

Article

A Critical History of Formal Pedagogical Strategies for the Valorization of Cultural Heritage in Brazil

Ana Laura Assumpção ^{*} and Paulo César Castral 

Instituto de Arquitetura e Urbanismo, Universidade de São Paulo (IAU-USP), 400 Trabalhador São Carlense Avenue, São Carlos 13566-590, SP, Brazil; pcastral@usp.br

* Correspondence: ana.assumpcao@usp.br

Abstract: The paper in question is focused on (1) valuing the expanded and transdisciplinary approach for the definition of cultural heritage, consolidated in Brazil from the 1970s/1980s onwards, (2) and its subsequent applicability in the field of education, under the influence of a liberating pedagogy proposed by educator Paulo Freire. An important consequence of this process involves the conception of a formal education system structured to promote collectivity, equality, diversity, and educational equity, as a solution towards ensuring both the learning and development of students. (3) The paper discusses the contribution of the expanded context of cultural heritage and its relationship with the field of education in the development of pedagogical strategies that promote educational equity, through the *Base Nacional Comum Curricular* (BNCC), a document that parameterizes the curricula from early childhood education to high school in Brazil. From a bibliographic review, the paper presents the conjuncture on which the new look at cultural heritage has been consolidated, and the consequent redefinition of heritage education actions, and then, as a result, analyzes the approximation between this new approach and the formal educational strategies present in the BNCC, as well as the possibilities of intercommunication between both.



Citation: Assumpção, A.L.; Castral, P.C. A Critical History of Formal Pedagogical Strategies for the Valorization of Cultural Heritage in Brazil. *Heritage* **2024**, *7*, 259–271. <https://doi.org/10.3390/heritage7010013>

Academic Editors: Marco Gaiani, Olaia Fontal-Merillas and Marta Martínez-Rodríguez

Received: 22 November 2023

Revised: 4 January 2024

Accepted: 5 January 2024

Published: 8 January 2024



Copyright: © 2024 by the authors. Licensee MDPI, Basel, Switzerland. This article is an open access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).

Keywords: cultural heritage; heritage education; education; curriculum

1. Introduction

The first Brazilian federal law that organized heritage was Decree-Law No. 25, from 30 November 1937. According to it, heritage was the set of movable and immovable assets in the country, and their conservation would be associated with memorable facts in the history of Brazil, whether for their archaeological or ethnographic, bibliographic, or artistic value [1]. Therefore, for a long time, the term “heritage” was related to material goods, especially large buildings intended for military and religious use. Heritage was seen only as monuments of the white elite, represented mainly by the baroque cities of Minas Gerais [2]. Such a conception reflected the European influence on the Brazilian cultural heritage, thus motivating both the valorization and preservation of assets related to Western culture and the country’s economic elite.

From the 1970s and 1980s onwards, the concept of heritage significantly broadened in Brazil, and some events contributed to the change in perspective (e.g., the creation of *Centro Nacional de Referências Culturais* (CNRC), in 1975; *Fundação Nacional Pró-Memória*, in 1979; and Article 216 of the 1988 National Constitution, which was fundamental in legally recording that Brazilian cultural heritage is constituted by the assets of a material and immaterial nature, taken individually or as a whole, bearing reference to the identity, action, and memory of the different groups that form the Brazilian society) [3]. From then on, a more plural view of culture was progressively considered—heritage ceased to be understood as something related to the individual and began to represent and identify a collectivity, being a patrimony and a right of all. This new concept expanded the possibility for the community to recognize itself as part of a given cultural context; such a change

reflected the plurality of the Brazilian society, which is diverse from both ethnic and cultural points of view.

The trajectory of the notion of heritage in Brazil had its origin in the knowledge acquired from heritage issues in France, which, since the 19th century, had created legal instruments for the protection of its historical monuments [4]. According to Choay [5], one of the main questions raised in relation to historical heritage in the 19th century concerned the debate between restoring original aspects or conserving the state in which the building was. The positions of Eugène Emmanuel Viollet-le-Duc (1814–1879) in France and John Ruskin (1819–1900) in England were seen as opposites in this debate. The principles defended by the Italian architect Camillo Boito (1836–1914) represented a middle ground in this debate and influenced the establishment of Restoration as a discipline. Despite the presence of Alois Riegl (1858–1905) in Austria, with a position that considered past and present symbolic investment in heritage assets, Boito's stance prevailed on the 19th-century European scene and is still well accepted today.

Such preservation thinking, based on the protection of historical monuments, has developed alongside what Laurajane Smith [6–8] has called the Authorized Heritage Discourse (AHD).

At the heart of the Authorized Heritage Discourse, heritage is seen as a “thing”, i.e., something that has an innate value, an essence, and, in this sense, should be passed on from generation to generation without changes towards preserving that essence [8]. Moreover, AHD privileges the understandings and values of specialized heritage professionals, who associate the notion of heritage with material objects or places, rather than with the cultural values and meanings that provided those objects with social meaning, since authorized heritage tends to reinforce the legitimacy of consensual or received historical narratives [8].

According to Smith on the heritage assets in the AHD register, the current generations do not have any right to change the heritage visions or values represented by a property, a monument, or a place [7] (p. 43). Such a statement is justified by the fact AHD prioritizes the object, i.e., its innate and untouchable value, as aforementioned, to the detriment of people and the ways in which they use and identify with heritage objects politically, socially, and emotionally [8].

Moreover, the innate value of the asset reinforces the idea that heritage refers to imposing buildings from the past, as stated by Choay [5], reinforcing the association of monumentality with heritage and the creation of a unique identity, representative and founding of a nation-state notion. This approach was established during the process of historical and political affirmation of a new France, which was being built after the fall of the Bastille. The celebration of the heroes of the French Revolution was the celebration of the representatives of the French people themselves.

