Anna Góral, PhD

TO WHAT EXTENT IS THE HERITAGE MANAGEMENT SYSTEM IN POLAND REALLY PARTICIPATORY?

Abstract

The participatory approach towards management seems to be adopted, to a certain extent, in different spheres of public space, including heritage management. The experts seem to believe that the participation of stakeholders in each phase of a proposed project's development will assist in building trust and confidence between the affected community and local government authority and will encourage community participation in future phases of the project. As a consequence, it will also help to satisfy the expectations of different groups of interest and in a longer perspective facilitate the sustainable development of a region. The aim of this article is to provide a critical reflection on the contemporary Polish cultural heritage management system as seen from the perspective of active citizens as well as on the role of local communities in this system. Attention is also paid to the relationships that exist between the social and public sector in heritage management processes.

1. Introduction

In 2013, the Polish village of Lipnica Murowana (Małopolska Province) celebrated the 10th anniversary of entering its little wooden Church of St. Leonard on the UNESCO World Heritage Site List. During the ceremony, the then parish priest, who was the church guardian, told the story about the 1997 flood, often referred to as "the flood of the century," during which the locals abandoned their homes to first save this twelfth-century church. They did it by tying it with ropes to a large oak tree growing nearby, thus preventing the church from collapsing and turning into ruins. Before the flood, the St. Leonard Church was of only marginal interest to conservators despite its extraordinary historical and artistic value. It was only the enormous ravages of the flood and the resulting citizen involvement in preserving the monument which became the actual reason to commence the maintenance and restoration work that has

restored the Church's greatness. The Church is now considered a world-class gem of wooden architecture. It is worth noting that the locals were continually involved not only in the conservation work but also in the archiving activities and the promotion of this unique piece of heritage.

The above example is unique, as it shows the local community as a key participant in the process of cultural heritage management, ever-present on all its stages. More often, however, we are faced with quite different situations where relevant public bodies responsible for heritage management seem to pay little attention to the opinions and needs of local communities. On the other hand, in order to do justice to the public sector, it has to be mentioned that in many cases local communities remain indifferent to the fate of many monuments located in their immediate neighborhood, or their actions are inconsistent. The results of the research called *Dziedzictwo kulturowe w oczach Polaków – raport z badań społecznych* (Cultural heritage in the eyes of the Poles – a social research report), commissioned by the Polish Ministry of Culture and National Heritage in 2012[1], indicate that the society's awareness of the heritage and its role is insufficient. However, more and more grassroots initiatives dedicated to local heritage appear in the public space each year. Such initiatives seem to complement those areas of heritage management and preserve those heritage items that have not been included in the state management system, which is certainly a positive development.

The aim of this article is to provide a critical reflection on the contemporary Polish cultural heritage management system as seen from the perspective of active citizens as well as on the role of local communities in this system. Attention is also paid to the relationships that exist between the social and the public sector in heritage management processes. It is an explorative analysis. However, it contains certain questions about the issues that appear in the development of different forms of Polish civic engagement for heritage, especially the informal ones, and about the possible ways to solve them.

2. Background. The heritage management system in Poland

The inspiration to reflect upon the phenomenon of public participation in heritage management came mostly from the new trends in management, particularly from the critical trend arising in the field of humanities according to which the management practice changes in response to social and economic shifts occurring in its milieu[2]. At the same time, what is increasingly visible in the public space is the presence of the social sector represented by both formal organizations (NGOs) and informal civic initiatives.

Paraphrasing the words of Sophia Psarra, who said that visiting the 19th-century building of the Natural History Museum in London, whose architecture directly al-

---

[1] *Dziedzictwo kulturowe w oczach Polaków – raport z badań społecznych*, Warszawa 2012.
[2] K. Barańska, *Muzeum w sieci znaczeń*, Kraków 2013, p. 22–25.

ludes to a monumental church, was like experiencing a theatre performance[3], it can be said that this building also reflects the traditional approach to cultural heritage management which was popular at that time. In the late 19th century and actually until the mid-20th century, visitors who came to London's Natural History Museum were part of an anonymous audience of "empty vessels" passively absorbing and accepting whatever the exhibition creators provided as the representation of their culture and imposed as "their cultural heritage" or whatever the museologists thought to be the representation of the cultures of other nations. At the same time, it was emphasized that the domain of heritage management "belonged" to the public sector. This resulted from the then prevailing paradigm identified and described by Laurajane Smith as *authorized heritage discourse [AHD]*[4]. The building of the Natural History Museum in London is still there today, but the audience-institution relationship is now completely different. The socio-economic and cultural changes of the second half of the 20th century and early 21st century led to a paradigm shift, along with which came a transformation of the way people think about the responsibilities institutions have towards the community whose heritage they are to collect, protect, and share. What has become the symbol of the new approach is the Darwin Centre's Cocoon, added to the Museum in 2009, whose exhibition enables visitors to explore the museum from the inside. At the same time, the heritage has symbolically "returned" to its owners – local communities – who are increasingly included in numerous bottom-up heritage preservation initiatives and take many of them independently.

