
MONUMENTS OF HISTORY AND THE EXPERIENCE OF WORLD HERITAGE - REFLECTIONS ON THE EXAMPLE OF WOODEN SACRAL ARCHITECTURE

SIWEK Andrzej¹

¹ dr Andrzej Siwek, Institute of Art History at the Jagiellonian University
<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3255-8768>

ABSTRACT: The success and dynamic development of the World Heritage List shows the carrying capacity of the concept of identifying an elite group of goods important to the global community in terms of value. At the same time, the evolution of the list reveals threats of blurring of the message and compromising the value of entries after exceeding the critical quantitative mass. In the Polish context, one can see analogous processes and threats in relation to the group of the most valuable property - the Monuments of History. This raises questions about analogies and differences between the two sets of special assets and about the possibility of the Polish reception of the world's concepts of protection. An excellent reference group showing system inconsistencies are Polish monuments of wooden sacral architecture. It is on this example that the concept of "Serial monuments of history" is being discussed. The connection of this concept with the obligation to develop management plans as an expression of an active protective attitude may contribute to the optimization of the system of protection of the property of the highest value. At the same time, comparative analyses included in the management plan methodology may become a tool for rationalizing new recognitions of monument of history, determining the limits of the phenomenon's representation. Referring to a group of monuments, and not to a single, authoritatively appointed representative, is important both for the establishment of protection and education about heritage, as well as for the presentation of the cultural heritage of the country. There is no doubt that the collection of historical monuments and the subset of world heritage in the Polish system of monument protection should stand out as the most valuable assets, both in terms of prestige and due to the effectiveness and standards of protection specified in the management plans.

KEY WORDS: Monument of History, UNESCO World Heritage List, Heritage Management, Preservation of Cultural Property, Wooden Sacral Architecture

Introduction - national and international experience

The place and form of the Monuments of History in the Polish system of protection of historical monuments, or more broadly in the system of state policy of protection of cultural heritage, is one of the current topics of the doctrinal and programmatic discussion. The discussion on the system of protection of monuments in Poland is dominated by polonocentrism. We eagerly refer

to the unique character of our heritage, the separate legal and material situation, different social conditions in relation to other European countries with well-established traditions in the field of historical monuments protection¹. Frequently, in order to prove this claim, Great Britain or Scandinavian countries are used as reference points². However, the existence of many factual, local differences does not change the fact that the basic mechanisms for selecting, evaluating and establishing the protection of monuments originate from common doctrinal sources, paradigms that have been developed for a long time in the pan-European discussion and conservation practice³. International protection of historical monuments continues to improve the opportunities for exchange of conservation views, inspiration from good practices, or cooperation in the creation of doctrinal documents⁴. The World Heritage Movement, initiated in 1972 with the adoption of the UNESCO Convention on the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage⁵, plays a special role in the global forum. The World Heritage List, which is created within the framework of the UNESCO mission, in accordance with the letter and spirit of the Convention, is a collection of the most valuable cultural and natural assets contributing to the image of the development of human civilization. It is also an axis around which discussions and experiences in the field of improving the principles and tools for the protection of world heritage are focused. In the general perception, it is primarily a determinant of an elite group of cultural assets, a guarantee of their attractiveness, and, at the same time, a commitment to protection⁶. It is easy to associate the concept of awarding the most valuable cultural assets on a global scale – the List, and on a national scale - Monuments of History. Although we are able to demonstrate a separate tradition of establishing and understanding them for our historical monuments⁷, the common areas will remain vast. Therefore, it is worth considering analogies and possibilities of reception of international experience in shaping the list of monuments that

¹ Zachwatowicz J., *O polskiej szkoły odbudowy i konserwacji zabytków*, *Ochrona Zabytków*, 1981, 34/1-2 (132133), pp. 4-10; Rymaszewski B., *Klucze ochrony zabytków w Polsce*, Warszawa 1992, pp. 5-9.

² Żuchowska B., *Partycypacja społeczeństwa w rewaloryzacji i ochronie zabytków – niektóre doświadczenia brytyjskie*, *Ochrona Zabytków*, 1983, 36/3-4 (142-143), p. 185-18; Purchla J., *Wielowymiarowa lekcja Norwegii. Polska perspektywa na rezultaty projektu Zarządzanie miejscami wpisanymi na Listę Światowego Dziedzictwa UNESCO w Polsce i w Norwegii* [in:] *Zarządzanie miejscami wpisanymi na Listę Światowego Dziedzictwa UNESCO w Polsce i w Norwegii*, Kraków 2011, s. 401 – 409; Skaldawski B., Chabiera A., Lisiecki A., *System ochrony zabytków w wybranych krajach europejskich*, *Kurier Konserwatorski* No.11, 2011 r., pp. 5 - 9.