The idea of a generic, national identity, representative of only a small portion of the population—in the case of Brazil, the white, military, religious elite subordinated to European thought—becomes exclusionary and erases the participation of other social authors of the constitution of the nation. Bosi [9] refers to the idea of culture and the term acculturation; acculturating a people would translate, after all, into subjecting them or, in the best case, adapting them technologically to a certain standard considered superior, since culture is the set of practices, techniques, symbols, and values that must be transmitted to new generations to guarantee the reproduction of a state of social coexistence.

In this process of “inventing a tradition”, Aleijadinho is one of the mulattos chosen to be among the white heroes. The artist does not receive attention for his ancestry, but for his contribution to overcoming the Portuguese Baroque for the Brazilian Baroque with a singular genius, the fruit of mestizaje. As Cavalcanti [10] (p. 2226) explains, the figure of Aleijadinho served Mário de Andrade's nationalist project, whose aim was to discover the “roots of the Brazilian soul”, and sought to turn the Baroque of Minas Gerais into an art of genuinely national expression. In this sense, black people are only endowed with cultural value when they mix with white people, in activities that are characteristic of the European artistic tradition. It can be seen that the constitution of an authorized discourse,

in the early years of IPHAN, was based on the valorization of a civilizing process, through which the mixture of races is directed towards the symbolic reproduction of a European culture, erasing all other manifestations that do not fall into this category.

It is with the creation of Article 216 of the Federal Constitution of Brazil by authorized specialists that the definition of cultural values ceased to be the State and became the society itself, since social groups are the true holders of cultural heritage. Heritage is first and foremost a social fact [11] (p. 33). The notion of cultural value was pointed out by Menezes [11], who claimed cultural assets do not have intrinsic meanings, which are proper to things themselves; rather, the properties of things are mobilized selectively by societies, social groups, and communities, who socialize, operate, and make their ideas, beliefs, affections, meanings, expectations, judgments, criteria, and norms act. In other words, prior to values being found in things themselves, as argued by AHD, they are in social practices. Subjects are responsible for attributing value to something—which will be considered a cultural asset, a cultural heritage—based on criteria and interests determined by themselves, recalling such attribution is always collective, a shared history, a building, a party, or a place that many consider important, or other elements around which many people from a same group identify [12] (p. 8).

The expansion of the notion of heritage in Brazil follows the expansion of its worldwide notion. Fontal [13] summarizes and explains the course exposed so far from the point of view of Spain, arguing several views of heritage are contained in the same concept, from a traditional one, based on lists of international heritage assets, to another one, progressively holistic, polysemic, and expanded. A previous paper [14] provides a mapping of studies related to this holistic approach to heritage in Spain, aimed at heritage education and aspects of identity and citizenship, axes that are of interest to this discussion. The author speaks of an expansion of that concept that ranges from the idea of object to the idea of identity link. The view of heritage as an object focuses on material assets, things, on what can be preserved in a space or place, what has matter and, therefore, degrades over time. This is a conservation of materiality, and, therefore, refers to aesthetic, economic, and formal values. On the other hand, the view of heritage as a link assumes people establish forms of connection or relationship with heritage assets, i.e., links. In this respect, the most important value of heritage is its ability to contain and generate identity links, i.e., its relational value, reinforcing there is no inseparability between person and heritage [13]. Heritage is inseparable from those people because it establishes links of ownership, belonging, transmission, selection, and valorization with them. All that cannot be done without people; however, it does not make sense to be done if it is not for people [15] (p. 2).

Fontal's description [13] portrays the aforementioned discussions. It separates heritage as an object—the importance given to the material, the intrinsic cultural value, and the authorized discourse—from heritage as a link, while focusing on individuals and identity relations, in an understanding that heritage escapes from a pre-established and already defined idea to be a process of construction, social construction, in which everyone has the right to choose, decide, and form their cultural assets. Heritage is a moment or a process of cultural and social (re)construction of values and meanings [8] (p. 141). As argued by Simone Scifoni [16], heritage should be understood as a social achievement.

2. A New Perspective on Heritage

The first actions in the field of heritage in Brazil, within the national preservation agency, at the time called *Serviço do Patrimônio Histórico e Artístico Nacional* (SPHAN), were intimately connected to the idea of formation and affirmation of the nation-state [17]. Associating Brazilian heritage with such a model was, at first, valuing an origin of the chosen nation, the Portuguese legacy. Therefore, the monuments of colonial architecture were highlighted to the detriment of a possible indigenous heritage built in Brazil [18].

Such an influence was so intense that, even today, the notion of heritage is often associated with colonial architecture, religious architecture, monumentality, and purely material characteristics—heritage as an object [13]. The expansion of the heritage concept associated

with the notion of link [13] has appeared as a challenge presented on international and national agendas. Rethinking the notion of both heritage and “subjects of preservation” [16], what heritage communicates, and those that recognize themselves in it are questions to be answered at this time of a new look at heritage.

This paper reports on moments relevant to the change in thinking—a consequent change in perspective on the criteria for the preservation of cultural assets—and that can be considered starting points for a deconstruction of the notion of heritage within IPHAN, the Brazilian heritage preservation agency.

The creation of the aforementioned CNRC, in 1975, during the military regime of *Centro Nacional de Referências Culturais*, must be cited. The notion of cultural reference, incorporated into the discourse of preservation policies, aims to include cultural manifestations representative of other groups that make up Brazilian society, such as Indians, blacks, immigrants, and popular classes in general [19]. By taking cultural references, rather than the homogeneity of national heritage, as a basis, CNRC developed projects based on strengthening local cultural knowledge and references, with the proximity and participation of groups and communities, as opposed to cultural homogenization [17] (pp. 45–46). Differently from what was proposed within the official body regarding the aforementioned option for preserving buildings and monuments, CRNC aimed to protect exactly what was on the margins of what was considered heritage, i.e., the living cultural manifestations, inserted in contemporary social practices [17] (p. 46), and, therefore, chose the term “reference” for distinguishing what already existed in official institutions and proposing a new way of acting in the area of culture [19].

