

Anger Doesn't Just Disappear into Thin Air

Weronika Szwebs talks to Monika Glosowicz

1.

The title of your book, *Maszynerie afektywne. Literackie strategie emancypacji w najnowszej polskiej poezji kobiet* [Trans. Affective machines: Literary strategies of emancipation in the newest Polish poetry of women] may herald a double discomfort for the reader. In mainstream society, emotions seem elusive, ephemeral. We have become accustomed to trusting rationality, argumentation and communication procedures... What is more, we experience emotions as something personal, intimate and thoroughly our own, and yet your book is an expression of the belief that they are part of certain supra-individual mechanisms, social machines and systemic rhetoric that govern us. Why is reclaiming the subject of emotionality such an important task?

First of all, it's because it's women who have been attributed some kind of abstract emotionality and who have been discredited in this way. This emotionality is evaluated negatively and serves as a mechanism or tool to take away social agency from us, that is, us as a community, or perhaps as a social group. We are talking about functioning at various levels: from the level that seems most private to us, although it is not, in actual fact, private, i.e. the family level, through the levels of micro-communities, up to the political level. Thinking of my book as more than just an analysis of texts, I'd like to be very careful in using certain concepts: affects and emotions are not only concepts, they are not only categories understood in a strictly analytical way, but are elements of social, collective and material life. When I try to reconstruct the reasons why it is affects or emotions that have become the main, most important categories for me, I can't actually find a specific reason, but now, after the publication of the book, surprisingly, I very often come across an argument assessing my causative abilities as a woman in social and political life. Emotionality comes up as a catchphrase to keep me quiet.

This is a very interesting topic because you shed light on, and refute such potential accusations in the introduction to your book. It would seem that in the academic environment, which is accustomed to new methodologies, such an approach should not arouse much resistance.

The problem I am talking about appeared not so much in academic life or in my field of research, but instead was something that confronted me in the political field in connection with my activity within the Rybnik Women's Council. These were situations that were difficult for me to dismantle, despite all the intellectual instruments I had developed. I wrote a lot of this book in 2011-2016, then worked on revising it until the beginning of 2018, and I think this was a time of building a some kind of barrier ahead of time, as I knew what reactions I might encounter. However, writing and working as a researcher locked away and dealing with an analysis of texts, is quite a lonely work. And then, after a few years, amid social tensions, everything that I – as it seemed to me – had already solved and worked through, begins to surface in front of my eyes.

We'll come back to the topic of your social activity in Rybnik, but first I'd like to talk about your book. What are the benefits of thinking about affects and emotions in the supra-individual, systemic dimension? How do you understand the basic category of machinery for your book?

Let's start with the affective machinery. In order to explain this category in the simplest terms, I always try to say that these are some kind of forces, phenomena, structures thanks to which we, as subjects-in-dividuals, function between various institutions of supervision and control, and power, or coercion and

resistance to these institutions. In the structure of the book, you can see that the machinery is not focused on individual affects, such as anger, which has been talked about a lot recently, or anxiety, which also appears in my work. Rather, affective machinery are structures powered by these affects. Specific affects are not isolated, they fuse with each other.

Why should we think about affects and emotions in the supra-individual dimension? Us women, and especially women researchers, can intercept these mechanisms, sharpen them, and redirect them the other way. A good example of that is the discourse on hysteria, which is so beautifully described by Joanna Mueller in her new book *Hista & her sister*. Popularising and explaining where this narrative comes from and how it works, and how it diminishes and discredits our skills, will eventually lead to its, at least, partial elimination. It is an opportunity for didactic work, which I value greatly, but which is often forgotten in discussions about the university. So we can push this revolution – maybe it's too big a word, but whatever – further. I think that realising how such mechanisms work is the moment when revolutionary thinking is triggered. We begin to consider other possibilities of structuring the world and organising space. This is also where the power of literature manifests itself. After the last few years, I no longer think of literature as having ad hoc fighting and reality-changing properties, as something that has a huge and immediate range of impact, but rather as something that organises the collective imagination, that has a thin, but long fuse.

