

VILNIUS UNIVERSITY
LITHUANIAN INSTITUTE OF HISTORY

Viktorija
KURIENĖ

State Protection of Cultural Heritage in the Vilnius Region 1922- 1939

SUMMARY OF DOCTORAL DISSERTATION

Humanities,
History and Archaeology (H 005)

VILNIUS 2022

The dissertation was prepared between 2011 and 2021 at Vilnius University.

Academic supervisor – Prof. Dr. Marija Drėmaitė (Vilnius University, Humanities, History and Archaeology, H 005).

This doctoral dissertation will be defended in a public meeting of the Dissertation Defence Panel:

Chairman – Prof. Dr. Alfredas Bumblauskas (Vilnius University, Humanities, History and Archaeology, H 005).

Members:

Dr. Algė Andriulytė (Vilnius Academy of Arts, Humanities, Art History, H 003).

Dr. Dalia Klajumienė (Vilnius Academy of Arts, Humanities, Art History, H 003).

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Salvijus Kulevičius (Vilnius University, Humanities, History and Archaeology, H 005).

Dr. Vitalija Stravinskienė (the Lithuanian Institute of History, Humanities, History and Archaeology, H 005).

The dissertation shall be defended at a public meeting of the Dissertation Defence Panel at 3 p. m., on 11 February 2022 in Room 211 at Vilnius University at the Faculty of History.

Address: Universiteto street, house No. 7, Room No. 211, Vilnius, Lithuania

The text of this dissertation can be accessed at the libraries of the Lithuanian Institute of History and Vilnius University, as well as on the website of Vilnius University:

www.vu.lt/lt/naujienos/ivykiu-kalendorius

VILNIAUS UNIVERSITETAS
LIETUVOS ISTORIJOS INSTITUTAS

Viktorija
KURIENĖ

Valstybinė kultūros paveldo apsauga Vilniaus krašte 1922-1939

DAKTARO DISERTACIJOS SANTRAUKA

Humanitariniai mokslai,
istorija ir archeologija (H 005)

VILNIUS 2022

Disertacija rengta 2011–2021 metais Vilniaus universitete.

Mokslinė vadovė – prof. dr. Marija Drėmaitė (Vilniaus universitetas, humanitariniai mokslai, istorija ir archeologija, H 005).

Gynimo taryba:

Pirmininkas – prof. dr. Alfredas Bumblauskas (Vilniaus universitetas, humanitariniai mokslai, istorija ir archeologija, H 005).

Nariai:

dr. Algė Andriulytė (Vilniaus dailės akademija, humanitariniai mokslai, menotyra, H 003),

dr. Dalia Klajumienė (Vilniaus dailės akademija, humanitariniai mokslai, menotyra, H 003),

doc. dr. Salvijus Kulevičius (Vilniaus universitetas, humanitariniai mokslai, istorija ir archeologija, H 005),

dr. Vitalija Stravinskienė (Lietuvos istorijos institutas, humanitariniai mokslai, istorija ir archeologija, H 005),

Disertacija ginama viešame Gynimo tarybos posėdyje 2022 m. vasario mėn. 11 d. 15 val. Vilniaus universiteto Istorijos fakulteto auditorijoje. Adresas: Universiteto g. 7, 211 auditorija, Vilnius, Lietuva.

Disertaciją galima peržiūrėti Lietuvos istorijos instituto ir Vilniaus universiteto bibliotekose ir VU interneto svetainėje adresu: <https://www.vu.lt/naujienos/ivykiu-kalendorius>

SUMMARY

Problem of the Research

In September 1921, the law on the protection of monuments - the Decree of the Polish Council of Regents for the Protection of Art and Cultural Monuments - entered into force in the Vilnius region, then in the Central Republic of Lithuania. In 1922, when Central Lithuania was incorporated into the Republic of Poland, the administrative structure of the country was unified. Therefore, on October of that year, Jerzy Remer, then the conservator of monuments in Kielce Voivodeship, was appointed to the same position in Vilnius. Since 1923, the Nowogródek Voivodeship has been assigned to the Vilnius conservators of monuments. This creates the administrative district of two voivodeships with the centre in Vilnius. This was the official beginning of the state heritage protection in Vilnius - a law and an institution.

In 1928, Vilnius monument conservator Remer, after graduating from Vilnius and leaving for Warsaw to take up the post of General Conservator of Monuments, wrote in the daily "Kurjer Wileński" about Vilnius and its monuments as follows: "Here [at the Gate of Dawn] feel the strongest that the whole nation lives [in monuments], that the cult of the past is not the dead letter of the researcher, not a sentiment and not a romance. <...> The monumental buildings of Vilnius stood and stand not only in the memorial guard of the national church, but in the guard of the whole State as border

pillars and as the front guard of the redout between East and West, testifying that the land where they, the most beautiful flowers of art and culture, grew up, belong to the spirit of the great Polish state"¹. This was the official interpretation, narrative, value and meaning or discourse of Vilnius monuments.

These sentences of Remer perfectly convey the essence of the official Vilnius heritage protection between the wars. They make us realize that the protection of monuments in Vilnius and Poland was not a romantic concern for antiquities. Heritage was material, the most beautiful surviving of the past, but it was primarily concerned with the present rather than the past. Heritage expressed national, Polish, Catholic identity and connected Vilnius / Poland with Western culture. The protection of heritage was a state policy and, in a sense, a struggle (the "front guard of redout") in which the balance of power was decisive.

All this is important when we talk about Vilnius, the city and its land, which have never belonged to the Polish state before; a city that was central to the vast area of the former Grand Duchy of Lithuania (GDL); the city and the region, whose ethnic and confessional composition was different, were inhabited not only by Poles and not only by Catholics; a country whose inhabitants have expressed themselves through various identities, not just national ones; a city that was central in the mythology of several national

¹ J. Remer, *Pochwała miasta*, Wilno, 1928, s. 11 [Specjalna odbitka bibliofilska z Nr. 189 „Kurjera Wileńskiego“, w stu numerowanych egzemplarach].

revivals (Lithuanians, Belarusians, Litvaks, Poles from GDL). The possibility of naming such an ambiguous city, important for at least four nations, a Polish "redout", and its monuments belonging to the spirit of the Polish state, was made possible by the possession of power. Remer (like later monuments conservators) had it both as a state conservator of monuments, as an art historian and professor at Stephen Bathory University (SBU), and as a Pole, a Catholic, and a man from a higher social class.

