

Discourse and the Macabre.
Creating an Image of the Past
in the Film Hatred
 by Wojciech Smarzowski

ABSTRACT. Kornacki Krzysztof, *Discourse and the Macabre. Creating an Image of the Past in the Film Hatred by Wojciech Smarzowski*. "Images" vol. XXXIV, no. 43. Poznań 2023. Adam Mickiewicz University Press. Pp. 227–245. ISSN 1731-450X. <https://doi.org/10.14746/i.2023.34.43.14>.

The film *Hatred* (*Wołyń*) is a hybrid of a classic historical drama (with elements of discourse) and a modernist anti-war film. Smarzowski created a scenario that complicates the history of Volhynia, and renders it open to ambiguous assessments of Poles, Ukrainians, Jews and Germans. The film was supposed to be conciliatory. But this desire to distance itself from factual and ethical simplifications was doomed to lose in confrontation with the emotional force of the final sequence of the cruel crime. The author of the article does not oppose the macabre. From the Polish perspective, it was rather unavoidable in the first film on this subject, because it was not about the information about the crime itself but rather its emotional experience (probably cathartic for some viewers). The author only points to the fact that thinking in terms of reconciliation in the making of the film, which in the first part approaches a distanced discourse (for the full expression of the "voice of history"), and in the final parts is an immersive anti-war film, could not be successful.

KEYWORDS: *Hatred*, history, Volyn slaughter, discourse, macabre

A filmmaker undertaking a historical subject faces, in my opinion,[1] three fundamental questions:

1. What is my attitude to the image of the past emerging from the existing accounts of historians and witnesses, and what are the relations between these two (historiography and memory) representations of the past; in other words: How much of "the voice of history"[2] (historical knowledge verified as much as possible) do I want in the film, how much of "the voice of memory", and how much space do I leave for "the voice of art" (fiction, metaphors, creation, genre patterns, etc.)?

2. What immediate use do I want to make of undertaking the subject (mainly in the sphere of moral valuation)?

3. What formal solutions – those relating to plot, genre, stylistics – do I choose to express these two aspects?

It is from this discursive perspective of constructing a representation of the past in which the filmmaker reaches out to the aforementioned spheres (knowledge, values and poetics) that I would like to

[1] K. Kornacki, P. Kurpiewski, *Kino jak nauczyciel. Klasyfikacja działań autorskich współczesnego polskiego kina historycznego (propozycje)*, [in:] *Historia wizu-alna w działaniu: studia i szkice z badań nad filmem*

historycznym, eds. D. Skotarczak, J. Szczutkowska, P. Kurpiewski, Poznań 2020, pp. 59–90.

[2] W. Guynn, *Przekształcanie historii w filmie*, "Kwartalnik Filmowy" 2010, no. 69, pp. 5–30.

look at the film *Hatred* (2016), directed by Wojciech Smarzowski, and discuss the extent to which the content-related assumptions adopted by the director could have been implemented in terms of the formal solutions he adopted.

Representing the Past

From the point of view of sources and accounts of the past, Smarzowski had no easy task. As far as historiography is concerned, a radical difference divides Polish and Ukrainian historians. As is well known, the attempt to develop a common position has not yielded significant results.[3] The differences exist mainly at the level of the origins of the Volhynian massacre (a spontaneous peasant uprising or planned ethnic cleansing organised by the OUN-B?), its assessment (the revenge of the Ukrainians for post-colonialism or pragmatic, cynical cruelty?) and the symmetry of the “ethnic fratricidal war” advocated by the Ukrainians (on the Polish side there is a lack of agreement on equalising the blame). It seems that in the initial period, Smarzowski was more inclined towards ideological symmetry – this would be evidenced by his desire to make a film “two-handed”, i.e. with equal participation of a Ukrainian director.[4] Ultimately, the screenplay adopted the Polish perspective in describing and evaluating the events. It should therefore come as no surprise that Ukrainians reacted negatively to it.[5]

But this, of course, did not solve Smarzowski’s cognitive problems. He had to confront the aforementioned conflict of the memory of the Borderland Poles and their families with historiographers, and the differences between historians themselves. With regard to the latter, Smarzowski adopted a Solomonic stance: he invited both researchers closer to the memory of the Borderlands communities (Ewa Siemaszko, Leon Popek), and a historian representing a more distanced approach to the events in the Borderlands in the years 1939–1943–1947 (Grzegorz Motyka). But he also did not shy away from the testimonies of the Borderland Poles and consulted the screenplay with Stanisław Srokowski, the author of the book *Nienawiść (Hatred)*, which was the main inspiration for taking up the theme of the massacre and also the basis for some

[3] G. Motyka, *Wołyń ’43: ludobójcza czystka – fakty, analogie, polityka historyczna*, Kraków 2016, pp. 201–247; idem, *Cień Kłyma Sawura: polsko-ukraiński konflikt pamięci*, Gdańsk 2013.

[4] M. Rychcik, *Kręcone siekierą: 9 seansów Smarzowskiego*, Warszawa 2019, p. 284. Let me add that there have already been such experiments in Polish culture, such as the performance *Aporia 43/47* and Agnieszka Arnold’s two documentaries *Oczyszczenie* and *Przebaczenie* (both 2003) – both of which resulted in two visions of the events of the Volhynian-Galician massacre that are completely different in terms of evaluating the past.

[5] On the other hand, what may come as a surprise is the often very highly emotional attitude of some Ukrainian commentators towards the right to dissent from this vision, for example, just to mention Oksana Zabuzhko’s reaction – M. Nowicki, *Oksana Zabuzhko: Wołyń jest jak nóż wbity w plecy*, Newsweek, 2.11.2016, <https://www.newsweek.pl/swiat/oksana-zabuzko-o-filmie-wolyn-jest-jak-noz-wbity-w-plecy-ukraincow/3s15f57> (accessed: 29.12.2022). Irina Patron also writes about such a very negative reaction from some Ukrainian commentators, I. Patron, *Polski Wołyń na ekranie. Przegląd ukraińskich publikacji internetowych o filmie Wojciecha Smarzowskiego*, [in:] *Mistrz Wajda*, ed. S. Bobowski, Wrocław 2010, pp. 199–211.

of the scenes.[6] In the end, the result of such extensive consultation was a fusion of divergent points of view, which does not mean extremely different, but which differ in terms of detail. This, in turn, meant that the general acceptance of the film by the aforementioned circles was nuanced by some reservations in individual statements. Thus, for example, Grzegorz Motyka said: “The film succeeded in combining the memory of the crime preserved in the Borderland communities with what scholars have to say about it.” At the same time, he had reservations about some of the storyline solutions, especially the scene of the blessing of the murder weapons (in his opinion, there is no irrefutable evidence of this).[7] Ewa Siemaszko, on the other hand, is convinced that such events did take place.[8] In a generally affirmative article on the film, which represents the position of the Borderland Poles, such a passage appears in the finale: “There is, however, a scene in the film that is surprising and appalling at the same time. It is a retaliatory action by the Poles. In it, they murder Ukrainians with axes, knives, pitchforks and anything else that comes to hand. In a savage, mindless frenzy, they kill everyone without exception, i.e. defenceless men, women and children [...] And yet this is a historical lie and a brazen falsehood.”[9] Leaving aside the interpretation of this scene, it is clear that Polish (brutal) retaliation had no place in this standpoint.