To illustrate the benefits of thinking in these terms, I'd like to refer to the affective work to which I have devoted one of the chapters. It was a breakthrough chapter for me and I took a long time to get where I wanted to go. It opened up a lot of perspectives for me, and I think this is the most important point that I reached in this book, even though it is not the last chapter. In this context, the concept of emancipation also appears as a problem that I am constantly working on. The point is not only to change the definition of this concept, but to change the conditions of emancipation itself. Just a few hours ago I read a mocking comment somewhere on Facebook saying that if someone now had quintuplets, they would be able to afford a helicopter thanks the Polish New Deal (Polski Nowy Ład). If we do not see motherhood in the broader perspective of work (not just a reproductive role), then the concept of equality will fall upon deaf ears. We should also remember that gender and femininity should also be clarified, because they automatically open up discussions about class structures. So, if we are talking about emancipation, whose emancipation are we talking about, on whose behalf are we talking?

I have a feeling that in the discussion about motherhood in my book, I stopped at a certain point. There are many moments in which the very institution of the family is criticised. These were discoveries and important theses for me, but I think that this should be taken further, because the mere criticism of the institution of the family is not enough. As a kind of environment,

we actually find ourselves facing some kind of backlash, because it seems that we are starting to define emancipation again as the possibility of women's paid work, and yet it's easy to realise that non-affective, out-of-home work alone will not set us free. This is the moment when you need to reorganise structures and look for other possibilities to organise these worlds.

Do you think that the pandemic, paradoxically, despite the fact that it has obviously hindered certain forms of functioning, has given people a chance to notice this problem and go beyond it, or has it rather served as a situation that has cemented traditional roles?

At the beginning of the pandemic, it seemed to me that the situation opened a new discussion about the division of labour, about the division of caring work, about gender inequality – a discussion which revalued the domestic work of women in a way. It must be remembered that women perform 76% of all care work in the world, and this includes both paid and unpaid work (and the majority is the latter, which is obvious). However, I think that at this stage of the pandemic we are dealing with the cementation of an unequal division of labour. The main reason for this fact seems to be the shift of professional work to the home setting, probably not just for the duration of the pandemic, but for good. The *Home office* is not a temporary solution, many companies have optimised the operation of their structures and closed their offices,

so mothers stayed with both their housework and professional work in the same space. This theoretically – there are still many such opinions among my friends – allows them to save time, i.e. they have more time, because they do not have to commute to work, but I am not overly optimistic. I think that we will all be worse off because of managing the costs that were previously taken care of by the employer, allowing for the blurring of the boundaries between working time and free time and allowing us to be pushed even more in the name of the most important competence of our time, which is “flexibility”.

This is a thread that you write about especially in relation to Kira Pietrek, that is, the convergence of traditional interests of patriarchy and capitalist interests...

Yes. I think that we are dealing here with classic fem-washing, i.e. the “borrowing” of emancipatory narratives by the mechanisms of late capitalism and making them sales and advertising narratives. This is only supposed to increase the profits of the subject that uses the postulates that theoretically would come from the women who are part of the group.

You write that your analyses make up the history of the affective transformations of female subjects, and you consistently shed light on these aspects through reference to, and commenting on the poetry of Joanna Lech, Marta Podgórnik, Justyna

Bargielska, Kira Pietrek, Kamila Janiak, Wioletta Grzegorzewska and others. You write about the machinery of disease, trauma and shame, love, affective work and migration that inform their creativity... In the introduction to the book, you point out that reprogramming the machinery is possible, and at the same time most of the poets whose works you discuss expose and criticise the currently functioning mechanisms rather than present their own, new projects. Ilona Witkowska in your last chapter on alternative affective communities is an exception here. I'm wondering if you organised the book this way because you are more interested in the critical potential, or is this how you diagnose the condition of recent Polish women's poetry?

It is difficult to separate one from the other. I can see very clearly that if I was writing this book now, I would have done it differently. Firstly, the chapter on Witkowska would not have been the apogee and the only chapter that opened up new perspectives. I also think I would have put more focus on the critical parts. I feel like I stopped at the findings regarding the criticism of certain social mechanisms and then didn't go any further... I now know that if I'd included Joanna Mueller's work and approached the criticism of the family as a social institution in a slightly different way, I would have found a platform for reflection, for charting new paths or new models of community. The family as a community does not have to be a purely oppressive