In this context, we cannot talk only about facts and events about the interwar state heritage system, such a historical study does not reveal why such a heritage system existed and why it operated in this way. Therefore, the theoretical perspectives of authorized heritage discourse and critical discourse analysis are used to understand the topic. Discourse is both language and text, and the practice of language use, and a system of symbolically structured, normatively reproduced, and socially controlled meanings, and ways of cognizing social reality that structure social relationships².

The concept of critical discourse analysis is entrenched in the humanities, but its descriptions and denominations vary. Norman Fairclough's analysis of critical discourse considers "as much a theory as a method, and most of all a theoretical perspective on language". Teun A. van Dijk, meanwhile, believes that the notion of "critical discourse studies" would be more appropriate: the notion of

² A. Valantiejus, K. Nastopka, „Diskursas“, in: *Visuotinė lietuvių enciklopedija*, in: <https://www.vle.lt/Straipsnis/diskursas-49128>, (2021-01-28).

"analysis" erroneously implies that "critical discourse analysis" is a method, although it is a more scientific practice (a domain of scholarly practice). Ruth Wodak, given the differences in methodological and theoretical approaches to critical discourse analysis, considers this to be at most a shared perspective in discourse research³.

The perspective of critical discourse analysis was first applied in linguistics, where language is treated as a social practice and the main focus is on the context of language use and the language-power relationship⁴. This research perspective has spread in the social sciences and humanities. The focus of the analysis of critical discourse is on social relations, discourse here is not an entity that can be defined independently, but only through internal and external relations with other objects⁵. In this way, the connections

³ N. Fairclough, „Critical discourse analysis as a method in social scientific research“, in: *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis*, R. Wodak and M. Meyer (eds), London: Sage, 2001, p. 121; T. A. van Dijk, *Discourse and power*, Basingstoke, New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2008, p. 2; R. Wodak, „What CDA is about - a summary of its history, important concepts and its developments“, in: *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis*, R. Wodak and M. Meyer (eds), London: Sage, 2001, p. 2; G. Weiss and R. Wodak, „Introduction: theory, interdisciplinarity and critical discourse analysis“, in: *Critical discourse analysis: theory and interdisciplinarity*, edited by G. Weiss and R. Wodak, Basingstoke, New York, 2003, p. 6-7, 12.

⁴ R. Wodak, „What CDA is about - a summary of its history, important concepts and its developments“, in: *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis*, R. Wodak and M. Meyer (eds), London: Sage, 2001, p. 1-2.

⁵ N. Fairclough, *Critical discourse analysis: the critical study of language*, London, New York, 2013, p. 3; N. Fairclough, R. Wodak „Critical discourse analysis“, in: *Discourse Studies: A Multidisciplinary Introduction*, ed. T. van Dijk, Vol. 2, London: Sage, 1997, p. 258.

between discourse and practice are highlighted, not only the discourse is analyzed, but also its social and political context and the social impact of the discourse⁶. Laurajane Smith, the creator of the concept of authorized heritage discourse, uses the concept of discourse as it is perceived in the analysis of critical discourse: discourse reflects social practices and arises from social practices⁷.

Discourse is socially conditioned, so the question of power becomes important. It is power, dominance, control, ideology (as well as discourse) that are the key concepts in the analysis of critical discourse⁸. In analyzing this relationship, special attention is paid to how power is created in society, how discourse is involved in this process. Such research has shown that many forms of social inequality based on gender, class, and race are constructed, perpetuated, and legitimized in text, language, and other forms of public discourse controlled by a symbolic elite: politicians,

⁶ D. Howarth, *Discourse*, Buckingham, Philadelphia, 2000, p. 6-8; L. Smith, *Uses of Heritage*, London, New York, 2006, p. 14-15; G. Weiss and R. Wodak, „Introduction: theory, interdisciplinarity and critical discourse analysis“, in: *Critical discourse analysis: theory and interdisciplinarity*, edited by G. Weiss and R. Wodak, Basingstoke, New York, 2003, p. 21-22.

⁷ L. Smith, *Uses of Heritage*, London, New York, 2006, p. 16; N. Fairclough, R. Wodak „Critical discourse analysis“, in: *Discourse Studies: A Multidisciplinary Introduction*, ed. T. van Dijk, Vol. 2, London: Sage, 1997, p. 258.

⁸ G. Weiss and R. Wodak, „Introduction: theory, interdisciplinarity and critical discourse analysis“, in: *Critical discourse analysis: theory and interdisciplinarity*, edited by G. Weiss and R. Wodak, Basingstoke, New York, 2003, p. 11-15. T. A. van Dijk, *Discourse and power*, Basingstoke, New York, 2008, p. vii, viii.

journalists, scholars, writers, and bureaucrats⁹. Thus, discourses have the power to persuade by maintaining and legitimizing the hierarchy of social relations, legitimizing, naturalizing ideologies, cultural, and social assumptions about how the world works¹⁰.

It should be borne in mind that the analysis of critical discourse does not focus on power in general, but on the abuse of power, that is, the forms of domination that lead to social inequality and injustice. Coercion of power is the illicit use of power where discourse promotes forms of social inequality by prioritizing the interests of dominant groups over the best interests of non-dominant groups because the latter do not have the same access to public discourse. On the other hand, standards of legitimacy are conditional and vary historically and between cultures, even if they are always affirmed as universal. Then, in addition to the legitimate use of power (and the abuse of power), we have legitimate forms of inequality¹¹.

The concept of control is important in this context. Power is about control, and discourse control means preferential access to its output, to its content and style, and ultimately to public opinion. These are those who have access to the resources of public discourse,

⁹ T. A. van Dijk, *Discourse and power*, Basingstoke, New York, 2008, p. vii.

¹⁰ Laurajane Smith, *Uses of Heritage*, London; New York: Routledge, 2006, p. 16, 19, 21; N. Fairclough, R. Wodak „Critical discourse analysis“, in: *Discourse Studies: A Multidisciplinary Introduction*, ed. T. van Dijk, Vol. 2, London: Sage, 1997, p. 258

¹¹ T. A. van Dijk, *Discourse and power*, Basingstoke, New York, 2008, p. 1, 19.

those who have access to the discourses of politics, the media, education, science, they control part of the production of public discourse, part of its content, and indirectly public opinion. The views and opinions of groups without access to discourse resources rarely reach the media and public opinion¹².

