

BACHELOR THESIS EVALUATION: THESIS OPPONENT

Thesis topic: Unity or Separation: Exploration of different concepts of federalization within Twentieth Century Central Europe

Author: Adam Hamza

Advisor: doc. Samuel Abrahám, PhD.

Opponent: Prof. PhDr. Roman Holec, DrSc.

Study program: Political Science, Liberal Arts

Evaluation contains objective and critical analysis of a bachelor thesis proposal. Evaluation should be considered by the following criteria:

| Criteria for the evaluation of the final thesis | Max. points | Points given by evaluator |
|---|-------------|---------------------------|
| 1. Methodological aspect (Logical frame, process of inquiry, topic specification, how realistic are set goals and how adequate are proposed working methods) | 10 | 10 |
| 2. Sources of domestic and foreign literature, familiarity with relevant literature | 15 | 10 |
| 3. Formatting and style | 15 | 15 |
| 4. Scope and proportionality of content | 5 | 5 |
| 5. Systematic approach | 15 | 15 |
| 6. Evaluation of achieved results | 40 | 35 |
| Total | 100 | 90 |

Final evaluation: **A** (90-100 points), **B** (80-89 points), **C** (70-79 points), **D** (60-69 points), **E** (50-59 points), **Fx**(<49 points)

Evaluation, comments, recommendations:

Adam Hamza should be congratulated for having written an interesting work that makes a significant contribution to the understanding of different concepts of federalization within Twentieth Century Central Europe. I only have a few comments:

I see as a somewhat simplified view his part about Friedrich List: List's strength lay in the fact that he adapted his economic recipes to the specific conditions of individual states. For example, for economically less developed Hungary, these were protective tariffs, which many Hungarian statesmen adhered to until 1918 and – this is important – which primarily served disintegration (f. e. for the Independence Party).

“Absence of the Empire” opened the way for ever more concepts for Central-Europe. On one side was the German power policy with its conception of Mitteleuropa and on the other, a second, Russian, imperial tradition associated with the ideology of communism. Hodža was well-aware of these factors and tried to draw attention to them. Throughout the inter-war period he strove for solidarity between the Central European countries, which would be more able to resist these influences if they came together.

I miss Milan Hodža's ambitious agrarian concept based on a special mentality, economic background and political interests of Central-European or Slavic peasantry. The core problem that this concept circulates around is an „agrarian (peasant) democracy“ and Green Internationale as an organisation form.

Milan Hodža's federalist concept for Central-Europe was based on the view that nationalism and democracy were „interwoven“ in Central-Europe, because defensive nationalism and democracy developed side by side in the nations of the region concept. For this reason, Central-Europe was and is, with some temporary exceptions „favourable for democracy“ – more than Germany or Italy.

Questions for the author (relevant to the content of the Thesis):

1. What is left of Central Europe in the 21st century? Does this concept still make sense? Is there such a thing as common interests and mentality?

2. “European security cannot be built only on Western democracy. Its structure demands more reliable support. It is Central Europe. This is also in the interest of European democracy. Apart from the west, it must have strong support in Central Europe. This alliance ... will therefore provide satisfactory results.”

What, if anything, has changed in comparison with Hodža's words?

In Bratislava, on May 28th 2024

Signature of evaluator: _____