³ Krawczyk J., *Teoria Aloisa Riegla i jej polska recepcja a problemy konserwatorstwa współczesnego* [in:] *Współczesne problemy teorii konserwatorskiej w Polsce*, ed. B. Szymgin, Warszawa–Lublin 2008, pp. 63–74; Gaczol A., *Wpływy włoskich doświadczeń w ochronie dziedzictwa kulturowego na powstanie i kształt praktyki konserwatorskiej w Polsce*, [in:] „*Pod niebem północy*”. *Z dziejów polsko-włoskich związków artystycznych*, ed. P. Kondraciuk, Zamość 2010: <http://muzeum-zamojskie.pl/wp-content/uploads/2011/03/11>; Szymgin B., *Kształtowanie koncepcji zabytku i doktryny konserwatorskiej w Polsce w XX wieku*, Lublin 2000, pp. 204 – 237.

⁴ Szymgin B., *Teksty doktrynalne w ochronie dziedzictwa – analiza formalna i propozycje* [in:] *Współczesne problemy teorii konserwatorskiej w Polsce*, Warszawa – Lublin, 2008, pp. 145 – 154.

⁵ Zalasńska K., ed., *Konwencje UNESCO w dziedzinie kultury. Komentarz*, Warszawa 2014, pp. 236 – 311.

⁶ Szymgin B., *Światowe dziedzictwo kultury UNESCO – charakterystyka, metodologia, zarządzanie*, Warszawa – Lublin 2016.

⁷ *100 Pomników Historii*, ed. E. Jagielska, Warszawa 2018, p. 9.

stand out on the scale of the national resources.

Monument of History - statutory framework

The Act on the Protection and Care of Historical Monuments defines a monument of history as one of the forms of protection of historical monuments. The Act concisely defines the place of monuments of history in the Polish system of monument protection and the procedures for their establishment⁸. Importantly, the statutory provision stipulates that only immovable monuments already covered by other forms of protection (register of monuments or cultural park) "*of special value for culture*"⁹ may become monuments of history. The Act does not give indications on how to evaluate this special value. Hence, there have been attempts to supplement the statutory formulations with instructions and criteria adopted at various levels of the evaluation of applications. It may be added that in the sphere of practice, the first criteria and auxiliary evaluation procedures for applications for the establishment of a monument of history were modelled on world heritage documents. Although it did not refer directly to the notion of outstanding universal value (OUV), the concept of criteria that should be met in order for a monument to be considered particularly valuable was adopted. This document, adopted and formally confirmed by the Council for the Preservation of Monuments on 6 October 2005¹⁰, was developed at the National Centre for Monuments Research and Documentation on the initiative of Jacek Rulewicz, by a team headed by Roman Marcinek¹¹. Currently, the statutory provision also defines the relationship between the establishment of a historical monument and the possibility of applying for inclusion in the World Heritage List. However, the phrase "*the minister in charge /.../ may present*"¹² is so open that, first of all, it does not automatically link recognition as a Historical Monument to a candidate for inclusion on the World Heritage List. Secondly, it also does not mean that the competent minister may "only" propose candidates from the list of Monuments of History for inclusion in the World Heritage List. This lack of an obligatory link between the two collections of historical monuments is confirmed by the nomination practice, in which we find objects that are not Monuments of History, included on the World Heritage List, such as wooden Orthodox churches or Auschwitz-Birkenau German Nazi concentration and extermination camp, or property only a small part of which is a monument of history, while the entry on the List covers a much larger area (such as Tarnowskie Góry or Krzemionki

⁸ Article 15 of the Act of 23 July 2003 on the protection and care of monuments, in JL of 2018, item 2067, 2245, of 2019, item 730.

⁹ Article 15 of the Act of 23 July 2003 on the protection and care of monuments, ... and Siwek A., *Representative or unique – dilemmas in protecting architecture of the 2nd half of the 20th century [Reprezentatywne czy wyjątkowe – dylematy ochrony dziedzictwa 2. połowy XX wieku]*, *Wiadomości Konserwatorskie = Journal of Heritage Conservation*, 49 (2017), pp. 125 – 133.