Thus, power needs a basis and resources that socially enable the exercise of power or the imposition of sanctions in the event of non-compliance. These resources usually consist of the assets of socially valued but unequally distributed attributes such as post, rank, status, authority, knowledge, expertise, privileges, membership in a dominant or majority group, or property. Rarely does one power occur - institutional power (government, educational institutions, church, media, etc.) often occurs at the same time as group power based on gender, class, race, age, or nationality¹³.

Heritage theorist Laurajane Smith in published book "Uses of Heritage" where she introduced the concept of authorized heritage discourse¹⁴. Such a discourse of heritage has established itself and dominated the West in the twentieth century as a traditional

¹² T. A. van Dijk, *Discourse and power*, Basingstoke, New York, 2008, p. viii; T. A. van Dijk, „The discourse-knowledge interface“, in: *Critical discourse analysis: theory and interdisciplinarity*, edited by G. Weiss and R. Wodak, Basingstoke, New York, 2003, p. 87-88.

¹³ T. A. van Dijk, *Discourse and power*, Basingstoke, New York, 2008, p. 29, 48.

¹⁴ The authorized heritage discourse is discussed and analyzed throughout the whole book, but in detail: L. Smith, *Uses of Heritage*, London, New York, 2006. p. 3-44, 299-300, on the basis of which this part of the text is written.

perception of heritage, and still dominates in many parts of the world, despite the fundamental (theoretical) development of the concept of heritage in the late 20th and early 21st centuries. The authorized heritage discourse originated in Europe at the end of the 19th century in the context of nationalism and modernity, and was quickly enshrined in law and institution, and in international law and international organizations since the middle of the 20th century. The authorized heritage discourse varies in time and space, but also has clear solid features. (I) Heritage is perceived as material. (II) Material heritage objects are considered to have an innate unchanging cultural value / significance that is directly related to the age, monumentality and / or aesthetics of the objects: heritage is perceived as representing all that is good, beautiful and important about the past. (III) This is a professional discourse that prioritizes expert knowledge and values about the past and at the same time depends on the power / knowledge of technical / aesthetic experts, is institutionalized. (IV) Authorized heritage discourse takes over signs from major national and class narratives, based on the male experience and values of the elite class. It is a national, patriotic discourse, but also a discourse of a certain class, gender experience, social and aesthetic values.

The discourse of heritage determines how we perceive heritage (how we talk about it, write about it, discuss it) and what practices we perform, how we treat it. And all this has material, real consequences. The authorized heritage discourse affects the relationship with heritage in several planes.

(I) The materiality of heritage objects has legitimizing power, establishes them as self-evident, objective, authentic, universal, creates a sense of unchanging values and meanings. Indeed, the materiality of heritage is in itself a brutal physical statement about the power and cultural achievements of the owner. However, turning the gaze to the materiality (appearance) of the heritage conceals its subjectivity, the ways in which the heritage operates, creates, regulates, authorizes / empowers a number of identities and values. In addition, the materiality of heritage objects means that the object can be marked on a map, researched, preserved / restored, managed, and its protection can be an object of the legal system. Narrowing the concept of heritage to easily manageable individual objects / places, reduces the contradiction / dissonance of heritage, hides the conflict / ambiguity of social, cultural, historical values, values and hides the (political) origin of heritage. In this case, the discussion, negotiation or objection of the heritage is possible only within the framework of a single individual object or a specific technical issue.

(II) Within the framework of the authorized heritage discourse, legitimate speakers about heritage are experts. This is due to several aspects: (a) the attribution of heritage to the past, and the uncertainty of the past means that it must be talked about by those who know it, that is, experts (archaeologists, historians). (b) The idea of heritage as a legacy for future generations means that heritage is not for the present but for the future and can only be used in the present under the supervision of experts who act as managers of the

past. In this context, the public needs to be educated about heritage and the heritage is passed on to future generations unchanged. In this way, the idea of heritage is detached from the present, the wider society is distracted from the active relationship with heritage, its use, the meanings of the present; constructing heritage as an object to be treated passively conceals other competing discourses, power relations that raised it.

(III) Authorized heritage discourse was formed in the 19th century in the context of nationalism, therefore, heritage as a symbolic representative of identity is mostly associated with national identity, and the narrative of a nation exclusively reflects the masculine experience and values of the elite class. This means obscuring or eliminating other identities and other experiences of other groups. When telling national / national histories, heritage does not reflect the cultural and social experiences of alternative groups, does not take into account the historical legitimacy of the experiences of these groups, and undermines their current social, cultural or political roles. At the same time, it conceals the continuing social bias, social and political marginalization. Such an elite national elite heritage does not speak to other alternative groups, then there is a need for experts to educate and thus pass on values .

All this: the materiality of the heritage, the guidance of experts and the constant confirmation / repetition of the dominant stories about the nation, class, culture, nationality determine the power of this discourse. The foundation of the discourse is ideological and political. The authorized heritage discourse creates

the idea of heritage in such a way as to exclude certain social actors from an active relationship with the heritage, perceiving the audience as passive recipients of sanctioned heritage values; at the same time, however, clear barriers are being created for active public negotiation on the meaning and origin of heritage, the social and cultural roles that heritage can play.

In this work, heritage is explored in the context of critical discourse analysis as a variety of social practices, verbal and nonverbal (both texts and events), on the basis of which a certain sense of reality and public understanding is created and maintained. Creating and maintaining a heritage discourse is inseparable from power and control. Access to authorized heritage discourse is used to analyze the creation and maintenance of interwar Polish heritage discourse (in this case, the state system for the protection of monuments). It allows to understand the principles and logic of the system operation, ways to create and maintain a state heritage discourse. All this makes it possible to talk about what and why it was perceived as heritage, why it was protected in this way, and how the heritage system is affected by power.

Relevance of the Research

The concepts of critical discourse analysis and authorized heritage discourse are interrelated, their conceptions and functioning overlap, their significance for research is closely related and partially identical. Their suitability in analyzing the protection of the interwar

Vilnius heritage was determined by several motives. The approach to critical discourse analysis makes it possible to see heritage not as something objective and universal, but as deliberately created, dependent on the social and political context and having a social impact. The inclusion of the approach to the analysis of critical discourse raises the importance of power and the symbolic elite in controlling the discourse of heritage and, through this, in establishing the hierarchy and ideology of social relations. Such access allows heritage texts, events, actions to be perceived as one whole, which is characterized by a certain common logic, tendencies, ideas, goals, etc.

