

ARTICLE

**THE POLITICAL PEDAGOGICAL PROJECTS OF HERITAGE EDUCATION: AN ANALYSIS  
OF THE PROPOSALS OF UNESCO<sup>1</sup>**

**ANA CAROLINA FERNANDES GONÇALVES<sup>1</sup>**

ORCID:<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8847-7852>

<carolfernangon@gmail.com>

**CEZAR LUIZ DE MARI<sup>2</sup>**

ORCID:<https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0404-0328>

<cezar.demari@ufv.br>

<sup>1</sup> Secretaria Estadual de Educação de Ervália, Minas Gerais (MG), Brazil.

<sup>2</sup> Universidade Federal de Viçosa (UFV), Viçosa, Minas Gerais (MG), Brazil.

**ABSTRACT:** This article is a product of research carried out for the Master's in Education, whose objective is the political pedagogical project presented by the *United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization* (UNESCO) for heritage education, through the initiatives it encourages for the preservation of cultural and natural heritage. From qualitative research of documentary analysis of UNESCO recommendations, declarations, and conventions, it was possible to reconstruct the political proposals and uses of heritage education and political pedagogical projects planned by this agency. The result presented is an overview of the pedagogical policy designed for heritage preservation and its economic exploitation, either as support for the creation of sustainable networks for traditional communities, responsible exploration of cultural tourism by public and private agents, and scientific and pedagogical responsibility in the preservation of material and immaterial cultural. The contribution of this article is, in the end, a reflection on the importance of establishing criteria to evaluate the impacts of these pedagogical political projects for the public they are aimed at.

**Keywords:** heritage education, UNESCO, cultural heritage, political-pedagogical project, assessment.

**OS PROJETOS POLÍTICO-PEDAGÓGICOS DA EDUCAÇÃO PATRIMONIAL: UMA ANÁLISE DAS  
PROPOSTAS DA UNESCO**

**RESUMO:** Este artigo é um produto da pesquisa realizada para o Mestrado em Educação, cujo objeto é o projeto político-pedagógico apresentado pela Organização das Nações Unidas para a Educação, a Ciência e a Cultura (UNESCO – *United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization*) para a educação patrimonial, por meio de iniciativas, por ela encorajadas, para preservação do patrimônio cultural e natural. A partir de uma pesquisa qualitativa de análise documental das recomendações,

---

<sup>1</sup> Article published with funding from the *Conselho Nacional de Desenvolvimento Científico e Tecnológico* - CNPq/Brazil for editing, layout and XML conversion services.

declarações e convenções da UNESCO, foi possível reconstruir as propostas e os usos políticos da educação patrimonial e dos projetos político-pedagógicos planejados por esta agência. O resultado apresentado é um panorama da política pedagógica idealizada para a preservação patrimonial e sua exploração econômica, seja como suporte para criação de redes sustentáveis para comunidades tradicionais, seja para exploração responsável do turismo cultural por agentes públicos e privados, seja para o incentivo à responsabilidade científica e pedagógica na preservação de bens culturais materiais e imateriais. A contribuição deste artigo é, ao final, uma reflexão sobre a importância do estabelecimento de critérios para avaliar os impactos desses projetos político-pedagógicos no público por eles visado.

**Palavras-chave:** educação patrimonial, UNESCO, patrimônio cultural, projeto político-pedagógico, avaliação.

## LOS PROYECTOS POLÍTICOS PEDAGÓGICOS DE LA EDUCACIÓN PATRIMONIAL: UN ANÁLISIS DE LAS PROPUESTAS DE LA UNESCO

**RESUMEN:** Este artículo es producto de una investigación realizada para la Maestría en Educación, cuyo objeto es el proyecto político pedagógico que presenta la Organización de las Naciones Unidas para la Educación, la Ciencia y la Cultura (UNESCO *United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization*) para la educación patrimonial, a través de las iniciativas que impulsa para la preservación del patrimonio cultural y natural. A partir de una investigación cualitativa de análisis documental de las recomendaciones, declaraciones y convenciones de la UNESCO, fue posible reconstruir las propuestas políticas y los usos de la educación patrimonial y los proyectos políticos pedagógicos previstos por esta agencia. El resultado que se presenta es un panorama de la política pedagógica diseñada para la preservación del patrimonio y su aprovechamiento económico, ya sea como apoyo a la creación de redes sostenibles para las comunidades tradicionales, exploración responsable del turismo cultural por parte de agentes públicos y privados y responsabilidad científica y pedagógica en la preservación de bienes, culturas materiales e inmateriales. El aporte de este artículo es, en definitiva, una reflexión sobre la importancia de establecer criterios para evaluar los impactos de estos proyectos políticos pedagógicos en el público al que van dirigidos.

**Palabras clave:** educación patrimonial, UNESCO, patrimonio cultural, proyecto político-pedagógico, evaluación.

## INTRODUCTION

Heritage education is generally understood as an educational activity within a program or project aimed at preserving both tangible and intangible cultural heritage. Initially, such educational activities were implemented as complementary initiatives to the preservation program, serving as a return on investment from this program to society, as evident in museum education programs and archaeological projects (Marchette, 2016). However, the contribution of educational activities shifted down the list of priorities as the concept of cultural heritage expanded to encompass the set of assets known as intangible, such as knowledge, celebrations, languages, and ways of life.

