

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

Thesis 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. et Mgr. Jan Černý, Ph.D. Katedra filozofie a společenských věd, FF UHK
Thesis opponent (name and surname with titles, workplace)	PhDr. Ondřej Slačálek, Ph.D., Ústav politologie FF UK
Thesis consultant (name and surname with titles, workplace)	
Year of the defense	2024

Picture attachment	no	Charts and graphs	No	Other attachments	No
--------------------	----	-------------------	----	-------------------	----

Literature used (number):

Evaluation of the objective(s) of the thesis

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

Evaluation of the content of the thesis

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

Evaluation of the formal criteria of the thesis

<i>Stylistic level of work</i>	Good	With reservations	Bad
<i>Spelling and grammar</i>	Good	With reservations	Bad
<i>Appropriate graphic design of pagination and text</i>	Good	With reservations	Bad

Principal comments on the level of content of the thesis

a) As the most important positive aspect, I have to underline the strong ambitions of the thesis, the study of a broad range of literature, and the will to combine various and highly diverse approaches.

b) In terms of content, the greatest problem of the thesis, in my view, is the combination of too many various approaches. The author combines study of “traditional anarchism”, post-structuralist philosophy, post-anarchism, Han’s critical psychologisation, to some extent also the Frankfurt school, individualist anarchism, feminist theology, Bookchin’s polemics against “lifestyle anarchism”, Zerzan’s anarchist primitivism, cyberpunk... The author often is not precise enough in identifying the intellectual sources of the various streams that he combines, which leads him to problematical or banal conclusions.

c) Some of the author’s steps and conclusions are based on simplifications or errors. His opinion that the concept of kyriarchy is being a revolutionary innovation for anarchist theory is possible only because he simplified traditional anarchism to the negation of state and capitalism; in fact, what the author depicts as the negation of “kyriarchy” is part of classical anarchism called “anti-authoritarianism”. Also, the inclusion of Deleuzian and Guattarian “Kinopolitics” is important, but is it such an innovation considering that Deleuze and Guattari are among the most important sources of post-anarchism?

Principal comments on the formal level of the thesis

a) The main formal problem is, I believe, the handling of literature. There is one whole chapter in the thesis without any references (chapter 3) and there are the long passages in the texts of other chapter where the reader does not know what the sources are for the author’s claim. The most important example is the author’s image of “traditional anarchism”: any post-anarchist text needs this cartoon-like image/caricature, but the author chose, unlike Newman’s ideal type image, a depiction based on various authors. For problems, see question 2. The author omits Stirner and covers him extensively in pp. 70-73, but he omits to say that the inclusion of Stirner into the genealogy of post-anarchist thought is the intellectual innovation of Saul Newman. Also, the author presents Bookchin’s and Zerzan criticism of postmodernism and anarchism influenced by postmodernism as a “critique of post-anarchism”, which is misleading, to say the least. Neither Bookchin (1996), nor Zerzan (1991, not 2014) reacts to May, Newman and other post-anarchist authors, mostly publishing after publication of Bookchin’s and Zerzan’s criticism. Zerzan criticizes postmodernist philosophy, Bookchin its influence on authors like Hakim Bey. Formally, it is also a problem that the author uses various reference styles in the list of references and some of those styles do not provide enough information.

b) Another problem is structure. It is simply not clear why the chapters follow each other, what the story they put together is, why there are so many chapters and so many concepts. The thesis needs a stronger intellectual plot and a stronger formulation of the questions with which it deals.

Questions for the thesis defense

1) Is it really possible to combine Foucault’s approach, including deconstruction of psychological discourses, with Han’s psychologisation? How can post-structuralist

philosophy, part of which is the deconstruction of the modern individual, be combined with the radical individualism of Stirner and/or Goldman?

2) What is the basis for the author's reinterpretation of "traditional anarchism"? Did he work with some interpretation of history of anarchist past (Nettlau, Woodcock, Joll, Guérin) and if not, why? Why are some authors included (Cafiero) and why are others (Reclus, Malatesta) not? Why are anarchist individualists (Stirner, Goldman) discussed outside of the chapter on "traditional anarchism", in spite of the fact that "traditional anarchism", whatever it means, had its individualist stream. Stirner overlapped with this stream temporarily and he decisively influenced it; Goldman also personally participated in "traditional anarchist" movement?

3) What is the main contribution of the thesis? Please re-state why the inclusion of kinopolitics is an innovation of post-anarchist thought.

Final evaluation of the thesis

I recommend the thesis.

Brief verbal evaluation (at the discretion of the assessor)¹

The thesis has strong ambitions, which is great but which also brings problems. Too many concepts bring too many contexts and not all of them have been properly presented and integrated by the author. His combination of them thus suffers from a lack of evaluation of the implications of the contexts in which the ideas were developed and their implications. The thesis also suffers from problems relating to the handling of literature and to structure.

Final grade: D

Prague, 21 January 2024

.....
date and place

.....
signature of the author of the opinion

¹ 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.