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Piotr MADAJCZYK, Inżynieria społeczna – między biopolityką a etnopolityką / Social Engineering: Between Biopolitics and Ethnopolitics

Social engineering comprises two major models of politics: ethnopolitics and biopolitics. Biopolitics aims to create a society whose government does not treat the right to decide about death as the main tool of politics and is responsible for life development and management. The most important task of this government is no longer to receive certain benefits, but to control them and increase their efficiency. Ethnopolitics, in turn, aims to create an ethnically homogenous state, although such projects were sometimes more complicated in terms of the structure of a nation. This article aims to look at the main directions in the development of social engineering projects in Central Europe (Germany), East-Central Europe (Poland and Ukraine), as well as on the border between the latter and Southeastern Europe (Croatia).

Grzegorz MOTYKA, Czy zbrodnia wołyńsko-galicyjska 1943–1945 była ludobójstwem? Spór o kwalifikację prawną „antypolskiej akcji” UPA / Were the Massacres of Poles in Volhynia and Eastern Galicia in 1943–1945 Genocide? A Discussion about the Legal Classification of the ‘Anti-Polish Operation’ Conducted by the Ukrainian Insurgent Army

The anti-Polish purges carried out by the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists-Bandera (OUN-B) and the Ukrainian Insurgent Army (UPA), which are known in Polish history as the massacres of Poles in Volhynia and Eastern Galicia, claimed the lives of about 100,000 people. These purges were among the bloodiest episodes in Poland’s twentieth-century history and among the major mass killings of civilians during World War II. Moreover, they were committed by an irregular partisan formation. In terms of scale, the massacres in Volhynia and Eastern Galicia can be compared to the mass pacification of Belarusian villages by German police formations and the massacres of Serbs by Croatian nationalists. Historical research indicates that, regardless of whether the objective of the OUN and the UPA was to exterminate or ‘only’ to expel the Poles, implementation of their plan must have assumed the killing of the Polish population, or at least part of it, in the disputed areas.
Therefore, further research conducted in Poland confirmed the conviction about the genocidal nature of the UPA’s activities. Jędrzej Giertych was probably the first Pole to use the term ‘genocide’ in this context. He used it in the London-based literary weekly ‘Wiadomości’ [News] in 1951. In the second half of the 1990s, this opinion became dominant among scholars dealing with the issues in question. Similar conclusions were reached by prosecutors of the Institute of National Remembrance. It seems that their evaluation could not be different in the light of the definition of genocide specified in Article 118 of the Polish Criminal Code. Polish scholars argue, however, whether the term ‘genocide’ should be used in reference to all of the activities conducted by the OUN and UPA in the years 1939–1947, or only those conducted in the period from 9 February 1943 to 18 May 1945, known as the anti-Polish action (mass murders). They also argue whether the UPA’s actions were typical genocide, or should be considered as a specific example of cruel genocide (genocidum atrox) due to their ferocity. Some scholars are inclined to recognize the UPA’s ‘anti-Polish campaign’ as ethnic cleansing rather than genocide, but the scale of the crimes against the Polish population seems to undermine this opinion.

The author suggests that the massacres of Poles in Volhynia and Eastern Galicia should be recognized as ‘genocidal ethnic cleansing’, or ‘ethnic cleansing that meets the definition of genocide’, as the terms indicate that from the very beginning perpetrators committed ethnic cleansing in the regions with intent to conduct mass murder of civilians.

Wanda JARZĄBEK, Czy polityka okupacyjna Niemiec wobec Polaków w czasie II wojny światowej była ludobójstwem? / Was Germany’s Occupation Policy against the Poles during World War II Genocide?

Due to the very limited use of the term ‘genocide’ in scientific discourse, researchers did not carry out broad methodological considerations on the legitimacy of its use in relation to the occupation policy of the Third Reich against the Poles during World War II. Historians often conducted their research based on other theoretical models (often those that were popular at that time). For example, they studied the policy of the Third Reich in terms of the racial theory, social engineering, ethnic cleansing, total war or in a classical way, i.e. they examined various aspects of the Nazi occupation without referring to models and theories. Interestingly, many authors presented the problem in a manner similar to that resulting from Lemkin’s definition of genocide. In other words, they described the phenomenon, but without using the
term ‘genocide’. They used it, however, in reference to the Holocaust. Perhaps, they did not apply it in reference to other nations due to the fact that almost the entire Jewish population was annihilated in the areas occupied by the German Third Reich. The term ‘genocide’ appeared with regard to the German policy against the Poles mainly in the colloquial sense, thereby reducing its conceptual content to mass murder. The discussions on genocide have entered a new phase in Poland. The aim of this article is to reflect on the possibility of using the term ‘genocide’ to describe the German policy against the Poles in the context of the definition created by Raphael Lemkin and the UN Convention of 1948.