Heritage education is currently at the forefront of numerous preservation initiatives, being systematically integrated into both national formal and non-formal educational programs. This is akin to

the Plan Nacional de Educación y Patrimonio developed by the Spanish government (Ministerio de Educación, Cultura y Deporte, 2015) and the Brazilian guidelines established in Ordinance 137/2016 by the National Institute of Historical and Artistic Heritage (IPHAN, 2016a). These efforts culminate in local tourism programs, which are similar to projects undertaken by NGOs, secretariats, institutes, and community-based tourism initiatives in the Caiçara territory (Barros; Rodrigues, 2019). A key preservation methodology within these initiatives is the Participatory Inventory methodology created by IPHAN, particularly when it is implemented by and with the local community (IPHAN, 2016b).

Heritage education is a complex and nuanced subject of study, provided by a range of agents including schools, museums, tourism services, and various printed materials, both in formal and informal settings. It employs diverse methodologies tailored to the specific heritage asset in question and has varied objectives that necessitate ongoing critical evaluation. This is important because heritage education can promote both emancipation and the preservation of exclusionary and subjugating hegemonic narratives, as noted by Nestor Canclini (1994).

Due to its multidisciplinary nature, the academic literature on Heritage Education is also diverse. Some studies generally deal with its history and systematization (Demarchi, 2016; Franco, 2020; Horta; Grumberg; Monteiro, et al, 1999; Lacerda et al, 2015; Marchette, 2016; Oliveira, 2019; Valecillo, 2017), its planning as a political program (Florêncio, 2019; Fontal, 2016, Valecillo, 2013), reports of school and tourist experiences (Barros; Rodrigues, 2019; Melo; Cardozo, 2015; Silva et al, 2016) and criticism (SCIFONI, 2012, 2017, 2019), to name a few. In this broad literature, international documents are cited as references that guide the work of theoretical research and political-pedagogical practice.

Heritage Charters, as they are known, are international documents and are also incorporated into diverse groups of documents produced by various national, regional, and international organizations. Generally, under this umbrella we find UNESCO recommendations, declarations, and conventions for Member States on the preservation of tangible and intangible natural and cultural heritage, as well as recommendations from organized civil society organizations such as the International Council of Museums (ICOM), the World Council on Monuments and Sites (ICOMOS), the International Centre for the Study of the Preservation and Restoration of Cultural Property (ICCROM), the International Society of Modernist Architects (ISMA), and government organizations such as the Council of Europe (CE). More than a contract or an official communication, these documents express consensus and divergences regarding heritage preservation. According to Jurema Machado (2017, p. 264), former president of IPHAN, these:

[...] letters are the main representatives of the effervescence of thought on heritage, more frequent and innovative in these thirty years than in those that followed. Far from being finished recipe book, or an “application manual” of conservation theory, the letters reflect, like UNESCO's instruments, the consensus possible at a given historical moment, a consensus generally originating from culturally and politically very diverse collectives. For this reason, they are often limited to general issues, often unfolding into regional or national letters, as there are several examples of Latin American or Brazilian letters (Machado, 2017, p. 264).

This article will briefly present the results of documentary research, the primary source of which is these Heritage Charters, to identify the political role that heritage education plays in international relations, through bi- and multilateral agreements between countries and between countries and international organizations, more specifically UNESCO, responsible for providing technical advice and

administering international programs for the protection of world heritage and the fund itself for this purpose.

This study involved a qualitative textual analysis of 21 documents on heritage preservation produced by UNESCO between 1930 and 2015. These documents emphasize education as a crucial initiative within the safeguarding measures recommended or agreed upon in response to various threats, including armed conflict, terrorism, resource scarcity, time constraints, industrialization, modernization, subjugation, and prejudice. Overall, the analysis encompasses eleven recommendations, three declarations, five conventions, one charter, and a Pedagogical Kit.

This corpus underwent an interpretative analysis at three levels of depth. The first, most superficial, analysis sought to identify the concept of education and its project, expressed in the documents, and its relationship with the forms and methodologies identified by the researchers as “heritage education.” The second level involved analyzing the documents' authors, as well as local, national, and international political actors, to highlight the political use of these heritage education projects. Finally, the third analytical level sought to locate the political-pedagogical projects for heritage education within the globalized international political landscape, in which nation-states establish cooperative relationships, using the term “glocal” for this purpose. This work will present, in each section, the results of the analysis at each level, with the data and synthesis tabulated, accompanied by a discussion, followed by a suggestion presented as the final product and contribution of the research.

## PROPOSALS FOR HERITAGE EDUCATION IN UNESCO DOCUMENTS

To understand the international consensus on heritage education, 21 documents were analyzed. This analysis is summarized in Table 1, where the data obtained are organized chronologically. This data refers to the concept of education expressed in the document, the type of heritage referred to in the document, the responsibility for the educational initiative, the objective of the educational initiative, and a keyword taken from one of the documents to represent the general idea.