¹⁰ Zalaśńska K., Zeidler K., *Wykład prawa ochrony zabytków*, Warszawa 2015, p. 101.

¹¹ Archive of NIH in Cracow, Working materials of R. Marciniak.

¹² Article 15.4 of the Act of 23 July 2003 on the protection and care of monuments...

Opatowskie)¹³. Therefore, the aforementioned Article 15(4) of the Act on the Protection and Care of Historical Monuments actually serves to emphasize the importance of Historical Monuments, by indicating the perspective of further "advancement" in the hierarchy of monuments, and at the same time does not have any significance in the practice of activities in the sphere of World Heritage. Nevertheless, the analysis of the evolution of the Polish legal system for the protection of historical monuments leads to the conclusion that in recent decades the axis of the change is the pursuit of creating a hierarchy of forms of protection – ranging from the record of historical monuments, through the register, to monuments of history and world heritage, which appears to be the superior, resulting from treaty obligations, form of protection under the supervision of the international community¹⁴. On the other hand, the relations between the Monument of History and World Heritage both in the provisions of the Act and in the selection procedure are inconsistent and ambiguous.

A reference group – wooden sacral architecture

An excellent reference group showing systemic inconsistencies are Polish monuments of wooden sacral architecture. They are represented on the World Heritage List and they are listed among the Monuments of History. However, to a large extent they are separate collections. Churches and Orthodox churches representing in the world the phenomenon of sacred wooden buildings in Poland are not endowed with the title of Monument of History. In the case of six wooden churches of southern Małopolska region entered on the World Heritage List in 2003, none of them has been awarded the title of a Monument of History¹⁵, although the aspirations of the hosts of churches in Haczów and Lipnica Murowana in this respect are currently being signaled. In the case of eight Polish wooden churches constituting the entry of wooden churches of the Carpathian region in Poland and Ukraine, none of them had been recognized as a Monument of History in 2013, at the time of the entry into the World Heritage List¹⁶. Recently, in 2018, an Orthodox church from Radruż was awarded the title of Monument of History¹⁷. In the case of Protestant churches of peace with a wooden beam structure, at the time of entry into the World Heritage List, in 2001, also none of them had been considered a Monument of History. However, since 2017 both the church in Jawor and in Świdnica have been proud bearers of the title of

¹³ Cf.: Tarnowskie Góry - <https://whc.unesco.org/en/list/1539/documents/>; Krzemionki Opatowskie - <https://whc.unesco.org/en/list/1599/documents/>; Pomniki historii: https://nid.pl/pl/Informacje_ogolne/Zabytki_w_Polsce/Pomniki_historii/.

¹⁴ Złasińska K., Zeidler K., *Wykład...*, pp. 63 – 110.

¹⁵ Kornecki M., ed., *Kościół drewniany południowej Małopolski – Materiały do dokumentacji wpisu na Listę Światowego Dziedzictwa UNESCO*, Teki Krakowskie, vol. 12; 2000, pp. 3 – 94.

¹⁶ Cf.: <https://whc.unesco.org/en/list/1424/documents/>.

¹⁷ Regulation of the President of the Republic of Poland of 22 November 2017 on the recognition of the "Radruż - Orthodox Church Complex" as a historical monument, JL of 6 December 2017, item 2253.

the Monument of History awarded by the President of the Republic of Poland¹⁸. At that time, other churches in the category of wooden sacral architecture obtained the title of Monument of History. It is enough to mention wooden churches from Szalowa (2017), Klempsko (2017), or Olesno (2018)¹⁹, or advanced efforts with regard to the church in Orawka²⁰. If we add to this the signals about (justified in the author's opinion) aspirations of the hosts of churches in Hańczowa, Grywałd, Lachowice or Tomaszów Lubelski, the entire complexity of the problem becomes apparent. At the same time, it is worth noting that in the case of both the entry in the World Heritage List of churches and wooden churches, it was emphasized that it is a representation of a wider phenomenon, and the "serial" entry was supposed to ensure the representativeness of a sample illustrating an important phenomenon in the history of civilization²¹. On the other hand, the recognition as a Monument to History is individual in character, although theoretically the possibility of creating a group - a "series" of objects of the same category - was envisaged²². The specificity and richness of the Polish heritage of wooden sacral architecture leads to the verification of the criteria for the selection of Monuments of History, as well as the reflection on the uniqueness or typicality of candidates.

