Evaluation of master thesis „***Rewriting Israeli History: New Historians and Critical Sociologists – Formation, Terminology, and Criticism***“ written by **Adam Coman**.

Adam Coman is dealing with the issue of „rewriting Israeli history“ since 1980s that is connected with so called new historians and so called critical socilogists. Such a discussion has been ever since focusing on tree interrelated topics: the role of the zionist movement during the European holocaust, war crimes against the Palestinians committed by the IDF during the 1948 war, and a discrimination and exclusion of new Jewish immigrants into Israel by the hegemonic zionist elite.

Adam Coman is deeply discussing the many reasons for establishing so called new historians and critical sociologists (archives opened, new generation that do not have a direct experience with the 1948 war, inspiration by critical approaches from the Western academia, traumas or shocks by 1973 and 1982 wars, deep transitions of Israeli society etc.).

After that, Adam Coman analyses the change in more neutral or even critical terminology (from „alija" to „immigration“ or even „colonization“, from „Arabs“ to „Palestinians“, from „The war for independence“ to „first Arab-Israeli war“ etc.) and critically introduces the many key theories and interpretative shifts in understanding the Israeli history (zionism as colonialism, stereotypes and exlusion of new Jewish immigrants by old zionist elite, similar labeling of European Jews as the Nazi one in contrast with the so called „new Jews“).

At the end of the diploma thesis Adam Coman is showing the ever continuing discussions between the so called old and the new historians, which is putting one more critical point of view and even more different perspectives on the whole topic of the diploma thesis. As such, Adam Coman is critically discussing both, the old and the new historians/critical sociologists.

I consider the diploma thesis extraordinary for several reasons. Adam Coman has read and impressive amount of relavant books and articles. After that, he was able to clearly identify the very substance and the most important facts and arguments from the many present in the whole literature he went through. He was also able to put the many different perspectives and arguments into productive, however tense, dialogue, and at the end to draw the dramatic story of the paradigmatic clash. For this reason, the logic and structure of the diploma thesis and its arguments is crystal clear, every paragraph has got its exact place in the whole story.

Finally, I would like to highlight that for the Czech context, the diploma thesis is very inovative and useful, since except of few Czech scholars (like prof. Pavel Barša) and journalists (like Břetislav Tureček), the mainstream academia and especially journalism is still presenting very uncritical mythology written by the so called old Israeli historians. For this reason, I strongly recommend to publish a paper at Journal of Historical Sociology based on the diploma thesis.

Questions for the defense:

1. What is the role or place of Palestinian historians in the whole debate between the so called old and new historians in general? What was the position of late Edward Said in the emerging discussion?

2. In which way the discussion proliferated into the history textbooks and into the way history is taught at elementary and secondary schools?

3. Did so called new historians also attempted to study more recent events (1967 or 1973 war, first Palestinian intifada, the latest immigration from Ethiopia), although the archives are not open yet?

4. Is there really any critical analyses of the IDF connected to the events after the 1948 war or is the issue of IDF a taboo even for the new historians/critical sociologists? Are there any other taboos in Israeli historiography or sociology these days?

I propose mark „**excellent**“ („1“).

Prague, 13th September, 20016 Mgr. Karel Černý, Ph.D.