JANUSZ A. MAJCHEREK

WSB University, Dąbrowa Górnicza
ORCID – 0000-0001-8500-1544

CRITICAL PEDAGOGY IN THE FACE OF THE ARBITRARINESS OF PLACES OF MEMORY AND OBLIVION*

Introduction: Location, territorial assignment, is an element of identity, both individual and collective. They are expressed by such terms as Tarnovian (Tarnovians), Widzewian (Widzewians), Silesian (Silesians), New Yorker (New Yorkers), Alsatian (Alsatians), etc. Since the place of origin and residence significantly determines identity, its past becomes important for its formation, and places preserved and distinguished in individual and collective memory become special objects of care, often cult. However, as they are critical for the formation of identity, they are exposed to manipulation, mythologisation or even mystification, which sometimes leads to the creation of places of oblivion. Education and upbringing, influencing identity in the sensitive period of its formation in pupils and alumni, future citizens, must recognise such threats and oppose them.

Research Aim: To determine the influence of mechanisms shaping collective memory and its selectivity on the processes of creating places of memory, and thus the collective consciousness and identity of pupils and alumni and causing their disorders, as well as the possibilities and methods of their elimination by establishing places of memory in the existing places of oblivion and non-places of memory.

Evidence based Facts: Pedagogy of memorial sites is a relatively well-developed part of place pedagogy, the influence of memorial sites on educational and upbringing processes is recognized in many aspects. However, insufficient interest has been shown so far in the arbitrariness of the processes of creating these places of memory, resulting from the selectivity and bias of memory, both individual and collective, and especially the challenges posed by these processes to educators and educators.

Summary: Educational and upbringing processes should not uncritically perpetuate – also in memorial rituals – the selection of places of remembrance and oblivion, made under the influence of historical policy and leading to the formation of deformed consciousness and collective identity, but should be based on documented facts and events. This requires a critical approach to the existing set of places of memory and oblivion, its revision, and thus critical education, carried out in defiance of the dominant narratives.

INTRODUCTION

"Sites of remembrance" is a concept created and introduced into scholarly circulation in the 1970s by Nora. As a contemporary Polish researcher states, it was not precisely defined by its creator, but can be understood as "institutionalised forms of collective memories of the past" (Szpociński, 2008, p. 12). These collective memories are collectively referred to as collective memory, seen as "a set of perceptions of the members of a given collectivity about its past, the people who populated it and the events that took place in it", manifested in the form of "commemorating and transmitting knowledge about them, regarded as an obligatory equipment of a member of this collectivity" (Szacka, 2003, p. 4). Collective memory, in turn, is an element of the broader phenomenon of collective consciousness (Zenderowski, 2011, p. 149 et seq.). This, in turn, has been linked to collective identity in recent decades. "Some kind of deep-seated wave of memory has recently spread across the world, everywhere linking very closely allegiance to a real or imagined past with a sense of belonging, collective consciousness with individual self-awareness, memory with identity" (Nora, 2001, p. 37).

RESEARCH AIM AND QUESTIONS

Memory and collective identity have been embodied in the form of memorials. "What is meant here", writes Nora, "is a place in the literal sense of the word where certain communities, whatever they may be – nation, ethnic group, party – deposit their memories or consider them an integral part of their personality" (Szpociński, 2008, p. 12). Thus, they play a critical role in the formation of collective identity as the self-consciousness of the collective subject. Collective memory, of which they are symbolically and metaphorically characterised expressions, as carriers of certain meanings, is objectified, positioned, localised in them. Like any individual memory, the collective one is also selective. Thus, culturally regulated and rationed content is ascribed to places of memory, "that is, [that] only certain and not arbitrary content can be ascribed to specific loci" (Szpociński, 2008, p. 12). Thus, they are reflections of currently dominant or past-acquired perceptions or consciously given or even imposed interpretations. This was pointed out by the pioneer of social memory research Maurice Halbwachs, according to whom "the creation of the past depends on the present, because the existing social and related thought structures act as filters rejecting certain contents from our memories and letting others through" (Hirszowicz & Neyman, 2001, p. 26).

Thus, "like tradition, memory is not about what really happened in the past, but about what uses the contemporary generation makes of memory. Thus, memory is only partly deter mined by the past; it is determined primarily by the present, and in particular by the possibilities of its cultivation, dissemination, agreement, negotiation and functioning, bound largely by current particularistic interests and conflicts of interest" (Ziółkowski, 1999, p. 56). What uses are made of collective memory by the contemporary generation, in turn, has an impact on the shaping of the collective identity of the future generation, subjected to education and upbringing in accordance with these current interests and conflicts.