Thereby, without being symmetrical in the area of Polish and Ukrainian findings (because he could not, due to the scale and nature of the crime), Smarzowski tried to maintain a distance from the monopolising narratives of domestic “social actors”, while at the same time drawing inspiration from them, which was ultimately intended to achieve his individual “artistic truth”. Therefore, he was not afraid to reach for expressive messages that were intended to have the status of a symbol (such as the aforementioned blessing of the murder weapons or fratricidal killing). There will, of course, be more such transgressions – and this will be a consequence of the axiological assumptions made (more on these in a moment).

Historical cinema usually chooses the formula of cinematic microhistory to tell the story of the past, written out for characters immersed in everyday life, with more or less exposition of the socio-political context.[10] The dramaturgical scheme of “interference of political

[6] S. Srokowski, *Nienawiść (opowiadania kresowe)*, Warszawa 2006.

[7] Grzegorz Motyka o Wołyniu. *Noży nie święcili*. Interviewed by Andrzej Brzeziński, “Gazeta Wyborcza”, 24.09.2016, <http://wyborcza.pl/magazyn/1,124059,20738472,wolyn-nozy-nie-swiecili.html> (accessed: 22.12.2022); see also I. Hałagida, *Wołyń ’43 – czy faktycznie „święcono” narzędzia zbrodni?*, <https://zbrodniawolynska.pl/zw1/czytelnia/czytelnia-1/219,Igor-Halagida-Wolyn-43-czy-faktycznie-swiecono-narzedzia-zbrodni.html> (accessed: 22.12.2022).

[8] E. Siemaszko, *Święcenie narzędzi banderowskiej zbrodni*, “Biuletyn IPN” 2017 no. 1–2 (January–February), pp. 81–91.

[9] C. Kowalczyk, *Nie mogłem nie napisać o Wołyniu*, “Namysłowskie Spotkania Kresowe” 2016, special issue, November 2016, pp. 12–16.

[10] Jerzy Topolski wrote about microhistory that it is “a history close to man and his behaviour, it shows him in everyday action and at the same time blurs the distinction between events hitherto considered «important» and others, between «historical» and

events into the personal agenda of the protagonists” is the most popular way of narrating historical breakthroughs. It is also an eminently Polish peculiarity, stemming from the traumatising role of history, which has ruthlessly encroached on our everyday life over the last two centuries. Microhistorical cinema can make the lives of textbook characters familiar, or it can create fictional characters against the background of real events. The example of *Hatred* is a good demonstration that fictionalisation does not have to contradict historical credibility. All of *Hatred*'s main and supporting characters have been invented, and yet, as viewers (at least Polish viewers), we have a sense of the complexity of the world depicted, which is also needed to balance the rationale in assessing the genocide. Fictionalisation need not diminish historical truth if the latter is not confined to facts but to deeper/broader historical processes, to a class of generalised events and behaviours. By inventing characters, the screenwriter *de facto* creates types of attitudes. In such a situation, a specific communicative economy of the fictional work comes into play: the film character is – regardless of his or her greater or lesser individual uniqueness – a representative of the many, one village, of many villages, etc. Let us add that despite its clearly microhistorical “bias”, such a formula of cinema has at its disposal methods to generalise the image of the world through the multiplication of plots and protagonists or other storytelling procedures that lead to a social panorama. *Hatred* is precisely such a panorama.

Despite the recognisable stylistic elements characteristic of Smarzowski's works, *Hatred* was made in the traditional formula of “historiographical cinema,”^[11] i.e. cinema referring to important textbook events of the past and taking care of the credibility of the historical message; using consultations, which today – in the context of the rules of public financing of films – have become a requirement.^[12]

One other aspect of historical representation in *Hatred* should be noted. Filmmakers usually have to decide on the ratio between the historical and the universal (*hic et nunc a semper et ubique*).^[13] In historical cinema, the tension between these aspects of creating a vision of the past is inescapable. One should therefore ask to what extent the filmmaker sticks to the generally complex events of the past and to what extent he or she adapts them to universalising patterns, such as cultural, communicative or genre patterns. As far as *Hatred* is concerned, this

«non-historical» persons” – J. Topolski, *Wprowadzenie do historii*, Poznań 1998, p. 135. Of course, I am aware that the “non-historical” in Topolski's quote implies the subordinate rank of a real-life person rather than an invented figure.

[11] According to the division I proposed (together with Piotr Kurpiewski), cinema relating to the past can be divided into 4 models: “historiographical cinema” (or alternatively “academicized cinema”), “motif-based cinema”, “cinema of thought experi-

ment” and “action cinema of the past”.

[12] “Programy Operacyjne Polskiego Instytutu Sztuki Filmowej na rok 2022”, p. 34, <https://pisf.pl/wp-content/uploads/2022/04/PO-PISF-2022.pdf> (accessed: 22.12.2022). The requirement for historical consultation is the result of the well-known “affair” with the script of 1939 *Battle of Westerplatte*.

[13] This, among other things, is the subject of Rafał Marszałek's now classic book, R. Marszałek, *Filmowa pop-historia*, Kraków 1984.

aspect was brought into focus by the seemingly strange decision of the jury at the Gdynia Festival, who overlooked the film when distributing the major awards (earlier, the same thing had happened in the case of *Rose*; let us add that a few months later, *Hatred* won the “Eagle” for Best Polish film). The problem was, on the one hand, the complicated historical layer of the film, and on the other hand, the international composition of the jury: its members did not understand the story presented on the screen. They could not grasp all the nuances of pre-war and wartime Polish (and Ukrainian) history, they did not know who fights against whom, why a brother kills a brother, who are the Ukrainians dressed in black uniforms, what ethnic and religious group is represented by the priests presented on screen, etc. (I think also most Polish viewers might not have been aware of this). In addition, understanding the plot was hampered by the verbal method of conveying some information through dialogues (e.g. on pre-war attitudes or state politics) rather than through plot conflict. The problem of the tension between the particular and the universal (translating a nation’s culture into categories understandable to other nations) confronts every filmmaker.

