

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

Yaman Kouli¹

¹ Heinrich-Heine Universität Düsseldorf

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

In theory, this would be a promising project. The methodology has the potential to lead to improved knowledge. Yet the paper lacks sufficient information on the sources and on what kind of field research he (or the team) conducted during the three-year-stay in the region. Does he only look at monuments, or are there additional sources? The author mentions media, for instance. And more importantly: how does the theory explained in the first paragraphs help in the project? Another challenge for the reviewer is that it is unclear on what time-period field-work was focussed on.

The information in the paper are interesting, yet in an eclectic way. Therefore, without an internal structure to guide the reader through the argument, the pictures and examples serve as anecdotal evidence.

To improve the article, I recommend two things:

- Integrating the semiotic, semantic and pragmatic aspects of signs in an explicit way.
- Specify, how media had been used as a weapon in this war.
- Reveal the sources you use explicitly.

I am convinced that there is enough potential for a convincing case study. Yet at the moment, based on this paper, I do not see how to make that decision.