As in the case of individual memory, collective memory is subject to mechanisms of denial and suppression. In many cases it is the product of an intentionally designed and implemented historical policy, which often denies or deforms historical facts. Also the very selection of specific places as suitable for making them sites of memory, i.e. the procedure of "historicising space", bears features of arbitrariness, subordinated to a certain vision of history or the past in a broader sense. Just as the criteria for the selection and characterisation of events in individual memory are conditioned by the subjective conception of the subject, so the criteria for the selection of events, their characteristics and the places objectifying them in collective memory are conditioned by the dominant conception of the collective subject. "The central referential function of the past within collective memory is identity formation. The result is that what is particularly remembered is that which corresponds to the group its own image and interest. [...] Memory does not show a reflection of the past, but reconstructs it within the collective social framework and aligns past, selected events with the changing present" (Kasztelan, 2012, pp. 187–188). Thus, not only does the past influence the present, but the present shapes the image of the past, and thus the selection of sites to commemorate it and the omission or concealment of those that may disrupt it.

For example: during the communist era in Poland, places of remembrance were those where anything considered significant from the point of view of the history of the workers and communist movement by the authorities of the time had taken place (e.g. the places where Lenin had stayed or the actions of communist armed units). On the other hand, places emblematic of the history of the interwar Second Republic, especially those connected with the Polish-Soviet War and the figure of Józef Piłsudski, but also those bearing witness to the oppressive nature of the communist system (by not allowing commemoration of its victims), were removed from the collective memory and common space. Education and upbringing were subordinated to this dialectical process of removal from memory and commemoration (Król, 2016). After 1989, many sites in turn commemorated events significant for the history of the "Solidarity" movement and the Catholic Church (e.g. the sites of major strikes and the visit of John Paul II), removing monuments and other forms of commemoration of events and figures emblematic of

the period of communist rule. Places established and restituted in this way become components of the pedagogy of place, especially as locations for ceremonies and celebrations involving schoolchildren.

However, the arbitrariness of the choice of sites transformed into places of remembrance, the assigning of specific meanings to them and the imposition of forms of the memorial ceremony that cultivates them, raises doubts about the role they play and can play in the education and upbringing of children and young people participating in such a ceremony, and, thus, in the shaping of their identity. This is all the more so because the process of creating memorials can be considered part of the educational process, and the memorial as an "educating place" (Mendel, 2006, p. 13). Therefore, what kind of places, such education and such identity. Since "memory should be a source of knowledge about one identity, both when it comes to individual and social memory" then "perhaps it is pedagogy that should focus on accentuating the value of social remembering and recollection" (Cukras-Stelą-gowska, 2016, p. 8). Including remembering places of unremembrance.

EVIDENCE-BASED REVIEW

The starting point in genealogical inquiries around the territorial origins and foundations of the Poles' collective identity, also reflected in history textbooks, is the dispute between representatives of the autochthonous and allochthonous interpretations of the Slavs'presence in the Vistula and Oder river basins. The dispute, characteristic of 20th-century "reflections on the territory that »gave birth« to a given people" (Minta-Tworzowska, 2015, p. 159) is still far from being resolved, with new motifs and hypotheses emerging (e.g. about the Scandinavian, Viking origin of Mieszko, his team and even his subjects). For most of the 19th and almost all of the 20th century, in the background of this essentially scientific dispute, a feeling was present in the minds of Polish researchers that admitting the presence of Germanic tribes on the Vistula and Oder prior to the Slavs, might constitute an argument against the right of modern Poles to locate and operate their own state on this territory. The place where these genealogical controversies concentrated and accumulated was and is the prehistoric settlement of Biskupin, accidentally discovered in 1933. This was associated with attempts to give ethnic identifications to the creators and participants of prehistoric cultures, functioning on the territory of present-day Poland and leaving here their artefacts discovered today. This is exactly how Józef Kostrzewski, a researcher of Biskupin, understood and declared his scientific duty, promising to "determine the ethnicity of these as yet nameless prehistoric cultures, linking them to the specific peoples who had produced them" (quoted in Minta-Tworzowska, 2015, p. 155). And this was to link them to contemporary peoples, specifically

the Polish nation. Nowadays, the practices of ethnisation of prehistoric cultures are disavowed from a scientific (anthropological) point of view, but still present in some interpretations. This is because they perform the integrative function of collective memory, which Szacka (2003) described as having the task of reassuring people that they are part of a long-established community. The older it is, the stronger and more significant it is.

Similar disputes over the prior presence in a territory and the resulting alleged precedence of claims to it have other examples, especially in areas with a long and documented history located in the present-day borderlands. Their prototype is the historically uncontroversial precedence of Jewish over Arab settlements in what is now Palestine and the consequent controversial claims of the modern Israeli state to claim under its jurisdiction the lands of former Judea and Samaria as having been given to the Jews by Yahweh ("Here is the deed of ownership of our land", declared the Israeli ambassador to the United Nations, lifting up the Bible). The hotspot for the symbolic justification of such deeds is Jerusalem, subject to sacralisation as the seat of Judaism, main temple and the place where the Ark of the Covenant is kept (Pace, 2020; Shalhoub-Kevorkian, 2021).