"Serial Monument of History"

The choice of the assumption that the Monuments of History are to illustrate the most valuable achievements of the cultural heritage of the country leads to the conviction that certain categories of monuments preserved in our history, landscape and artistic tradition, and at the same time repetitive in formal and typological terms, should be represented not by single, but by "serial" - group recognition. The characteristics of the assets of sacral wooden architecture in Poland lead to the conclusion that there is a significant number of objects of comparable, high artistic and historical value²³. Limiting the recognition as a Monument of History to merely one of the examples leads to impoverishment of the image. However, the question about the selection criteria remains even more crucial. After all, the "first come, first served" principle cannot determine the representation of the most valuable monuments in the country. An important

¹⁸ Regulation of the President of the Republic of Poland of 15 March 2017 on the recognition of the history of "Świdnica - the complex of the Evangelical-Augsburg church under the invocation of the Holy Trinity, called the Church of Peace" as a monument, Journal of Laws of 28 March 2017, item 672; Regulation of the President of the Republic of Poland of 15 March 2017 on the recognition of "Jawor - Evangelical-Augsburg Church under the invocation of the Holy Spirit, called the Church of Peace", Journal of Laws of 15 March 2017 on the recognition of "Jawor - the Evangelical-Augsburg Church under the invocation of the Holy Spirit, called the Church of Peace" as a monument. 29 March 2017, item 673.

¹⁹ *100 Pomników Historii...*, pp. 153 – 155, 257 – 259, 333 – 335.

²⁰ <http://orawka-kosciol.pl/2019/04/wizyta-przedstawicieli-narodowego-instytutu-dziedzictwa/>.

²¹ Siwek A., *Drewniane cerkwie w polskim i ukraińskim regionie Karpat na Liście UNESCO – o światowym dziedzictwie uwag kilka*, Watra, no 12;2015, pp. 141 – 152.

²² *In the case of architectural monuments - objects with homogeneous features and values, representing a common cultural circle, may be grouped into groups, see.:* https://www.nid.pl/pl/Dla_wlascicieli_i_zarzadcow/opiekanadzabytkami/pomniki-historii/kryteria-wyboru/.

²³ Ruszczyk G., *Architektura drewniana w Polsce*, Warszawa 2009.

inspiration for solving the problem may be the experience of World Heritage in the field of serial entries. The concept of serial (multi-part) entries is not to be found in the text of the 1972 Convention on the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage. It has been codified in a document ancillary to the Convention, namely the *Operational Guidelines for the Application of the Convention for the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage*²⁴. The document, which is still being modified and optimized, defines the essence of serial entries (multi-part property). Serial nominations are referred to in Articles 137-139. Article 137 contains basic definitions characterizing the concept of serial good. Dobra wieloczęściowe zinterpretowano następująco:

Multi-part property is defined as follows:

a) The components should reflect cultural, social or functional links, occurring over time, which provide, respectively: landscape connection.

(b) Each component should contribute to the unique universal value of the good as a whole in a meaningful, scientific, legibly defined and discernible way, and may include, inter alia, intangible attributes. The resulting unique universal value should be easy to understand and communicate.

*c) Consequently, in order to avoid excessive fragmentation, the process of preparing an application for inclusion of the good, including the selection of components, should take full account of the overall operability and coherence of the good and assume that the whole, and not necessarily its individual parts, has a unique universal value*²⁵.

*In addition, Article 114 of the Operational Guidelines states that: In the case of multi-part property, there is a need for a management system or mechanisms to ensure coordinated management of the various components, which should be described in the application for inclusion of the goods in the List*²⁶.

A serial History Monument can be successfully modelled on this concept, which has proved its worth in international practice. In this way, in the category of sacral wooden architecture, significant typological groups could be distinguished. Then, it would be necessary to successively fill them with representative examples, which in general illustrate a given historical and artistic phenomenon in the fullest possible way. For example, in typological groups "Gothic churches", "Baroque churches", "searching for the national style", etc... The first and seemingly most obvious postulate is to "take over" the representation of the phenomenon from the World Heritage List and establish "serial" historical monuments in the form of wooden, Gothic churches of Małopolska region and wooden churches of the Carpathian region. These series could be extended with equally valuable, but underestimated in the global sphere examples, such as the mentioned Grywald church or Hańczowa church, so that the representative group in the world, at the national level, could have a wider range of references.