The concept of authorized heritage discourse fits the context of the place and time of the topic. The authorized heritage discourse is not only made up of the ideology of nationalism, it is itself an integral part of the ideology of nationalism. In interwar Europe, including Poland, nationalism was the prevailing ideology and was a conducive medium for authorized heritage discourse. In the interwar period, this discourse of heritage was already enshrined in the national law of many states and in the first International Charter for the Protection of Monuments in Athens (1931)¹⁵. In interwar Poland, it resonated, Poland was represented at the conference in Athens¹⁶.

The concept of authorized heritage discourse allows us to see the content of heritage protection in interwar Poland and Vilnius.

¹⁵ L. Smith, *Uses of Heritage*, London, New York, 2006, p. 89.

¹⁶ M. Lalewicz, *Sprawozdanie z międzynarodowej konferencji, zwołanej w 1931 r. w Atenach*, Warszawa, 1932.

Legislation, methodological / theoretical material, heritage practice testify to the importance of the materiality of heritage, the perception of heritage objects as innate, the supremacy, authority and control of heritage, the unequivocal perception of heritage as a witness to the nation's past, conveying the experience and values of the nobility. This also affects the historiography of heritage protection: between the interwar heritage historiography of Vilnius and Poland, we will not find works that go beyond the authorized heritage discourse. The Vilnius / Polish heritage texts quote each other and create a common consensus text. The heritage of Vilnius (both in terms of the interwar period and in general) is visible through the eyes of Ferdynand Ruszczic, Jan Bułhak, Jerzy Remer and other representatives of the interwar symbolic elite, within the framework of the Polish authorized heritage discourse.

The Object, the Aim and the Tasks of the Research

The object of the research is the official state heritage protection in Vilnius in 1922–1939.

The aim of the research is the analysis of this official heritage protection, revealing how the state heritage system functioned, deconstructing the Polish authorized state heritage discourse and the conditions for its existence through a monopoly of interpretation and image. To achieve this goal, the following tasks are set:

1. To set out the context of the protection of monuments in interwar Poland on the basis of historiography and legal documents of the period, emphasizing the unity of the system and the concentration of authority and power in a narrow circle of experts and in voivodeships delegating all authority to the conservator. The focus on the Poland's monument protection system is based on the fact that the state monument protection system was the same throughout Poland, Vilnius monument protection area was part of that unified system, and Vilnius monument protection did not differ in that context.

2. To find out the sources of power and influence of that period and place, to show how the demographic situation, nationality, gender, education, economic resources, positions, status affect the concept of monuments, the relationship with monuments and the system of monument protection itself. It is based on the premise that power comes not only from institutional power, but also from such non-institutional attributes as nationality, gender and money. Such attributes are equally the basis of power, authority and the latter, in turn, naturalize, legitimize cultural and social attitudes, the hierarchy of public relations.

3. To analyze the state (Polish) discourse of heritage through the monument listing system and the protection of individual groups of monuments, i.e. to find out what was considered a heritage / monument and how it is treated. To this end, (a) scientific inventory and administrative registration are analyzed as tools for educating and validating the state heritage discourse. (b) It is clarified which

objects are legally protected by the state in Vilnius monument protection area and the register of monuments is fully analyzed. (c) Based on the data of the register, the circumstances of protection are discussed of separate groups of monuments: architecture, objects of urban scale, nature, archeology and movable ones.

4. To analyze the state heritage discourse as a part of the wider public discourse or the system of monument protection as functioning in the wider field of cultural policy. In the interwar period, the ideology of regionalism was an effective way to influence public discourse and / or the field of cultural policy. In this context, the movement / direction of regionalism, which is rarely found in interwar Vilnius historiography, and specifically the regionalism of Vilnius land as a form of Polish patriotism or polonism are analyzed. At the same time, the aim is to reveal the relationship between regionalism and heritage protection in interwar Vilnius, which has ensured a monopoly on the interpretation of Polish heritage.

5. To show the Polish monopoly of the creation and dissemination of images of Vilnius through the case of Vilnius photographer Jan Bulhak; the vision of his work, which is visible in the context of regionalism and the wider European context, reveals the relationship between photography and the protection of monuments, seeing photography as another tool to authorize heritage discourse.

The Hypothesis of the Research

The following hypothesis is put forward in the research:

(a) The interwar Vilnius state heritage system operated within the framework of the state (Polish) authorized discourse heritage. The discourse, which was based on the materiality of heritage, the innate value, the transmission of national and social meanings and the supremacy of (male) experts. The dominance of the discourse of state heritage was determined both by the characteristics of the discourse itself (experts, materiality, transfer of national meanings) and the possession of power (and resources): political / institutional, professional / expert, national / religious / social / gender. (b) Others (primarily of other nationalities but also of other social strata, other gender) had no access to the sanctioned Polish heritage discourse, both because of the closed nature of the discourse itself and because of the general monopoly of Polish interpretation of cultural policy or public discourse through the vision of regionalism or monopoly of image through the Polish Vilnius and region in the photography of Bulhak. (c) Thus, the state protection of monuments in Vilnius monument protection area told only one story. This is the story of the experts in the field of Polish culture, those who had the authority and influence i.e. power. Monuments, their interpretation and ways of preservation reflected their values, identities, interpretations and perceptions. (d) However, this geographical-historical region was much more diverse in terms of historical and cultural significance and had a diverse demographic

situation. Therefore, such a policy of monument protection reflected and was focused not on the actual situation at that time, but on the aspiration - the vision of Vilnius and its region as a "redout" of Polishness. Vilnius region was not as much Polish as it was created through text and visual image. Today, such an aspiration and vision of the protection of interwar monuments is perceived in historiography as an actual situation of the protection of interwar monuments.

