

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

Helena Pociechina

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

This article leaves a bitter aftertaste after reading and I don't like to write negative reviews. Below I will give my thoughts on its content and compliance with the requirements for scientific articles. The title of the article does not match its content. The analysis of the stated problem cannot fit into the standard framework of a journal article; this is a problem for a monograph. The author uses modern trendy terms: semiosphere (given in Introduction), military anthropology, memorial conflict, obrona antropologiczna, etc., but these terms are devoid of conceptual content and therefore do not form a logically coherent research methodology. The author does not rely on research in any of the areas represented by the above concepts, does not cite scientific literature, the list of references, with the only exception, contains publications of the author himself. The author declares that the article presents the results of field research - however, the article does not describe the methodology for conducting these studies, nor their content, nor the results. Discussions about aggression are conducted at the level of broadly understood public opinion and are not based on any analysis of the material collected during field research in Warmia. For Lotman, the semiosphere is inextricably linked with history and - most important - at the same time, it creates a communication space and is created by it. The article does not talk about any communication, since the situation of communication provides for the presence of a sender, a receiver, a channel between them and transmitted message. The semiosphere is a system or structure, but the article presents eclectic facts that are difficult to combine into one. To describe the semiosphere of Warmia (or Warmia and Mazury together, since it makes no sense to separate these territories at present), it would be enough to choose one of its elements within the framework of the article - a public dialogue associated with a monument of "gratitude to the Soviet army" in the center of Olsztyn. The article is politically biased: only one aspect of relations on the Polish-Russian border is taken into account, namely: the negative attitude of abstractly understood Russia towards abstractly understood Poland. At the same time, East Prussia is interpreted solely as a part of this abstractly understood Poland, outside of any historical realities, in abstract history. The article contains tendentious statements that are not supported by analysis. The conclusion does not contain the results of the study. This article is not thought out, does not contain scientific evidence and discoveries, and I do not recommend it for publication in a scientific journal.