Sacralisation is a common procedure that establishes the special status of certain places, sensitive to the construction of collective identity (Belaj et al., 2018). As Eliade argued, it accompanied locative procedures in the most ancient cultures. "Settlement in ancient cultures was a repetition of the act of creation of the world. It started from a focal point – »a navel«, a sacred place – and spread to the four sides of the world. An altar or temple or just a symbolic »world axis« had to stand in the middle of the earth [...]. This is how the sacred was created, and human settlements were built around it" (Eliade, 1993, p. 68). Tuan, a pioneer of humanistic geography and research on the role of place in identity formation, also recognises such a process in later cultures.

> The original inspiration for city building was the desire to associate with the gods. Early Mesopotamian cities were essentially temple communities. The ritual centres and the more important settlements along the Nile also had a religious basis, for they were believed to be located at the sites where the creation of the world took place. [...] In the Mycenaean period, Greek cities offered sacred monuments to their divine residents. Athena and Helen patronised Athens and Sparta respectively. In these prehistoric times of royal rule, temples were of great importance. (Tuan, 1987, pp. 190–191)

Sites sacralised in this way often maintain their distinguished status to this day. But more were subjected to sacralisation. In the case of the aforementioned Jerusalem, the process of sacralisation was carried out by representatives of three religions: in addition to Judaism, Christianity, as the place commemorating the passion and resurrection of Jesus, and Islam, as the site of Muhammad's ascension

to heaven. The Crusaders claimed their special rights to the site and, on the basis of these rights, attempted to reclaim it from the Muslims and establish the kingdom of Jerusalem there as a Christian state ("Kingdom of Heaven"). The dispute between the adherents of the three religions over the accessibility of the site and the right to perform liturgical rites there, stems from the process of appropriation of a place considered sensitive for adherents, typical of sacralisation (Giuliani, 2003, p. 138; Marshall, 2010, p. 64).

Also in the Polish modern tradition, the sacralisation of certain places as constitutiveof the national collective identity was carried out. The Marian apparitions at Gietrzwałd, where two girls claimed that the Mother of God addressed them in Polish, were used to justify the Polishness of Warmia (in spite of the German name of the village: *Dietrichswalde*). St. Anne Mount (named after alleged visions of the local 15th-century alderman Krzysztof Strzała) was a hot spot in the Polish-German struggle for Upper Silesia in 1919–1921. Jasna Góra is, in the self-consciousness of many contemporary Poles, the central place of Poland, concentrating and condensing Polish identity as a Catholic spirituality. And the holy mountain of Grabarka fulfils the same function for Polish Orthodox Belorussians.

Sites of memory are socially and especially politically constructed, sometimes based on historical facts, sometimes by manipulating them, not at all infrequently by mythologising or even confabulating them. This is due to the characteristics of collective memory. "Our experience and research suggest that memory consists of multiple elements: rationally documented facts, mythical threads, stereotypes, intentionally and selectively juxtaposed clusters, it can be manipulated and dictated by the orders of various authorities, and where it affects us personally, it can be emotionally painted and come close to panegyric" (Chojecka, 2011). The field of the historic Battle of Grunwald is the site of annual re-enactments and accompanying events of a spectacle and picnic nature. However, in the interwar period it was revered by the Germans in a pompous and monumental way as the site of the Battle of Tannenberg, where the German army resisted and defeated the Russian army while defending East Prussia in August 1914. The mausoleum of Marshal Hindenburg, commander in that battle and later president of the Weimar Republic and the Third Reich, was built on the site. These monumental forms of commemoration were intended to push the first Battle of Tannenberg of 1410 into oblivion (called the Battle of Grunwald in Poland), when the knights of the *Deutsche Orden* (called Teutonic Knights in Poland) were defeated by the Polish-Lithuanian army. After the Second World War, all these German commemorations were removed and replaced by a monument to the Battle of the Teutonic Knights. On the aforementioned St. Anne Mountain, in a former quarry, the Germans carved out a monumental amphitheatre to document and perpetuate the German belonging of the surrounding area (German: *Thingplatz*, *Thingstätte*). After the Second World War and the takeover of these areas by the

Polish state, these buildings were demolished and replaced by their own, otherwise designed by the outstanding sculptor Xawery Dunikowski. The symbolic appropriation thus carried out, the imposition of symbolic rule, had many features of manipulation, as the obelisks erected bore inscriptions incompatible with objective historical facts (Nijakowski, 2001, pp. 95–99). Memorial ceremonies are held there, often with nationalistic overtones. The role of commemorating and thus "historicising space", in fact appropriating it and making it the basis of a legitimising identity, as Castells (2008, p. 22) calls it, is usually fulfilled by monuments, obelisks, mausoleums, but also by the names given to specific or symbolically designated places. Manipulations to this effect are often carried out even in places such as the site of the former death camp at Treblinka, which was subjected to Polonisation and Christianisation, through the placement of specific symbols, especially crosses and commemorative plaques. One of the boulders intended to commemorate the Jewish communities annihilated by transports to the gas chambers bears the name "Jedwabne".