or suppressive structure or institution. Such a change of perspective is connected with the reorganisation of my thinking, with my experiences, with – as it is said now in young literary criticism – “identity”, which I do not reject, because starting a family opened and broadened my perspective, rather than narrowed it down. The critical part was by far the most important to me, which is why it is the most extensive. And at the same time, in my opinion, these poets really stood out in the world of women poets. It is important to remember that when I started writing the book, they were not necessarily the most recognised poets. It was a completely different situation than it is right now. And I’m not just saying more debuts have been made and new narratives and new voices have emerged. The map is dynamic and looks very different to the way it did in 2016. I think at the moment I’m also much more sensitive to the market mechanisms that are starting to arrange even this little world of poetry. Had I had to write this book again, then I would have looked at the margins of the publishing market with a much clearer eye, because I have the impression that we are now dealing with forces that are trying to silence or promote certain stories. If I were to explore this space now, I would try to work out some resistance techniques and look for what is on the margins, in the nooks and crannies. Perhaps there would also be voices that would have written this whole story about the affective machinery differently.

I think that your earlier point of view has many advantages, because focusing on negative and critical aspects allows you to work through them... This is the great strength of this book. And if you were to add new threads now that would show positive community projects, besides searching in the margins and besides Joanna Mueller, would you be inclined to point out the names that would help you do this? I think Joanna Mueller is the greatest absentee. I would definitely like to add more debutants and I think that Anna Adamowicz would appear there alongside Ilona Witkowska in the chapter on affective communities. Nina Manel is definitely interesting. Or maybe Katarzyna Szweda's *Bosorka*, which was nominated this year for the Stanisław Barańczak Award?

Or Antonina Tosiek with her baggage and series of peasants' diaries? It occurred to me now that this is an interesting topic, especially as I am trying to somehow fight with my Silesian identity and work through it, however it may be defined. So ethnic or micro-community issues, concerning smaller languages, but at the same time clearly defining class statuses, would be something interesting.

2.

Both your book and the poetry you write about show that they are close to life, and at the same time, the

instruments you use are perfect for analysing social phenomena. I would like us to now try to use those tools to look at the instance of the strongest eruption of affects in recent times, namely the Women's Strike and the debate over reproductive rights. On the one hand, we can think of anger as the fundamental affect that led to mass protests and as an opportunity for change in social discourse, and on the other hand, we can talk of shame as an affect that, as you write, has enormous potential to block and thwart changes.

I think that it's necessary to add fear to that list, which was probably a primary affect and which led to an eruption of anger. This fear did not lead to alienation or isolation, nor to a sense of total inertia. Instead, the sense of danger provoked an outburst of anger, and thus a kind of community was consolidated that was not embarrassed by the fact that they were so diverse. On the one hand, diversity was the strength of this movement, and on the other hand, the greatest weakness of this hastily consolidated community. It was because at the moment when some form of leadership was emerging, it turned out that there was basically no solid foundation that shaped this community and subsequently a tension appeared surrounding the connective tissue which was supposed to be shared by the community and its female representatives, and sometimes also its male representatives. Therefore, it's one of the most important social events of the last year, and at the same time one of the greatest failures of the community.

Hopefully this experience will pay off in the future... One of the problems hindering the establishment of a strong community was the attitude towards the permissibility of abortion without embryopathological grounds. A strong dividing line emerged between those who feel attached to the Catholic Church and those for whom it offers no point of reference. I know you have a text on feminist Marian revindications, and I wonder if you think there is possibly space to bring back Catholicism and Catholic women into feminism. I also remember that in the chapter of your book devoted to Justyna Bargielska you debated with Anna Kałuża, who was critical of the poet's conservatism...

The Catholic Church itself, as an institution of hierarchs, does not interest me. I function outside of it and I would not think about having any alliances with it. This was not always the case, as I completed all the stages of the Catholic "preparation" for the faith, including receiving communion during the first Friday of the month for nine months, which was supposed to guarantee my salvation. Recently the parish priests from Rybnik read the appeal of the Rybnik Women's Council, in which we asked the townspeople to pay more attention to what materials are being used for heating homes. They agreed to read it at the explicit request of the city's mayor.