Historiography

The protection of Vilnius' interwar heritage is a little researched topic. The topic was not considered important for various political-ideological reasons: (I) World War II, its aftermath overshadowed the interwar period; (II) Soviet ideology was generally future-oriented, the interwar period was not ideologically acceptable, so after World War II, both Lithuanian and Polish monument historiography focused on the problems of monument protection at that time; (III) in the historiography of independent Lithuania, the research of interwar Lithuania is often limited to the then territory of the state without the Vilnius region; (IV) Polish historiography, although interest in the eastern part of interwar Poland grew in the 1990s, in the 21st century seems to be more focused on research within the current country and on Polish-German, and often Polish-Ukrainian, relations. The scarce research on the topic results in the fact that the actual history of the events is completely unclear,

lacking deeper examinations of the topic. This leads to repetition of the same facts and conclusions, evaluation clichés and extremes.

The historiography we can divide it into three conditional groups according to the object of research. (I) (a) Works which are designed for the interwar Polish heritage protection of Vilnius. These are the articles of Józef Poklewski¹⁷ and Jolanta Fedorovič¹⁸. (I) (b) Research on certain aspects / areas of interwar Polish heritage protection in Vilnius. These are articles by Jūratė Markevičienė¹⁹, research by Alina Kowalczykowa²⁰ and articles by Edita Povilaitytė-

¹⁷ J. Poklewski, „Wileńsko-nowogródzki okręg konserwatorski w okresie międzywojennym“, in: *Acta Universitatis Nicolai Copernici. Nauki Humanistyczno-Społeczne. Zabytkoznawstwo i Konserwatorstwo*, Toruń, 1991, t. 17. s. 215-230; J. Poklewski, „Organizacje artystyczne i instytucje opieki nad sztuką w międzywojennym Wilnie“, in: *Kultura międzywojennego Wilna. Materiały konferencji w Trokach (28-30 VI 1993)*, Białystok, 1994, s. 173-202; J. Poklewski, *Polskie życie artystyczne w międzywojennym Wilnie*, Toruń, 1994, s. 234-256.

¹⁸ J. Fedorovič, *Nekilnojamojo kultūros paveldo apsauga Vilniaus krašte 1920-1939: lenkiško paveldosaugos modelio raiška ir praktika*, magistro darbas, Vilniaus universitetas, Istorijos fakultetas, Istorijos teorijos ir kultūros istorijos katedra, 2011, 86 p.; J. Fedorovič, „Nekilnojamojo kultūros paveldo apsauga Vilniaus krašte 1920-1939: lenkiško paveldo saugos modelio raiška“, in: *Lietuvos istorijos studijos*, 2012, t. 29, p. 84-97.

¹⁹ J. Markevičienė, „Rytų Lietuvos paminklai“, in: *Kultūros paminklų enciklopedija*, Vilnius, 1998, p. 7, 8; J. Markevičienė, „Kultūros paveldo saugos raiška: mokslinės, emocinės ir teisinės prielaidos“, in: *Vilniaus kultūrinis gyvenimas 1900-1940*, Vilnius, 1998, p. 271-307

²⁰ A. Kowalczykowa, „Świież i inne miejsca. Pamiątki mickiewiczowskie w zagrożeniach“, in: *Blok-Notes Muzeum Literatury im. Adama Mickiewicza*, 1999, nr. 12/13 s. 263-270; A. Kowalczykowa, „Konserwator Stanisław Lorentz na Wileńszczyźnie - przyczynek“, in: *Acta Academiae Artium Vilnensis*, t. 29: „Vilnius kaip dailės mokymo ir sklaidos centras“, sud. V. Jankauskas, Vilnius, 2003, p. 129-138.

Leliugienė²¹. (II) Works examining the topics of Vilnius history, the disclosure of which includes the aspect of interwar heritage protection. These are Markevičienė's article²², Karolis Kučiauskas' dissertation²³.

Both groups of historiography focuses on the Polish legal and administrative areas and the discussion of the practice of monument protection. Thus, the official authorized constituent of monument protection is examined, which in principle does not allow noticing the multiculturalism of interwar Vilnius. The introduction of the Polish legal and administrative system for the protection of monuments in Vilnius is perceived as the basis for the protection of monuments in Vilnius. In addition, these areas are seen as an expression of Polish monument protection, and only in this way is Vilnius monument protection connected to the general context of the state's monument protection. The concept of a monument regulated

²¹ E. Povilaitytė-Leliugienė, „Architectural heritage investigation in interwar Vilnius: problems and methods“, in: *Acta Academiae Artium Vilnensis*, t. 98: „Tarpukario Vilnius: dailės ir architektūros pavaldai 1919-1939 metais“, sud. A. Andriulytė, Vilnius, 2020, p. 212-261; E. Povilaitytė-Leliugienė, „(Ne)prarasti archyvai“: architektas Janas Borowskis“, [interaktyvus], in: <https://www.bernardinai.lt/2018-10-27-ne-prarasti-archyvai-architektas-janas-borowskis/>, (2022-01-02); E. Povilaitytė-Leliugienė, „Fotografija paveldo istorijoje: Vilniaus Aukštutinė pilis“, in: *Dailės istorijos studijos 7: Vaizdų tekstai - tekstų vaizdai*, sud.: L. Balaišytė, E. Grigoravičienė, Vilnius, 2016, p. 135-163.

²² J. Markevičienė, „Senamiesčio įvaizdžiai Vilniaus kultūros paveldo saugoje XX a.: nuo kraštovaizdžio iki praeities skeveldrų“, in: *Kultūrologija*, 2003, nr. 10, p. 233-293.

²³ K. Kučiauskas, *Prieškario Vilniaus urbanistinis modelis ir jo recepcija karo ir pokario metais (1932-1956 m.)*, daktaro disertacija, Vilniaus universitetas, 2016.

by law, and / or the prerogatives of the conservator of monuments define the limits of historiographical research. The theoretical aspect does not shape in historiography. The activity and sensitivity of Vilnius' Polish cultural elite on heritage issues is emphasized. At the same time, the cooperation between the conservatives of monuments and the Polish cultural elite in this area is emphasized, which is considered to be the specifics of Vilnius. The period is perceived as seamless, but the change in monument conservatives marks a change in activity / methods / theory. Remer is singled out as a pioneer in scientific inventory and heritage protection as a university discipline, Lorentz is singled out as a particularly active official and a staunch supporter of the conservation concept. Monument preservation works are named as frequent and evaluated positively. The preservation of sacral buildings, first of all the surroundings of the Gates of Dawn, the cathedral and other churches and medieval castles are distinguished.