These changes in the general environment inspire reflection upon the contemporary heritage management system in Poland, with its structure and efficiency. The heritage management system itself means certain fixed framework used in order for the system to work. This framework consists of three crucial elements: the legal framework which defines the rationale for the system's existence; the organizational framework which defines system-related organizational needs and decisions; and, finally, resources necessary in order for the system to function[5]. These elements enable planning, implementing, and monitoring of specific activities related to cultural heritage, ensuring its preservation and development. Management systems are created in order to manage specific resources in an effective way.

Each European country has its own system of monuments protection. Its fundamentals were developed in the 19th and early 20th century based on the rules of dealing with monuments which were shaped both by legislation and art theorists. The following analysis serves as a starting point for a reflection upon the role of local communities in the Polish heritage management system and focuses on this system's few

---

[3] A. Janus, D. Kawęcka, *Od publiczności do uczestników. Instytucje dziedzictwa w dobie cyfryzacji i partycypacji*, Presentation made during the conference: Kreatywne rozwiązania w zarządzaniu kulturą – nowatorskie teorie, techniki i technologie, Kraków 12.05.2012 [after:] S. Psarra, *Victorian knowledge. The Natural History Museum, London and the Art Gallery and Museum Kelvingrove, Glasgow* [in:] *Architecture and Narrative. The formation of space and cultural meaning*, London 2009, p. 145.

[4] L. Smith, *The Uses of Heritage*, London 2006, p. 11–42.

[5] *Zarządzanie Światowym Dziedzictwem Kulturowym*, Warszawa 2015, p. 57.

selected elements: legal regulations; organizational regulations; and resources, especially human resources which become involved in activities to promote and protect heritage. The Polish system has very often provoked a barrage of harsh criticism, particularly due to the untapped social potential that is the result of numerous difficulties reported by citizens when it comes to cooperating with the public sector[6].

2.1. Public organizational framework

At the outset, it is worth noting that the Polish legislation does not contain any direct reference to the concept of cultural heritage, and the heritage-related regulations are contained in the legislation on the protection of monuments. Even a cursory analysis of the Polish heritage management system indicates that it is extremely complex and bureaucratic, with all decision-making processes entangled in the network of countless procedures and relationships. In accordance with Article 89 of the Polish Act on the protection of monuments, the Minister of Culture and National Heritage is the higher authority in the field of heritage protection. On his behalf, the tasks and competences related to the protection of monuments are executed by the General Conservator (Polish: Generalny Konserwator Zabytków), who is a secretary or undersecretary of state at the Ministry of Culture and National Heritage. He or she performs the assigned tasks with the help of the Department of Monuments Protection. The recently established National Heritage Institute – a state cultural institution responsible for the protection of monuments – is a specialized organization which supports the General Conservator in their work. According to Article 93 of the above-mentioned Act, the first-instance bodies include: provincial conservators in the matters specified in the Act and in other regulations; heads of the regionally competent marine offices in the matters specified in Article 36(2) and Article 48 of the Act. The management structure formulated this way indicates the specific nature of the system in question and thereby its problem areas. First of all, the function of General Conservator is exercised by the deputy minister, which means we are dealing with the combination of two roles: political and substantive, which raises the potential danger of a conflict of interest. Second of all, the Polish Ministry of Culture and National Heritage has two departments: Monuments Protection; and Preservation of Cultural Heritage. Given the common goals of both departments articulated on their websites and comprising of a total of 59 tasks, such a division of competences indeed suggests that monuments are not part of the heritage, which makes it really difficult to understand the logic of how the system works at the central level.

At the regional level, the tasks related to heritage and monuments management are the responsibility of communes (Polish: gminas). In Poland, these activities are regulated by the Polish Local Government Act of 8 March 1990, whose Article 7 Sec-

---

ZARZĄDZANIE PAMIĘCIĄ KULTUROWĄ, REWITALIZACJA

tion 1(9) stipulates that the commune's own duties encompass cultural issues, including local libraries and other cultural institutions, as well as the protection and preservation of monuments. However, it is impossible to precisely define the scope of communes' duties in this area. It is known that communes are legally obliged to prepare local monuments preservation programs according to the instructions given by the National Institute for Monuments Protection; however, it is not known which of the departments of the commune office deals with the matters in question. Communes can establish cultural parks and are required to keep records of monuments and introduce conservation areas to local spatial development plans.