However, when it comes to religious women, Catholics... I believe that faith itself can be a huge driving force and

life force that must be appreciated. So I would never cut myself off from believers by saying that it's impossible to argue with them and that they cannot join the group of emancipated women. On the contrary, certain alliances should be forged in this field, without trying to impose each other's points of view on the other. We return to the starting point again, to the question of what emancipation is and what conditions would have to be met in order to talk about emancipation. We – I'm already establishing some form of community here – could quickly build a community of women researchers, but we have no right to impose certain conditions and others on the part of the community referred to as women. There should be negotiations that would make it possible to reciprocally feed this emancipatory force. That is why, when reading Bargiel's poetry, I did not want to straightforwardly accept the criticism that it is conservative poetry, and so it should be criticised from the "feminist point of view" (whatever this entails). Who determines what is conservative and what is progressive? What does "progressive" even mean? I think that dialogue should be undertaken, but the mere reform of Catholic discourse doesn't seem to be a possible action within my world. Of course, the question arises whether we are able to move en masse anywhere without undermining and reforming the foundations of the Polish Catholic Church. We are still rather a niche community and we must remember that even if we manage to carry out some micro-revolutions, there are much more powerful forces outside our bubble.

Let's go back to the Women's Strike. The conservative PiS government tried to embarrass the protesters by referring to strong, exaggerated images. For example, "Julki" appeared, that is, young, screaming women with superficial leftist views who do not understand what they are protesting against. The image of motherhood as unconditional devotion and idealised sacrifice was also used to shame and discipline. I wonder if the very interesting category of the "sticky object" by Sarah Ahmed you use in your book could help in describing this struggle for language and the collective image of motherhood.

I am constantly working on the use of the maternal imaginary not only by conservative parties who construct the figure of a childless woman as evil, but also by widely understood leftist circles. We have been dealing with a strange movement for some time, which is of course related to class tensions, and it is even difficult to reduce those tensions to antagonism between the middle and lower classes, because these concepts are probably too broad and too absorbent, but it could be roughly described in this way. In any case, I'm thinking of all sorts of declarations that can be brought together with the single neat slogan "anti-natalism". It's a view – some say a philosophical standpoint – that it's immoral to bring children into the world. There is a book by Mikołaj Starzyński on this topic, and *Krytyka Polityczna* have published several articles on the matter, too. This leads us in a straight line to the image of

a bad woman with many children on the other side of this maternal horizon. It seems to me that when there is a climatic and ecological context in these discussions, we are dealing with a complete misunderstanding. The arguments seem, of course, rational – there are too many of us, we generate a carbon footprint and so on, but to say that the solution to this problem is childlessness by choice that will save the world is absurd.

So the same mechanism works both on the right and on the left. Motherhood is instrumentalised through the same mechanisms, only the reference points are different: the divine order vs. the climatic order. As a result, we are simply dealing with an even stronger devaluation of care work. This is all the more reason we should speak out loudly and everywhere about the invisible work of women.

It seems that you also had an opportunity to observe how the machines of anger and shame work in practice, when you were fighting for clean air in Rybnik as a member of the Rybnik Women’s Council...

Yes. This is very interesting, because we are dealing here with a similar triad and mechanism as in the case of the Women’s Strike. There is fear, shame and anger. The elements of this triad drive, try to annihilate, silence and fight one another. Fear for one’s own health, but most of all for the health of one’s children, is the source of the anger of this group, which fights

for some kind of social change. On the other hand, we have another group that does not want to accept the need for social change so quickly and is working out its techniques of resistance. And it is also built on fear, fear for the future of the region, family, job, and stability of employment. This fear also gives rise to anger. So we have two sides: the fear and anger of the group that wants to force social change as quickly as possible, and the fear and anger of the group that resists this change. And between these groups there are mechanisms of higher levels of government, which, on the one hand, embarrass those who want social change, claiming that hysterical women demand it too quickly, are too emotional, do not understand the mechanisms of the state, local government, regional offices or parliament. On the other hand, they embarrass the latter group, presenting them as uneducated, conservative, backward miners who love coal and love burning it. In this complex situation, the affective forces operating in the social space drive and fight each other. These are not individual experiences, but supra-individual forces which, in some way, drive the actions of social groups.

