

Original article

Protection of monuments as an element of cultural security (on the example of the Liw Castle)

Michał Godlewski

Institute of Social Sciences and Security,
Faculty of Humanities, Siedlce University of Natural Sciences and Humanities, Poland,
e-mail: stopa42@op.pl

INFORMATIONS

Article history:

Submitted: 18 September 2018

Accepted: 15 March 2019

Published: 17 June 2019

ABSTRACT

The article presents various ways of defining cultural security, which is one of the human primary needs represented in the literature on the subject. It focuses on explaining the meaning of the term “monument”, which is defined and understood in many ways. The history of the Land of Liw and the Liw Castle is presented through the analysis of historical literature. Furthermore, the article discusses Otto Warpechowski’s contribution to the protection of the Liw Castle, which is the cultural heritage of the Mazovia region and the entire Poland, against total destruction planned by the Nazi authorities. The article reveals the impact that the Castle in Liw has on the feeling of cultural security of the local community, and describes cultural activities undertaken at the Liw Castle aimed at promoting the sense of safety, cultural identity and belonging to the Polish cultural community and a local community.

KEYWORDS

cultural security, heritage, Mazovia region, local community



© 2019 by Author(s). This is an open access article under the Creative Commons Attribution International License (CC BY). <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>

Introduction

The aim of the article is to describe the role and importance of monument protection as an important element of cultural security on the example of the Liw Castle. Therefore, the subject of the research are undertakings initiated for the protection of this monument over its history. The basic research method used was a critical analysis of archival sources and literature on the subject.

The concept of cultural security and its definitions appeared in the literature of the subject in the second half of the twentieth century, however, issues related to the area of cultural security have been present since the beginning of human civilization. All kinds of armed conflicts, conquests, invasions that have taken place since the beginning of time were a threat to culture. As a rule, the winners imposed their culture. It also happened that the winners took over the culture of the defeated. An example is

ancient Rome, which succumbed to the culture of conquered Greece. It shows what a great importance culture had in the lives of nations. Culture reflected the quality of life and the basic values of societies [1].

Security, being the main need of a human being, is a measure of the chances of existence, survival and proper development of a state, society and its citizens [2]. Satisfying security needs determines the protection of life and health as well as the development of human and human communities [1].

According to Jan Czaja, cultural security, being one of the dimensions of national security, is referred to as “the ability of a state to protect cultural identity, cultural goods and national heritage in the conditions of openness to the world, enabling cultural development through the internalization of values consistent with its own identity” [2]. In turn, Grazyna Michalowska uses the following definition of cultural security: “Cultural security in the national dimension means the conditions in which society can consolidate and cultivate values that determine its identity, and at the same time freely draw on experiences and achievements of other nations. Thus, it is a state of a certain balance necessary, but neither theoretically nor empirically possible to determine” [3].

Adam Wielomski presents another view on cultural security: “We talk about cultural security when we want to describe the issues of the psychological well-being of individuals and entire social groups. They are safe when they live in a state or are part of society (region, group), where they feel at home and have a (subjective) feeling that they are not threatened by worldview, religion or ideological aggression. We can say that this is a sort of soft security, since it is connected with the sphere of culture, not traditionally understood external and internal security, which is not accidentally associated with the classical definition of a state as a public law entity with a monopoly on the legal use of violence” [4].

The review of definitions related to cultural security found in the literature allows for the statement that they include, among others, such elements as preservation and nurturing of cultural identity, language, traditions, customs, religion, customs, protection of the spiritual culture and material cultural goods and heritage. Cultural identity is an important element of cultural security, and consciousness, both individual and social, is an integral element of cultural identity. Individual consciousness can be described in two ways: “On the one hand, as an individual’s ability to reflect objective reality and the proper understanding of it and processes taking place in it. On the other hand, self-consciousness – awareness of own thoughts, goals, actions, as well as attitude towards the external world (social, natural, technical)” [1]. Social awareness is “the totality of ideas and views existing in society in a given historical age, genetically though not necessarily functionally connected, with the way of its material production” [1]. The term “consciousness” [5] is synonymous with the concept of “identity”, it becomes more important at the time of social and political turmoil, when a threat of crisis and fear of losing freedom arise. Cultural identity can be defined as “the identity of the social community, understood in terms of the distinctiveness of a given culture in relation to other cultures. Cultural identity is a dynamic phenomenon; its flexibility and survival depend on the balance between efforts to protect one’s own identity and

openness to the cultural influences of other communities. Cultural identity defines the source of norms and values, the scope of their validity and the scope of rational behavior” [6]. Furthermore, cultural identity means awareness and affiliation “to a specific cultural circle (area) and emotional relationship with its traditions, achievements and present day” [6]. Language, religion, literature, art, history, tradition, customs, symbolism, lifestyle with its values, norms, institutions, ways of thinking are the elements on which contemporary culture is based. They are also the “ideological foundation of a nation” [1].