Thus, we will reiterate that in the sphere of constructing a representation of the past (“the voice of history”), Smarzowski adopted: the Polish perspective; the formula of “historiographic cinema” (sticking to facts); at the same time, he meandered between sources (the findings of historiographers; between historiography and memory), he chose the most popular formula of cinematic microhistory (the scheme of politics interfering with the characters’ personal agenda); he used fictionalisation as a method of constructing the historical message; he created, through the multithreaded plot, a broader social panorama; he chose to complicate the “voice of history” at the expense of communicativeness.

After this introduction, let us return to the historical message of Smarzowski’s film – what basic information about the past do we get from the *syuzhet* (I am leaving aside for the moment whether this is in the dialogues or through plot situations)? To be precise, this is not a film about the Volhynian massacre, but about the history of Volhynia at the most dramatic moments of its twentieth-century history. The ethnic and political background of interwar Poland was presented, accentuating the resentment of pro-Ukrainian activists towards the Polish authorities as a result of the erroneous national and religious policy of the Polish state and the feeling of superiority towards the “Ruthenians”. On the other hand, it also provided an opportunity to show the “rough neighbourhood”, the pre-war coexistence of citizens of different cultures, who sometimes, however, were willing to enter into dialogue (and even into Polish-Ukrainian marriages). Stretching the plot over time made it possible to show the hopes of the Ukrainians, which they pinned on the successive occupants (Soviet and German) for an independent homeland, on the one hand, and their gradual moral decline, on the other, which was the consequence of their complicity

in the murder of, mainly, Jews. The shifting boundaries of the crimes committed by Ukrainian partisans and policemen (first on duty with the Germans, later in the UPA) made the brutal violence more tolerable. No one could stop the unbridled spiral of cruelty. Smarzowski's film also makes it quite clear that the UPA units were the active perpetrators of the ethnic cleansing, while the peasants were not so willing to kill their neighbours (the scene in which a Ukrainian refuses to behead a Pole, for which he is killed by the Banderites; or another in which a Ukrainian peasant saves the heroine hidden in the corn from death; or finally the one in which a Ukrainian brother kills his brother because he is unable to murder his wife, a Pole). In the words of Grzegorz Motyka, "not all Ukrainians wanted to murder Poles, and not all of them consented to it, even when they were already setting out with a mob for a bloody harvest."^[14] This last statement by Motyka is important because Ukrainian historians try to argue, as I mentioned, that the Volhynian crime was the consequence of a people's revolt – of Ukrainian peasants against their Polish masters. "So far, however – to quote the researcher again – no evidence has been found that any Polish village was spontaneously slaughtered by peasants."^[15]

This film also contains a scene functioning as a *pars pro toto*, of bloody retaliation by Poles for Ukrainian crimes, but at the same time, there is no symmetry in the juxtaposition of the murder scenes. Smarzowski's film also avoids simplifying the description of ethnic characteristics in line with a simple good-evil pattern: Poles (not all, of course) can feel aversion to Jews (like Zosia's father and unlike Zosia herself), but even in this film, somewhere in the background, there is a flash of a Jewish man waving with joy at the Red Army soldiers entering this land (which must have strengthened the Poles' aversion to Jews). There are no simple categorisations in *Hatred*. How many viewers are relieved by the scene when Zosia and her child are saved from a cruel death at Ukrainian hands by a marching squad of Nazi soldiers? As the historian recalled, "this «historical mess» accurately represents the situation in Volhynia. In 1943, there were times when Poles owed their lives to the Germans"^[16] – the same ones who otherwise committed war crimes. This is a film which, in its historical reconstruction, is close to the real facts,^[17] and therefore cannot be crammed into any of the mythologising narratives. Every viewer (Polish viewer) will see what he or she wants to see, but whatever doesn't fit into the image will bother them. And ultimately, in the final scenes of this film, there is what is most important, what had to be there (?) – *genocidium atrox*.

[14] Grzegorz Motyka *o Wołyniu...*

[15] *Ibidem*.

[16] *Ibidem*.

[17] I am leaving aside the plot "deceptions" that are the essence of cinema, e.g. the incongruity of the passage of historical time with the maturation of

Zosia's son; or the hard to accept incognito situations, both of Skiba, who pretends to be Ukrainian, and of Zosia, who pretends to be Ukrainian. Cf. J. Roy, *O sztuce manipulacji [o Obywatelu Kane]*, "Kwartalnik Filmowy" 1995, no. 12–13, pp. 61–74.

When one analyses a film through the prism of historical plausibility, material culture is assessed alongside factography and its interpretation. Although this is mainly pointed out by professional historians and/or ethnographers – a definite minority in the audience – the filmmakers still painstakingly try to recreate the realities of the past world. This often leads to a paradoxical situation: attention to the credibility of iconography and custom does not always go hand in hand with the factual truth (often the reconstruction of material culture is a kind of alibi for the filmmakers, who boast about how much they have done to recreate the past). In the case of *Hatred*, the reconstruction of the culture of the time was carried out with care,^[18] but fortunately not at the expense of factual truth. One of the rituals – the cutting of the bride's braid on the threshold of the house – was taken from Lemko tradition. And this example introduces us to another sphere that is, in principle, the most important for a filmmaker – the postulatory sphere of values.

For Grzegorz Motyka, the effect of his collaboration with Wojciech Smarzowski was, as I mentioned, satisfactory. But at the same time, the historian declared: “I had reservations about the scene of the blessing of knives by the Ukrainian priest. The Borderland Poles are convinced that such ceremonies took place, but there is no evidence for this.”^[19] From the way Smarzowski tried to nuance the past, one can assume that he was close to the assessment of the Volhynian events advocated by Motyka.^[20] But at the same time, in this case, he took advantage of a historiographical “crack” (as in the scene in which a brother persuades his brother to kill his Polish wife). The omission of the historian's reservations is due to the basic, and most important, feature of historical cinema, which is presentism.^[21] What is treated as a methodological error in historical studies – the description of the past being modernised, the ad hoc reasons for its (re)construction – is the norm in cinema. This makes fictional historical films actually the closest to parabolic or allegorical stories (they relate a historical plot, but there is a universal or topical problem behind them).^[22]

What ethical postulates guided Smarzowski when implementing his project? Firstly, to recall the crime, to “exhume the memory”. This is why the film begins with the motto from Jan Zaleski's memoirs: “The Borderland Poles were killed twice: once by blows with an axe, the second time by silence”. This is Smarzowski's way of emphasising his intention, expressed in numerous interviews, to make a film-recall (as was the case with *Rose*). Secondly, a serious attitude to the complexity of historical events and historiographers' findings, without, of course,

Interpreting the Past

[18] See interviews with the stage design department in Marcin Rychcik's book, op. cit., pp. 280–341.