As is known from historical findings, the Jews of Jedwabne were not exterminated by Nazi criminals at Treblinka, but murdered by their Polish neighbours in their place of residence. The commemorations at the site of the barn where they were burned are also subject to manipulation, including devastation, but above all to being omitted, concealed, ignored, repressed from the collective memory (Bikont, 2012). Places of commemoration of former Jewish residents are few and scarce in Polish towns. Memorial patriotic and martyrological ceremonies, also or especially with the participation of school youth, are usually celebrated at monuments or obelisks commemorating Polish fallen partisans or insurgents (recently especially the so-called "cursed soldiers" from the period of anti-communist partisans) or civilian victims of Nazi terror. Many times more numerous victims consisting of Jewish residents, killed on the spot or deported to death camps, are usually not commemorated, their martyrdom is not recalled in historical ceremonies. These are places of social oblivion, i.e. selective memory, imposed on the participants of such ceremonies, including school youth. They are non-places of remembrance, because they have often become non-places in the sense of Augé, i.e. as pedestrian places, walking areas, pavements and streets, car parks, pavilions and shopping centres, petrol stations.

The website sztetl.org.pl reports that in 1972 the Presidium of the Provincial National Council in Zielona Góra issued a decision to liquidate the Jewish cemeteries in Słubice and Rzepin in order to create new municipal green areas in their place. In turn, the *Gazeta Wyborcza* reported in 2024 that the area of the former Jewish cemetery in Sosnowiec had become a rubbish dump, and that local allotment holders did not agree to its fencing and closure because it was their shortcut. The mayor of Trzebnica in Lower Silesia pushed through the establishment of a park named after Maria and Lech Kaczyński on the site of a pre-war cemetery

where human remains still lie – a particularly spectacular example of the com-memoration of some figures by removing others from memory, the simultaneous establishment of a place of remembrance and oblivion; they become like the ob-verse and reverse of the same place.

Such non-places of memory are also found in the Bieszczady Mountains, in the sites of displaced Ukrainian and Lemko villages, now used as tourist hiking and camping areas. "Voids" or "ghost sites" are some of the synonyms for non-places of memory (Sendyka et al., 2020, p. 10). A lack of commemoration does not mean a lack of meaning.

> Although the semiotics of these places is not based on iconic objects (monuments) and symbolic objects (inscriptions, information on plaques), this does not mean that it cannot be constructed at all. [...] Non-places of memory are diagnostic objects with a fascinating degree of complication: they are swollen with meaning. These are places whose past does not allow them to be completely negated (e.g. because of the affects caused by the presence of dead bodies or ethical motivations), but which, for inartic-ulate reasons, are not-to-be-incorporated into local history. Since an effort is made to neutralise their meanings, they are not completely forgotten. Thus, it can be assumed that they generate complex processes linked to their paradoxical status. (Sendyka, 2017a, pp. 90, 88)

They are pushed out of collective memory and memorial rituals, unremem-bered and unnoticed, marked by "memorial scarcity" (Sendyka, 2016, p. 254). Also in education and upbringing, memorial rituals in school and after-school. An emblematic example of such a place of non-remembrance was Katyń during Communist Poland. At that time, and for many years thereafter, Jedwabne had such a significance, and it still has not rid itself of that paradoxical status referred to in the above quote (an undeclared event, its course denied, including the iden-tification of the perpetrators). Today, similar sites of oblivion still exist, for ex-ample, those described in the collective publication by Sendyka et al. (2020), or Tryczyk (2015).

Places of non-memory

> are those spaces that are able to constitute and influence communities and groups, they are meaningful places, but in a negatively directed stream of memory, i.e. not remembered, passed over in silence, tabooed, bypassed or destroyed (e.g. grave, mon-ument), perversely however supporting the memory of these places, although moti-vated by opposite intentions. The mechanism of action of the sites of non-memory (or, more precisely, sites of non-memorialisation) would be similar to that of Nora's sites of memory (commemoration), although group identity and cohesiveness would be constituted in negatively understood remembering, i.e. intentional non-memory or forgetting. (Posłuszny, 2014, p. 315)

This is precisely the manifestation of the selectivity of memory and the mechanism of displacement as serving the constitution of identity, according to the regularity that identity (including collective identity) is based on difference (individual identity is expressed through the counterposition "I am not like him", while collective identity is expressed in the negation formula "we are not like them"). The construction of identity is, thus, accomplished by differentiating from others, which can be expressed by removing them and their associated sites from collective memory as alien.