²⁴ *Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention*, WHC.17/01; 12 July 2017, Cf.: <https://whc.unesco.org/en/guidelines/>.

²⁵ <https://swiatowedziedzictwo.nid.pl/media/uploads/dokumenty/wytyczne-operacyjne/wt-operacyjne-pol/wo2015-tekst-glowny-pl148421293082.pdf>.

²⁶ *Ibidem*.

Protection and management as a function of value identification

Adoption of the "serial" concept of the history monument will have further significant systemic repercussions. The Polish system of monument protection is based on an individual approach to a protected object, both in the legal sphere - the personalized responsibility of the owner for the state of good and doctrinal - the thesis of the necessity of individual recognition of each monument before making binding conservation decisions²⁷. At the same time, reports, media statements and experiences point to significant regional differences in conservation policies²⁸. Hence the presence in the public discussion of the issue of conservation standards²⁹. However, given the passive, prohibitive and supervisory character of the traditional system of monument protection, the standards may be useful, but they are not sufficient to optimize the protection. For the group of monuments considered to be the most valuable in the country, it is advisable to implement active protection systems based on the experience in heritage management developed in the sphere of world heritage. An important element of this practice is the obligation to prepare management plans, which serve to organize, coordinate and direct conservation activities in a wide range of issues and with the involvement of numerous stakeholders³⁰. Such documents, due to their analytical character, perfectly show the areas which require broadening of research or documentation, as well as allow the hierarchy of activities to finally serve to achieve the results indicated in the vision, specifying how to optimally maintain a given monument. For the "serial" category of a historical monument, such management plans would require a two-stage approach - preparing documents on a single object and on the entire typological group. It should be mentioned that the developed methodology of creating management plans for special precious goods, taking into account the requirements of world heritage, and dedicated also to Polish monuments of history, includes, among others, a comparative analysis of the property³¹. It is a necessary stage of the analysis, serving to identify the value and its attributes for a given property. Attributes then play the role of essential elements of the managed system, as their preservation, exposure and interpretation are the focus of the protection strategy³². Therefore, the management plan, or rather its analytical part including the analysis of the good, may also be a tool revealing which other objects should be included in the group of "serial" monuments of history awarded the title in a given typological category. It may be an expert signal to the hosts of particular objects that there are grounds to undertake efforts to obtain the title. In this way, it is possible to reconcile the need for expert shaping of the collection

²⁷ Rouba B., *Pielęgnacja świątyni i innych zabytków*, Toruń 2014, pp. 116 – 128.

²⁸ *Raport o stanie zachowania zabytków nieruchomych w Polsce. Zabytki wpisane do rejestru zabytków* (księgi rejestru A i C), Warszawa 2017.

²⁹ *Krajowy program ochrony zabytków i opieki nad zabytkami na lata 2014 – 2017*, p. 52. http://bip.mkidn.gov.pl/media/download_gallery/20140530projekt_zalacznika_do_uchwaly_o_KPOZiONZ_cz-1_w.pdf.

³⁰ Wijesuriya G., Thompson J., Young Ch., *Zarządzanie światowym dziedzictwem kulturowym*, Warszawa 2015, pp. 4 – 5.

³¹ Fortuna-Marek A., Siwek A., Szmygin B., *Wartościowanie dziedzictwa w systemie SV - metoda i przykłady zastosowania*, Lublin 2017.

³² Szmygin, B., *Atrybuty wyjątkowej uniwersalnej wartości*, [in:] Szmygin B., (ed.), *Wyjątkowa uniwersalna wartość a monitoring dóbr światowego dziedzictwa*, Warszawa 2011, pp. 58-69.

