

Film and TV School of the Academy of Performing Arts in Prague
Department of Photography

Assessment of the Master's Thesis

Author of thesis: Lin Jun-ye

Title of thesis: Atrocity Images and the Audience

Assessment of the primary advisor

Assessment of the opponent

Author of the assessment (first name, last name, workplace): Ladislav Šerý, FAMU

Evaluation of the content and final form of the thesis (A/excellent – B/very good – C/good – D/good with objections – E/satisfactory – F/unsatisfactory – not recommended for defence)

Suitability of the selected objective and work approach....B

Relative completeness of the literature used for the selected topic.....C

Ability to critically evaluate and use professional literature.....B

Logicity of the thesis structure, connection of its chapters.....D

Language and stylistic level of the thesis.....D

Compliance with citation norms (should the text repeatedly contain adopted passages without citing the source, the work cannot be recommended for defence).....B

Sufficient extent of image attachments, justifiability and suitability of attachments, graphic layout.....B

Originality of the thesis, contribution to the development of the field of study....C

Overall evaluation of the thesis.....C

Verbal evaluation of the thesis including questions that the diplomate must address in his/her thesis defence:

Lin Jun-ye try to clarify Susan Sontag's perspective on photography and her thesis is focused especially on atrocity images. The structure of the work is strange. I don't understand why the Preface makes part of the Introduction. Some chapters are segmented into small units, sometimes without any logic (chapter 2.2 or chapter 3, including even two brief summaries). I find author's approach maybe excessively didactic: every chapter starts with „In the second (third, fourth) chapter, the aim is...“ and ends with a summary. I would prefer more inventive style.

The explanation of the commodity fetishism is too short, it is only a quick fly over this basic issue, yet rich in possible interpretations. Otherwise, the two examples of atrocity images in the contemporary art in chapter 4 are well chosen, described and analysed enough, correctly enlarging the previous text. The conclusion seems to be quite confused and doesn't bring anything new.

As far as I can evaluate author's English, there are frequent grammatical mistakes in the text that should be corrected. Quotations are ok, the graphic layout is acceptable.

My question: In what sense the photography is deeply connected to capitalism? (p. 6)

Date:

Signature:.....