Most definitions concerning cultural security indirectly link this issue with national security and with the protection of the cultural heritage of a nation. Cultural identity is a basic, indispensable element of national identity, which is usually identified with the distinctiveness of origin, language, history and culture from other nations. The more we perceive others as more different, the greater the sense of our separateness and identity [1]. This results in the creation of own, specific, unique and collective image, “recognized by others negatively or positively”, whose main “features are longevity, rituals confirming and sustaining community bonds, attaching great importance to common origin, symbolism, religion, tradition, customs, etc.” [1]. It is possible to become aware of own identity when this process takes place in others. It is a reference point for self-identification [1].

Monuments and cultural identity

Appropriate state of cultural security and the strongly related national security and national identity translates into the quality of life of individuals and entire communities. The sense of bond and belonging to a given group or nation makes protection and saving of material objects, monuments concerning their history and heritage from destruction very important for these communities, and for some individuals it becomes the goal of life. It happens that they sometimes do so by putting their lives at risk. Such an attitude is best exemplified by Otto Warpechowski, who most of his short life devoted to archaeological research mainly to the areas of the Sokolowski and Wegrow poviats and the protection of monuments [7].

The term “monument” is defined and understood in many ways. Pursuant to Article 3(1) of the Act of 23 July 2003 on the protection and care of historical monuments – “a monument is an immovable or movable property, part of or groups of it, being the work of man or related to its activity and giving testimony of a bygone era or events whose preservation is in the public interest because of their historical, artistic or scientific value” [8]. The Polish word for “monument” does not find a literal translation in other languages. The word “monument” is used in the world. In Poland it is used with the adjective – historical. Monuments (in Polish meaning) are a material testimony of the past. Monuments have been created to preserve the memory of important figures or events. “This term can be applied to all historical places, above all the former buildings and their groups, works of art and crafts, parks, gardens, cemeteries, various objects as well as machines, instruments, books, films, photographs, documents. This term could be used to denote many other pieces of the past, provided, however, that

they really constitute an authentic relic of past eras” [9; 10, p. 32-4]. According to the dictionary definition, a monument is referred to as “an object or a set of objects representing a period or event, with historical, scientific, cultural, artistic value and subject to legal protection: architectural monument, urban monument, medieval monument, cultural monument, Polish language monument, natural monument of species of animals or plants existing in specific areas in ancient times and currently occurring in small numbers under protection, and also inanimate nature monuments (e.g. caves, rocks, boulders) protected due to their scientific and historical value, etc.” [11]. The PWN Encyclopedia (in Polish: *Encyklopedia Popularna PWN*) defines a monument as: “an object of historical, scientific or artistic value subject to legal protection, entered in the register of monuments in Poland” [12]. The PWN Great Encyclopedia captures a monument as “a movable or immovable object as well as a set of objects or places that are a testimony to the epoch or event and have a historical, cultural and artistic value and thereby are legally protected” [13]. Anna Gerecka-Zolynska presents monuments as a special group of protected objects that create national treasures and monuments of history, that is, monuments and goods of outstanding historical and scientific, artistic and cultural values, which justify taking particular care of them. The total number of monuments covered by protection at a national level is defined as national heritage, and internationally – as world cultural heritage or cultural legacy [14].

The history of the Liw Castle and the land of Liw presented in this article show the significant role as well as the importance of monuments and cultural heritage for the security and defense of the Polish state over the centuries and for the formation of cultural security of the contemporary Republic of Poland.

The history of the Land of Liw

“The Land of Liw, covering an area of 17 square miles, in whole located on the Liwiec River left bank, which separated it from the Drohiczyn Land from the east, that is from the Podlasie region, was not divided into poviats. The town starosty was in Liw, and the non-town starosty in Korytnickie. It elected 2 members of Parliament and every fifth year a deputy for the Sejm in Lithuania. The town of Liw on the Liwiec River, the capital of this land, with an ancient brick castle of the Mazovian Dukes, was a former settlement, as indicated by a lot of ancient Roman money found here” [15].

In the absence of written sources as to the time when the Liw Land emerged, various theories are put forward. Some studies link the creation of the Land of Liw to the rule of Prince Siemowit III Trojdenowic (1370-1381), when the reforms of the judicial system in Mazovia took place [16].

According to Henryk Samsonowicz, the Land of Liw was formed at the turn of the 13th and 14th centuries. From the west it bordered the Warsaw Land, from the north with the Nur Land, from the south the border of the Liw Land ran along the Kostrzyn River. From the east, the Liw Land neighbored Podlasie via the Liwiec River. In the 11th century, the border between Piastow Mazowsze and Podlasie, belonging to the Rurik dynasty, probably formed extensive forests in the watershed and marshes of the Liwiec River [17; 18].

Jakub Rogulski thinks that probably the Land of Liw was constituted “around the year 1471 when the district belonging to Boleslaw IV was partitioned between his sons: Konrad, Kazimierz, Boleslaw and Janusz, who ruled as the Sunday brothers” after the death of their father in 1454 [19].