of historical monuments with the area of initiatives taken by the hosts of the objects. In the case of applications formulated for monuments from outside the "typological canon" indicated by experts, the comparative analysis should decide whether the applied object represented by values sufficiently corresponds to the other elements of the "series", whether it brings new values to the presentation of the type of presentation, or whether it is, for various reasons (e.g. state of preservation, authenticity, integrity) a candidate of inadequate value in relation to the other representatives of the phenomenon. Authorizing such a procedure for the selection of new historical monuments would be another analogy to the procedures for the selection of world heritage goods, where comparative analysis is an important and necessary stage in defining the declaration of exceptional universal value. The only difference is that in the case of historical monuments we should expect the demonstration of not universal, global value, but exceptional value on a national scale. Incidentally, the case of wooden churches of the Carpathian region from Poland and Ukraine shows that the comparative group may include monuments remaining outside the current borders of the country³³. Of course, there is no legal possibility to include them in the procedures for establishing a historical monument, as the Act on the protection and care of monuments in principle concerns the territory of the Republic of Poland. However, it may be an impulse to search for a separate formula for a list of specific monuments of Polish and related culture of significant symbolic and educational significance.

Conclusions

The success and dynamic development of the World Heritage List shows the carrying capacity of the concept of identifying an elite group of goods important for the global community in terms of value. At the same time, the evolution of the World Heritage List reveals threats of blurring of the message and devaluation of the value of entries after exceeding the quantitative critical mass³⁴. With the dynamic development of the list of historical monuments and the growing aspirations of successive hosts, such threats may also appear on a national scale. Referring to the concept of "serial nominations", which will be associated with the obligation to develop management plans, may contribute to the rationalization of new recognitions as a monument to history, objective determination of the limits of representation of the phenomenon, and at the same time will serve to optimize and standardize the system of protection of goods of the highest value on a national scale. The important advantages of such a solution can be pointed out:

- Possibility of presenting historical and artistic contents important at the national scale, related to specific categories of monuments, which occur not individually, but in the form of a group

³³ For example, a temple in Zhovkva connected with Sobieski's patronage can be mentioned in the group of churches of the Carpathian region, or an Orthodox church from Matthew documenting the penetration of Polish and Russian elements in the foundation of a wooden Greek Orthodox temple.

³⁴ Szmygin B., *Światowe dziedzictwo UNESCO z perspektywy 40 lat*, *Ochrona Zabytków* 2013 T. 66, NR 1-4 (260 -263), pp. 169 – 180.

of comparable, equal-value objects³⁵. Referring to a group, and not to a single, authoritatively appointed representative, is important both for the establishment of protection and education about heritage, as well as for the presentation of the cultural heritage of the country.

- The condition for the success of the concept of serial recognition as a monument of history is a reliable comparative analysis defining the selection criteria. The application of the methodology of management plans mentioned above combines the aspiration to objectify the selection (comparative analysis) with the standardization of protection measures (management strategy common for a selected group of monuments). For "serial" recognition, a management plan for a given category of monuments, which takes into account already gained experience in the evaluation of monuments by means of comparative analysis, could also be a mechanism revealing which other objects should be included among those distinguished by the title and covered by a special form of protection.

- The conclusion that comes to mind on the margin of the presented considerations is the need to agree on the status of the historical monument and the property previously inscribed on the World Heritage List. The area of discrepancies in this respect causes the hierarchy of monuments to become unclear and unbelievable. However, drawing conclusions from the previous practice, we should support the principle that the goods included in the World Heritage List should at the same time obtain the status of a historical monument, due to their outstanding universal value, which has been confirmed on a global scale. The opposite condition cannot be overlooked: only a few monuments of outstanding value on a national scale (monuments of history) will meet the criteria of outstanding universal value on a global scale.

- The significance of a monument of history in the system of protection of cultural heritage in Poland should result equally from the prestigious nature of the award (and the resulting better opportunities to raise funds, participate in promotional programs, etc.) and from the high standard of protection, which should be defined by means of obligatory management plans.

- Management documents produced according to a common methodology should be required for both monuments to history and world heritage. This convergence can also be an excellent platform for the acquisition and adaptation of global experience for the national conservation system.

- The strategy of management of cultural property (monuments) of the highest value on the national scale, formulated in the management plans, in the long-term perspective should positively influence the system of protection of monuments in Poland and ultimately lead to the evolutionary development of a new form of this system.

There is no doubt that the collection of monuments of history and the sub-collection of world heritage in the Polish system of protection of monuments should stand out as the most valuable assets, both in terms of prestige and in terms of effectiveness and standards of protection.

³⁵ The presented text refers to the example of wooden sacral architecture, but in a similar spirit a number of other categories of monuments can be considered, from medieval monasteries, through the manors of particular centuries, to the monuments of industry and engineering of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries.