Regarding CNRC, incorporated into IPHAN during the administration of Aloísio Magalhães, who was appointed director of IPHAN, in 1979, and primarily responsible for the creation of CNRC, actions on the theme were more strongly taken. One of them was the creation of *Projeto Interação* (Interaction Project), in partnership with *Ministério da Educação e Cultura*, in the early 1980s, whose programmatic line *Interação entre educação básica e os diferentes contextos culturais existentes no país* (Interaction among basic education and the different cultural contexts in the country) was based on the assumption that it is essential to verify with the communities which assets constitute their “cultural references”, including those to be recognized and valued by the public authorities as cultural heritage [20] (p. 19). In the words of Demarchi [21], it was an education project that financed work with subalternized communities. The actions of the project involved the active participation of the community in both the educational process and decision making, through integration with aspects of its own daily life. *Interação* aimed to symbolically recreate spheres of meaning; create new symbols in education and subvert existing ones; shake up the doldrums of the basic education schools offered to children, adolescents, and adults in peripheral villages, slums, and rural villages of this infinite country; fertilize ideas, images, and relationships; renew popular knowledge, incorporate it into the work that creates school culture, and thus make the school fertile, creative, experimental: a social place of participation in the transformation of culture and education itself [22] (p. 32).

The incorporation of those changes was an attempt to differentiate the official, standardized, and unique education applied throughout the country towards inserting the particularities of each cultural context into teaching and, therefore, instigating the interest of students in being provided with the production of knowledge and bringing them closer to the learning process. The bundle of relationships established with the social and symbolic life of people now is about seeking, as an ever-present and diverse re-reading of what is traditional [22].

Although *Projeto Interação* lasted only from 1982 to 1986, it greatly influenced the broad definition of the concept of culture adopted by the Federal Constitution of 1988 and has continued to inspire the work of many educators who value the cultural context in which students are inserted, aiming at social transformation [21].

At that moment, a renovating thought appeared encouraged by the notion of cultural reference. It began to cover the domains of a broad and effective education, going beyond

the school space and strengthening itself in the interaction with daily practices by taking into account different contexts and realities—in short, an education that embraces the cultural diversity of the country. Moreover, the concept of cultural reference, constituted in those actions, served as the basis for the aforementioned changes and for others such as the definition of cultural heritage present in Article 216 of the Federal Constitution of 1988 [19].

Decree 3.551/2000, which instituted *Programa Nacional de Patrimônio Imaterial* (National Program of Intangible Heritage) and the instrument of Registration, as a tool for the protection of cultural assets of an intangible nature, also contributed to the opening of new horizons. As defined by IPHAN, intangible assets are considered practices and domains of social life that manifest themselves in knowledge, crafts, and ways of doing things, in celebrations, forms of expression, whether scenic, plastic, musical, or playful, and in places, such as markets, fairs, and sanctuaries. As an example, the first intangible asset registered in December 2002 in the Book of Forms of Expression was *Kusiwa* art, a painting and graphic art technique associated with orality, typical of the *Wajápi* indigenous people who live in the west of the state of *Amapá*. The graphics can be on the human body or on baskets, gourds, weaving, and wooden objects. *Kusiwa* art is a communication system of the *Wajápi* people, and the graphics are loaded with meaning and symbolism related to the group's worldview [23]. In the same period, December 2002, the craft of the *Paneleras de Goiabeiras* was also registered as intangible heritage and entered in the Book of Knowledge. The purpose of the registration was to recognize the knowledge involved in the artisanal manufacture of clay pots, the preparation of which uses traditional indigenous and African techniques, as well as raw materials from the natural environment, such as clay deposits and mangroves. This craft, rooted in the daily life and way of being of the *Goiabeiras Velha* community in *Vitória*, the capital of *Espírito Santo*, is practiced mainly by women, on a family and domestic basis [23].

An important event in this context was the 32nd General Conference of the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), held in Paris, in October 2003, which approved the Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage, ratified by 150 countries. The convention is an international legal instrument that aims to respond to possible threats to heritage, derived from the processes of globalization and social transformations that occur continuously [24]. It is also a moment when the importance of intangible cultural heritage is considered at a global level as both a source of cultural diversity and a possibility to preserve such diversity, or even as cultural heritage of groups, communities, or in use by individuals belonging to collectivities living in specific cultural areas, characterized by their own lifestyles or organizations [24].

For Smith [6], the 2003 Convention significantly marked an international debate on the definition and values of heritage. In this sense, it challenges the Authorized Heritage Discourse, pointing out that heritage is understood and defined not only as a category, but also as a set of social practices.

Although material, heritage becomes recognizable only from a set of immaterial social and cultural values. It is at this point that the importance of the notion of intangible heritage stands out, not only as another category of heritage, but also as something associated with any heritage, expanding its conceptualization [6].

One of the keys to the expansion of heritage is its applicability in the field of education, as seen in *Projeto Interação*. The insertion of the discussion on heritage and hence on its preservation in educational actions is the means for dialoguing with the true holders of heritage, i.e., the social groups directly involved, valuing local identity, and strengthening links, so that the relationship established among the different actors of society, namely residents, professionals working in the heritage area, educators, architects, historians, geographers, sociologists, anthropologists, and professionals from public agencies, among others, is horizontal, democratic, and of mutual learning.

The fact is the exclusive principle of authority—be it scientific, religious, based on tradition, or even political (the State acting on behalf of the nation)—is not sustainable in a society that aims to be democratic. On the other hand, other “voices”, i.e., interests other

than those of the groups with greater economic and/or intellectual power, are listened to only if the society is organized for that purpose [19].

3. Heritage Education

We define heritage education as the discipline responsible for analyzing and developing didactic proposals (in formal, non-formal, and informal educational contexts) of an investigative, transdisciplinary, and socio-critical nature, in which the design and development of purposes, contents, and methodological strategies favor the construction of identity values, fostering intercultural respect and social change and leading to the formation of a socioculturally committed citizenship [25] (p. 38).