The historiography of interwar Vilnius heritage is hardly examined in the context of interwar Polish heritage protection. However, all the authors finally come to the conclusion about the greater or lesser uniqueness / contribution of Vilnius heritage protection in the Polish context. Such excellences are usually the activity of the Vilnius cultural elite and the activities / works of the conservators of monuments (conservation of medieval castles, inventory) and the cooperation of these two groups. Interwar heritage protection is usually compared to the tsarist, Lithuanian and Soviet periods in Vilnius. This is believed to lead to an exceptionally

positive image of the heritage of this period: a legally regulated monument protection with a sensitive and active cultural elite and active conservators, and thus positive results. Then it is obvious that these features are undoubtedly progressive / exceptional when comparing this period of Vilnius with the previous or later one.

(III) (a) Works on interwar Polish heritage protection include the monograph of the subject by Pavel Dettloff²⁴, and a collection of articles to mark the centenary of the heritage service in Poland²⁵. (b) Polish heritage studies, which also cover the interwar period, include a section of Bogusław Szmygin's monograph devoted to the interwar period²⁶ and similar chapters of Bohdan Rymaszewski's books²⁷. In the examined historiography of interwar Polish heritage protection, the cases of Vilnius are quite common, they are woven into the general context of the country's heritage protection, illustrating certain features of Polish heritage protection. Vilnius heritage protection is not considered to be the exclusive in context of the country, it is mentioned in several cases. First, the management of the ruins of medieval castles is cited as an example of the

²⁴ P. Dettloff, *Odbudowa i restauracja zabytków architektury w Polsce w latach 1918-1939. Teoria i praktyka*, Kraków, 2006.

²⁵ *Służby konserwatorskie w dwudziestoleciu międzywojennym: narodziny, organizacja, działalność: w 100-lecie odzyskania niepodległości: Warszawska Konferencja Konserwatorska, 22 listopada 2018 r.*, redakcja naukowa K. Guttmejer, Warszawa, 2018.

²⁶ B. Szmygin, *Kształtowanie koncepcji zabytku i doktryny konserwatorskiej w Polsce w XX wieku*, Liublin, 2000, s. 57-116.

²⁷ B. Rymaszewski, *Polska ochrona zabytków*, Warszawa, 2005, s. 49-97; B. Rymaszewski, *Klucze ochrony zabytków w Polsce*, Warszawa, 1992, s. 44-50.

conservation of "dead" monuments, illustrating the gradual transition to the restoration of monuments and the conservator's direct involvement in research and management. Secondly, the management of the churches, which were converted into Orthodox churches during the tsarist period, is discussed in connection with the liquidation of the consequences of the division of the state and the cases of the monument management caused by ideological reasons.

In general, throughout the historiography, the topic of interwar Vilnius heritage protection means an exclusively Polish topic of heritage protection, which remains essentially within the framework of the Polish authorized heritage discourse. Historiography, like the interwar protection of monuments, overlooks other (non-Polish) concepts, narratives and objects of heritage, the view of conservators and the Polish intelligentsia is intercepted, which ignores others (primarily through nationality but also through religious and social aspects) and affirms monuments and the idea of protecting them as universal and inherently valuable.

Sources

The group of sources consists of (I) archival documents, (II) legal documents, (III) publications and periodicals of the time, (IV) memoirs. The first three groups of sources form the texts of the Polish authorized heritage discourse, in which this discourse is formed, consolidated and disseminated. The basis of the archival documents is the fund (f. 22) of the Vilnius Voivodeship Art

Department (or the institution of the conservator of monuments) kept in the Heritage Protection Library of the Cultural Heritage Center in Vilnius. It contains 266 cases covering the activities of the conservator of monuments for the protection of heritage from 1922 to 1939. Other documents of the Art Department are in the Central State Archives of Lithuania (LCVA), the Vilnius Voivodeship Board fund (f. 51), the Communications and Construction Department (ap. 10) and the Archive of the New Acts (Archiwum Akt Nowych) in Warsaw, where in the fund 14 (zespół) documents of the Ministry of Religion and Public Education are kept.

The Structure of the Dissertation

The work consists of an introduction, five chapters, conclusions, list of sources, bibliography and appendices. The first chapter discusses the system and operation of interwar Polish monument protection, understanding the process as the legalization and institutionalization of authorized heritage discourse. The second chapter deals with the power and influence that arise both from the possession of political power, institutions and positions, and from the demographic, cultural, economic context: nationality, language, religion, gender, education and wealth. The third chapter deals with the practice of monument protection. First of all, listing, both scientific and administrative, is analyzed, it is perceived as the legitimation and introduction into science of the state heritage

discourse. The practice of monument protection of separate groups: architecture, nature, archeology, urban scale, movables, is discussed below. The fourth chapter deals with regionalism, which in the interwar process of protection of monuments was relevant as a way to reconcile local (city / country / region) and national patriotism, in this context patriotism of Vilnius meant patriotism of Poland. The fifth chapter discusses the case of Vilnius photographer Jan Bulhak. His case illustrates the model of regionalism in photography, the close links between all fields of culture in Vilnius and its region and the relationship between photography and monuments in the interwar Vilnius context.

Conclusions

1. The modern concept of the protection of monuments, the meaning and value of monuments, models of the treatment of monuments or, in a word, discourse, developed in Europe in the early 19th and early 20th centuries. It is the concept of a monument as a witness to the past, a document preserved for future generations; perception of the monument as a carrier of the nation's achievements and meanings; identification of the monument with an architectural monument; focusing on the material and appearance of the monument, stylistically restoring or conserving it; attributing the issue of monuments exclusively to experts. This model of monument protection was already established in the legislation and administrative structure of European countries at the beginning of the

20th century. Thus, at that time, discourse became official state sanctioned and allowed in Europe, after World War II - in the world.