Fig. 1 Dębno Podhalańskie - a wooden church inscribed on the UNESCO World Heritage List is not a historical monument, typologically connected with a group of wooden churches in the Podhale region. Photo A. Siwek



Fig. 2 Grywałd - a wooden church not inscribed on the UNESCO World Heritage List, is not a historical monument, typologically connected with a group of wooden churches in the Podhale region. In terms of value, it is close to the church from Dębno. Photo A. Siwek



Fig. 3 Orawka - a wooden church was not inscribed on the UNESCO World Heritage List (applied for, excluded in the evaluation procedures in 2013), at present in the course of advanced efforts to obtain the title of a historical monument. Photo A. Siwek



Fig. 4 Zhovkva (Ukraine) - Tsar's gateway to the iconostasis of a wooden church inscribed on the UNESCO World Heritage List as part of the nomination: wooden churches of the Carpathian region in Poland and Ukraine. Two figures from the Tree of Jesse, with the Sobieski coat of arms shield in his hands - a panegyric bow to the family of the church founders. The church is an example of a monument beyond the borders of the Polish state, of great importance for Polish history and culture (like the entire historical complex of the city). Photo A. Siwek

Bibliography

Drewniane Cerkwie Regionu Karpat w Polsce i Ukrainie - <https://whc.unesco.org/en/list/1424/documents/>.

Fortuna-Marek A., Siwek A., Szmygin B., (2017). *Wartościowanie dziedzictwa w systemie SV - metoda i przykłady zastosowania*, Lublin: Politechnika Lubelska.

Gaczoł A., (2010) *Wpływy włoskich doświadczeń w ochronie dziedzictwa kulturowego na powstanie i kształt praktyki konserwatorskiej w Polsce*, [in:] P. Kondraciuk (Ed.), „Pod niebem północy”. *Z dziejów polsko-włoskich związków artystycznych*, Zamość: Muzeum Zamojskie w Zamościu.

Jagielska E., (Ed.), (2018). *100 Pomników Historii*, Warszawa: Narodowy Instytut Dziedzictwa.

Kornecki M., z zespołem, (2000), *Kościół drewniany południowej Małopolski – Materiały do dokumentacji wpisu na Listę Światowego Dziedzictwa UNESCO*, Teki Krakowskie, t. 12, p. 3 – 94.

Krajowy program ochrony zabytków i opieki nad zabytkami na lata 2014 – 2017, (2014), http://bip.mkidn.gov.pl/media/download_gallery/20140530projekt_zalacznika_do_uchwaly_o_KPOZiONZ_cz-1_w.pdf.

Krawczyk J., (2008), *Teoria Aloisa Riegla i jej polska recepcja a problemy konserwatorstwa współczesnego*, [in:] B. Szmygin (Ed.), *Współczesne problemy teorii konserwatorskiej w Polsce*, pp. 63–74, Warszawa–Lublin: Międzynarodowa Rada Ochrony Zabytków ICOMOS, Politechnika Lubelska.

Krzemionki Opatowskie - <https://whc.unesco.org/en/list/1599/documents/>.

Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention, (2017), WHC.17/01; 12 July 2017, <https://whc.unesco.org/en/guidelines/>.

Pomniki historii (2019), https://nid.pl/pl/Informacje_ogolne/Zabytki_w_Polsce/Pomniki_historii/.

Purchla J., (2011), *Wielowymiarowa lekcja Norwegii. Polska perspektywa na rezultaty projektu Zarządzanie miejscami wpisanymi na Listę Światowego Dziedzictwa UNESCO w Polsce i w Norwegii*, [in:] J. Purchla (Ed.), s. 400 – 409, *Zarządzanie miejscami wpisanymi na Listę Światowego Dziedzictwa UNESCO w Polsce i w Norwegii*, Kraków: Międzynarodowe Centrum Kultury.

Rouba B. (2014), *Pielęgnacja świątyni i innych zabytków*, Toruń: Wydawnictwo Naukowe Uniwersytetu Mikołaja Kopernika.

Rozbicka M., (Ed.), (2017), *Raport o stanie zachowania zabytków nieruchomych w Polsce. Zabytki wpisane do rejestru zabytków (księgi rejestru A i C)*, Warszawa: Narodowy Instytut Dziedzictwa.