According to Scifoni [26], the educational field, in which heritage education is inserted, is still a privileged field of political-ideological confrontation, whose decisions are made in function of the interests of local power. In other words, education can follow two paths—either it is seen only as instrumental for the reproduction of society as such and reproduction of the system and the status quo, consolidating the current society, in its great inequality, or it can be thought of as part of a project of social transformation, a project of human emancipation and liberation, as claimed by Paulo Freire, so that citizens live up to their right to exercise citizenship.

The aforementioned confrontation falls within what Paulo Freire [27] calls “theories of cultural action”, as also demonstrated by Scifoni [26]. Cultural action can be either of antidialogical matrix, when it aims to maintain the current social structure, based on the relationship of oppressor and oppressed, or of dialogical matrix, when it intends to be transformative and egalitarian, i.e., to overcome the conditions of reality and social inequalities. According to Freire [27], the former matrix behaves as an oppressor, whereas the latter behaves as a revolutionary liberator.

Fonseca [20] claimed the verb educate originates from Latin, *exducere*, whose meaning is to lead from the inside out; therefore, the educational process should focus on the student, so that he/she appropriates knowledge, exercises his/her citizenship, and develops for adult life. The role of the educator will be rather inductive, guiding, stimulating, aiming, above all, towards forming people and citizens committed to the well-being of the community [20] (p. 16). Or even, in the words of Sônia Florêncio [28], education means constant reflection and transformative action of subjects in the world and not an education that only reproduces information, as a one-way street and that identifies students as consumers of information.

When the dialogical notion (according to Freire’s denomination), which should be intrinsic to the educational process, is transformed into an antidialogical performance, the dominators impose an education in their own way, which is called a “banking” vision of education [27]. Educators are the holders of knowledge, and students are those who do not know—while the former discipline, the latter are disciplined; while the former say a word, the latter listen to it, always stimulating hierarchization. There is no space for students to place themselves as active subjects of their world, since they simply act as spectators, receiving the “deposit” of knowledge, for the educator sees them as a “bank” [27].

The structuring of heritage education actions must be cautious about not only aiming to be dialogical, but how, in fact, to be. Actions should really be transformative, becoming accessible to society and inserting themselves within Paulo Freire’s proposal of liberating education [27,29], which, according to the author, appears as an overcoming of banking education. It no longer presents itself as a one-way street and an act of depositing and transferring knowledge; it is built together with the learner, in a constant exchange of knowledge between educator and learner, in which the latter gains space and voice and begins to feel noticed and belonging somewhere. The reason for liberating education resides in its initial conciliatory impulse [27] (p. 82).

At this point, the notion of the learner can be extended to the community. Freire’s liberating education must be understood beyond the formal space of the school, or rather, it must be understood in the three spaces, namely formal, non-formal, and informal [25,30].

Educational actions are applied to the entire community space; it is for the community, which is seen and treated as active, as a participant in the educational process, hence, in relation to the field of preservation, in the process of safeguarding what belongs to it. Subjects of different cultural contexts play the role of not only informants, but also interpreters of their cultural heritage [19] (p. 14). According to Scifoni [26], it is a process of listening and building together and socializing the technical-scientific knowledge produced in the preservation agencies, while also learning to value local knowledge and practices.

Liberating education, based on the construction of knowledge in a dialogical way, encourages actions of social movements aimed at preserving heritage. Social groups become active participants and can choose the assets to be preserved, assign values to them, and submit proposals for listing and registration. Such initiatives change the scenario built within the heritage field for long and reflect a positive update of the social attitude towards the challenges posed by the complexity of contemporary life, especially in relation to that hierarchical view, whose processes were always arranged from top to bottom, from the State in relation to society [31].

Paulo Freire [27] calls “cultural invasion” such a relationship of domination by those who hold power, framed in antidiagonal cultural actions, and defines the term as the penetration of invaders into the cultural context of the invaded ones, imposing a worldview and ending up curbing their creativity by putting freedom in check. He adds that invasion is always violence to the person of the invaded culture, which either loses its originality or is threatened to lose it [27].

For Scifoni [26], heritage education based on liberating pedagogy has the search for the construction of a new relationship between the population and its cultural heritage as a fundamental assumption. Fontal [32] corroborates Scifoni’s thought, stating heritage education operates on those forms of relationship between assets and people, which are the very essence of heritage, since they order, structure, sequence, measure, and value them. In this sense, the attempt to seek effective heritage educational actions, which do not have the character of “cultural invasion” and prioritize educational equity, is the way. The horizontal relationship between entities—public power, competent bodies, university—and community should command the process.

Such actions related to heritage aim at transformation to build identity awareness, hence producing citizens attentive to regional diversities, as well as maintaining the activation of local traditions [33]. The reaffirmation of an identity is one of the aspects that involve the individual’s relationship with heritage and are mobilized in the context of heritage education. Fontal [32] claimed one of the benefits of heritage education concerns identity values, because cultural heritage explains who we are, why we are the way we are, and how we have come to be, with all our variations. This “we are” includes numerous levels, from personal and intimate ones to all those that imply sharing with other people common identity references, namely family, neighborhood, locality, region, country [32] (p. 43).

Base Nacional Comum Curricular (BNCC), a normative document in force since 2017 that defines the set of essential learning topics, competencies, and skills to be developed by all students of Brazilian schools throughout the stages and modalities of basic education, is an example of an attempt to insert education, as a whole, in a dialogical matrix for ensuring human formation and development in its various dimensions, whether intellectual, physical, affective, social, ethical, moral, or symbolic, considering the historical and cultural context of the students [34].

4. Discussion: BNCC Pedagogical Strategies

Since BNCC is a base document for the elaboration of school curricula and pedagogical proposals in education networks, it follows the ethical, political, and aesthetic principles aimed at integral human formation and construction of a fair, democratic, and inclusive society [34]. This first definition shows an attempt to work according to the aforementioned liberating education proposed by Paulo Freire.