At that time, the Mazovian Dukes began to create a frontier defense zone for fear of hostile actions by their neighbors. They populated border areas with settlers, giving them, on the Knight Law *ius militare*, 10-volok forest or wilderness areas, which they had to develop with their own forces or with the help of new settlers [20]. The settlers, with full armor on and on a horseback, were obliged to take part in military expeditions at the call of the prince [15].

The usual equal distribution of property between heirs resulted in the large increase of families, fragmentation of estates and density of settlement in noble villages. The resulting population structure had no equivalent either in Poland or in Europe at that time. Through this process, the nobles accounted for 40% of the total population living in some parts of eastern Mazovia [21].

The beginnings of the Liw castellany are traced back by some researchers to the fortified settlement from the early Middle Ages [15]. The remnants of this fortified town are located about 4 km from Liw in the town of Grodzisk. The fortified town covers an area of 5 hectares, which means that its vastness is incomparable to any other town in this part of Poland. This defensive castle was situated on a hill above a wide swampy river valley. It was surrounded by two lines of defense walls with a circumference of 900 meters. While studying this area in the 90s of the 20th century, Wojciech Wroblewski claimed that this was the original assumption of Liw, pointing to the then settlement center of these areas [22]. The changing water conditions caused that the Liwiec River washed out the embankments, which in turn reduced its defensive features. As a consequence, the weakened settlement probably fell victim to the Yotvingian or Lithuanian invasions, and at the end of the 12th century it was no longer used by the inhabitants. Mazovian Dukes' aspirations aiming to conquer neighboring territories, including Drohiczyn, contributed to the tense situation on the borderland. This was also probably the reason for the construction of a new fortress, which could protect an important trade route from Rus through Drohiczyn to Czersk and further to west of Europe, and the most important river crossing in the area. This stronghold could also be a good base for expeditions to the east [23].

In 1390, when Wladyslaw Jagiello was already the king of Poland, he chose Liw as the concentration place of his troops hastening to relieve Vilnius, which was under siege by the Teutonic forces and the hosts of Prince Witold, who was in conflict with the King at that time. The King enfeoffed Janusz I the Older with a part of Podlasie with Drohiczyn, Mielnik, Suraz and Bielsko for participation in this expedition on March 2, 1390. Janusz, however, did not maintain his rule for a long time over the Drohiczyn Land given to him by the King. Two years later, on August 7, 1392 in Ostrow Grodzienski, Witold concluded an agreement with Jagiello [24]. Having concluded the agreement with the King of Poland, Witold did not recognize Janusz's claims to the lands of Podlasie. He believed that the Drohiczyn Land was part of the patrimony returned to him

by the King. Despite the provisions of the agreement concluded in Ostrow, Janusz I the Older believed that the act of granting him lands in Podlasie issued by Jagiello retained its legal power, and thus he did not intend to voluntarily abandon Podlasie. With this issuance Jagiello created arguments between Janusz with his brother-in-law. Witold probably decided to hand over the disputed lands of Suraz in Podlasie together with the district, to Henryk, the half-brother of Janusz I the Older, as the dowry of his sister Ryngalla Anna (Henryk abandoned the clergy and married Witold's sister, Ryngalla Anna).

In the winter of 1392/1393, Henryk was probably poisoned by the Teutonic Knights. In 1400 Janusz I the Old owned only Drohiczyn, Mielnik and Tykocin with adjacent lands. Until 1405, Janusz I lost Western Podlasie to Witold. After 1405, in Janusz held only a border strip with Lithuania, with the center in Tykocin, where the Prince established an aldermanship on April 5, 1424 and gave it to Piotr of Gumow. A year later, Tykocin received municipal rights. Before the end of 1425, these areas were joined to Lithuania. In 1424, Danuta Anna, Janusz I the Older's wife and Witold's sister, died. This event could have speeded up Witold's decisions to separate the areas with the center in Tykocin from the Janusz's district. The conflicts between Janusz I and Witold about Podlasie did not have a negative impact on the relationship between Janusz I and the King of Poland. The prince together with his brother Siemowit IV participated in the negotiations conducted by the Polish side with the Teutonic Knights. In 1410, he mobilized the subjects and personally took part in the battle of Grunwald.

In the following years, Janusz I the Older supported Władysław Jagiello in a conflict with the Teutonic Knights, taking active part in military expeditions in 1414 and 1419. Until the end of his rule, he remained a faithful ally and vassal of the Polish King. Janusz I outlived all his sons and died on December 8, 1429 at the castle in Czersk. After his death, the entire duchy was inherited by his grandson Bolesław IV [25]. After the death of the Lithuanian prince Zygmunt Kiejstutowicz in 1440, Bolesław IV, under previous agreements with the deceased, took Podlasie. The Grand Duke of Lithuania Kazimierz Jagiellonczyk did not accept this fact and attacked Podlasie militarily. For the monetary compensation, Bolesław IV resigned from a part of the Podlasie region, retaining the Land of Wegrow until 1444 [24]. During the rule of Podlasie in the years 1440-1444, Bolesław IV colonized very intensively the areas he had occupied, which is evidenced by the location granted the town of Wegrow that he carried out in 1441. At the same time, the Russian population was coming from the east. The double names of localities completed with the words *Lacki (Lechitic)* or *Ruski (Russian)*, e.g. Kosow Ruski, Kosow Lacki, etc., were the fruit of the intermingling wave of settlement. [15] The end of the existence of the Polish-Lithuanian border in this area was designated the incorporation of Podlasie to Poland under the Union of Lublin [24].