The scope and forms of monuments protection in Poland in relation to their respective owners are regulated by the Polish Act of 23 July 2003 on the protection and guardianship of monuments (Dz. U. 03.162.1568, as amended) and the secondary legislation to the Act, including the Order of the Minister of Culture and National Heritage of 27 July 2011 on carrying out conservation work, restoration work, construction works, conservation research, architectural research, and other activities on monuments entered into the register of monuments and archeological research. A monument's owner may apply to a monument conservator for issuing written conservation recommendations, helpful in preparing documentation or formulating the scope of scheduled work. The aim of such conservation recommendations is determining how to use and protect the monument and how to perform conservation work as well as specifying the scope of acceptable changes that can be made in the monument. Moreover, obliging the owners of registered monuments to promote and disseminate knowledge about the monuments and their significance for history and culture is only a provision on paper, whose enforcement poses many difficulties.

Form of ownership (dominant and preferred)	Private ownership of monuments
Responsibility for monuments	By law, responsibility for monuments assigned to owner and user
Financing of monuments	Owner obliged to finance monuments (including research)
The historic building status	Monuments treated as commercial goods – financing monuments is an investment
Competences of conservation office	Conservation office is not independent (is part of provincial structures)
Role of conservation office	Conservation office is passive; owners and investors take the initiative

Fig. 1. The system of heritage management in Poland

Based on: Purchla J. (Ed.), *Raport na temat funkcjonowania systemu ochrony dziedzictwa kulturowego w Polsce po roku 1989*, 2009, http://www.kongreskultury.pl/library/File/RaportDziedzictwo/dziedzictwo_raport_w.pelna(1).pdf [access: 5.01.2016]

Despite so many solutions, which are often questionable and perceived as odd, the key role in the above-described heritage management system belongs to heritage owners. They are the ones directly responsible for it and obliged to finance monuments, while the role of public authorities, in spite of all the complexities and numerous regulations, is clearly passive and boils down to issuing opinions and permits and monitoring the activities of private owners of monuments. Therefore, in order to fully evaluate the heritage management system in Poland, the analysis should also include the role and activity of the social sector in this regard.

2.2. Local communities and heritage management

In each monuments protection system, society plays a special role. This is primarily associated with people's strong emotional attachment to their own national heritage, which makes them interested in the fate of mementos of the past. Although the Act of 2003 on the protection of monuments obliges the Polish Minister of Culture and National Heritage to draw up the National Programme for the Protection and Guardianship of Monuments, such a program was not established until 2013[7]. It was passed on to the Sejm Committee on Culture by the General Conservator, who also presented the results of the study commissioned by the National Heritage Institute and conducted on the representative group of Poles asked about their awareness of the importance of monuments. The results indicate that, in 2011, a total lack of interest in monuments was declared by 14% of the respondents; 10% saw no relationship between the presence of monuments in a given area and the improvement of life for local communities; and 7% were confident about the negative impact of monuments on the local living standards due to the obligation to finance them. Asked about their own reaction to the destruction of monuments, as many as 19% of respondents declared passivity, and 20% were unable to identify any monument in their area[8]. The results of this study clearly show that the Poles' awareness of the value of historic monuments is extremely low. While the 20% score in the inability to name at least one monument in one's immediate vicinity is an objective fact, other answers undoubtedly include a significant portion of different answers that were not verbalized for various reasons, primarily due to the respondent's feeling of embarrassment and desire to bolster his self-esteem in the eyes of the interviewer. Therefore, what we get is the image of a society whose majority is not interested in monuments and their protection. This situation is caused by the fact that schools and cultural institutions do not conduct any educational activities in this area, despite being obliged to do so. This observation leads to the conclusion that all legal regulations about public participation in the protection of monuments are just empty provisions. The exact same speech delivered by the General Conservator suggests that no one actually

---

[7] *Powstał plan ochrony zabytków do 2016 roku*, http://wiadomosci.onet.pl/kraj/powstal-plan--ochrony-zabytkow-do-roku-2016/nf778 [access: 20.01.2016].

[8] *Dziedzictwo kulturowe w oczach Polaków – raport z badań społecznych*, Warszawa 2012.

knows how many immovable monuments there are in Poland exactly, as the Monuments Register verification program implemented since 2009 has verified 80% of all the monuments, 2,597 of which had ceased to exist and therefore had to be deleted from the Register. 2,257 monuments were considered as extremely endangered. In all likelihood, scarce public awareness can be deemed as one of the reasons for this state of affairs.

