

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

Marko Lehti¹

¹ Tampere University

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

This is highly interesting theme, but it still requires further development. Theoretical framework and empirical case remain separate and interesting theoretical concepts among all anthropological aggression and defense are not applied to empirical analysis. Furthermore, structure is confusing: core theoretical concept is introduced and defined in abstract, starting introduction with Loitman's theory left reader confused and ending conclusion with new empirical case is not what it usually expected. Suggest adding current abstract to theoretical part as core concept (anthropological aggression) is best described there, starting introduction by general objective and linking it to interesting case, shortening Loitman's theory introduction and writing a new conclusion. As it is now the article describes Polish-Russian memory conflict and change of memory narratives. If possible, author should explain more clearly how anthropological aggression and defense describes this memory conflict in Warmia. Here emphasis on local voices is important and it is mentioned how wrongdoings of Red Army are locally remembered. Would it be possible to give also voice (agency) to marginalized group descendants of those Ukrainians settled in Warmia after the war? This would give more nuanced and richer picture of local semiosphere. Maybe it could have been mentioned that Warmia was before the war part of Germany which makes narrating historical memory of Warmia more controversial issue.