[19] Grzegorz Motyka *o Wołyniu...*

[20] In fact, he recommended Motyka's book *Wołyń 43* with a note on its cover (“Everything you should know to understand the film *Hatred*”).

[21] R. Marszałek, op. cit.

[22] K. Kornacki, P. Kurpiewski, op. cit.

slavishly clinging to it, but nevertheless with respect (at the expense of the communicativeness of the storyline message).

Thirdly, and most importantly, *Hatred* was intended as a universal protest against extreme nationalism (chauvinism). Hence the two extended sequences – the sermons and the fratricidal murder and subsequent Polish retaliation. In the latter sequence, the aim was to highlight the status of the victims – not only innocent but clearly pro-Polish. This is the paradoxical consequence of a nationalist crime: a Ukrainian man who rescues his Polish wife (he killed his brother a moment earlier) is killed in blind retaliation by Poles. It is safe to assume that in this way Smarzowski wanted to emphasise what he has said many times in interviews: that this is a film about hatred which, once unleashed, can blindly kill without looking at national labels.

Fourthly, Smarzowski wanted to express his opposition to religion being used instrumentally for political purposes. Hence the most objectionable scene of the blessing of the future instruments of a crime^[23] by an Orthodox priest. He invokes evangelical arguments to justify the ethnic cleansing. The priest's philippic referring to the parable of the tares uses scripture to justify criminal ends. In this way, Smarzowski attacks the role of "false religiosity" as a moral alibi. And to emphasise that it is not religion itself that is the problem, but its particularist interpretation that contradicts the teachings of Christ, the parallel scene shows another priest who argues for the duty of tolerance towards others. In the middle of these two opposing sermons, there are scenes of hunting people in the grain. They are the tares of the parable to be plucked out.

Fifthly, regardless of the effect (which we will come back to), one can believe that Smarzowski was concerned with the postulate of Polish-Ukrainian reconciliation, and he really did a great deal to emphasise it (obviously rejecting the symmetry of mass killings, which was unacceptable from the Polish perspective).^[24] The basic vehicles of the idea of reconciliation are, of course, the love themes. These themes are perfectly symmetrical: in the very first sequence (or even in the very first scene of this sequence) we are confronted with two couples in love: Zosia falling in love with Petro and her sister marrying (out of love) Vasył. It is worth noting that these are the only couples in this picture who truly love each other, with a free and sincere (but also passionate) love. In this way, Smarzowski establishes the ground for developing supra-ethnic relations as axiologically (though, in the context of the

[23] However, in interviews Smarzowski also referred to the example of Croatian Catholic priests blessing the weapons of the Ustasha, which was certainly a consequence of his cooperation with Motyka, who pointed out the analogy between the crimes committed by the OUN-B against Poles and the Croatian Ustasha against Serbs – G. Motyka, *Cień Kłyma Sawura...*, pp. 155–197.

[24] "It's the only film I've given so much attention" – Smarzowski's statement at the meeting in Rzeszów, see A. Bosak, *Wojciech Smarzowski: W pewnym sensie film Wołyń to porażka*, *Biznes i Styl*, 14.12.2018, https://www.biznesistyl.pl/kultura/teatr-i-kino/7768_.html (accessed: 23.12.2022).

horror of the finale, no longer emotionally) most important. Male-female relationships devoid of national labels triumph plot-wise over nationalism: when Zosia gives herself up to Petro, and when she visits his mother to ask about him, and when, risking his own life, he saves Zosia (and, incidentally, her husband's children) from the deportation that she probably would not have survived; and then when Petro dies. Smarzowski indulges in a great deal of melodrama in these solutions in order to emphasise that love for another human being, rather than national labels, is crucial in human relationships (this was also the case in *Rose*). Similarly, of course, in the scene in which Vasył kills his brother (in order not to kill his Polish wife), again, love appears here to be postulated as a regulator of human actions. Certainly, also the final, visionary scene of Zosia crossing the bridge with her Ukrainian lover is intended as a postulate for the future – for Polish-Ukrainian reconciliation. It is worth noting that these interpersonal, family relationships also affect people who were not previously inclined towards reconciliation. Like Petro's mother, when she helps Zosia to escape with her child from the Ukrainian slaughterers. Even if she is motivated by the intention to save her grandson, the scene proves how important (in the foreground) family relationships are, beyond ethnic conflict. An interesting thing to note is that commentators on the historical credibility of the film, while criticising some of the solutions, accepted, with all possible upsides and downsides, what was also risky – precisely this exposed and proportionally doubtful multiplication of Polish-Ukrainian love themes. Smarzowski consciously postulates to reinforce them, even at the expense of credibility and the danger of turning the film into a discourse.

But both the director and some commentators wanted to see the film not only as a parable but also as an allegory of a specific social and political situation. Thus, they argued that the film is about the fact that the hydra of chauvinism can revive at any time – that is, also in Poland AD 2016.^[25] There is not much on-screen evidence of this, but, ultimately, it is there: the racist views of Zosia's father or the character played by Michał Gadomski, who, already devoid of empathy when he shows Germans a fleeing Jew, is easily persuaded to work for the auxiliary police, and in the scene of the Poles' bloody revenge on the Ukrainian family clearly "relishes the bloodshed". Certainly, the symmetry-based sermon sequence was also created to condemn chauvinism in toto, but, judging from the dialogue, probably also its contemporary emanations: "The world is infected," says the «good» priest, "with an immoderate

[25] The case of *Hatred* is not the only one in which a message that *de facto* coincides with the policies of the ruling party is interpreted against the party and its electorate. Such a situation happened in the case of a film that also refers to Ukrainian history, Agnieszka Holland's *Mr. Jones* (2019). Although the film is exemplarily conservative (anti-Soviet and additionally

taking up the theme of the "betrayal of the West"), Holland argued at the 2019 Gdynia Film Festival that the most important theme is that of the journalist who fights the regime for the truth (bluntly suggesting that a journalist in Poland under the rightist rule has a similar duty).

attachment to one's own homeland, to one's own nation and the measure of this attachment is the strength of hatred towards other nations. Let us not delude ourselves that any nation is immune to this poison. And therefore let the man of any nation, of any denomination, feel at home; let belonging to any denomination not entail hurting anyone with evil thoughts and evil deeds." These words, while illustrating a universal lesson, could also be used in contemporary left-liberal discourse.