> They are inconvenient to the surrounding community in the sense that their commemoration is a greater threat to collective identity than (also threatening criticism) the failure to commemorate. In other words, these places are not sites of memory in the sense that Nora gave to the term, because the community topographically assigned to the location has no need or even does not want to locate its memory in this object: it wants to forget it, not to remember it. (Sendyka, 2013, p. 326)

The community of non-remembrance is as constitutive of collective identity as the community of memory; it completes it. Places of non-remembrance are therefore the reverse side of places of memory, their negative reflection (Sendyka, 2017b, p. 12). "Their memory is not revealed in the order of material culture (no plaques are erected on them), but through denial, turning away, closing ones eyes, and finally radical gestures such as ditching, littering or devastation" (Sendyka, 2013, p. 325). These practices are sometimes bluntly referred to as "memorycide" (Hirszowicz & Neyman, 2001, p. 30). Ricoeur (2012) referred to them more disparagingly as "obliteration of traces". Thus, these are not forms of omission, overlooking or failing to notice, but a conscious action to remove, eliminate, get rid of; for displacement from collective memory strengthens it, consolidates it.

An element of the phenomenon of repressed memory (non-remembrance) are the places (non-places) left behind by removed, eradicated funerary objects, including entire cemeteries, Jewish and German (Protestant). Their restoration to local memory is still relatively rare. A spectacular positive example is the Cemetery of Non-Existent Cemeteries in Gdańsk, which commemorates 27 necropolises of various denominations that were liquidated (destroyed) after World War II. Valuable work is being carried out in this area by Olympic canoeist Dariusz Popiela, who, together with volunteers, is restoring forgotten Jewish cemeteries, as well as Evangelical cemeteries, in former Galicia, as part of the "People, Not Numbers" project.

If non-places are defined as "a type of place that, once produced or marked by people, has not only lost the perceptual qualities of place, become invisible or forgotten, but above all has been deprived of its material basis or ascribed meanings and relations with the people using it", then "it is to be presumed that in many of them a trace in memory or a remnant in space has been preserved, making it possible to return to them in spite of everything, to attest to a present

but imperceptible place in spite of everything" (Posłuszny, 2014, p. 312). Sendyka also uses the term "places in spite of all", citing Georges Huberman, who proposed it as interchangeable with the "non-place (non-lieu)" used by Claude Lanzmann (Sendyka, 2013, p. 325; Sendyka et al., 2020, p. 10). Many non-places of memory can thus be restored to memory, transformed into places of memory. For "the »unremembered« past is invisible, but not inaccessible. It is right there, right next door" (Sendyka, 2016, p. 256). Especially if the "invisibility" of the place of oblivion is not due to the total annihilation of material traces, but to the obliteration of their meaning; thus, the object itself still exists, if only fragmentarily, but in a different function (e.g. not the square after the demolished synagogue, but the synagogue converted into a warehouse or its remains into a rubbish bower). The point, then, is not to restore the former function of the site-object, but its meaning, making it first seen in collective perception. "The reconstruction of places from non-places can lead through a group and/or a material trace. When there are no groups to reconstruct the history of a place, and a material remnant remains to attest to it, then it becomes an ethical postulate to reconstruct its history" (Posłuszny, 2014, p. 316). Such a group can be formed spontaneously or with teacher and educator inspiration by students implementing, for example, the nationwide educational programme "To Bring Memory Back".

Since, as Nora wrote, a place of memory is "any unit of significance of a material or imagined nature which the will of the people or the work of time has transformed into a symbolic component of the memorial heritage of a given community" (after Kończal, 2024, p. 50), the will of the people can make such a transformation, making a place of memory out of a place of oblivion or a non-place of memory, and out of "tacit knowledge" – the knowledge made available. Chojecka (2011) proposes replacing the notion of collective memory with the term collective memory – negotiable, consensual, thus, civic, unofficial, serving to build identity on the basis of interpersonal ties rather than political-administrative establishments. Such memory and its associated sites of remembrance are thus still possible to revive, to make present, to make visible. Hirsch (2010), on the other hand, has proposed the notion of postmemory – "postmemory characterises the experience of those who have grown up in an environment dominated by narratives derived from before their birth. [...] Postmemory is a powerful and very particular form of memory precisely because its relation to the object or source is mediated not by recollection but by imagination and creativity" (p. 254). This sounds like a message or even an encouragement to the younger generation (*Generation of Postmemory* is the title of her book) to critically revise dominant narratives about the past and to express it through a new "relation to the object" and therefore place. Creative acts of postmemory enable a new situating, locating, positioning of narrative identity. The various forms of creating places of remembrance on territories that for a long