The 1988 Constitution, specifically, Article 205, was one of the legal frameworks that supported the BNCC elaboration. It recognizes education as a fundamental right shared among State, family, and society by determining education, the right of all and the duty of the State and the family, will be promoted and encouraged with the collaboration of society towards a person's full development, preparation for the exercise of citizenship, and qualification for work [3,34]. Also important is Article 210, which recognizes the need for minimum content to be set for elementary education, in order to ensure common basic training and respect for national and regional cultural and artistic values [3,34]. The use of the foundations present in the specifications of the 1988 Constitution approximates the notion of heritage education, which has the pluralized vision present in Article 216 of the same Constitution at its core.

An effort by competent bodies towards expanding and updating the notions of education in the most varied spheres is, therefore, perceived, since they think of collectivity, equality, diversity, and educational equity as a way to better guarantee both learning and future development of those involved. As described elsewhere, BNCC proposes overcoming the disciplinary fragmentation of knowledge for stimulating its application in real life, giving importance to the context, i.e., giving meaning to what is learned and giving students protagonism in their learning, and the construction of a life project [34]. Therefore, BNCC is committed to assuming a plural, singular, and integral vision of the child, adolescent, youth, and adult and promoting an education aimed at their reception, recognition, and full development, in their singularities and diversities [34] (p. 14).

Based on the understanding of singularities and diversities, educational equity is a BNCC concern, which also includes a commitment to reversing the situation of historical exclusion that marginalizes groups such as indigenous peoples, populations of the remaining communities of quilombos, and other Afro-descendants, towards reducing the frontiers of inequality and prejudice [34]. The prejudiced practice of race, class, gender offends the substantivity of the human being and radically denies democracy [29].

The ten following competences on which learning is based are presented by BNCC for systematizing the aforementioned vision:

1. Value and use historically constructed knowledge of the physical, social, cultural, and digital world to understand and explain reality, continue learning, and contribute to building a fair, democratic, and inclusive society.
2. Exercise intellectual curiosity and use the approach of the sciences, which includes research, reflection, critical analysis, imagination, and creativity to investigate causes, develop and test hypotheses, formulate and solve problems, and create solutions (including technological ones) based on knowledge of the different areas.
3. Value and enjoy the various artistic and cultural manifestations, from local to global ones, and participate in diversified practices of artistic and cultural production.
4. Use different languages—verbal (oral or visual-motor, such as Libras, and written), body, visual, sound, and digital—as well as knowledge of artistic, mathematical, and scientific languages to express yourself, share information, experiences, ideas, and feelings in different contexts, and produce meanings that lead to mutual understanding.
5. Understand, use, and create digital information and communication technologies in a critical, meaningful, reflective, and ethical way in various social practices (including school ones) to communicate, access, and disseminate information, produce knowledge, solve problems, and exercise leadership and authorship in personal and collective life.
6. Value the diversity of knowledge and cultural experiences and appropriate knowledge and experiences that promote the understanding of relationships of the world of work and make choices aligned with the exercise of citizenship and life project with freedom, autonomy, critical awareness, and responsibility.
7. Argue on the basis of facts, data, and reliable information to formulate, negotiate, and defend ideas, points of view, and common decisions that respect and promote human rights, socio-environmental awareness, and responsible consumption at local,

regional, and global levels, with an ethical stance in relation to caring for oneself, others, and the planet.

8. Know, appreciate, and care for your physical and emotional health, understanding yourself in human diversity and recognizing your emotions and those of others, with self-criticism and ability to deal with them.
9. Exercise empathy, dialogue, conflict resolution, and cooperation, respecting and promoting respect for others and human rights, welcoming and valuing the diversity of individuals and social groups, their knowledge, identities, cultures, and potential, without prejudice of any kind.
10. Act personally and collectively with autonomy, responsibility, flexibility, resilience, and determination, making decisions based on ethical, democratic, inclusive, sustainable, and supportive principles [34].

Several key elements are present in the competencies for a transformative and liberating education, as heritage education is intended, concerned with placing the student as an active and autonomous subject in the learning process—in the conditions of true learning, the students become real subjects of the construction and reconstruction of the knowledge taught, alongside the educator, also a subject of the process [29] (p. 13) based on democratic and inclusive principles, emphasizing respect for diversity, the other, and the environment, appreciation of different practices and sociocultural manifestations. Regarding inclusion in educational processes, Ferri [35] (p. 71) reinforces the importance by stating inclusion is the key to providing society with the tools for coexistence. When we discuss inclusion, we value the capacity of a human being to put themselves in the place of another, to be able to empathize and feel that rights must prevail over any difference.

Inclusion, if considered in the context of heritage education, is also a key element: when we talk about inclusion, we start from the concept of heritage as inclusive content in itself, since the relationship that people establish with it enables the creation of networks and links with others. When we think of inclusion in projects, we admit full access to the heritage of all people, i.e., a heritage that belongs to everyone, a footprint that promotes the creation of a society that becomes richer with the participation of all its diversity [35] (p. 71).

In this sense, the principles present in BNCC are the same that drive the field of heritage education in Brazil; after all, both are inserted in an approach to the discipline of education that focuses on local identities. The plurality of the concept enables the integration of the notion of heritage education in several stages of teaching–learning, and the principles pointed out continuously touch on cultural and identity values. The issue of cultural identity, which includes the individual and class dimensions of the students, and whose respect is absolutely fundamental in progressive educational practice, is a problem that cannot be ignored. It has to do directly with the assumption of ourselves by ourselves [29] (p. 19).

By enabling the approximation of knowledge to issues present in the life and daily life of students, whether thinking individually or collectively, the incorporation of identity values in the contents of the school curriculum increases interest, improves the learning process, and, therefore, favors respect for others and diversities. As pointed out by Pollak [36], identity is the image of oneself, for oneself and for others; it is what makes it possible to understand myself as a person, to understand the other and to recognize myself in the other and, from then on, to be able to establish a feeling of unity, continuity, and coherence. In fact, such a note appears in BNCC, in the description of the Specific Competencies of Human Sciences for elementary school, as follows: understand yourself and the other as different identities, in order to exercise respect for difference in a plural society and promote human rights [34] (p. 357).