Remaining in the realm of allegory, it should be noted that very often the on-screen "ethical lesson" is entangled in current disputes concerning historical politics. It is symptomatic that the biggest public arguments over films made during the Polish Film Institute period (after 2005) concerned historical pictures (the only contemporary exception was *Clergy*). Emotions were heated by: *1939 Battle of Westerplatte*, *Aftermath*, *Ida*, *Walesa: Man of Hope* or *Smolensk*. To a great extent, this was because they presented a strongly ideologically profiled (and simplified) picture of the past (perhaps apart from *Ida*), which in a stigmatised social reality had to lead to fierce polemics. Meanwhile, *Hatred* belonged to that group of films which did not arouse heated debates among Poles (which is not to say that there was no criticism – but without such apparent ideological bias). This is due to the fact that Smarzewski constructed a historical representation that shunned simplifications – both panegyric and pamphlet-like. The kind of historical message that, from the point of view of the national-patriotic narrative about the Polish past, I once called a "commentary on the canon"[26] – not negating the martyrdom of Poles, but making the events and characters more real and not always noble.[27] For *Hatred* is not uncritical of Poles. The extensive Jewish themes are worth noting in this context. Of course, they are explained by the desire to create a socio-political panorama and to point out the complicity of the Ukrainians in the Holocaust. But in order to illustrate the complexity of the social situation, it was not necessary, in my opinion, to expand these themes so much (for example, the scene of the Jews being hidden by Havryluk or that of the Jews being shot by the Germans). In my opinion, it was Smarzewski's conscious decision to show the extermination of Poles against the background of other exterminations; in accordance with the director's intention, to universalise the message: not to deprive it of its specificity and tragedy, but, at the same time, not to make it a fetish.[28]

[26] Other axiological-ideological models include the panegyric (or hagiography, e.g. *Katyn*, *Popieluszko*, *Jack Strong*, etc.), the pamphlet (*Aftermath*, *Oblawa* [*Manhunt*], *Obywatel*, etc.) and the apocryphal, i.e. a picture seemingly converging with the national-patriotic canon but making subversive corrections, such as *Stones for the Rampart*, *General. Assassination on Gibraltar*, *Rysa (Scratch)*, *The Mole* or *Warsaw '44* – K. Kornacki, P. Kurpiewski, op. cit.

[27] This is – as an example – the case of with such films as *General Nil*, *The Reverse*, *In Darkness*, *Matura matura 1947* [*The Exam 1947*], *Rose* or *Wszystko co kocham* [*All That I Love*].

[28] One is reminded here of the original ideological conception of the Museum of the Second World War, which was still being developed under the PO-PSL government; at that time Grzegorz Motyka published a book under the imprint of the Museum on the Pol-

However, cognitive and axiological assumptions alone are not enough: they have been subjected to a specific form, which has made it difficult to implement certain postulates, especially the conciliatory ones.

Most of the formal solutions adopted by Smarzowski were a consequence of assumptions concerning the representation of the past and its evaluation. The result was a film that, from the point of view of form, I would describe as a hybrid of a classic historical drama (using elements of fictional discourse) and an immersive anti-war film.

For most of its length, Smarzowski's film is close to a classic historical film adhering to the formula of "everyday film language."^[29] Its stylistic identification is, of course, not devoid of authorial elements (such as the choppy, "incorrect" editing characteristic of Smarzowski, naturalism in presenting the scenes of violence or musical restraint), but ultimately they do not "come to the fore" at the expense of the historical content, apart from the finale. In *Hatred*, we are faced with an unambiguous and comprehensible, chronological and objectively told storyline, with a dramatic progression – a story with a semblance of cinematic realism. These aesthetic assumptions are important, as a classic historical drama offers a clear opportunity to open up to the on-screen "voice of history" without overemphasising stylistic solutions.

The desire to create a picture of the past that was epic in its scope determined both the plot and the relaxed dramaturgical construction. And although it retains chronological order and a cause-and-effect relationship, it does so with an abundance of ellipses, on the one hand, and a sizable number of characters, including those in the background, on the other. All this weakens the strength of the personal and causal relationship, and thus also the degree of dramatic tension. The first radical leap between the extended opening sequence of the wedding and the abrupt entry into the war sequence involving Skiba is symptomatic of this, while the whole part of the background of Maciej and Zosia's wedding, very important from the point of view of the construction of the main character, was abandoned. Reaching for such an episodic formula obviously stemmed from the desire to present as many plots and events as possible, stretched over time, which constitute the content of the aforementioned complex historical representation. This is also what the omniscient narration serves – the film's narrator is not only associated with the main character (Zosia) but also accompanies other characters, sometimes secondary, such as Hawryluk hiding Jews, Franek and his sister at a lesson given by a Soviet teacher, etc. The screenwriter and dramaturgical consultant Artur Wyrzykowski criticised such a relaxed plot and dramaturgical construction, explicitly calling *Hatred* a lecture and proposing his own idea for the storyline:

ish-Ukrainian conflict of memory (G. Motyka, *Cień Kłyma Sawura...*).

[29] See P. Witek, *Andrzej Wajda jako historyk: metodologiczne studium z historii wizualnej*, Lublin 2016, pp. 248–251.

Staging the Past

Maciej's counterpart would be a Ukrainian who, having married Zosia, becomes radicalised in his behaviour until he finally kills his wife.[30] This intriguing concept would probably have resulted in a more compact, emotional and probably deeper psychological character. The only question is whether it would have borne Smarzowski's intentions and ambitions as a "historian" and "ethicist" at the same time; whether it would have conveyed the entire variety of historical and axiological nuances.[31] But leaving aside Wyrzykowski's critical assessment, this "lecturing" trope is legitimate, only that instead of the word "lecture" (which is associated pejoratively), let us use the word "discourse".

Discourse is, as we know, one of the functions of fictional cinema – the storyline is a pretext for intellectual deliberation.[32] Obviously, *Hatred* does not have much in common with such radical examples of cinematic discourse as Eisenstein's *October* or Zanussi's *The Illumination*, but thinking in terms of using a storyline to illustrate argument – in this case: historical – is intensely noticeable. As I mentioned, the complexity of the world presented can be treated as a virtue. But at the same time, this, in a way ostentatious, representativeness can feel somewhat artificial, imposed on the world being presented and not absorbed by the diegesis.[33] There is a lot of informative and illustrative dialogue in the film to express the aforementioned complexity of the ethnic situation in the area before the war. Similarly, the entire sequence of Maciej Skiba's peregrination in September 1939, when he returns home, is primarily a form of recounting the behaviour of Ukrainians at the outbreak of war. In such a situation, Skiba acts as a guide through the world of the historical representation of Borderlands AD 1939 (so there is also the cruelty of the Ukrainians, there is the stealing of the property of Polish landlords, there is the "burial of Poland" – but there is also the first Righteous, i.e. the coachman, thanks to whom Skiba manages to escape).