At the same time, leaving the Heritage Institute's research aside, it is impossible not to notice the presence of the third sector in the initiatives for culture and cultural heritage. In 2012, Poland had more than 80 thousand registered NGOs: 11 thousand foundations and 72 thousand associations (excluding Volunteer Fire Brigades)[9]. Based on other research, conducted by the Klon/Jawor Association, it can be estimated that about three-quarters of them remain active, which means 60,000 organizations. According to the Klon/Jawor research authors, arts and culture is the main field of activity for 17% of Polish NGOs, which in practice means that there are approx. 10,000 cultural associations and foundations in Poland. In addition, 16% of such organizations mention arts and culture as an additional (non-core) sphere in which they become involved. Thus, the total percentage of cultural organizations is 33%, which means about 20,000 associations and foundations. Given the fact that Poland has 2,478 communes, the area of culture and heritage is particularly well developed, and, statistically, each commune has eight non-governmental organizations dealing with culture. The most popular projects implemented by cultural organizations include different kinds of workshops and trainings. In the past two years, such activities have been offered by half (52%) of the researched organizations. Other popular initiatives are festivals and local celebrations (46%), exhibitions (43%), and concerts (40%). More than one-third of cultural associations and foundations have also organized festivals, shows, competitions, lectures, conferences, and seminars. Less than one-third has been involved in other types of activity[10].

Furthermore, both in the public and virtual space, we can observe countless initiatives for heritage, which is somewhat at odds with the data presented by the National Heritage Institute on heritage awareness among Poles. However, the social sector and civic participation seem to be chaotic and still at the self-organization stage. They are still seeking their directions for development and defining their objectives. In order to accurately assess their role in the system of heritage management, we should take a closer look at the organizational aspects of current initiatives and reflect upon whether they can be continued and developed further.

---

[9] P. Adamiak, et al., *Współpraca w obszarze kultury – samorządy, publiczne instytucje kultury, organizacje pozarządowe*, Warszawa 2013, http://civicpedia.ngo.pl/files/wiadomosci.ngo.pl/public/civicpedia/kultura.pdf [access: 20.10.2015].

[10] Ibidem.

3. Research Design

This text has been embedded in the idea of qualitative research which covered 20 selected civic initiatives dedicated to cultural heritage. For the purposes of the research, two research techniques were used: 1) in-depth interviews conducted with 20 leaders of said initiatives who already had experience in implementing similar projects; 2) in-depth analysis of online content dedicated to selected civic initiatives published on dedicated social media profiles. The interviews were conducted from September to December 2015; the web content analysis covered the period from the initiative launch to the end of December 2015. In many cases, the end date of the research coincided with the end date of providing funds for some of the researched initiatives. It was chosen deliberately in order to be able to ask questions about the future of these initiatives in the face of lack of funds and to confront them with the enthusiasm and future plans of the leaders.

The interviews were semi-structured and developed in different directions, depending on the heritage management-related issues and challenges identified by the research participants as the most important. The collected data were coded and analyzed in terms of three aspects:

1) Ways of managing grassroots initiatives dedicated to heritage;
2) Major challenges in organizing heritage initiatives;
3) The heritage management system in Poland.

By analyzing the activities in the field of social initiatives for heritage in different social networks, attention was paid to the size of the culture of participation in society. This approach stems from the observation made by Elizabeth Yakel, who points out that in order to better understand the dynamics of the participatory culture on the Web, we should look at why it is used as well as analyze the available content, its quantities, and the comments and discussions it generates[11]. A special role of social media in building a culture of participation among citizens is also emphasized by Magdalena Szpunar[12]. Therefore, the above-mentioned research focuses on: a) the extent to which social media are used for the management of civic initiatives for heritage; b) the durability of the published content and the initiatives themselves; and c) the level of on-line activity displayed by the recipients and participants of the studied initiatives. The research covers formalized initiatives (10) conducted by registered associations and foundations as well as informal projects undertaken by local activists (10).

The research findings, regarding both the quantity and the content of the collected materials, have been presented in the form of a summary built around the main issues and challenges faced by civic initiatives for heritage. At the same time, by re-

---

[11] E. Yakel, *Balancing archival authority with encouraging authentic voices to engage with records* [in:] K. Theimer (Ed.), *A Different Kind of Web: New Connections between Archives and Our Users*, Chicago 2011, p. 97.