After the death of the last representatives of the male line of the dukes of Stanisław (he died in 1524) and Janusz III (he died two years later, in 1526), their sister, Duchess Anna, put forward claims to take over the rule in Mazovia. During the Sejm on March 10, 1526, the nobility of Mazovia supported Anna and announced that, "they would defend their heiress even if the blood came is to be shed and life sacrificed" [15].

When assuming the throne the Duchess took the title of *dux Masoviae et Russiae* [26]. For fear of too much independence of the duchess, at the Sejm assembly convened by her in August 1526, deputies from Sigismund I the Old demanded the Duchess' obedience to the King. The ruler gave her the Castle in Liw together with the two settlements – Liw Stary and Liw Nowy and the surrounding villages to use (until the moment she would get married). The King, however, reserved the return of the Liw Castle at the request of his or his successors, as well as he promised to preserve the old and grant new privileges to the nobles. 10 years later, after Anna married Stanislaw Odrowaz – the voivode of Podole, the King demanded the return of Liw, designating the dowry in the amount of 10,000 Polish zlotys. Duchess Anna, supported by the Mazovian nobility, refused. Anne's stubbornness was only broken by the threat of the use of armed forces by the King and the seizure of starosties held by her husband. She waived on April 5, 1537, after many months of mutual threats and accusations. She received 50,000 Polish zlotys of compensation from the King. This is how the Liw Land came into the Kingdom of Poland, the last independent part of the Duchy of Mazovia. The symbol of this was the takeover of the castle by the royal envoy Tomasz Sobocki [26; 27]. With the end of the reign of the Piast dynasty in Mazovia and the beginning of the Jagiellonian era, a new administrative division took place under the act of taking over the Castle, which became established after the incorporation of Mazovia into the Crown. Such a legal status persisted until the fall of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth in the 18th century. At that time, Mazovia was divided into three voivodeships: Rawa, Mazovia and Plock, which comprised the so-called lands (15 all over Mazovia). The lands were divided into poviats, several of which belonged to the administration of one land. In terms of size, the Liw Land covered an area of 1038 km² and came 13th behind the Rozan and Wyszogrod Lands [15]. Archaeological research carried out in the areas of Liw revealed traces of settlement from the first century CE [15]. It is not exactly known when Liw received municipal rights. A document referring to the location of Liw dates back to 1421, hence it had to take place before the mentioned (1421) year [28]. In the years 1421 to 1869, Liw was a town; currently it is a village in the Wegrow poviat, in the Masovian Voivodeship. The oldest archival references regarding Liw come from 1304. It is a document of Duke Boleslaw II giving Jan Sowc a village located near Liw. The next mention about Liw is from 1350. After a fire in the town in 1446, the second town of Nowy Liw was founded under the law of Chelm by Duke Boleslaw IV. He also confirmed the privileges granted to Liw by his ancestors. The village destroyed by the fire was unexpectedly rebuilt, thus creating an atypical layout of two neighboring settlements. Separated only by the Miedzianka River, Stary Liw and Nowy Liw had their own, independent authorities [29]. Liw Stary and Liw Nowy had their separate coats of arms. The preserved seals of the Liw Stary depict an ox turned to the right. Liw Nowy possessed a coat of arms in the form of a battlement wall with a gate in the middle and three towers with pointed helmets topped with balls [15]. The times of the Mazovian Dukes were the continuous development of Liw Stary and Liw Nowy. The Livonian land experienced its golden age under the rule of Queen Bona. The busy route leading from Warsaw to Lithuania and Brest caused that both towns were getting rich on trade. The number of inhabitants grew very quickly. In 1564, almost two thousand

people lived in both towns, including a large number of craftsmen, among others: 104 brewers, 27 shoemakers, 24 bakers, 2 sword makers, millers (there were 6 water mills on the Liwiec and Miedzianka Rivers), 7 butchers, 2 needle makers, 14 distillers and 1 goldsmith. Liw, supported by the Mazovian Dukes, was a competition of Lithuanian Wegrow located 5 km away, on the other side of Liw. Such a situation meant that “Valeryan, the Vilnius bishop, advised to hold elections of kings at the borders of two countries, near Liw for Poles and near Wegrow for Lithuanians, the proposal was previously made at the Bielski Seym” [15].

The Swedish Wars interrupted the good situation for Liw. Marches of troops, fires and plundering connected with the times of the Deluge (1656) and the period of the Great Northern War (1703) ravaged these areas, and hunger and epidemics decimated the inhabitants.

