

Review of: "Semiosphere and Anthropological Aggression on the Example of the "Memorial Conflict" — Polish-Russian borderland: Warmia"

Maria Fernanda Olarte-Sierra¹

¹ University of Vienna

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

The paper addresses the relevant issue of the political dimension of memory practices, showing that this is a contested matter that has at stake the handling of the past. By addressing the Poland-Russian borderland of Warmia, the author points to the complexities and contingencies faced by societies regarding what and how to remember. However, the paper needs further development to achieve strength and become a full academic piece. The following are comments intended to help bring robustness and clarity to the article.

1. It would be beneficial if the argument and how the author develops it is clearly stated in the introduction of the paper. In that way, the reader can relate better to the discussion presented and the empirical material mobilised.
2. There needs to be further engagement with the literature dealing with memory practices and the complexities of handling the past, especially in war-ridden contexts. In this way, the author can relate what he is presenting here with what exists in this area. By doing so, the author can nuance and deepen the current analysis while inserting his work into broader academic discussions.
3. Similarly, there need to be references that address the discussions around cultural naturalization, fake news and polarisation, and military anthropology. In that way, the author shows how his work is relevant to such bodies of knowledge and what he is learning from them.
4. The empirical material, although relevant, needs to be treated differently. By this, I mean that while the author tells us (readers) what the people say and institutions do, there is no empirical material presented (in the form of quotations, for instance) that shows how things are done, perceived, and experienced by the people referred to. There are many statements throughout the paper lacking either empirical support or support from the literature. This needs to be addressed, so they do not lack academic robustness. The photographs used are valuable and help make the argument. However, further engagement with them –in the form of a deeper analysis, would enrich the paper.
5. There needs to be a methodological section in which the author addresses how he gathered material, who participated, why he chose these participants, which kinds of tools he used, and so on.
6. The conclusion needs rework. At the moment, it is not so much of a conclusion. New data should not be presented in this section. Also, the author can round up by making evident what this paper adds to the discussions addressed here (and that are relevant to the field the author wants to insert his work).