Rozporządzenie Prezydenta Rzeczypospolitej Polskiej z dnia 15 marca 2017 r. w sprawie uznania za pomnik historii „Świdnica – zespół kościoła ewangelicko-augsburskiego pod wezwaniem Świętej trójcy, zwany kościołem pokoju”, Dz. U. z 28 marca 2017 r., Poz. 672.

Rozporządzenie Prezydenta Rzeczypospolitej Polskiej z dnia 15 marca 2017 r. w sprawie uznania za pomnik historii „Jawor – kościół ewangelicko-augsburski pod wezwaniem Ducha Świętego, zwany Kościołem Pokoju”, Dz. U. 29 marca 2017 r., Poz.673.

Rozporządzenie Prezydenta Rzeczypospolitej Polskiej z dnia 22 listopada 2017 r. w sprawie uznania za pomnik historii „Raduż – zespół cerkiewny”, Dz. U. z 6 grudnia 2017 r., Poz.2253.

Ruszczyk G. (2009), *Architektura drewniana w Polsce*, Warszawa: Muza.

Rymaszewski B. (1992), *Klucze ochrony zabytków w Polsce*, Warszawa: Ośrodek Dokumentacji Zabytków.

Siwek A. (2015), *Drewniane cerkwie w polskim i ukraińskim regionie Karpat na Liście UNESCO – o światowym dziedzictwie uwag kilka*, Watra, no 12; pp. 141 – 152.

Siwek A. (2017), *Representative or unique – dilemmas in protecting architecture of the 2nd half of the 20th century [Reprezentatywne czy wyjątkowe – dylematy ochrony dziedzictwa 2. połowy XX wieku]*, *Wiadomości Konserwatorskie= Journal of Heritage Conservation*, 49, pp. 125 – 133.

Skaldawski B., Chabiera A., Lisiecki A. (2011), *System ochrony zabytków w wybranych krajach europejskich*, *Kurier Konserwatorski*, Nr 11.

Szmygin B. (2000), *Kształtowanie koncepcji zabytku i doktryny konserwatorskiej w Polsce w XX wieku*, Lublin: Politechnika Lubelska.

Szmygin B. (2008), *Teksty doktrynalne w ochronie dziedzictwa – analiza formalna i propozycje*, [in:] B. Szmygin (Ed.), s. 145 – 154, *Współczesne problemy teorii konserwatorskiej w Polsce*, Warszawa – Lublin: Polski Komitet Narodowy ICOMOS, Politechnika Lubelska.

Szmygin, B. (2011), *Atrybuty wyjątkowej uniwersalnej wartości*, [in:] B. Szmygin, (Ed.), s. 58-69, *Wyjątkowa uniwersalna wartość a monitoring dóbr światowego dziedzictwa*, Warszawa: Polski Komitet Narodowy ICOMOS, Narodowy Instytut Dziedzictwa.

Szmygin B. (2013), *Światowe dziedzictwo UNESCO z perspektywy 40 lat*, *Ochrona Zabytków*, T. 66, NR 1-4 (260 - 263), pp. 169 – 180.

Szmygin B. (2016), *Światowe dziedzictwo kultury UNESCO – charakterystyka, metodologia, zarządzanie*, Warszawa – Lublin: Polski Komitet Narodowy ICOMOS, Politechnika Lubelska.

Tarnowskie Góry - <https://whc.unesco.org/en/list/1539/documents/>.

Wijesuriya G., Thompson J., Young Ch. (2015), *Zarządzanie światowym dziedzictwem kulturowym*, Warszawa: Narodowy Instytut Dziedzictwa.

Zachwatowicz J. (1981), *O polskiej szkole odbudowy i konserwacji zabytków*, *Ochrona Zabytków*, 34/1-2 (132-133), pp. 4-10.

Zalasińska K., (Ed.) (2014), *Konwencje UNESCO w dziedzinie kultury. Komentarz*, Warszawa: Wolters Kluwer.

Zalasińska K., Zeidler K, (2015), *Wykład prawa ochrony zabytków*, Warszawa - Gdańsk: Wolters Kluwer, Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Gdańskiego.

Żuchowska B. (1983), *Partycypacja społeczeństwa w rewaloryzacji i ochronie zabytków – niektóre doświadczenia brytyjskie*, *Ochrona Zabytków*, 36/3-4 (142-143), pp. 185-187.