Leitmotifs are also an element of discursivisation: while watching the scene of the bride's braid being cut on the doorstep, the viewer could expect the situation to be repeated; similarly with the throwing of the burning hay sheaf. In the sermon sequence, on the other hand, the principle of structural symmetry resounds, as an attempt to create an ideologically balanced commentary. The whole montage sequence

[30] See <https://nieskonczone.pl/wolyn> (accessed: 28.12.2022).

[31] "I knew that this was the first film about these events", Wojciech Smarzowski said during the meeting in Rzeszów. "If it wasn't for that, I might not have left the three houses – Polish, Ukrainian and Jewish – at all. But I decided to digress so that this film would also have an educational value." – A. Bosak, op. cit.

[32] "A film with the markings of «classical storytelling» is classified precisely as «discursive», when the viewer gains the impression not so much of an

involuntary «emergence» of some expressive moral or idea from the plot events (as generally happens in traditional Hollywood film), but of a programmatic «pursuit», or «illustration» of a certain thesis" – T. Klys, *Film fikcji i jego dominanty*, Warszawa 1999, p. 131.

[33] When I first was watching the film, I couldn't shake the obtrusively recurring thought of how hard the author tries to balance everything, to confront rationales, to create juxtapositions, sometimes symmetrical ones.

is precisely planned by Smarzowski, jumping between the “good” and “bad” sermon, and weaving in rhythmically Anthony’s escape in the grain and the oath of the Banderites. I have mentioned that Smarzowski has not produced a model film discourse – that is clear. But just watching the sequence in question, I had the feeling of being confronted with montage solutions characteristic of the Soviet montage school, for example, in Pudovkin’s filmmaking; but there is also in this fragment a clear departure from diegesis in the spirit of Eisenstein, when the sermon of two priests is listened to by the same people (in a frame identical in content and composition!). This is actually a very rhetorical solution.

As I have already suggested, in the film’s finale, the genre formula clearly changes – from the moment terror directly affects Zosia’s world. Andrzej Szpulak pointed this out some time ago, noting the parallels between *Hatred* and Elem Klimov’s film *Come and See*; in both cases it is an anti-war film with a clear apocalyptic climax. Szpulak pointed to such features of the film as the threat to the everyday lives of civilians, ordinary victims of war; the evolution of the protagonist from a hero to an anti-hero, physically changed but above all spiritually dead in the finale; [34] and the subjectivity of the narrative. This is why the Poznań film scholar wrote of a quasi-epic film spectacle – it was precisely this anti-heroic and subjective point of view on the tragic events that prompted him to use the prefix. While generally agreeing with these recognitions, I would suggest looking at the film’s plot construction in its chronological order – from this standpoint, a formula close to the poetics of classical historical drama (with elements of discourse) turns into an anti-war film – and a modernist one at the same time. It is in the final scene that the heroine fully “constitutes something of a focal point that centres the image of the cinematic cosmos, the medium through which the world is told.” [35]

The final act of the film breaks the conventions of realistic drama by turning into a modernist drama, challenging the materialist order of the world (even at its most cruel). It is not just that, with the slaughter, we are confronted with an “unbelievable” reality in which previous hierarchies of values go awry: lives are saved by the occupant (the escape of Zosia and her son under Nazi guardianship) and the righteous one is unjustly killed (Zosia’s sister and brother-in-law). It is about the ontic ambiguity of the world presented in the final parts when the boundaries of the rational and the irrational are blurred, a feature characteristic of some of Smarzowski’s films. The catastrophe that makes the world presented absurdly carnivalesque was already

[34] A. Szpulak, *Echa Idź i patrz Elema Klimowa w dwóch polskich filmach antywojennych – Mieście 44 Jana Komasy oraz Wołyniu Wojciecha Smarzowskiego*, „Images. The International Journal of European Film, Performing Arts and Audiovisual Communication” 2018, no. 23(32), pp. 219–230. “Their [the heroes’] confrontation with the element of war in each case proved externally (physical degradation) and inter-

nally destructive, disintegrating the established order of life, leading not to maturation but to personality regression, invalidating the sphere of the sacred and the sphere of ethics, reducing the actions undertaken to instinctive reflexes serving survival or, in the case of the male heroes, revenge.” – *ibidem*, p. 225.

[35] *Ibidem*, p. 226.

present in the climax of the first *The Wedding*, then *The Dark House*; in the finale of the latter, Dziabas's corpse ruthlessly enters the world of the seemingly real diegesis, questioning, or at least casting doubt on, its status. *Hatred* is no different.

There are two somewhat hidden and one ostentatiously overt ontological ambiguity. The latter, of course, is the film's finale, when the image of Zosia crossing the bridge with her son changes to that of a horse-drawn cart driven by Petro, with which Zosia and her son cross the river. But is what we are watching (in the presumably true version, i.e. Zosia crossing the bridge alone) really happening? And here we come to two hidden ambiguities – both are violent ellipses. The first takes place on the night of the massacre. It would seem that the woman and her son have managed to escape – the Banderite who has spotted them, after a moment's hesitation, averts his eyes from them. The heroine wades through the water with her son,^[36] emerges into a space full of fiery glows, turns abruptly, and sees the Ukrainian approaching with an axe. The shot lasts a while, but we are able to recognise Szuma, the opportunistic village leader, formerly as eager to embrace Soviet as Nazi rule. He approaches Zosia with a strange, disturbing smile. Then there is a cut and a sudden change of chronotope. We see the face of an awakened Zosia leaning against some farm building, and right next to it, the face of a dead man. What has happened? Has Szuma saved her (this could be a consequence of the Ukrainian's earlier conciliatory statement when they met on her doorstep)? But the sinister smile of the preceding scene generates doubt, as does Szuma's earlier opportunistic behaviour. And why does Zosia wake up immediately after the cut in a cadaverous frame (in terms of content, but also colour)? Also, what was going on at the time with her son, whom we do not see? Immediately afterwards, the woman stands with him in a wide shot in a land of cruel death, surrounded by bestially torn, mutilated and dehumanised bodies. Of course, this ellipsis can be bridged at a push (that's probably what the shot with the repentant Szuma was for, so that we assume he could have saved her), but a significant doubt remains. Reinforced by the equally unclear fate of Antoni, who survived the slaughter in the church, as if by *deus ex machina* – when the narrator leaves him, he has taken cover with some Poles in the tower of the temple that has just been set on fire, the smoke already getting into his throat... How he managed to escape from that tower we don't know. From this perspective, Smarzowski's words that it is up to the viewer to perceive the bridge crossing as a real journey to the other side of the river, or as Zosia's journey "across the Styx" sound less mysterious.^[37] Obviously, after Zosia's alleged "posthumous awakening", the earlier

[36] "The passage through the water (the Thanatic tinge of the symbolism of this element is used here) was associated with the acquisition of a certain self-consciousness of dying. Both Fiora, upon reaching the island, and Zosia, upon the annihilation of

her place on earth, viewed from the perspective of the overgrown swamp, have lost the remnants of normal perception of reality" – *ibidem*, p. 228.