One successful example was the *Rolé na Penha* educational project, which took place for the first time in 2018 at the Bernardo de Vasconcelos municipal school, located in *Vila Cruzeiro*, one of the favelas in the Penha neighborhood in the city of Rio de Janeiro, Brazil. It was a project carried out by the history teacher and his students as part of the school's political pedagogical project.

The initial activity was intended to introduce the teacher to the students' daily route to school, so that he could learn a little about the students' reality. Through heritage education, local history, memories, and cultural references, the students collectively created affective maps of the Penha neighborhood, drawing the routes they took to school every day. The information on the maps was a source of shared knowledge. According to Saba [37], each student, in their maps and in the dialog about them, can present their community and highlight what represented it for them and what they had as a reference in their locality.

The activity of the affective maps was extended into a larger action that included observing and listening to the students on their paths and stories; the collective identification of the neighborhood's cultural references with visits to the places listed on the maps; and, at the suggestion of the students themselves, self-guided tours for people from outside who were interested in getting to know the neighborhood. The project, which was aimed at recognizing oneself, others, and cultural references and building historical knowledge, also made it possible for different members of the community to interact and exchange knowledge. Saba states that the project was developed from a dialogical and collective understanding of education, seeking to value the different convergent knowledges in the classroom [37] (p. 367).

Another example was the project *Educação e Patrimônio Compartilhado: Cooperação Brasil e Holanda* (Education and Shared Heritage: Cooperation between Brazil and the Netherlands), which took place in seven schools located in different areas of the municipalities of *Recife* and *Itamaracá* Island, involving a total of 20 teachers and 200 students who used the conceptual approach of heritage education. The project was a joint action with various institutions, including IPHAN, the *Museu da Cidade do Recife*, the Secretariats of Education and Culture of both cities, *Fundarpe*, and the Brazilian Army, whose aim was to get to know the communities that inhabited the territory located around the fortifications and the relationships established with these assets, to reflect on their significance in the past and present and to identify other values, hitherto unknown, unidentified or not even attributed [38] (p. 456).

The project centered on three fortifications in *Pernambuco*: *Forte das Cinco Pontas* and *Forte do Brum*, both in *Recife*, and *Fortaleza de Santa Cruz de Itamaracá*, known as *Forte Orange*, on *Itamaracá* Island. The project aimed, more than recognizing the value of the monuments of the fortifications as elements that outlined the formation and occupation of the territories, to contemplate the values, memories, and emotions that these monuments aroused in each of the Brazilian citizens, especially those who lived in their immediate surroundings [39], bringing together different contexts, communities, and cultural references.

These two examples reinforce the importance of heritage education in the school environment and reaffirm the effectiveness of educational experiences when integrated into the various dimensions of people's lives. In other words, they must make sense and be perceived in everyday practices [39] (p. 21).

5. Conclusions

By exposing the historical path of cultural heritage and punctuating its significant expansions, this article aimed at elaborating possible approaches between the expanded field of cultural heritage, through heritage education, and some approaches present in the discipline of education, namely Base Nacional Comum Curricular of Brazil. The guiding element for such approaches was Paulo Freire's liberating pedagogy.

A similar aspect among those spheres is based on democratic and inclusive principles, respect for diversity, and appreciation of the most diverse cultural manifestations. Inclusion in educational and heritage processes is the key for the subjects in question to become involved and feel an integral part of the place where they are, in an equal way, without feeling depreciated in relation to a hegemonic culture. Inclusion touches on the understanding of cultural and local identities. Being active subjects, they can become stronger as a group and community, reaffirming and valuing their own identities. As Paulo Freire [27] (p. 77) states, there is no other way but to practice a humanizing pedagogy, in which the

revolutionary leadership, instead of overlapping with the oppressed and continuing to keep them as almost “things”, establishes a permanent dialogical relationship with them.

The dialogical relationship proposed by Freire [27,29] is, in fact, a relationship based on dialogue and on the horizontal exchange of knowledge, in which the two parties complement each other. There is no room for an active presence of the subjects if there is no dialog, listening, and, above all, respect. Listening, in the sense discussed here, means the permanent availability on the part of the listening subject to open up to the speech of the other, to the gesture of the other, to the differences of the other [29] (p. 45).

The process of implementing the BNCC has not yet been the subject of a systematized nationwide study. Researchers in the various areas of knowledge have presented studies that are very narrowly focused both in terms of the competences analyzed and their geographical scope, but none have been found so far in relation to the issue of heritage. What can be said from the examples cited and some activities related to the research project “The city for all: perception, belonging, and preservation of the cultural heritage as a way of constituting the senses of collectivity in Bocaina city” [40], from which this study originates, is that the process varies from maintaining the reproduction of ADH given through official local narratives to recognizing heritage as a social construction of a community.

A challenge to be faced in this regard is the naturalization of cultural heritage by the educators themselves and other agents involved in the teaching–learning process due to failures in the continuing education process provided for in the BNCC’s implementation policies. There is also a strength of the Authorized Heritage Discourse (AHD) in associating the notion of heritage with the monumentality of objects and specialized knowledge that distances the collective and egalitarian notion of heritage.

This is similar to the situation in Spain, where even with some legal frameworks and a local tradition that is strongly rooted in the culture of some provinces, a traditional approach to heritage teaching still prevails, to the detriment of a more holistic approach that constitutes social identity [41,42].

As a consequence, the challenge is to bring theory closer to practice, since there is a considerable gap between what is planned, i.e., what is described in the BNCC, and what is actually introduced into practice. The process for effective change seems long, but very necessary. Offering material and theoretical conditions for the preparation and practice of education agents based on liberating education—heritage education—whether in the formal, non-formal, or informal environment is the way to solidify effective actions and not just stop at laws and guidelines. Paulo Freire, in the 1960s, stated that the way, for this very reason, for liberation work to be done by the revolutionary leadership is not the “liberating propaganda”. It is not in the mere act of “depositing” the belief of freedom in the oppressed ones towards gaining their trust, but in dialoguing with them [27] (p. 74).

