

**University of Hradec Králové**  
**Philosophical Faculty**  
**Department of Philosophy and Social Sciences**

**Thesis supervisor's/ ~~opponent's~~ opinion** \* delete those that do not apply

Author's name	Doruk Kaynak
Title of the thesis	Kinopolitics in contemporary anarchism
Study field	Philosophy
Thesis supervisor (name and surname with titles, workplace)	Mgr. Jan Černý, Ph.D., FF UHK
Thesis opponent (name and surname with titles, workplace)	PhDr. Ondřej Slačálek, Ph.D., FF UK
Thesis consultant (name and surname with titles, workplace)	
Year of the defense	2024

Picture attachment	<del>yes</del> - no	Charts and graphs	<del>yes</del> - no	Other attachments	<del>yes</del> - no
--------------------	---------------------	-------------------	---------------------	-------------------	---------------------

Literature used (number): 37

**Evaluation of the objective(s) of the thesis**

*(characteristics of the objective, how it was set, usefulness of the objective, in words)*

The aim of the thesis is to outline the "schism" between "traditional anarchism" (what the author calls the anarchism of the founding figures of the movement from the 19th century) and post-structuralist anarchism, and then to overcome this schism by integrating the two traditions of thought through a kinopolitical perspective. The aim of the thesis is ultimately normative - to create a synthesis of traditional anarchism and poststructuralist anarchism that is applicable to contemporary anarchist theory and practice.

**Evaluation of the content of the thesis**

<i>Use of essential literature and resources</i>	<del>Yes</del>	With reservations	<del>No</del>
<i>Appropriate professional terminology of thesis</i>	Yes	<del>With reservations</del>	<del>No</del>
<i>Appropriately chosen method</i>	<del>Yes</del>	With reservations	<del>No</del>
<i>Meeting the stated aim(s) of the work</i>	<del>Yes</del>	With reservations	<del>No</del>

**Evaluation of the formal criteria of the thesis**

<i>Stylistic level of work</i>	Good	<del>With reservations</del>	<del>Bad</del>
--------------------------------	------	------------------------------	----------------

<i>Spelling and grammar</i>	Good	<del>With reservations</del>	<del>Bad</del>
<i>Appropriate graphic design of pagination and text</i>	Good	<del>With reservations</del>	<del>Bad</del>
<i>Processing of attachments</i>	<del>Good</del>	<del>With reservations</del>	<del>Bad</del>

***Principal comments on the level of content of the thesis***

- a) To offer an original authorial synthesis of two schools of thought (traditional anarchism and post-structural anarchism) is too big a task for a master thesis. In order to be convincing, such a synthesis would have to work with a larger body of literature than this thesis has worked with, so as not to repeat what has already been written and to really come up with something original.
- b) The overly grandiose goal of the thesis leads to the fact that it works with a large number of themes, intellectual or artistic traditions and concepts, which it deals with only superficially. The thesis sometimes comes across more like a political manifesto than an academic paper. It uses very general ideas without arguments and often without reference to literature; examples from social practice are also missing. It is hard to imagine a concrete social reality behind the slogans.
- c) An example of a certain superficiality of the author's work is his handling of one of the central concepts of the thesis, kinopolitics. The author makes no mention of Thomas Nail, who coined the term and introduced it into the academic literature. Instead, he looks back for kinopolitical motifs in the work of earlier authors Henri Lefebvre, Michel Foucault and Gilles Deleuze (who inspired Nail). The concept of kinopolitics is not introduced in sufficient detail, yet it should form perhaps the most important part of the author's final original synthesis of traditional anarchism and poststructuralist anarchism (at least according to the title of the thesis itself). Poststructuralist anarchism itself is a synthesis of the anarchist and poststructuralist thought; however, the author of the thesis wants to come up with his own higher synthesis, in which, in addition to kinopolitics, Max Stirner and the critique of neoliberal power structures from the pen of the Korean philosopher Byung-Chul Han appear. The synthesis, however, again takes the form of brief slogans rather than an elaborate thesis. Therefore, there is not even sufficient justification as to why these components were chosen for the final synthesis, nor does the thesis attempt to establish whether anyone has attempted anything similar in the past.
- d) The thesis should work better with the literature - refer much more to it and through these references stick more to concrete issues and also to concrete social reality.
- e) In spite of all that has been said so far, the author has demonstrated in his thesis a capacity for independent philosophical thinking and the courage to tackle fundamental questions. The author also writes in good English and in a smooth, flowing manner.

***Principal comments on the formal level of the thesis***

- a) The formal level of the work is good. There are only minor formal errors - e.g. on pp. 32-33 one identical paragraph is repeated twice.

***Questions for the thesis defense***

- 1) Could you argue convincingly why your final synthesis has the components it has? For what reason should kinopolitics play a central role in it, at least according to the title of your thesis? And do you know of any similar attempts by anyone else, if any?
- 2) Try to apply a specific idea from your final synthesis of traditional anarchism and post-structural anarchism to concrete actions in the contemporary world (assuming you are looking for “a viable path forward for anarchist theory and practice” as stated in the abstract of the thesis).
- 3) One of the different starting points of traditional anarchism and poststructuralism (in authors like Foucault, Deleuze, Derrida, Butler) is the different conceptions of the subject and individual agency. As you yourself write, "traditional anarchists maintain a clear distinction between oppressive power structures and the individual". In contrast the poststructuralist subject is weak; the agency of the poststructuralist subject is weakened, dependent on the relations the subject enters into; subjects are not transparent to themselves and their actions are not consciously fully controlled, even when they are trying to resist power and achieve justice. How, specifically, does your final synthesis overcome these different starting points of the two types of thinking?

### ***Final evaluation of the thesis***

I recommend the thesis - ~~I do not recommend it~~ for defense. \*not suitable to be crossed out

### ***Brief verbal evaluation*** (at the discretion of the assessor)<sup>1</sup>

The thesis has an interesting but overly grandiose goal that could hardly be fulfilled. The thesis does not sufficiently refer to the literature. Yet it shows a certain courage and capacity for independent philosophical thought.

### ***Final grade: D***

.....21.1.2024, Klatovy.....  
date and place

.....Jan Černý.....  
signature of the author of the opinion

---

<sup>1</sup> For example, the difficulty of the topic, the specifics of the solution, the independence or inventiveness of the student, what are the main advantages, shortcomings of the work, or what is the benefit or usefulness of the work, proposed recommendations for the possible use of the work; in particular, a proposal for a solution in the case of a non-recommendatory opinion: a) clarify, supplement or elaborate the specified passage, b) correct, rework the specified passage, c) rework the entire work on the specified topic, d) develop a new work on a new topic.