[37] K.J. Zarębski, *Po to robię filmy – rozmowa z Wojtkiem Smarzowskim*, "Kino" 2017, no. 5, p. 39.

plot themes continue, but the impression that she is peregrinating in the land of death – not metaphorical but ontologically literal – does not disappear. And it is now associated strongly with the apocalypse, even if secularised.

Looking for analogies between *Come and See* and *Hatred*, Andrzej Szpulak also pointed to the scenes of the protagonists looking into the well. Zosia, wanting to draw water, notices a corpse submerged in it. Like many symbols, the symbol of the well is ambiguous, but two meanings (diametrically opposed, by the way) dominate: on the one hand, the water of life, on the other, death or hell.^[38] Characteristically, a moment later, Zosia covers her ears to protect herself from a terrifying sound; one could assume that this is a sign of crossing the boundaries of her inner strength. But then why does her son also cover his ears? If we reject the hypothesis of a staging error (in Smarzowski's case?), it turns out that the hellish sound is the diegetic sound of a terrifying world – an earthly hell.

When writing about the formal aspects of the picture, one cannot forget about the staging of the earthly inferno, especially the scenes of violence, for it is these that have a key influence on the final effect of the choices made by the director in the sphere of representation and interpretation of the past. Andrzej Szpulak – looking for analogies between Klimov's and Smarzowski's films, as anti-war films that by their very nature do not shy away from naturalism – wrote: "Many parallels and references can be found in the presentation of the visual macabre: raped women, wounded soldiers and civilians, people killed and dying in cruel agonies, dismembered, massacred bodies", adding the caveat that the very issue of violence in cinema is a very complex phenomenon.^[39] Nevertheless, this naturalism and/or cruelty can be graded. Comparing Klimov's film and Smarzowski's, it is impossible not to notice that the former's staging activity is relatively restrained and sparing, appealing more to the viewer's imagination than to sight (apart from one brief snapshot in which one can see the heaps of corpses behind the barn). Even the execution of the villagers in Klimov's film (they are burned alive in a barn) is shown in the "off-screen space". It is different in *Hatred* – the torture scenes are presented with all the brutality and openness. Admittedly, in the responses to the film, the observation "it could have been worse" came back like a mantra, but this was more due to Smarzowski's identification as a director with a predilection for cruelty. Of course, it was recognised that many of the images are shown in the distant background or for a split second. However, a few cruel ones are strongly memorable; the aforementioned field of dismembered, "minced" victims makes a harrowing impression (and in the earlier parts of the film, the so-called glove, i.e. the skinning

[38] R. Kuleszewicz, *Słownik symboli literackich*, Białystok 2000, pp. 237–238.

[39] A. Szpulak, op. cit., p. 228. The complexity of the issue of violence in cinema – both in its genetic

and functional aspects – was analysed by Rafał Syska in his book *Film i przemoc: sposoby obrazowania przemocy w kinie* (Kraków 2003).

of the hand and the tearing of the body with horses). I am leaving aside the question of whether or not there is too much of this macabre, as this depends on the viewer's sensitivity. Instead, I would like to ask what the arguments were in favour of such a solution and how the use of violence might have affected the aforementioned spheres of historical representation and the film's axiology?

Grzegorz Motyka, temperate in judgement and inclined to conciliation, stated: "The film will be brutal because it has to be so [...] There will be atrocious scenes in *Hatred*. And certainly, the director has a duty to show that brutal killings took place then."^[40] So one can say that the historian considered this an ethical requirement, a condition for the truthfulness of the reconstruction of these events. A credible representation of them could not, according to Motyka, be limited to outlining the socio-political background of the genocide, but should also take into account the "technology of killing". If this is what a scholar (and one whose views are distinctly distanced from the expectations of the Borderland Poles) said, then it is not surprising that Smarzowski upheld the "atrocious" disposition contained in the screenplay, all the more so given that none of his earlier films were devoid of the macabre and/or the ugly. And bearing in mind that, regardless of his artistic predilections, Smarzowski was influenced by reading Srokowski's book, which described atrocities that were difficult to imagine; as did the memoirs of Borderland people and their descendants or the accounts in the book by Ewa and Władysław Siemaszko.^[41] If the borderline experience of the Volhynians was the moment of an exceptionally cruel death, which shattered the whole sense of the world, made it carnivalesque in a negative sense, knocked it out of life's homeostasis and introduced a traumatizing component into the memory (individual and collective) for decades, it is probably difficult to imagine that, having assumed such a great obligation towards the witnesses of the past, Smarzowski could have completely avoided the presentation of cruelty.

It can probably be assumed that if the director had not shown this massacre, the aforementioned historical discourse would have come to the fore. In such a situation, it is highly likely that Polish viewers (and not only those from Borderland families) would have seen the lack of on-screen cruelty as a desire to conceptualise the events and conciliate Polish-Ukrainian relations too far, in which the commemorative (in part also psychotherapeutic) function of the picture would have been lost. Without the emotional shock, questions about Smarzowski's tendency to revise Polish martyrdom and the Polish ethos in the film (Poles as anti-Semites, Poles as colonisers who despise "stupid Ukrainians", Poles as the advocates of the romantic – ineffective – gesture, etc.)

[40] P. Śmiałowski, *Film będzie okrutny, bo taki być musi. Wywiad z Grzegorzem Motyką*, "Kino" 2015, no. 6, p. 37.

[41] W. Siemaszko, E. Siemaszko, *Ludobójstwo dokonane przez nacjonalistów ukraińskich na ludności polskiej Wołynia: 1939–1945*, vol. 1 and 2, Warszawa 2000.

would have probably returned to some viewers, especially those with conservative sensibilities. However, the presentation of the Volhynian massacre makes the viewer if not forget then at least accept this “harsh” truth, because what he expected has been bluntly shown. The viewer can also be sure that the filmmaker was not afraid of controversy and did not shy away from the horror on screen, which, on the one hand, did not facilitate reconciliation (which, after all, Smarzowski wanted), and on the other, made the director a *nolens volens* ally of conservative historical policy.[42]

Researchers of visual history (historiophoty) point out how much the audio-visual message expands the register of the creation and reception of representations of the past. The cinema has certain liabilities here (it cannot be as abstract and discursive as a written text), but it also has merits: the visualisation of the space and proxemic relations of historical events, but above all, the emotional reception of the past; something that in a written discourse, regardless of the literary talent of the historian – is not achievable.[43] Cinema radically shortens this intellectual distance between the object (history) and the subject (viewer) through emotions.