[12] E.g. M. Szpunar, *Nowe media a paradygmat kultury uczestnictwa* [in:] M. Graszewicz, J. Jastrzębski (Eds.), *Teorie komunikacji i mediów 2*, Wrocław 2010, p. 251–262.

ferring to certain metaphors and analogies, efforts were made to illustrate different points of view represented by the research participants as well as the distinctive features of civic activities aimed at promoting heritage[13]. Metaphors as a method to describe the surrounding phenomena are highly effective, because they are deeply embedded in our everyday language, shaping (often unwittingly) our thoughts and affecting human behavior. That makes them a potent tool to be used in the analysis of organizations. Interpretation becomes subjective and depends on the researcher's experience, knowledge, and current situation. In the literature on organizations and management, metaphors appeared as early as the beginning of the 20th century[14], but their use was not yet studied back then. It was not until the end of 1970s that scholars started to explore metaphors as a means which helps understand organizations and their inner processes[15].

4. Research results – public participation in heritage management

Despite multiple definitions of management, there are as many common notions of management as people asked about it. Add to that a specific subject to be managed, and the list of definitions becomes even longer. Each individual has their own unique way of understanding the surrounding reality which is associated with their past experience, knowledge, values, and individual perception of their place in the world. Therefore, paraphrasing the title of Barańska's book[16], we could say that the heritage management functions in a large network of meanings. For this reason, in order to capture the complexity of the issue, the results are presented by way of metaphors and analogies which were either used by the research participants during the interviews or are deemed by the research author as the ones which best describe the situation in question.

Maze

The network of relationships and interdependencies between heritage owners, decision-makers, sponsors, and users appears to be like an endless maze. Finding a way through it often exceeds the available time-frame and systematically suppress-

---

[13] P. Bishop, A. Hines, T. Collins (2007): *The current state of scenario development: an overview of techniques*, „Foresight”, 2007, No. 9(1), p. 5–25.

[14] Among first metaphors of organisation we may indicate those proposed by Taylor and Smith, who compared bureaucratic organisations to machines. Next Maslow compared organisations to organisms. M.J. Hatch, *Teoria organizacji*, Warszawa 2001.

[15] M. Kostera, *Postmodernizm w zarządzaniu*, Warszawa 1996; A. Zając, *Wykorzystanie metafor do identyfikacji potrzeb informacyjnych*, 2012, http://ki.ae.krakow.pl/~zajaca/artykuly/WYKORZYSTANIE%20METAFOR%20DO%20IDENTYFIKACJI%20POTRZEB%20INFORMACYJNYCH.pdf [access: 09.10.2015].

[16] K. Barańska, *Muzeum w sieci znaczeń*, Kraków 2013.

es the enthusiasm of activists who want to work to promote heritage. This often makes people confused and discourages them from further actions. The research participants repeatedly emphasized clerks' unwillingness to support initiatives, lack of competence, conservative approach stemming from their fear of failure or making a mistake, and their responsibility-shifting approach which leads to additional red-tape and procedures. On the other hand, the public sector accuses local activists of being ignorant about the existing procedures, taking too much for granted, and being too eager to circumvent the law and formal solutions. As a result, local initiatives are impermanent and often discontinued due to discouraging bureaucracy, which is best illustrated with the next metaphor relating to citizens' activities for heritage. During the research the interviewed leaders of heritage initiatives few times mentioned the case of billboard in Kraków which was inhabited by homeless people. Due to bouro-cratic maze it took many months to remove the illegal costraction that was build near the Wawel Castle and only because of media intervention. Similar situations are facing owners of historic building who want to invest in them.

Sandcastles

The analysis of social media showed that in the last three years there have been several dozens of projects designed to promote, protect, and reuse the local cultural heritage resources in the Małopolska Province alone, from fund-raising projects for the conservation of selected historic buildings to collection digitization and completely new activities in the area of heritage. Undoubtedly, this should be interpreted as a sign of civic activity, people's desire to act, and the growing awareness of heritage value. However, a completely different picture emerges after taking a closer look at the time-frame of these initiatives on social media sites. They last for a few weeks to a few months. Only a small percentage of them is really long-lasting – and these are mainly initiatives prepared by NGOs. Initially, the enthusiasm of civic project initiators is usually enormous, which is reflected in numerous publications and discussions initiated on social media sites; sadly, it usually dies down after some time, as evidenced by the declining number of comments and unwillingness to interact with the audience. It brings to mind sandcastles – ephemeral constructions destroyed by a single wave. These waves are usually one's professional or personal engagements and informality, i.e. lack of obligation to continue one's actions. All this makes such initiatives only temporary.