In Rybnik, a city campaign entitled “Gańba” was carried out, which in Silesian means “shame”. This campaign just a week ago won an important award. In my opinion, however, it is a scandalous gesture of inducing shame that is to be internalised, lead to individual change and ultimately bring about social change. I think this kind of campaign and social change should not be carried out

from this perspective. What is also important is the fact that the Rybnik Women's Council initially supposed to function for a four-year term, but it rolled up its activities after just two years. The culmination of this activity was the international Stop Smog conference, which we organised with researchers from Belgian universities and French journalists. Of course, our authorities attended the conference and suggested that we, women, should bear this social change, progress, on our shoulders. This means that we are to be the avant-garde, to open and pave the way, to deal with "opponents" on this front (who are not our opponents at all), we have to shoulder all the sorrow and fear, and accept the aggression that is quite a natural defense mechanism, and they will then make changes. And here we come back to the supra-individual and systemic issues – the problem should be solved in a completely different way. First, systemic solutions should appear, conditions and tools have to be created, institutional aid should be provided... And women should be involved as equal actors in contributing to this change on the same principles as everyone else. Instead, we have been tricked and used as cannon fodder and, moreover, officially assigned to do what is called emotional work. We were supposed to face people's emotions and deal with them, but of course not to show them ourselves! And then the real players were supposed to come in, who would collect – and are already starting to collect – the rewards for this success, and who would go down in history as those who carried out the transformation. I do not want to say that it was a traumatic experience

for me, because it was rather a process in which I both found myself somehow and I did not find myself, but it was certainly a kind of formative experience that helped me learn a lot. The training which I received in the research and academic world, which I prepared for myself, which was my weapon, did not protect me against these types of mechanisms, and inside them I had to create some resistance techniques and prepare my own weapon on an on-going basis. I think it is very important to remember that these kinds of problems do not just occur on a personal level, and there is a need for micro-communities to bear this burden, which makes it easier to disarm the mechanisms of power and micro-violence.

3.

What is the University for you and what do you think it should be? Do you feel like a researcher, critic, teacher, activist?

All my scholarships, adventures and academic experiences have shaped my life in some way, that is, they allowed me to shape my life differently than it would have been without all these possibilities. I try to organise this identity and my being an employee on three levels: research, didactic (because I like teaching a lot and I really appreciate the opportunity to it) and activist or popularisation. And I am not talking about it in the context of late capitalism or marketing 2.0, but about popularising certain critical workshops or mod-

els and schools. These are these three interpenetrating components and functions, and I think they all give a sense of accomplishment and must intertwine with one another if we do not want to be appropriated by one of them and if we do not want to get bored.

How did I imagine the university, what was it supposed to be for me? I think these are two sides of the same coin again, two spaces, views from both sides. On the one hand, I still think of the university, meeting with students, as a space that is modelled, created, within which certain kinds of critical tools and common conclusions are developed. Everything happens between the teacher and the participating group, and each time from scratch, because you can teach the same subject for a few years, even using the same material, but you discover completely different aspects and read the same texts and books differently. I myself am not so much as educated, as I am shaped, thanks to these meetings. I think it is very important to ensure that this field is divided equally. It is really challenging for me to divide this common field of participation in classes so as to give everyone a voice and respect their different social competences. Not everyone wants to participate by voicing their opinions, but they can participate in other ways. It's extremely difficult and 30 hours is very little time to develop a working model for such a tiny community, but I think it has been quite successful so far and I have very fond memories of these joint projects. So, the university as a space should be – I do not want it to sound

like a cliché – open, cooperative, fair, thanks to the joint effort of all the entities that operate within it. In terms of distance education, I suppose it is incredibly difficult and basically almost impossible. On the other hand, the university that is subjected to various pressures, that is transforming, corporatising, changing in this modern world, is something that is worrying for me.

You mentioned that you had a lot of experience from abroad – post-graduate studies in Utrecht and Granada, and then a doctorate that you worked on in Katowice and Oviedo. In addition to methodological inspirations and contacts, did the trips provide you with a different perspective on Polish social life and Polish universities? It's possible that such experiences allow us to get used to the western academic model.

The trips simply saved my life. The history of my trips is actually the history of my escapes, the return from each of which coincided with attending a funeral. Therefore these were experiences that shaped me very much. I am saying this only because in many interviews and reviews the researcher who has a lot of foreign trips under their belt is presented as someone who fits perfectly into the grant logic and meets the requirements of University 2.0, and I would write this story in a completely different way. It was my way of saving myself. In addition, these were not trips that enabled me to have a fantastic, prosperous life, because I had to work in a logistics centre in Maarsse near Utrecht to support myself. It was there that

I saw a picture of the optimisation of human machines in a very modernised, aesthetically “beautiful” form. After all, we all got company backpacks with a thermal insert, with the name of our company embroidered on it.