Along with dialog, a challenge is to create links between the different agents by identifying their own heritage. One way of tackling this is by engaging the teaching staff and students in formulating actions based on raising awareness of the topics covered, related to elements of their daily lives. According to Scifoni, the identification of other possible heritages, those of everyday life, is a tactic and a resource that seeks to mobilize social groups around their trajectories and experiences, which also make it possible to problematize territories and public policies [43] (p. 11).

Author Contributions: Conceptualization, A.L.A.; methodology, A.L.A.; investigation, A.L.A. and P.C.C.; writing—original draft preparation, A.L.A.; writing—review and editing, A.L.A. and P.C.C.; supervision, P.C.C.; project administration, A.L.A.; funding acquisition, A.L.A. All authors have read and agreed to the published version of the manuscript.

Funding: This research received no external funding.

Data Availability Statement: Data is contained within the article.

Acknowledgments: The authors thank Angela Cristina Pregnolato Giampedro from Centro Cultural USP São Carlos for reviewing the article in English.

Conflicts of Interest: The authors declare no conflicts of interest.

References

1. Brasil. *Decreto-Lei nº 25, de 30 de Novembro de 1937*; Presidência da República: Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, 1937. Available online: http://www.planalto.gov.br/ccivil_03/decreto-lei/del0025.htm (accessed on 29 January 2021).
2. Apolinário, J.R. Reflexões sobre a Educação Patrimonial e experiências da diversidade cultural no ensino de História. In *Educação Patrimonial: Reflexões e Práticas*; Tolentino, Á.B., Ed.; Superintendência do Iphan na Paraíba: João Pessoa, Brazil, 2012; pp. 56–65.
3. Brasil. *Constituição da República Federativa do Brasil de 1988*; Presidência da República: Brasília, Brazil, 1988. Available online: http://www.planalto.gov.br/ccivil_03/constituicao/ConstituicaoCompilado.htm (accessed on 29 January 2021).
4. Scifoni, S. Conhecer para preservar: Uma ideia fora do tempo. *Rev. CPC* **2019**, *14*, 14–31. [CrossRef]
5. Choay, F.A. *Alegoria do Patrimônio*; Unesp: São Paulo, Brazil, 2001.
6. Smith, L. *Uses of Heritage*; Routledge: London, UK; New York, NY, USA, 2006.
7. Smith, L. El “espejo patrimonial”. Ilusión narcisista o reflexiones múltiples? *Antípoda* **2011**, *12*, 39–63. [CrossRef]
8. Smith, L. Desafiando o Discurso Autorizado de Patrimônio. *Caderno Virtual Tur.* **2021**, *21*, 140–154. [CrossRef]
9. Bosi, A. Colônia, culto, cultura. In *Dialética da Colonização*; Bosi, A., Ed.; Companhia das Letras: São Paulo, Brazil, 1992; pp. 11–63.
10. Cavalcanti, J.D. O Aleijadinho de Mário de Andrade: A problemática do artista como expressão do gênio nacional. *Cuad. Educ. Desarro.* **2023**, *15*, 2222–2238. [CrossRef]
11. Menezes, U.T.B. O campo do patrimônio cultural: Uma revisão de premissas. In *I Fórum Nacional do Patrimônio Cultural*; Sistema Nacional de Patrimônio Cultural: Desafios, estratégias e experiências para uma nova gestão; Sutti, W., Ed.; Iphan: Brasília, Brazil, 2009; pp. 25–39.
12. Instituto do Patrimônio Histórico e Artístico Nacional (IPHAN). *Educação Patrimonial; Inventários Participativos: Manual de Aplicação*; Iphan: Brasília, Brazil, 2016. Available online: http://portal.iphan.gov.br/uploads/publicacao/inventariodopatrimonio_15x21web.pdf (accessed on 5 October 2021).
13. Fontal, O. El patrimonio: De objeto a vínculo. In *Cómo Educar en el Patrimonio*; Guía práctica para el desarrollo de actividades de educación patrimonial; Fontal, O., Ed.; Comunidad de Madrid: Madrid, Spain, 2020; pp. 9–24.
14. Cuenca, J.M.; Estepa, J.; Martín, M.J. Patrimonio, educación, identidad y ciudadanía. Profesorado y libros de texto en la enseñanza obligatoria. *Rev. Educ.* **2017**, *375*, 136–159. [CrossRef]
15. Fontal, O.; Sánchez-Macías, I.; Cepeda-Ortega, J. Personas y patrimonios: Análisis del contenido de textos que abordan los vínculos identitarios. *Midas* **2018**, *9*, 1–17. [CrossRef]
16. Scifoni, S. Patrimônio cultural e lutas sociais. *Espaço Geogr.* **2013**, *16*, 517–530.
17. Tolentino, Á.B. Educação patrimonial decolonial: Perspectivas e entraves nas práticas de patrimonialização federal. *Sillogés* **2018**, *1*, 41–60.
18. Chuva, M. Fundando a nação: A representação de um Brasil barroco, moderno e civilizado. *Topoi* **2003**, *4*, 313–333. [CrossRef]
19. Fonseca, M.C.L. Referências Culturais: Base para novas políticas de patrimônio. In *Inventário Nacional de Referências Culturais*; Manual de aplicação; Instituto do Patrimônio Histórico e Artístico Nacional (IPHAN), Departamento de Identificação e Documentação/Iphan: Brasília, Brazil, 2000; pp. 11–21.
20. Fonseca, M.C.L.O. Patrimônio Cultural na formação das novas gerações: Algumas considerações. In *Educação Patrimonial; Reflexões e práticas*; Tolentino, Á.B., Ed.; Superintendência do Iphan na Paraíba: João Pessoa, Brazil, 2012; pp. 14–21.
21. Demarchi, J.L. Referências Culturais da Escola, na Escola; Contribuições do Projeto Interação Para a Educação Patrimonial. Master's Thesis, Universidade de São Paulo, São Paulo, Brazil, 2020.
22. Brandão, C.R. *O Difícil Espelho: Limites e Possibilidades de Uma Experiência de Cultura e Educação*; Iphan: Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, 1996.
23. Instituto do Patrimônio Histórico e Artístico Nacional (IPHAN). *Saberes, Fazeres, Gingas e Celebrações; Ações Para a Salvaguarda de Bens Registrados como Patrimônio Cultural do Brasil 2002–2018*; Iphan: Brasília, Brazil, 2018. Available online: <http://portal.iphan.gov.br/uploads/publicacao/sfgec.pdf> (accessed on 18 December 2023).
24. Castro López, M.P.; Ávila Rodríguez, C.M. La Salvaguardia del Patrimonio Inmaterial: Una Aproximación a la Reciente Ley 10/2015. *RIIPAC Rev. Sobre Patrim. Cult.* **2015**, *5–6*, 89–124. Available online: <http://www.eumed.net/rev/riipac> (accessed on 27 July 2020).
25. Martín-Cáceres, M.J.; Cuenca-López, J.M. Educomunicación del patrimonio. *Educatio Siglo XXI* **2015**, *33*, 33–54. [CrossRef]
26. Scifoni, S. Educação e Patrimônio Cultural: Reflexões sobre o tema. In *Educação Patrimonial; Reflexões e práticas*; Tolentino, Á.B., Ed.; Superintendência do Iphan na Paraíba: João Pessoa, Brazil, 2012; pp. 30–37.
27. Freire, P. *Pedagogia do Oprimido*, 82nd ed.; Paz e Terra: Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, 2022.
28. Florêncio, S.R. Educação Patrimonial: Um Processo de Mediação. In *Educação Patrimonial; Reflexões e práticas*; Tolentino, Á.B., Ed.; Superintendência do Iphan na Paraíba: João Pessoa, Brazil, 2012; pp. 22–29.
29. Freire, P. *Pedagogia da Autonomia*, 25th ed.; Paz e Terra: Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, 2002.
30. Fontal, O. *La Educación Patrimonial*; Teoría y práctica en el aula, el museo e internet; Ediciones Trea: Gijón, Spain, 2003.
31. Casco, A.C. Sociedade e educação patrimonial. In *Patrimônio*; Revista Eletrônica do Iphan. 2006; Volume 3, pp. 1–5. Available online: http://cmsportal.iphan.gov.br/uploads/ckfinder/arquivos/sociedade_e_educacao_patrimonial.pdf (accessed on 9 June 2020).