The Tower of Babel

On the one hand, from the perspective of event creators, social media are characterized by the potential to reach a wide and diverse audience. On the other hand, event participants can share their point of view with a lot of people and interact with them, which is a lot easier in the virtual world than in the real world. Social media is like the Tower of Babel, where we can meet a remarkable mix of people, needs, and interests, which are very often conflicting. Looking at selected civic initiatives in so-

ZARZĄDZANIE PAMIĘCIĄ KULTUROWĄ, REWITALIZACJA

cial media, one can get the impression that they arouse interest of very different audiences who are willing to share their opinions but find it difficult to come to an agreement and start practicing what they preach. Certainly, it should be noted that negative information provoke the most heated debates, because people have a reason to complain, as exemplified by people criticizing the passivity of local authorities towards the activities of developers in the historic districts of Cracow. However, the most serious permanent feature of on-line users, next to their tendency to criticize and complain, is their inability to come up with solutions to improve the system and their waiting for the relevant public authorities to hear their critical voices and take some action. An example can be the the Facebook fapage titled "Ratujmy Górnośląskie Zabytki" [Let's save m Upper-Silesian monuments]. The fanpage was created in 2012, initially very active in terms of number of posts and commnets published under them. Most of them were rather negative, critisizing the current situation of monuments but without undetaking or propisng real actions aimed to improve it. The authors managed to gather more than 5,000 followers which comparing to other simliar fan pages is a rather impressive result. However currently due to lack of time and decrease of enthusiams of the authors the profile rather passive, new information, which take a form of sharing materials written by the others are published about once per month.

Glass houses

Heritage is a process that transforms together with the changing environment as well as the awareness and expectations of heritage developers and users[17]. Currently, regardless of the National Heritage Institute's research results, this awareness seems to be relatively high, especially among young and educated people who are willing to act in their immediate surroundings. Active citizenship for heritage, restricted by no ossified organizational boundaries and combined with openness to new ideas and experimentation and a desire to pursue one's passions, inspires the development of innovative and creative heritage projects[18]. These undertakings, however, are fragile and often infeasible when confronted with reality: legal regulations, lack of resources, and the need for greater involvement. They are like glass houses – ideas which are wonderful yet impossible to be fully implement in life. On the one hand, the reasons for this can be traced to the unstable structures of civic initiatives, which primarily depend on the willingness and enthusiasm of their creators; on the other hand, creative ideas, even if the most innovative of all, lose when confronted with the grant paranoia: the constant pursuit of more and more funds for new projects, which leaves no room for the continuation of what has already been achieved. Some of them, furtunatelly, dspite all the obstacles and very idealistic aims, are successful. One of them is facebook community "Polska Dolina Loary" [Historic Manors of Lower Silesia], the

---

[17] S. Thurley, *Into the future. Our strategy for 2005–2010*, "Conservation Bulletin" [English Heritage], 2005, No. 49.

[18] Por. P. Hess (Ed.), *Foresight obywatelski*, 2014, http://stocznia.org.pl/wp-content/uploads/2014/01/foresight_lekkie_do_www.pdf [access: 09.01.2016].

grassroot initiative that was establised in 2012 by a group of friends who decided to save manors and palaces of Lower Silesia region. They decided to use social media to rise the awareness of Polish about the Silesian heritage and also use those media to find potential investors who would like to save the heritage. Despite all the obstacles, up till now they are trying to realize their passion for Silesian heritage.

The above metaphors refer to the reality of grassroots initiatives for heritage. They illustrate how the Polish heritage management system is perceived and how bottom-up initiatives for heritage are organized. It is worth complementing them with a reflection upon the major challenges and issues faced, sometimes unwittingly, by the initiators of bottom-up actions. They certainly affect their work methods and the types of actions they take:

– The project trap. The last decade has brought the incredible development of new mechanisms for financing the activities of civic organizations, primarily owing to the Polish EU membership. This enabled the implementation of countless projects for the heritage that would have been impossible within the structures of the public management system. However, it has also made citizens and NGO workers rely too much on EU funds and constantly pursue them, implementing heaps of projects, not always according to pre-planned strategy[19]. As a consequence, many of the implemented projects are very short-lasting.

– Another burden is the still-persisting Marxist dogma of the unproductivity of culture, reinforced today by the stereotype of the budgetary "horde" constantly trying to get their hands on public money. Hence, it is necessary to disseminate the new way of thinking about heritage as a factor contributing to development, including to the economic growth.

– Particularism. Research suggests that civic actions associated with heritage are very often particularistic and ad hoc in nature. This particularism is manifested by focusing on the "here and now," which means focusing the entire attention on specific single events taking place in the immediate time perspective. It makes people neglect strategic and forward-looking thinking which covers a broad and diverse field of cultural activity.

– The system is pragmatic, while people are not. The research participants repeatedly indicated that they were unable to implement their ideas in practice due to restrictive legal regulations or the absence of any regulation whatsoever, e.g. in the area of developing the so-called "nobody's sites." Bottom-up initiatives for heritage are often guided by emotions and dreams, as opposed to clerks, who base their actions on formal regulations.