In spite of attempts to recover Liw from the fall through the privileges granted by the Seym of the Commonwealth of 1748, 1766 and 1784, the town never regained its former significance. The fall of Liw Stary and Liw Nowy brought together both towns into one urban organism. The existence of the distinctiveness of the two towns of Liw Stary and Liw Nowy has been preserved in the Liw tradition until today, where the custom of choosing two village leaders survived.

After the defeat of Napoleon Bonaparte and the Congress of Vienna, these lands were within the dominated by Russia borders of the Kingdom of Poland. The ongoing fall of the town and the repression of the tsarist authorities in retaliation for participating in the January Uprising caused that in 1869 Liw lost its municipal rights [15].

The Castle in Liw

The Castle in Liw was created as a typically military facility. During its existence, it served as a frontier stronghold. The foundation of a stone castle dates back to the end of the 14th and the beginning of the 15th century during the reign of Duke Janusz I the Older in Mazovia. In his actions, Janusz took a model from Kazimierz Wielki, who spent his youth in the Krakow court, as well as from a powerful neighbor – the Teutonic State. Janusz I the Older was the founder of several fortified strongholds such as: Czersk, Wizna and Liw, located in the strategic points of the duchy, near the borders and main trade routes. The builder of the Castle in Liw was Niklos (Mikolaj). The Castle in Liw was built on a square plan, on a man-made isle on oak piles driven into the bottom of swamps in the fork of the Liwiec River and the Miedzianka River that is dried out today. The encircling walls were constructed of hand-made gothic red brick [30] on the foundation of erratic stones joined with a lime mortar [15]. Subsequent owners (the son of Janusz I, Duke Boleslaw IV, Duchess Anna Mazowiecka, and Queen Bona Sforza, who ruled Liw from 1548 to 1555) extended the Castle, thus significantly strengthening its defensive qualities [15].

The Castle in Liw retained its military significance corresponding to the then art of war until the middle of the 16th century. In 1569, after the incorporation of Podlasie to Poland and moving the border far to the east, Liw lost its strategic significance, which it

had possessed as a frontier fortress. Its facilities began to be used for judicial and administrative purposes [24]. The castle was ceased to be modernized. For economic reasons, the number of the armed crew of the stronghold was reduced, bringing its function to police and order-related tasks. The site inspection of 1595 described the poor condition of the buildings. "The buildings in it are bricked, empty, (...) the wall has been badly scratched, impossible for coating, only one ceiling repaired (undamaged) in the castle". It appears from the description of the barmkin inspection that there was only one heavily devastated house and a stable for seven horses. Therefore, it is not surprising that the Swedes marching in 1656 through Liw to help Duke Boguslaw Radziwill captured the Castle without difficulty, and then burned it. In 1657, during the Deluge the Swedes for the second time destroyed and burned the castle and the town. After the damages done by the Swedes, the Castle was rebuilt. During the Great Northern War in 1703, it was again seized, plundered and destroyed by the Swedes. After these destructions, the Castle's reconstruction was not undertaken. It lost its importance as a military-defensive object. However, it played public functions as a seat of administrative and judiciary power. The tower still housed the archives of the Land of Liw. A wooden office of poviata authorities was built inside the courtyard [15].

In 1782, the then Starost of Liw, Tadeusz Grabianka, financed the construction of a brick manor house intended for the seat of the starosty. In the inventory from 1789, we read "The chancellery was built in 1782 at the cost of the Starost of Liw esquire Tadeusz, and through the efforts of the Municipal and Rural Notary in Liw, Antoni Jaczewski, at the tower of the former Castle, with the bevel at the top and the two-chamber archive and alcoves" [15].

In the middle of the 19th century, a fire destroyed the old manor house. The remains of the burned manor and the Castle walls were taken apart by the residents of Liw. In 1918, ruins were nationalized. Two walls remained from the manor – south and west ones. As a result of taking stones from foundations by the local population, the north-western corner of the Castle's defensive walls collapsed and the tower was without a helmet. In the interwar period, the Castle area was cleaned by filling unevenness [15].

Otto Warpechowski and his contribution to the protection of the castle

In September 1939, the German occupation of these areas began. The German occupation authorities created the Sokolowsko-Wegrow powiat. The starost was hauptsturmführer SS Ernest Gramss, a war criminal. In 1942, Ernest Gramss issued an order to build a death camp in Treblinka. Two synagogues in Wegrow from the 17th and 19th centuries were destroyed to obtain materials for the construction of the camp. Later the ruins of the Piast Castle in Liw were to share their fate.

In order to prevent the destruction of national heritage, the abovementioned Otto Warpechowski, a local guardian of monuments, had a meeting with the initiator of the demolition of the Castle, the starost Ernst Gramss [7].

Otto Warpechowski (1917-1945) came to these areas as a young amateur archeologist in the 1930s. He conducted archaeological research, which he consulted with scientists

from the National Archaeological Museum in Warsaw. Through the intercession of Warsaw Mayor Stefan Starzynski, he was appointed a poviát guardian of monuments and began studies at the Faculty of Archeology of the University of Warsaw as an auditing student [15].