time or never belonged to the Polish state, and therefore posed particular difficulties in creating a legitimising identity, lead to a deformation of the collective memory of the present inhabitants, also as a result of biased, selective or outright manipulated education and such educational practices. Lewicka describes the results of research carried out in the so-called Recovered Territories (in the "recovered places"), whose inhabitants were asked about their estimates of the national composition of the pre-war population of these places. There was a widespread phenomenon of overestimating the percentage of the Polish population, also in places (e.g. Szczecin) where it was practically non-existent. This is undoubtedly, as the author admits, the result of certain manipulations, from giving (often arbitrarily and obtrusively) Polish-language toponymic designations to the erection of monuments and obelisks commemorating events and figures from Polish history (suggesting that the places in question had any connection with them, as "shown by the research of Polish sociologists (Piotr T. Kwiatkowski, Andrzej Szpociński) from the beginning of the 21st century – local histories in order to make them public are constructed in such a way as to fit into the Polish national metanarrative" – Traba, 2023, p. 48), right down to the creation of certain forms of collective consciousness or historical culture (e.g. the slogan "We were, we are, we will be" propagated in the aforementioned Szczecin, suggesting to current residents the assumption that Poles were already there in the past, reflected in an almost 20% estimate of their percentage for the pre-war period, when official statistics of the time did not record this national group at all).

A similar overestimation of the percentage of one's own nationality group in the former Galician towns was noted in a survey of their present-day inhabitants; for example, the present-day Ukrainians of Lviv estimated that the Ukrainian population in that city had been in the majority before the Second World War. A pilot study showed a similar deformation of historical consciousness in Vilnius, whose current residents estimated that Lithuanians dominated the city between the wars, which is contrary to the data at the time. Thus, in this respect, historical consciousness is deformed not only among Poles (Lewicka, 2012, p. 451 et seq.). This deformation results from the projection of the present ethnic composition onto the pre-war period, but also from semantic, toponymic and strictly historical manipulation, including that carried out during school education. Present interests and perceptions do not so much shape as deform the past.

This poses a real problem for historical education and pedagogical practice: what places of remembrance to create and make central in building the legitimising identity of pupils and young people from Szczecin, Koszalin or Zielona Góra. A reference to medieval Piast or Slavic (pre-German) traditions comes to mind, or to contemporary, post-war events, such as those connected with the workers' revolts in these areas and the "Solidarity" movement that crowned them (not necessarily with the communist regime, although it was during its rule that collective

ideas legitimising the territories' belonging to Poland, which are still alive today, were formed). But also in the rest of Poland there is the problem of non-places of remembrance and their transformation into places of remembrance, especially in those cities and towns where, before the Second World War, the majority or a significant part of the inhabitants were Jews and/or representatives of other nationalities or religions were numerous. Their commemoration is mostly yet to be realised, their places of non-remembrance are waiting to be transformed into memorials, to be restored to memory. A significant role in this process falls to educational and upbringing institutions as well as teachers and educators, who have to decide whether they should wait for official decisions of administrative and political authorities and the guidelines of their historical policy with the proclamation and commemorative celebration of local places of remembrance, or whether they should undertake them spontaneously together with their students, wards and pupils. The restoration of memory, and, thus, the shaping or deepening of a sense of local and regional identification, is one of the most interesting challenges for educational and upbringing practice.

SUMMARY

Sites of remembrance constitute an important element of collective memory, which has a significant contribution to collective identity, including identity legitimising presence in a given place and territory. The formation of this identity is strongly influenced by the processes of education and upbringing, as the transmission of models of the culture of remembrance, and therefore the role given in them to places of remembrance is of significant importance. This role is determined by, and at the same time influenced by, the dominant type of consciousness and historical culture of a given community (the notion of "historical culture" is taken from Szpociński (2021), who understands it as "a set of ideas, norms, behavioural patterns, socially respected values that regulate all forms of relating to everything that is considered past (bygone, historical) in a given culture, regardless of the actual state of affairs" – p. 9). Educators and educators must be aware of this interdependence but also of the ambiguity manifested in the selective character of the selection of sites of memory, which also means the emergence of non-remembrance and non-places of memory, sometimes simultaneously with the sites of memory as their dialectical complement. A method of limiting such arbitrariness and creating and restoring the collective, communal memory of deserving places that have been arbitrarily condemned to oblivion is to refer to reliable historical knowledge, free from the influence of historical politics and its ad hoc ideological trends. This includes in particular the achievements of the new Polish school of Holocaust studies (see Grudzińska-Gross & Matyjaszek, 2021; Leociak, 2021).

CONCLUSIONS

The task of establishing and restoring memorials should be carried out both in the process of historical education and in the selection of sites for memorial ceremonies with pupils and the choice of destinations for school trips and voluntary activities. This requires not only sound historical knowledge, but also a critical approach to the social framework of oblivion and the courage to go beyond it. Critical pedagogy provides the theoretical and methodological tools to carry out such activities in concrete sites of non-memory and non-places of memory and to shape a historical culture in students who are future citizens. This is all the more important because the official core curriculum remains inconsistent and contradictory on these issues: in the fourth-grade history curriculum, it requires students to "collect information on the history of their family, collect family memorabilia and talk about them" and "learn about the history and traditions of their local area and people of particular merit to it; know the local monuments and describe their history", while, at the same time, expecting them to "associate the most important monuments and symbols of Polish culture with their respective regions", which is difficult to fulfil in at least some of these regions due to the ambiguous origins of these monuments.