– Lack of mutual understanding and trust[20] is a characteristic feature of all cross-sectoral relationships, particularly visible in relations with the NGO

---

[19] M. Ćwikła, *W pułapce projektów*, "Dwutygodnik", edit. 119, 2013, No. 11, http://www.dwutygodnik.com/artykul/4841-w-pulapce-projektow.html [access: 09.01.2016].

[20] H. Izdebski, *Możliwości rozwijania partycypacji obywatelskiej w świetle aktualnych rozwiązań prawno-instytucjonalnych dotyczących trzeciego sektora* [in:] S. Mocek (Ed.) *Nieodkryty wymiar III sektora. Wprowadzenie do badań nad nowym społecznikostwem*, Warszawa 2015, p. 45–56.

sector due to NGOs' low formalization level and lack of organizational and financial soundness. The public sector often treats grassroots initiatives with reserve, fearing that they might fail; similarly, the third sector is equally reluctant to cooperate with public institutions, seeing them as resistant to change and overly bureaucratic. This mutual stereotyping affects the number and scope of joint activities.

The research allows us to go so far as to say that we are on the threshold of a revolution in cultural heritage management – the so-called participatory revolution[21]. The already mentioned social changes promoting the participatory model of public resource and goods management (with the cultural heritage resources and cultural resources in general considered as such), the growing public awareness of cultural heritage, the development of individualism, and better education of society have made the role of citizens in the effective functioning of the heritage management system much more appreciated and noticed. The modern system seems to be understood as the one which *adjusts to the surrounding reality*, *which means that it* [the system] *works so as to meet the requirements of time* [...][22]. However, it still seems that a fully functioning participatory heritage management system is still at a nascent stage, and many changes are required for it to become completely implemented and operate efficiently. In particular, what needs to increase is the general awareness of heritage as well as the mutual trust and equal partnership between the public, private, and social sector.

5. Conclusions

This paper is an attempt to show how the heritage management system is perceived by active citizens who are the authors of grassroots initiatives for heritage. First, however, in order to fully understand this phenomenon, attention should be paid to the scope of changes which have occurred in the cultural heritage management. It is also necessary to emphasize the evolution of the very concept of cultural heritage, which has ceased to be something merely imposed on the society by public authorities and has become a social concept created by citizens as a community as well as a concept of subjective nature, since the contemporary approach to the cultural heritage emphasizes the key role of the individual choice and interpretation of heritage.

The post-modern paradigm suggests that the cultural heritage should be interpreted in a dynamic and individualized way as a phenomenon shaped by the entire society in the interactive process, and not as an ossified set of cultural elements arbitrarily specified by authorities as relevant and valuable from the point of view of history, aesthet-

---

[21] P. Linett, *Participatory revolution is all around us*, 2011, http://www.sloverlinett.com/blog/2011/may/the-participatory-revolution-is-all-around-us [access: 26.11.2015].

[22] A. Datko, R. Necel, *Nowoczesna instytucja kultury. Raport z badań*, Poznań 2011, p. 4.

ics, and national/regional ideology. Cultural heritage is not a dead pool of symbolic meanings suspended in a social vacuum; quite the contrary – it is constantly evolving, responding to the ongoing social changes and greatly affecting regional identity. Hence, the main conceptual axis of cultural heritage should be built around its discursive nature, as cultural heritage is a malleable phenomenon, which changes with time and depends on the social status, origin, and experience of the speaker, and on the political and historical circumstances. The heritage management system should be the same – constantly evolving and adapting to the changes occurring in the surrounding reality and responding to the needs of society which is the basis of heritage existence.

The most desired cultural heritage management system today is best illustrated with the metaphor of collage. The heritage management system as shown from the post-modern perspective is a collage of fragments of knowledge, understanding, expectations in order to create a new perspective[23]. Collage, i.e. different objects and their fragments combined to create the new value, reveals a complex and heterogeneous structure of many organizations. It emphasizes the perspective of the organization which uses the fragments of knowledge available in its environment to shape new quality[24]. This metaphor shows the multiplicity of stakeholders and their objectives related to the use of cultural heritage. When skillfully combined, their goals, although very often fundamentally different, form a new whole. Rather than over-analyzing rules and procedures, public sector entities should stimulate dialogue between different heritage stakeholders and explore and create new frameworks for their mutual cooperation and actions.

Bibliography

Adamiak P. et al., *Współpraca w obszarze kultury – samorządy, publiczne instytucje kultury, organizacje pozarządowe*, Warszawa 2013, http://civicpedia.ngo.pl/files/wiadomosci.ngo.pl/public/civicpedia/kultura.pdf [access: 20.10.2015].

Barańska K., *Muzeum w sieci znaczeń*, Kraków 2013.