32. Fontal, O. La educación patrimonial: De la rentabilidad social a la rentabilidad identitaria. In *Cadernos do Patrimônio Cultural*; Educação patrimonial; Pinheiro, A.R.S., Ed.; Secultfor/Iphan: Fortaleza, Brazil, 2015; pp. 33–46.
33. Saballa, V.A. Educação Patrimonial: “Lugares de Memória”. *Mouseion* **2007**, *1*, 23–25.
34. Brasil. *Base Nacional Comum Curricular*; Ministério da Educação: Brasília, Brazil, 2017. Available online: http://basenacionalcomum.mec.gov.br/images/BNCC_EI_EF_110518_versaofinal_site.pdf (accessed on 10 March 2022).
35. Sánchez-Ferri, A. Patrimonio para todos pero, quiénes somos todos? Pensamientos, palabras y actuaciones inclusivas. In *Cómo Educar en el Patrimonio*; Guía práctica para el desarrollo de actividades de educación patrimonial; Fontal, O., Ed.; Comunidad de Madrid: Madrid, Spain, 2020; pp. 57–70.
36. Pollak, M. Memória e identidade social. *Estud. Históricos* **1992**, *5*, 200–212.
37. Saba, A.G. Mapas afetivos no caminho decolonial da educação patrimonial no rolé na penha. *Sillogés* **2022**, *5*, 365–389.
38. Rampim, S. Inventários Participativos nas fortificações em Pernambuco: Educação Patrimonial em contexto de bens culturais valorados e patrimonializados no “Discurso Autorizado do Patrimônio”. *Sillogés* **2022**, *5*, 446–462.
39. Romeu, G. *Novas (Velhas) Batalhas: Educação Patrimonial No Contexto das Fortificações de Pernambuco*; IPHAN: Brasília, Brazil, 2019.
40. Assumpção, A.L.; Bevílaqua, B.C.; Castral, P.C. Weaving memories: The creation and trajectory of the project “The city for all: Perception, belonging, and preservation of the cultural heritage as a way of constituting the senses of collectivity in Bocaina city”. *Rev. Nac. Gerenciamento Cid.* **2022**, *10*, 66–79. [[CrossRef](#)]
41. Moreno-Vera, J.R.; López-Fernández, J.A.; Ponsoda-López de Atalaya, S. La concepción del patrimonio en el profesorado en formación de Educación Infantil. *Profr. Rev. Currículum Form. Profr.* **2022**, *26*, 439–458. [[CrossRef](#)]
42. Moreno-Vera, J.R.; de Atalaya, S.P.-L.; López-Fernández, J.A.; Blanes-Mora, R. Holistic or Traditional Conceptions of Heritage among Early-Childhood and Primary Trainee Teachers. *Sustainability* **2020**, *12*, 8921. [[CrossRef](#)]
43. Scifoni, S. Patrimônio e educação no Brasil: O que há de novo? *Educ. Soc.* **2022**, *42*, 1–13. [[CrossRef](#)]

Disclaimer/Publisher’s Note: The statements, opinions and data contained in all publications are solely those of the individual author(s) and contributor(s) and not of MDPI and/or the editor(s). MDPI and/or the editor(s) disclaim responsibility for any injury to people or property resulting from any ideas, methods, instructions or products referred to in the content.