For some time I lived in a squat in Wimbledon, I had fun at a party organised on the eve of the eviction of a family tenement house in Granada, which was going to be taken by the bailiffs the next day, I took part in lots of demonstrations, especially in Spain. There is still, albeit to a much lesser extent, the cult of machism, so what consolidates the communities that take to the streets is often opposition to violence against women. What did it get me? It made me feel that the university is not at all at the vanguard of change, but instead is either trying to catch up with reality or participates in it. It is not even a laboratory in which certain processes are artificially recreated, but a space in which one tries to understand what is happening outside its walls. In any case, I felt that it was not an institution as isolated from the social space as I thought it was – or had been – in Poland. It allowed me to better understand my own Silesian narrative, appreciate this Silesianness, try to problematise it or tell it, so these are probably the most important non-research positives.

Returning to adopting patterns from the West... I don't think it's that simple, because we can observe a completely different model of university functioning in the Netherlands and a completely different one in Spain. I don't think this is due to my romanticisation of Spanish

universities, having spent a year or more in the North and a year in the South I had a good look at it. This state of affairs is related to, and probably results from, political and social history. The Netherlands, on the other hand, is at the opposite of the spectrum, where the university is just a large, well-functioning corporation. The student there is a customer who pays for their education, and of course the level of teaching and the demands placed on the students are high, all of this works very well, but these mechanisms were quite scary for me. And looking at the galloping changes in Poland, it I have to say that this is probably the way we're heading. In Spain, on the other hand, the university education system works a bit differently. The university is simply one of many social and educational institutions and it doesn't have such a huge air of elitism as it does in Poland. There is a feeling of familiarity, hospitality, openness and a strong immersion in the historical, social and political sphere.

The topic of Silesian identity has been mentioned in your answers several times. Would you like to say more about this aspect of the shaping and reworking of identity?

This Silesian identity is extremely difficult, and in so many respects, that it is still difficult for me to embrace it with a single analytical move. I try to tell stories myself and explain their course, take into account more and more conditions, not only gender and class, but include a broad background of historical, social and

economic changes. Paradoxically, they make it easier for me to find myself, even though this puzzle is really complex. I'm thinking of the processes that Stefania Orszulik from the district library called 'erasing one's own history', the reluctance to fit into a larger narrative. But how do we find, or locate ourselves in this larger story, if we still have a choice of black and white schemes: good Pole, bad German, hanys or gorol ['Local population' and 'newcomers' in Upper Silesia, respectively]? I am not even talking about the fact that there are no women in these stories at all, because when others are telling them, the women are still putting the children to sleep, and if they are not putting them to sleep, they are stoking the fire, and if this is done, they are still scrubbing the floor. They are repeatedly excluded from the symbolic sphere. Krystyna Kłosińska wrote about this peculiarity of Silesia in the relationship between the female and male genders not as a difference in quality, but as a difference in scale, compared to other literary variations. We could add to this the issue of the Silesian language, which is still considered vulgar, inferior, ugly, inadequate and is even not considered a language at all. So there comes a point where you discover that you have pushed everything that has shaped you deeply under universal patterns received in different schools... And then you say things should not be like this.

Literary awards are seen as an opportunity to attract potential readers to important literary and intellectual achievements. By awarding you the

Barańczak Prize, the jury of the Poznań Literary Award recommended your book to us. In some American universities, there is a practice of “as-signing” the entire academic community the same important reading, which may contribute to a wider debate. What book would you ask us to read?

I have to catch up on the whole Silesian series in the folk turn, so books by Dariusz Zalega and Michał Rauszer, which I instinctively recommend to everyone. However, as their background and a book that helps to understand the role that emotions play in social change, I recommend *Emotional communities in the early Middle Ages* by Barbara H. Rosenwein – an author of many publications on the social history of emotions. In this book, she explains many of the points we touched upon in a very accessible way. She explains how emotional communities are formed, how emotions are normalised and used for various purposes, and how education privileges some emotions and degrades others. It also points to the problem that I have just mentioned – the lack of materials that bear witness to “the life of the lower classes”. The function of emotions that initiate and “support” social change outlined in this way gives us hope that anger does not dissolve into thin air and that we can look into the future more boldly.

Translated from Polish by Aleksandra Sokalska-Bennett
Article first appeared in: “Czas Kultury” no. 3, 2021, pp. 106–116