Mariusz ZAJĄCZKOWSKI, Terror i represje sowieckie wobec zachodnich Ukraińców w latach 1943–1945 z jugosłowiańskimi kontekstami w tle / Soviet Terror and Repression in Western Ukraine from 1943–1945 and Comparisons with Yugoslavia from 1941–1945

The aim of this article is to show the relationship between Soviet partisans and the Ukrainian population in the western regions of Ukraine. It also aims to demonstrate how the attitude toward the armed troops of the Ukrainian national and nationalist underground, which operated in the area between 1942 and 1944, changed under the influence of the war on the Eastern Front and internal factors. All this led to the outbreak of an open armed conflict and terror of the red partisans against the Ukrainian peasants, most of whom supported national and nationalist partisans. These events are presented against the background of political, social and military conditions for the operation and development of the Soviet partisan movement in the area of Volhynia and Eastern Galicia. This article also describes how the Soviet security police and army fought the OUN-B and UPA in this area and repressed members of the anti-communist underground and its civilian supporters during the re-establishment of the communist authorities after 1944. It also attempts to show the similarities and differences between the events in Western Ukraine (1943–1945) and the Civil War in Yugoslavia (1941–1945), including the local communists’ fight for power in the country.

Croatia is the only modern country in Europe that gained independence (Independent State of Croatia, Nezavisna Država Hrvatska, NDH) during World War II thanks to the cooperation of the Axis. It is now struggling with the burden of responsibility for the mass crimes committed against Serbian, Jewish, Roma and Croatian political opponents on its own initiative rather than the Third Reich’s. On the other hand, the Croats were heavily repressed by the Yugoslav Army in 1945 (the remnants of the NDH forces were killed near Bleiburg during the so-called ‘way of the cross’). The Croats were also persecuted for their independence and cultural activities in the period between 1945 and 1991 (e.g. the Croatian Spring of 1971).

Since 1991, the political scene of Croatia has been dominated by two parties: the right-wing Croatian Democratic Union (HDZ), which refers to the whole tradition of the independence movement with the exception of the Ustaše and NDH, and the left-wing League of Communists of Croatia (SKH), the successor of the Communist Party of Croatia. The parties fight for the memory of activities conducted by the anti-communists and communists between 1941 and 1991. They also fight to include ‘the patriotic war’ of 1991–1995 to their symbolism and win the favour of veterans. The article examines the politics of memory pursued by the Croatian authorities in relation to the events of 1941–1991 and the main participants in the political scene in the period between 1991 and 2016. It takes account of the arguments of historians and intellectuals associated with the left and right side of the political scene. It examines the impact of international circumstances, such as Croatia’s pursuit of membership of NATO and the EU, inducing the state’s authorities to prosecute and condemn the perpetrators of crimes committed on its citizens in the years 1941–1945 and those responsible for the ethnic cleansing of 1991–1995. The author also points to the impact of individual orientations in the politics of memory on the process of Croatia’s transformation from totalitarianism to democracy and the related modernization changes.
Joanna SZYMONICZEK, Materialne ślady zbrodni. O „obcych” grobach i cmentarzach wojennych / The Material Traces of Crime. The War Graves and Cemeteries of ‘Strangers’

The construction of war cemeteries always evokes emotions. After the end of an armed conflict, each of which brings death of civilians and soldiers, people continue to think about the fallen and those who fought on their side. When conducting exhumations, inhumations and identification of bodies after the war, the authorities must also deal with the problem of the burial of enemy soldiers. The final resting place of the fallen is usually where they perished. Sometimes these are impressive cemeteries, maintained by local authorities, population and the state for whom the dead soldiers sacrificed their lives. Another time, it is only a forgotten place, somewhere near a dirt road or in the woods, where someone may light a candle. It may also be a mass grave overgrown with long grass, or covered by a newly built park. No one even knows who is buried there. The states on whose territory the grave sites of victims of wars and totalitarian violence are located are required to ensure their legal protection. War graves and cemeteries are now managed by municipalities, associations or social organizations. In order to minimize the controversy surrounding these sites, efforts are taken to preserve the neutral appearance of erected monuments, which are usually limited to simple grey crosses. The construction of war cemeteries always evokes emotions. These places are designed to remind the living of the past and confront them with the consequences of wars and violence. It seems that European societies are now mature enough to ensure that humanitarian reasons are stronger than prejudice and a sense of injustice.