2. At the beginning of the 19th and 20th centuries, there were certain state and non-state structures for the protection of monuments in the divided Polish lands, and a number of Polish art historians, architects and archaeologists took part in them. It was they who later developed a system for the protection of monuments in independent Poland, drawing on lessons learned, their own experience and the examples of other countries. Thus, the discourse, concepts and behaviors identical to other European nations, established in Polish lands at the end of the 19th century and the beginning of the 20th century, became state in interwar Poland: legalized by law, implemented by state officials and put into practice. The legislation specified exactly what objects can be considered as monuments (focused on architectural and art objects), what specific values must be carried (art, history, science), how to ensure (control) the physical survival of objects. The monument was understood unequivocally - as a witness to the history of the nation, preserved for future generations. The transmission to future generations took place through the physical preservation of the object. |

3. The field of protection of monuments in Poland was centralized, with little difference in general principles between the voivodships. This field was assigned to the Ministry of Religions and Public Education, an administrative structure had been created - areas for the protection of monuments and the position of conservator, they distributed through the country, their rights and

duties were defined by legal acts. The Vilnius region was connected to the state monument protection system in 1922, and in 1923 the Vilnius monument protection area was established, which also covered the Nowogródek Voivodeship. Non-local art history specialists were appointed as officials - conservators of monuments. They headed the voivodship's Art department, which oversaw all areas of culture and art. They were representatives of the Ministry of Religions and Public Education on monuments, and advisers of voivodes on culture and art.

4. The protection of monuments was in fact the occupation of a very small group of people, experts. Many issues in the field of his direct interests (architecture and art) were curated by the monument conservator himself, based on his professional knowledge, views and values. Commissions of experts in the field of culture were invited only to discuss technical issues or the implementation of certain measures. Both the conservators of the monuments and all those involved in the protection of the monuments were educated men of higher social layer of Polish nationality. The monument protection system was open only to these people. This reflected the wider situation of the whole country in relation to the other, the (im)possibilities of people of other nationalities or lower social strata, and the attitude towards the emancipation of women. Such speaking by several experts on behalf of all, the depiction of the "north-eastern land" as exclusively Polish Catholic, the treatment of monuments as witnesses to the history of

the Polish nation, the identification of monuments with churches and the houses of nobles and rich people allowed power.

5. Interwar Poland was a multinational, multicultural, multi-confessional state in which „national minorities“ there were not minorities. However, state policy in all areas was national, prioritizing one (Polish) ethnic group. Therefore, it is important to realize that the state policy in the field of heritage did not take into account and did not reflect the actual demographic situation, it was oriented towards aspiration, but not reality. During the interwar period, the national and confessional situation in Vilnius and Nowogródek voivodships (50% of Poles and 50-60% of Catholics) was neither very Polish nor very Catholic, or not so much that Poles, newcomers and locals felt confident in the country. This insecurity is evidenced by hundreds of articles, dozens of books and lectures on which the Polishness and Catholicism of the Vilnius or Nowogródek region is based, and the vivid image of Vilnius as a "redout", that is, a defensive fortification. All those texts do not testify to the fact that Vilnius / Nowogródek was Polish and Catholic, they are proof that it was necessary to write hundreds of articles in order to believe and convince the Polishness of the region. The protection of monuments in the Vilnius region should be seen in this context as the collection of evidence about the Polishness of the region and the nurturing of that evidence.

6. In addition, the economic and educational situation of the region is important. In the context of rural Poland, the "northeastern land" stood out as more rural and poor, with a high percentage of

illiterates. In addition, issues of education, occupation, economic capacity were clearly correlated with nationality. The rule was that the officials were of Polish nationality, lowland and the least educated - Belarusians. In this context, nationality, position, education and, consequently, financial capacity, which were certainly symbolized by both the conservator of monuments and other Polish experts in the field of culture, were a source of power. Just like the male gender, it was a social status and a source of power in traditional society. Monuments speak of identities, and the identities of those who can speak are loud and public. Therefore, the protection of monuments in the Vilnius region meant the worldview, values and the identities of experts / elites (educated wealthy Polish men). The heritage of this group was established as universal, inherently valuable through the concept of heritage (a) as a material, (b) the perception of heritage as having an innate value, (c) heritage protection as an area under expert supervision, (d) assigning the mission of custodians of national identity to heritage sites.

7. Listing of monuments, both administrative-legal and scientific inventory, is perceived as a way to establish specific monuments in public discourse as monuments. The administrative registration of monuments, by granting them legal protection, obliged them to treat the object as special, and the actions against it had to be limited, careful, and protected the material. The scientific inventory of monuments meant that the object was captured in detail and, in a sense, preserved and immortalized in the context of the history of Polish architecture. In the process, cultural monuments

become not so much an interest for the local community as for the scientific community, an object of science in the history of Polish art. The declaration of the object as a monument was determined by: one, the importance of the object in the context of art / history / politics / memory, and the other, the limits of the heritage system. There were no objects declared monuments where the system did not work. And it did not work where there was no support from the Polish authorities / intelligentsia. The conservator of monuments was the most important in heritage listing process. It determined from his interests, knowledge, aesthetic taste and beliefs, perseverance and power which objects the state would protect in the region. He was free to judge which objects to declare as monuments, in controversial cases he set a precedent himself. The issuance of the decree was a way to control, to directly influence the survival of the monument, and indirectly to the discourse of memory. The general public did not have the opportunity to participate in the heritage process, and even the defense of their property rights in the appeal process was hampered.

8. The protection of interwar monuments was mainly the protection of architectural monuments. The ordinance on the protection of monuments focused on architecture and artistic values. Such were the professional interests of the monument conservators. So the old and beautiful buildings were synonymous with the monument. The first to become monument was the professional architecture, mainly sacral, belonging to the Catholic Church. The most typical monument of the interwar period was the Baroque

church. The protection of monuments was focused on the preservation of the material of architectural monuments, on the repair of old buildings. Most of the time and the budget of the conservator of monuments was devoted to this. First of all, the lack of funds meant that many of the works were small in scope and only necessary. Large-scale works requiring special professional knowledge were carried out only at some of the most important (Catholic) and oldest monuments: the Cathedral, the Gates of Dawn (picture) surroundings, and medieval castles. The protection of the latter was regular and characteristic in interwar Poland. In the voivodeships of Vilnius and Nowogródek, moreover, all medieval castles were treated as a one system and certain works were undertaken in all castles.

9. The relationship between the protection of natural and cultural objects has been close since the occurrence of these phenomena in the second half of 19th century. In interwar Poland, these areas were not completely separated both ideologically and in practice. On the one hand, nature reserves and parks, which focused on nature, have been established. On the other hand, the cultural meanings of nature were alive and relevant, natural objects were often viewed, they were valued as cultural. The national significance and educational meaning of natural objects / monuments, partly taken over from architectural monuments, was self-evident; and the model of protection of nature as separate natural monuments practically operated within the framework of the system of protection of cultural monuments. In the case of Poland, this commonality of

the protection of natural and cultural monuments was due to practical reasons: the separate state legal and administrative systems for nature protection failed to be fully implemented, and the protection of natural monuments depended partly on the competence of the conservator of monuments.

