularly by the small Patriotic party, in the contemporary Turkish context, needs to be understood as rooted in the legacy of Kemalist Republicanism and its Eastward orientation. In this light, he makes the case that rather than seeking to locate this concept in the scholarship of identity and geopolitics and international relations as well as an offshoot of the Russian Neo-Eurasianism, 'Kemalist Eurasianism' needs so be

read in the scholarship of ideology (nationalism and imperialism, Marxism) and international relations and crucially in the modern Turkish political and historical discourse in which the Turkish Republic has sought to find a third way not only in ideological and civilizational terms but crucially in geopolitical and political terms, too. Some of the shortcomings of the thesis, in addition to the remarks made in section 2 of this assessment regarding fuller reflection on the methodological approach and fuller account on the state of the art especially with regard to Turkish foreign policy, have to do with rather long introduction to the thesis, unnecessary repetitiveness in some places, a more detailed account of the analysis of the articles of *Teori* journal, and crucially, when analysing the thoughts of Cadre and YON groups he gave a picture as if the members of each group spoke with one voice.

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

We meet twice (the first time was two years ago in which Mr. Yilmaz expressed interest in having his thesis supervised by me), while the rest of the interaction was via emails. We communicated regularly and Mr. Yilmaz delivered chapters in time and reflected on most of the comments that I made on his work.

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

What do you exactly mean by ‘Asiatic notions’? If Ataturk did not use the concept of Eurasianism, then from a conceptual historical perspective, how can we talk about semantic continuity or shift in semantic meaning between Ataturk’s understanding and Patriotic Party or journal *Teori* understanding?

7. DOPORUČENÍ / NEDOPORUČENÍ K OBHAJOBĚ A NAVRHOVANÁ ZNÁMKA

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

Datum: 24.05.2019

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.