Bishop P., Hines A., Collins T., *The current state of scenario development: an overview of techniques*, "Foresight", 2007, No. 9(1), p. 5–25.

Boxenbaum E., Rolecau L., *New knowledge products as bricolage: metaphors and scripts in organizational theory*, "Academy of Management Review", 2011, Vol. 36, No. 2, p. 272–296.

Ćwikła M., *W pułapce projektów*, "Dwutygodnik", edit. 119, 2013, No. 11, http://www.dwutygodnik.com/artykul/4841-w-pulapce-projektow.html [access: 09.01.2016].

Datko A., Necel R., *Nowoczesna instytucja kultury. Raport z badań*, Poznań 2011.

Dziedzictwo kulturowe w oczach Polaków – raport z badań społecznych, Warszawa 2012.

Hatch M.J., *Teoria organizacji*, Warszawa 2002.

Hess P. (Ed.), *Foresight obywatelski*, 2014, http://stocznia.org.pl/wp-content/uploads/2014/01/foresight_lekkie_do_www.pdf [access: 09.01.2016].

---

[23] M.J. Hatch, *Teoria organizacji*, Warszawa 2002, p. 66–71.

[24] E. Boxenbaum, L. Rolecau, *New knowledge products as bricolage: metaphors and scripts in organizational theory*, „Academy of Management Review", 2011, Vol. 36, No. 2, p. 272–296.

ZARZĄDZANIE PAMIĘCIĄ KULTUROWĄ, REWITALIZACJA

Heylighen F., Bollen J., *The World-Wide Web as a Super-Brain: from metaphor to model*, 1996, http://pespmc1.vub.ac.be/papers/WWWSuperBRAIN.html [access: 08.10.2015].

Izdebski H., *Możliwości rozwijania partycypacji obywatelskiej w świetle aktualnych rozwiązań prawno-instytucjonalnych dotyczących trzeciego sektora* [in:] Mocek S. (Ed.), *Nieodkryty wymiar III sektora. Wprowadzenie do badań nad nowym społecznikostwem*, Warszawa 2015, p. 45–56.

Janus A., Kawęcka D., *Od publiczności do uczestników. Instytucje dziedzictwa w dobie cyfryzacji i partycypacji*, Presentation made during the conference: Kreatywne rozwiązania w zarządzaniu kulturą – nowatorskie teorie, techniki i technologie, Kraków 12.05.2012 [after:] S. Psarra, *Victorian knowledge. The Natural History Museum, London and the Art Gallery and Museum Kelvingrove, Glasgow* [in:] *Architecture and Narrative. The formation of space and cultural meaning*, London 2009.

Kostera M., *Postmodernizm w zarządzaniu*, Warszawa 1996.

Lanzara G.F., *The Design Process: Frames, Metaphores and Games* [in:] U. Briefs, C. Ciborra, L. Schneider, L. (Eds.), *Systems Design For, With and By the User*, Amsterdam 1983.

Linett P., *Participatory revolution is all around us*, 2011, http://www.sloverlinett.com/blog/2011/may/the-participatory-revolution-is-all-around-us [access: 26.11.2015].

Purchla J., *W stronę systemu ochrony dziedzictwa kulturowego w Polsce*, "Zarządzanie Publiczne", 2010, No. 12, p. 69–82.

Purchla J. (Ed.), *Raport na temat funkcjonowania systemu ochrony dziedzictwa kulturowego w Polsce po roku 1989*, 2009, http://www.kongreskultury.pl/library/File/RaportDziedzictwo/dziedzictwo_raport_w.pelna(1).pdf [access: 05.01.2016].

Smith L., *The Uses of Heritage*, London 2006.

Szpunar M., *Nowe media a paradygmat kultury uczestnictwa* [in:] M. Graszewicz, J. Jastrzębski (Eds.), *Teorie komunikacji i mediów 2*, Wrocław 2010, p. 251–262.

Szulborska-Łukaszewicz J., *Trends in cultural policy and culture management in Poland (1989−2014)*, "Zarządzanie w Kulturze", 2015, No. 3(16), p. 221–240.

Thurley S., *Into the future. Our strategy for 2005–2010*, "Conservation Bulletin" [English Heritage]. 2005, No. 49.

Yakel E., *Balancing archival authority with encouraging authentic voices to engage with records* [in:] K. Theimer (Ed.), *A Different Kind of Web: New Connections between Archives and Our Users*, Chicago 2011, p. 75–101.

Zając A., *Wykorzystanie metafor do identyfikacji potrzeb informacyjnych*, 2012, http://tinyurl.com/gkraz4e [access: 09.10.2015].

Zarządzanie Światowym Dziedzictwem Kulturowym, Warszawa 2015.