Also unclear are the requirements concerning the manner of relating to monuments and places emblematic of other ethnic groups and cultural communities that once inhabited the areas currently belonging to the Polish state and the organisations and state institutions that once administered these areas. Many of them are places of non-remembrance and non-places of memory, often made so as a result of arbitrary administrative decisions, disturbances of collective memory or intentional manipulation of it.

REFERENCES

Belaj, J., Belaj, M., Krznar, S., Ivančan, T.S., & Tkalčec, T. (2018). *Sacralization of Landscape and Sacred Places*. Institute of Archaelogy. Zagreb.

Bikont, A. (2012). *My z Jedwabnego*. Czarne.

Castells, M. (2008). *Siła tożsamości*. PWN.

Chojecka, E. (2011). Trzy modele kulturowej pamięci: Kraków, Katowice, Wrocław. *Herito*, *2*, 78–87.

Cukras-Stelągowska, J. (2016). Słowo wstępne. In J. Cukras-Stelągowska (Ed.), *Pamiętanie i zapominanie. Wspólnoty – wartości – wychowanie* (pp. 7–12). Wyd. UMK.

Eliade, M. (1993). *Sacrum – mit – historia*. PIW.

Giuliani, M.V. (2003). Theory of attachment and place attachment. In M. Bonnes, T. Lee, & M. Bonaiuto (Eds.), *Psychological Theories for Environmental Issues* (pp. 137–170). Aldershot.

Grudzińska-Gross, I., & Matyjaszek, K. (2021). *Breaking the Frame. New School of Polish-Jewish Studies*. Peter Lang.

Hirsch, M. (2010). Żałoba i postpamięć. In E. Domańska & K. Bojarska (Eds.), *Teoria wiedzy o przeszłości na tle współczesnej humanistyki* (pp. 247–280). Wydawnictwo Poznańskie.

Hirszowicz, M., & Neyman, E. (2001). Społeczne ramy niepamięci. *Kultura i Społeczeństwo*, *3–4*, 23–48.

Kasztelan, M. (2012). Fenomen pamięci zbiorowej. *In Gremium. Studia nad historią, kulturą i polityką*, *6*, 185–198.

Kończal, K. (2024). Pierre Nora i jego nienapisana historyka. *Przegląd Polityczny*, *184*, 45–55.

Król, J. (2016). Modelowanie zbiorowej pamięci historycznej młodego pokolenia Polski Ludowej i PRL w okresie stalinowskim 1948–1956. In J. Cukras-Stelągowska (Ed.), *Pamiętanie i zapominanie. Wspólnoty – wartości – wychowanie* (pp. 133–146). Wyd. UMK.

Leociak, J. (2021). Polska szkoła badań nad Zagładą na przykładzie prac Centrum Badań nad Zagładą Żydów w Warszawie. *Wiadomości Historyczne*, *4*, 26–28.

Lewicka, M. (2012). *Psychologia miejsca*. Scholar.

Marshall, D.A. (2010). Temptation, tradition, and taboo: A theory of sacralization. *Sociological Theory*, *1*, 64–90.

Mendel, M. (2006). Pedagogika miejsca i animacja na miejsce wrażliwa. In M. Mendel (Ed.), *Pedagogika miejsca* (pp. 21–37). Wyd. Dolnośląskiej Szkoły Wyższej.

Minta-Tworzowska, D. (2015). Metafory genezy i etnogenezy w archeologii (prehistorii) w pierwszej połowie XX wieku. Dyskurs naukowy wokół Biskupina. *Archeologia Polski*, *60*, 153–164.

Nijakowski, L. (2001). Domeny symboliczne. O znaczeniu pomników w przestrzeni dominacji symbolicznej na przykładzie Śląska. *Kultura i Społeczeństwo*, *3–4*, 81–104.

Nora, P. (2001). Czas pamięci. *Res Publica Nowa*, *7*, 37–43.

Pace, V. (2020). Messianic movements and the sacralization of the territory. *Revista de Estudos da Religião*, *19*(3), 15–33.

Posłuszny, Ł. (2014). Przestrzeń, miejsce i nie-miejsce wobec pamięci i niepamięci. In Z. Budrewicz, R. Sendyka, & R. Nycz (Eds.), *Pamięć i afekty* (pp. 309–321). IBL PAN.

Ricoeur, P. (2012). *Pamięć, historia, zapomnienie*. Universitas.

Sendyka, R. (2013). Pryzma – zrozumieć nie-miejsca pamięci (*non-lieux de memoire*). *Teksty Drugie*, *1–2*, 323–344.

Sendyka, R. (2016). Niepamięć albo o sytuowaniu wiedzy o formach pamiętania. *Teksty Drugie*, *6*, 250–267.