The visit was an act of extraordinary courage. Knowing the mentality of the Germans, he told the starost a specially crafted story that the Castle in Liw was built by the Teutonic Knights and is a remnant of their power in the Middle Ages, also in Mazovia. According to Nazi views, the Poles, as a race of “subhumans”, were not able to create their own culture and everything that was material and valuable in Poland had to arise on the initiative of the Germans [15]. Gramss was passionate about history and archeology. The creation of German domination in the east was his dream, the idea of preserving the stronghold met with the approval of the starost who appointed Warpechowski as the manager of the works at the Castle, and financed the whole undertaking. The construction team consisted mainly of peasants from Liw and their minor sons. Peasants working at the Castle received the payment in the form of sugar and alcohol issued to Warpechowski on the orders of Gramss from the sugar refinery in Sokolow Podlaski [7].

Warpechowski was neither a conservator nor an architect. He was afraid of too much interference in the structure of the medieval monument. He slowed down the reconstruction work, focusing mainly on securing the Castle ruins and repairing the largest damage. In the period between 1942 and 1944, the tower was roofed and covered with tiles, the cavities in the inside and outside of the tower were supplemented, windows and doors were put in with metal ferrules, floors and ceilings as well as paving on the ground floor of the tower were laid. The foundations were unearthed and secured, one of the partition walls and the northern wall of the manor house were rebuilt. The Castle hill was cleaned up by filling pits with the rubble on the slopes of the hill. From the objects that were found during the digging of the Castle hill, Warpechowski arranged the exhibition devoted to its history [7].

When undertaking work related to the reconstruction of the Castle, Otto Warpechowski faced a very difficult situation, as he was exposed to allegations of cooperation with the Germans. The authorities of the Polish Underground State did not treat it as a collaborative activity. Warpechowski cooperated with the Home Army. The memories of the local population describe that he often employed men who were threatened with deportation for works to the Reich, and a certificate issued by Warpechowski that the person was employed by the Castle protected him/her from deportation [15].

At the beginning of 1944, after two years of renovation, historical hoax was revealed. The Germans stopped work at the Castle. Warpechowski, wanted by the Gestapo, hid in nearby Grochow at his family, where he saw the invasion of the Red Army. The Second Polish Army was formed in the vicinity of Siedlce. He joined the army as a volunteer on October 24, 1944 in the District Supplementary Command in Sokolow Podlaski. He served in the 1st Battery of the 8th Mortar Regiment and operated the radio station at the rank of corporal. His service did not last long. He died tragically and unexpected-

ly on February 5, 1945; he was shot during an argument, which he only witnessed, by his commander, Lieutenant Komarow, in the village of Paczuski near Sokolow Podlaski [7]. Otto Warpechowski was buried in Czerwonka Grochowska near Brzozow, at the local parish cemetery. Krystyna Kolinska wrote in her book *The Castle on Left Papers*: "Shreds of some sort, papers with an unfinished novel and the words of old Silesian song are crossed by streaks of moisture and rusty stains of blood. One has sunk an ink drawing of the Castle on the hill. The one, who wrote it, died a tragic death in 1945 and these papers together with documents and the mother's photography were found in the left breast pocket. He was in the uniform of a Polish soldier and was buried in this uniform. He lived for 28 years. His name was Warpechowski" [31].

Modern times

Ten years after the war, the reconstruction of the Castle recommenced. In the years 1955-1957, research on the condition of the object, including archaeological works, was carried out at the Castle. Until 1961, the tower and part of the defensive walls were restored. The baroque manor house was reconstructed, where the commune office and the library were located. The gate tower and rebuilt cellars with the archaeological exposition were put into use. The encircling walls were left as a permanent ruin [15].

In 1963 the Museum Armory at the Castle in Liw was established, its significance goes beyond the local scale. It is the only defensive building of medieval construction between Masuria and Lublin. The Liw Museum has the most interesting collection of weaponry and armaments from the 15th century to the Second World War. The exhibitions are located in the lobby, the Knight's Hall and exhibition halls in the attic. The museum collection consists of Polish and foreign militaria: armor and helmets, white weapons, pole arms, firearms, protective equipment, uniforms, military decorations, maps and artistic exhibits: painting, graphics including the priceless Sarmatian portrait gallery, furniture, and fabrics [32].

Conclusions

Assuming that culture is a fundamental element of the existence, survival and development of the nation, lowering the degree of its importance leads to the dying out of the nation. The destruction of the nation's cultural heritage causes a depreciation of national and cultural identity, which in turn leads to a crisis and, consequently, to the destruction of the state's defense system. Creative activity in cultural life to a large extent proves the quality of spiritual life of the society, and its basis is cultural activity [1], which consists of: creating, disseminating and protecting culture.

