

Excessive. Eccentric.

Very Good.*

Dr. Ondřej Ditrych

*) In review of the thesis 'Terrorism in Popular Culture: A Discourse Analysis of the Portrayal of IRA Terrorism in Films', by Kan Prateepjinda (Charles University, 2014). Done on June 22, 2014.

Appendix 1

Kan makes a good case for what he does. But he has a peculiar conception of 'genealogy', as he does of some other concepts, like 'monument' which, in Foucault's archæology, is juxtaposed to 'document'. His method is well-grounded, but often he repeats, repositions and revises. (Is that intended to represent an 'open structure'?) He recounts theory of many things – of camera angles, of lightning, of colour in film. His own narrative, however, lacks *focus*. The 'master narrative' is fluent, detailed and verisimilar. He also provides critical, perceptive and insightful reading of the chosen films. (Even if at times the reading is more a 'reproduction'.) It is not a genealogical reading, however. What we see is representations of IRA in different periods of the group's 'life span'. But that is not history, let alone the '*wirklich*' one, and any proposed 'discontinuity' in this imagined time turns out to be more a *difference*. Moreover, we find little about under what conditions – I'd avoid speaking of 'context' here, as Kan often does – the terrorist subject has been constructed. Whatever we may think a genealogy is like, and we're encouraged by Foucault to use it liberally, it should be a method of history and one which interrogates both continuities and discontinuities, emergences, transformations and subversions in the discourse conditioned on the play of power with a 'subject effect'.