Sendyka, R. (2017a). Nie-miejsca pamięci i ich nie-ludzkie pomniki. *Teksty Drugie*, *2*, 86–108.

Sendyka, R. (2017b). Miejsce/nie-miejsce pamięci. In K. Jarzyńska, M. Kobielska, M. Smykowski, J. Muchowski, Ł. Posłuszny, & K. Siewior, *Nie-miejsca pamięci. Elementarz*, (pp. 8–13). Ośrodek Badań nad Kulturami Pamięci.

Sendyka, R., Kobielska, M., Szczepan, A., & Muchowski, J. (2020). Nie-miejsca pamięci: nekrotopografie. Wstęp. In *Nie-miejsca pamięci 1. Nekrotopografie* (pp. 7–38). Wyd. IBL PAN.

Shalhoub-Kevorkian, N.(2021). Sacralized politics: The case of occupied East Jerusalem. In N.N. Rouhana, & N. Shalhoub-Kevorkian (Eds.), *When Politics are Sacralized* (pp. 134–158). Cambridge University Press.

Szacka, B. (2003). Historia i pamięć zbiorowa. *Kultura i Społeczeństwo*, *4*, 3–15.

Szpociński, A. (2008). Miejsca pamięci (*lieux de mémoire*). *Teksty Drugie*, *4*, 11–20.

Szpociński, A. (2021). *Współczesna kultura historyczna i jej przemiany*. Scholar.

Traba, R. (2023). Ziemie rozproszone. *Przegląd Polityczny*, 183,

Tuan, Y. (1987). *Przestrzeń i miejsce.* PIW.

Zenderowski, R. (2011). Pamięć i tożsamość narodowa. *Athenaeum*, *28*, 149–166.

Ziółkowski, M. (1999). Cztery funkcje przywracanej pamięci. *Studia Socjologiczne*, *4*, 55–76.

PEDAGOGIKA KRYTYCZNA WOBEC ARBITRALNOŚCI MIEJSC PAMIĘCI I NIEPAMIĘCI

Wprowadzenie: Lokalizacja, przypisanie terytorialne, jest elementem tożsamości, zarówno indywidualnej, jak zbiorowej. Wyrażają je takie określenia jak Tarnowianin (Tarnowianie), Widzewiak (Widzewiacy), Ślązak (Ślązacy), Nowojorczyk (Nowojorczycy), Alzatczyk (Alzatczycy), itp. Skoro miejsce pochodzenia i pobytu współdecyduje w istotnym zakresie o tożsamości, jego przeszłość nabiera znaczenia dla jej kształtowania, a miejsca utrwalone i wyróżnione w pamięci indywidualnej i zbiorowej stają się szczególnymi obiektami troski, często kultu. Jako newralgiczne dla kształtowania tożsamości, narażone są jednak na manipulacje, mitologizacje lub zgoła mistyfikacje, co prowadzi niekiedy do powstawania miejsc niepamięci. Edukacja i wychowanie, wpływające na tożsamość w newralgicznym okresie jej kształtowania u uczniów i wychowanków, przyszłych obywateli, muszą takie zagrożenia rozpoznawać i przeciwstawiać się im.

Cel badań: Ustalenie wpływu mechanizmów kształtujących pamięć zbiorową i jej intencjonalnej lub mimowolnej selektywności na procesy kreowania miejsc pamięci, a tym samym na identyfikację regionalną i lokalną uczniów, a także wywoływanie jej zaburzeń, oraz wskazanie możliwości i metod ich niwelowania poprzez ustanawianie miejsc pamięci w dotychczasowych miejscach niepamięci i nie-miejscach pamięci.

Stan wiedzy: Pedagogika miejsc pamięci jest stosunkowo dobrze rozwiniętą częścią pedagogiki miejsca, wpływ miejsc pamięci na procesy edukacyjne i wychowawcze jest rozpoznany w wielu aspektach. Niedostateczne zainteresowanie jednak okazywano dotychczas arbitralności procesów kreowania owych miejsc pamięci, wynikającej z selektywności i tendencyjności pamięci, tak jednostkowej, jak zbiorowej, a zwłaszcza wyzwaniom stwarzanym przez te procesy dla edukatorów i wychowawców.

Podsumowanie: Procesy edukacyjne i wychowawcze nie powinny bezkrytycznie utrwalać – także w obrzędowości memorialnej – selekcji miejsc pamięci i niepamięci, dokonywanej pod wpływem polityki historycznej i prowadzącej do kształtowania zdeformowanej świadomości i tożsamości zbiorowej, lecz opierać je na udokumentowanych faktach i wydarzeniach. To wymaga krytycznego podejścia do dotychczasowego zestawu miejsc pamięci i niepamięci, jego rewizji, a więc edukacji krytycznej, dokonywanej na przekór dominującym narracjom.

Słowa kluczowe: pamięć zbiorowa, tożsamość zbiorowa, tożsamość legitymizująca, obrzędowość memorialna, postpamięć