The Museum Armory at the Castle in Liw plays the role of a center for disseminating culture not only among the inhabitants of Liwa, the Wegrowski powiat or Mazovia. The castle often hosts artists from a circle of classical and popular music. Temporary painting exhibitions are organized in the "Tower" gallery in the gate tower. The boroughs hosts massive nationwide events every year, including archaeological festivals and knights' tournaments presenting the achievements of past centuries [15].

The Castle in Liw is an extremely valuable and important historical and architectural monument belonging to the cultural heritage of Poland. The history of the Castle in Liw, which is a building with defensive and military features, and the Land of Liw presented in this article indicate its important place and significance in shaping cultural security in the area of national security of the Republic of Poland. In the era of globalization, the Castle in Liw is not only a geographical notion for the local community, but a permanent and unchangeable point of support that gives a sense of security, cultural belonging, identity and values, it became a small homeland.

Acknowledgement

No acknowledgement and potential founding was reported by the author.

Conflict of interests

The author declared no conflict of interests.

Author contributions

The author contributed to the interpretation of results and writing of the paper. The author read and approved the final manuscript.

Ethical statement

The research complies with all national and international ethical requirements.

ORCID

Michał Godlewski – The author declared that he has no ORCID ID's

References

1. Kubiak M. *Kulturowe uwarunkowania obronności państwa*. Rozprawa naukowa nr 116 Uniwersytet Przyrodniczo-Humanistyczny. Siedlce; 2012.
2. Kunikowski J. *Słownik podstawowych terminów wiedzy i edukacji do bezpieczeństwa*. Siedlce: Wydawnictwo Akademii Podlaskiej; 2005.
3. Michalowska G. *Bezpieczeństwo kulturowe w warunkach globalizacji procesów społecznych*. In: Bobrow DB, Halizak E, Zieba R (eds.). *Bezpieczeństwo narodowe i międzynarodowe u schyłku XX wieku*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe Scholar; 1997.
4. Wielomski A. *Nieliberalna kultura dla liberalnej Ameryki? Leo Strauss i Erik Voegelin wobec problem bezpieczeństwa kulturowego*. In: Zarkowski P, Topolewski S (eds.). *Współczesne bezpieczeństwo kulturowe*. Siedlce: Pracownia Wydawnicza WH UPH; 2014.
5. Kubiak M, Tolwinski M. *Kognitywny wymiar szkolenia obronnego i obronności*. *Kwartalnik Bellona*. 2016;2(685).
6. Olchowski J. *Kultura i zjawiska dezintegracji i konfliktu*. In: Zietek A. (ed.). *Międzynarodowe stosunki kulturalne*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Poltext; 2010.
7. Zasłona M. *Otto Warpechowski – życie i działalność*. *Rocznik Liwski*. 2010/11;5.
8. Ustawa z dnia 23 lipca 2003 roku o ochronie zabytków i opiece nad zabytkami (Dz. U. z 2003 r. Nr 162, poz. 1568, art. 3).
9. Rymaszewski B. *Polska ochrona zabytków*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe Scholar; 2005.