10. The issues of archeology and movable monuments remained secondary to the conservators of monuments. They were either outside the competence and or interests of the conservator of monuments or outside authority. Archaeological monuments were ignored by the conservators of Vilnius monuments, although this area belonged to them by law, even in objects such as medieval castles, only masonry was valued. Movable monuments, meanwhile, had a strong concept of personal property and personal heritage, and were lack of specialists in the field and lack of funds for their management. In terms of urbanism, the interests and authority of the conservator of monuments covered only the old town of the city. In urban planning, the role of the conservator in planning / carrying out new construction could only be advisory, but when the issues concerned the old town, his approval was necessary.

11. Objects, regardless of type, valued as monuments for aesthetics, antiquity and as witnesses to history / historical events. Natural objects have been declared monuments not because of their natural features but because of cultural. Catholicism is recorded directly in the register of monuments - buildings of Catholic Church are the most frequent. The register is dominated by the 17th-18th century monuments from the period of prosperity of the state. In the

case of architecture - baroque and classicism are dominated. Culture, professional architecture, baroque in the north-eastern lands meant Polishness, baroque church meant Polish church. The close connection between nature and romanticism meant that concern for natural monuments also had a patriotic implication. Professional architecture, building ensembles, palaces, rich masonry, town halls and other buildings of this type told the stories of the elite of science, culture, politics, the stories of patrons, creators and those who lived there, and had the meanings of power, influence and wealth.

12. The Polish image of the city and region was created in various forms. Regionalism as an emancipation of a certain region, the perception and aspiration of originality and separateness, was a way to talk about the Polish Vilnius / Nowogródek / region in the Polish context. Regionalism responded to the political field in Poland and Vilnius in the 1930s, when a way had to be found to integrate Vilnius land into the country's overall situation. It allowed the newcomers to adapt, to include Vilnius in the general cultural context of Poland, and it allowed the locals to enjoy their uniqueness (Mickiewicz tradition and 19th century sentiments). Indeed, regionalism was a form of Polish patriotism or polonism, treating the former territory of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania as an ethnographic region, the "land between the Nemunas and the Daugava"²⁸,

²⁸ Morelowski, Łopalewski used such a designation of the lands of the GDL. See T. Łopalewski, *Między Niemnem a Dźwiną. Ziemia Wileńska i Nowogródzka*, Poznań, 1938; M. Morelowski, *Zarys sztuki wileńskiej z przewodnikiem po zabytkach między Niemnem a Dźwiną*, Wilno, 1939.

Wileńszczyzna or Nowogródzczyzna, the ethnicity or multi-confessionalism of the country was treated as an ethnographic curiosity. Regionalism did not have any aspirations for political separatism. The principles of heritage protection and regionalism coincided. The monuments / heritage of Vilnius Voivodeship expressed the uniqueness of this territory in the Polish context as a feature and part of the Polish heritage. Heritage created a regional identity / was part of a regional identity in the context of the Polish state.

13. Jan Bułhak was such a creator of the region's identity in the context of the Polish state. His photography was not documentary in the sense of neutrality or impartiality. The photographer had clear catholic, national values and a strong nobility worldview on which to base his work. As a creator of artistic photography, he did not seek to portray reality objectively in photographs. On the contrary, he sought to create images of enduring artistic value that depended on the motif and composition of the photograph. He considered the art of photography to be national, the motif of the photograph, the theme, and the content of the images must be Polish. In his view, the motifs and landscape of nature best expressed Polishness, and it was these themes that were considered to have enduring values of art, eternity, permanence, and immutability. His photographs have indeed acquired a lasting and universal value, due to the fact that Polishness was based on conformity with the West (the architectural heritage played this role ideally) and was implemented on the basis of the Western tradition of photographic heritage depiction. Bułhak's

photographs simultaneously had regional and national as well as European / Western meanings. In today's context, Bułhak's photographs remain relevant through regional and European meanings, not as Polish, but as being from/ depicting Vilnius and at the same time being Western.

14. The protection of Vilnius monuments did not differ in the Polish context, the protection of Polish monuments did not differ in the European context. The discourse of monuments was identical everywhere here, and it has not changed today. In today's Vilnius / Lithuania we are talking about the same monuments, their identical concept, identical values, purposes and reasons for preservation. Only the technical implementation of the protection of monuments, the number of bureaucrats, the means and methods of preserving the material have changed. In the narratives of monuments, the details of interpretation are adjusted, adding new accents, changing names and nations. In this sense, we can agree with Remer, the first conservator of Vilnius monuments, and return to his words quoted at the very beginning of the dissertation: "We cannot forget that the idea of protecting monuments is universal, encompassing the culture of the entire civilized [Western] world"²⁹.

²⁹ [Jerzy Remer], „Słowo wstępne“, in: *Ochrona zabytków sztuki*, Warszawa, 1930-1931, s. VI.

LIST OF PUBLICATIONS

1. Viktorija Kurienė, „Jano Bułhako Vilniaus fotografiniai vaizdai tarpukario Vilniaus paveldosaugos kontekste“, in: *Acta Academiae Artium Vilnensis. Dailės ir architektūros paveldas: tyrimai, išsaugojimo problemos ir lūkesčiai*, sud. D. Klajumienė, 2015, t. 77/78, p. 199-217.
2. Viktorija Kurienė, „Ką saugojo valstybė Vilniaus ir Naugarduko vaivadijose 1928-1939 m.? Kultūros paminklų vertinimas ir apskaita“, in: *Lietuvos istorijos studijos*, 2021, t. 47, p. 30-61.

ABOUT THE AUTHOR

Viktorija Kuriene graduated her MA in History at the Faculty of History of Vilnius University in 2010 and began her doctoral studies in 2011. While being a PhD student, Kuriene published two articles and presented the results of her research in two international conferences in Riga and London. Kuriene spent three months of 2013 in International Cultural Centre in Krakow. Her historical research centers on Vilnius history and heritage studies.

NOTES

NOTES

NOTES

Vilnius University Press
9 Saulėtekio Ave., Building III, LT-10222 Vilnius
Email: info@leidykla.vu.lt, www.leidykla.vu.lt
Print run 15