And it is in this context that the impact of the staged atrocity on the two earlier spheres, especially the film’s postulatory sphere, should be seen. As I mentioned, Smarzowski attempted to construct the screenplay based on as much information as possible complicating the historical realities of 1930s Volhynia, up to 1943. Except that there is a significant difference in the way they are conveyed – the Polish misdeeds are told in words, so *de facto* using the medium of traditional historiography (which, by the way, reinforces the aforementioned impression of discourse as being, for some, a lecture). On the other hand, the key elements of criminal behaviour are first informed in the words of witnesses (as the loop of the crime gets tighter and tighter), and then shown through emotionally harrowing scenes of atrocities: thus, we not only have information about the crime, but we take on an emotional attitude to it straight away. In such a context, Smarzowski’s next postulate – the reception of the film as a protest against extreme nationalism *in toto* – comes into question. The cruelty here has a clear historical author – it is the Ukrainians. And it is not balanced by a scene of bloody Polish retaliation – if only because of the proportion and sequence of events. However loud the director’s claims about his desire to create a universal statement may sound, when confronted with the emotional power of the macabre, Smarzowski’s postulates were destined

[42] This was reflected in the award given by the Chairman of TVP, Jacek Kurski, to the director, which the latter did not accept (and the subsequent dispute over the award) – E. Rutkowska, *Produkcenci „Wołynia” przyjęli od prezesa TVP nagrodę, której nie chciał reżyser* , Press, 5.10.2016, https://www.press.pl/tresc/45923,producenci-%E2%80%9D-przyjeli-od-prezesa-tvp-nagrode_-ktorej-nie-chcial-rezyser

wolynia%E2%80%9D-przyjeli-od-prezesa-tvp-nagrode_-ktorej-nie-chcial-rezyser (accessed: 14.12.2022).

[43] See H. White, *Historiografia i historiografia* , [in:] *Film i historia. Antologia* , ed. I. Kurz, Warszawa 2008, pp. 117–127.

to suffer defeat, in my opinion. And, as a result, the desire for reconciliation – regardless of the fictional efforts – was difficult to achieve. For Polish viewers, the scenes of the macabre either remind them of the experience of the massacre (the expectations of the Borderland Poles) and thus perpetuate the stereotype of the cruel butcher, or they arouse (in the case of viewers outside the “Volhynian family”) violent opposition to the murderers (the Ukrainians). Either way, emotion stands in the way of working through guilt and reconciliation. This has been recognised by Ukrainian commentators: “[Asymmetry] biases the senses: the persecution of the Ukrainians is mentioned in a few scenes, the shedding of Polish blood is shown on screen in a long, painful, naturalistic manner;”[44] “the issue that has been presented in an overly explicit manner is the one that will undoubtedly cause the most controversy in Ukraine, i.e. the issue of the UPA’s responsibility for the killings of Poles. They are shown very naturalistically. There is no «but» here. Poles are ripped to pieces, dismembered, axed and chopped.”[45]

Am I suggesting by this that a film about Volhynia should be devoid of atrocities or radically toned down? Not at all. I believe that from the Polish perspective – in the first film on the subject – this was unavoidable because it was not about the information on the crime itself (we know about it), but about the emotional, and for some probably also cathartic, experience of it. I am merely pointing out that thinking in universal and conciliatory categories when making a film that is, in the first part, a story with a relaxed construction (with a clear discursive intention for the full expression of the “voice of history”) and, in the final parts, an immersive anti-war and apocalyptic film with a high diapason of emotions generated, could hardly have been successful.

But it is precisely in this confrontation of a historical (distanced) discourse with an image of cruelty that negates this distance that, in my opinion, the logic of the Polish-Ukrainian dispute over events is contained. For we can talk about the sins of the Poles, however serious. But it is not possible to derive from them an argument justifying a cruel crime, to “talk down” the genocide.[46] For it goes beyond logic, and enters a macabre *punctum*, reaching the “heart of darkness” – the place where human cruelty ceases to be comprehensible...

Translation: Kamil Petryk

[44] According to the Ukrainian art critic Maia Harbuziuk, [as cited in:] Irina I. Patron, *Polski Wołyń na ekranie*, op. cit., p. 201.

[45] The opinion of Łukasz Adamski from the Centre for Polish-Russian Dialogue and Understanding, [as cited in:] *ibidem*, p. 207.

[46] The events were defined as genocide by the Resolution of the Polish Parliament of 29 July 2016 – text of the resolution, <https://isap.sejm.gov.pl/isap.nsf/download.xsp/WMP20160000726/O/M20160726.pdf> (accessed: 29.12.2022).

- Kornacki K., Kurpiewski P., *Kino jak nauczyciel. Klasyfikacja działań autorskich współczesnego polskiego kina historycznego (propozycje)*, [in:] *Historia wizualna w działaniu: studia i szkice z badań nad filmem historycznym*, eds. D. Skotarczak, J. Szczutkowska, P. Kurpiewski, Poznań 2020, pp. 59–90
- Motyka G., *Cień Kłyma Sawura: polsko-ukraiński konflikt pamięci*, Gdańsk 2013
- Motyka G., *Wołyń '43: ludobójcza czystka – fakty, analogie, polityka historyczna*, Kraków 2016
- Patron I., *Polski Wołyń na ekranie. Przegląd ukraińskich publikacji internetowych o filmie Wojciecha Smarzowskiego*, [in:] *Mistrz Wajda*, ed. S. Bobowski, Wrocław 2010, pp. 199–211
- Rychcik M., *Kręcone siekierą: 9 seansów Smarzowskiego*, Warszawa 2019
- Siemaszko E., *Święcenie narzędzi banderowskiej zbrodni*, „Biuletyn IPN” 2017, no. 1–2 (January–February), pp. 81–91
- Szpułak A., *Echa Idź i patrz Elema Klimowa w dwóch polskich filmach antywojennych – Mieście 44 Jana Komasy oraz Wołyniu Wojciecha Smarzowskiego*, „Images. The International Journal of European Film, Performing Arts and Audiovisual Communication” 2018, no. 23(32), pp. 219–230. <https://doi.org/10.14746/i.2018.32.18>
- Witek P., *Andrzej Wajda jako historyk: metodologiczne studium z historii wizualnej*, Lublin 2016