10. Charymska E. *Zabytki i dzieła sztuki, jako przedmioty ochrony*. De Securitate et Defensione. O Bezpieczeństwie i Obronności, [online]. 2015;1(1):31-46. Available at: http://www.deseuritate.uph.edu.pl/images/De_Seuritate_nr_11_2015_Charymska.pdf [Accessed: 22 November 2017].
11. Szymczak M (ed.). *Słownik Języka Polskiego PWN*. Warszawa: PWN; 1981.
12. Marcinkowski R (ed.). *Encyklopedia Popularna PWN*. Warszawa: PWN; 1982.
13. Wojnowski J (ed.). *Wielka Encyklopedia PWN*. Vol. 30. Warszawa: PWN; 2005.
14. Gerecka-Zolynska A. *Ochrona zabytków w Polsce. Zbiór podstawowych aktów prawnych z krótkim komentarzem*. Poznań: Ośrodek Badań Rynku Sztuki Współczesnej; 2006.
15. Postek R. *Liw miasto i zamek*, Warszawa: Wydawnictwa Naukowo-Techniczne; 2008.
16. Supruniuk A. *Mazowsze Siemowitów (1341-1442). Dzieje polityczne i struktury władzy*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo DiG; 2010.
17. Kasprowicz A. *Najdawniejsza przynależność terytorialna Mazowsza południowego*. Przegląd historyczny. 1985;76.
18. Tyszkiewicz J. *Srodowisko geograficzne w pradziejach i Sredniowieczu*. In: Samaonowicz H (ed.). *Dzieje Mazowsza*. Vol. 1. Pultusk: Akademia Humanistyczna im. A. Gieysztor; 2006.
19. Rogulski J. *Herb ziemi liwskiej*. In: Drelicharz W (ed.). *Arma terrarium et baronum. Studia heraldyczne*. Kraków: Kolo Naukowe Historyków Studentów Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego; 2009.
20. Russocki S, Pacuski K. *Ustroj polityczny i prawo*. In: Samaonowicz H (ed.). *Dzieje Mazowsza*. Vol. 1. Pultusk: Akademia Humanistyczna im. A. Gieysztor; 2006.
21. Samsonowicz H. *Gospodarka i społeczeństwo (XIII–początek XVI w.)*. In: Samaonowicz H (ed.). *Dzieje Mazowsza*. Vol. 1. Pultusk: Akademia Humanistyczna im. A. Gieysztor; 2006.
22. Wroblewski W. *Chronologia względna wczesnosredniowiecznych grodzisk środkowego i dolnego biegu Liwca*. Wiadomości Archeologiczne. 1995-1998;54.
23. Pazyra S. *Geneza i rozwój miast mazowieckich*. Warszawa: PWN; 1959.
24. Plewczynski M. *Wegrow na tle dziejów wojennych Mazowsza w XIV-XVI w.* In: Maksymiuk K, Wereda D, Zawadzki A (eds.). *Spoleczenstwo polskie i wojsko. Studia i materialy*. Siedlce: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Przyrodniczo-Humanistycznego; 2016.
25. Grabowski J. *Dynastia Piastów mazowieckich studia nad dziejami politycznymi Mazowsza, intytulacja i genealogia ksiąząt*. Warszawa: Archiwum Główny Akt Dawnych; Kraków: Wydawnictwo Avalon T. Janowski; 2012.
26. Piber-Zbieranowska M. *Liw jako oprawa (wdowia) księżnych mazowieckich i teren ich działalności. Materiały sesji archiwalno historycznej. Dzieje Ziemi Liwskiej i powiatu wegrowskiego*. Rocznik Liwski. 2005;1.
27. Zalewski L. *Ziemia liwska. Ludzie, miejscowości, wydarzenia*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe Scholar; 2002.
28. Wilska M. *Mazowieckie środowisko dworskie Janusza Starszego. Studium społeczne*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Neriton, Instytut Historii PAN; 2012.
29. Kolodziejczyk A. *Liw 1831*. Pruszków: Ajaks; 1998.
30. Galicka I, Sygitynska H. *Sztuka gotycka (XIV-początek XVI w.)*. In: Samaonowicz H (ed.). *Dzieje Mazowsza*. Vol. 1. Pultusk: Akademia Humanistyczna im. A. Gieysztor; 2006.
31. Kolinska K. *Zamek na lewych papierach*. Katowice: Śląsk; 1977.
32. Ziótek A. *Krajobraz i kultura. Informator turystyczny wschodniego Mazowsza*. Sokółów Podlaski: Efekt Studio; 2013.

Biographical note

Michał Godlewski – He was born in 1960 in Swiniary, where he graduated from elementary school. In 1979 he passed the Matura Exam at the Vocational Secondary School in Siedlce in the specialization of a cutting mechanic. In 2008, he graduated from the Faculty of Humanities in the specialization of pedagogy with art at the University of Podlasie (currently the University of Humanities and Natural Sciences) in Siedlce. Three years later, he defended his diploma in painting at the Academy of Fine Arts in the studio of Prof. Teresa Kotkowska-Rzepecka, and an annexe in an artistic fabric at Prof. Małgorzata Buczek-Sledzińska. Member of the Association of Polish Visual Artists. Currently, a third-year PhD student at the Institute of Social Sciences and Security at the Faculty of Humanities at the University of Humanities and Natural Sciences in Siedlce. The main research interests are cultural security and the protection of monuments.

Ochrona zabytków jako element bezpieczeństwa kulturowego (na przykładzie Zamku w Liwie)

STRESZCZENIE

Artykuł pokazuje różne sposoby definiowania bezpieczeństwa kulturowego będącego jedną z naczelných potrzeb człowieka oraz reprezentowaną w literaturze przedmiotu. Skupia się na wyjaśnieniu znaczenia terminu „zabytek”, który jest definiowany i rozumiany na wiele sposobów. Poprzez analizę literatury historycznej przedstawione zostały dzieje ziemi liwskiej i zamku liwskiego. Artykuł porusza również kwestię wkładu Otto Warpechowskiego w ochronę zamku liwskiego przed całkowitym zniszczeniem, jakie było zamiarem władz nazistowskich a będącego dziedzictwem kulturowym regionu Mazowsza i całej Polski. Artykuł ukazuje, jaką rolę odgrywa Zamek w Liwie w poczuciu bezpieczeństwa kulturowego społeczności lokalnej oraz jakie działania kulturalne są podejmowane na zamku liwskim, aby podnieść poziom poczucia bezpieczeństwa, tożsamości kulturowej oraz przynależności do wspólnoty kulturowej Polski, społeczności lokalnej.

SŁOWA KLUCZOWE bezpieczeństwo kulturowe, dziedzictwo, region Mazowsza, społeczność lokalna

How to cite this paper

Godlewski M. *Protection of monuments as an element of cultural security (on the example of the Liw Castle)*. Scientific Journal of the Military University of Land Forces. 2019;51;2(192):213-26.

DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.5604/01.3001.0013.2594>



This work is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution International License (CC BY).

<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>