The initial observation derived from the collected data pertains to the chronological evolution of the meaning of heritage education over time (refer to Table 1, column 1). This evolution encompasses not only the goals of education but also the very concept of heritage preservation. The data clearly indicates that the evolving understanding of heritage education arises from a conceptual transformation of heritage and a shifting responsibility for its safeguarding, as will be elaborated upon below.

Table 1 – Comparison of the term “education” used in UNESCO documents related to the safeguarding of cultural and natural heritage

Conception of education	Type of asset	Responsibility	Objective	Key phrase	Documents
<b>1930-1960 Public Education</b>	Local Material Cultural Heritage	Educators, museums and other organizations involved in the preservation of	Awareness: educate the public to prevent vandalism and understand	“Awaken and develop respect”	Athens Charter of 1931 (IMO, 1931) Hague Convention of 1954 (UN, 1954) UNESCO Recommendation of

Conception of education	Type of asset	Responsibility	Objective	Key phrase	Documents
		local cultural heritage	the importance of protecting it.		1956, New Delhi (UNESCO, 1956) UNESCO Recommendation of 1960, Paris (UNESCO, 1960) UNESCO Recommendation of 1962, Paris (UNESCO, 1962)
<b>1960-1970 Educational Programs</b>	World Material and Natural Cultural Heritage	State	Training: insert cultural heritage into the school curriculum as civic education.	“To encourage citizens to show interest and respect for the cultural and natural heritage of all nations”	UNESCO Recommendation, Paris, 1964 (UNESCO, 1964) UNESCO Recommendation, Paris, 1968 (UNESCO, 1968) Paris Convention, 1970 (UNESCO, 1970) Paris Convention, Paris, 1972 (UNESCO, 1972) Nairobi Recommendation, Nairobi, 1976 (UNESCO, 1976) Paris Recommendation, Paris, 1978 (UNESCO, 1978)
<b>1980 Cultural Heritage Teaching</b>	Local Intangible Cultural Heritage	State	Integration: inserting cultural heritage into the school curriculum as part of national and local culture.	“Comprehensive Education of Human Heritage”, for “reevaluation”	Recommendations of the 1982 World Conference on Cultural Policies (UNESCO, 1982a) 1982 Mexico Declaration (UNESCO, 1982b) 1989 Paris Recommendation (UNESCO, 1989)
<b>1990 International Heritage Education Program</b>	World Cultural, Material, Intangible and Natural Heritage	UNESCO	Action: engaging youth in the defense of heritage through praxis	“Know, estimate, act”	Pedagogical Kit (UNESCO, 2012)
<b>2000 Protection Policy</b>	Local, National, Regional and Global	State with partnerships (ICOMOS, category 2 centers,	Mobilization: education is included as one of the	“Education, awareness and capacity building”	Universal Declaration on Cultural Diversity, 2001 (UNESCO, 2001)

Conception of education	Type of asset	Responsibility	Objective	Key phrase	Documents
	Cultural, Material and Intangible and Natural Heritage.	States, volunteering)	measures to protect intangible heritage implemented by the State and communities.		Paris Declaration, 2003 (UNESCO, 2003a) Paris Convention, 2003 (UNESCO, 2003b) Paris Convention, 2005 (UNESCO, 2005) Paris Recommendation, 2011 (UNESCO, 2011) Paris Recommendation, 2015 (UNESCO, 2015)

Source: Frame with our adaptation (Gonçalves, 2022).

The initial initiatives aimed at protecting material and local heritage—commonly understood to encompass monuments and architectural complexes-between 1930 and 1960 proposed an educational approach to enhance public awareness. This initiative was to be implemented by local agents, museums, and educators to support conservation efforts (Table 1, line 1). This is evidenced by UNESCO's specific recommendation in 1960, which called for the institutions that endorsed the "documents" (Table 1, column 6) to become more accessible to the public, including through school visits:

- a. Creation in each museum of education specialist positions responsible, under the director's authority, for the use of the museum for educational purposes;
- b. Creation of educational services in museums that can obtain collaboration from teaching staff;
- c. Creation at the local, regional, or provincial level of organizations in which museum directors and teaching staff participate, to improve the use of museums for educational purposes;
- d. Adoption of any other measures that allow for the coordination of educational requirements with the resources available to the museum. (UNESCO, 1960).

From these data, the proposal raises awareness that heritage education originated from the need to justify to society and the state the cost of preserving material assets destroyed by war, neglect, and abandonment, as well as urban modernization and real estate speculation. This need is also observed by geographer Simone Scifoni, who, in analyzing the Brazilian context, highlights the role of education in Mário de Andrade's pioneering discourse on cultural heritage preservation, emphasizing the singularity or eccentricity that such an idea may have had in 1930 (Scifoni, 2019). According to the researcher, for whom awareness raising is an “idea out of time,” this awareness raising of heritage education actually contributes to the commodification of culture and the transformation of educational work into the formation of consumers who justify public spending (Scifoni, 2017).

However, beginning in the 1960s, and especially with the 1972 UNESCO Convention on World Cultural and Natural Heritage, heritage education ceased to be suggested as an initiative of local agents and became a public initiative for civic education (Table 1, line 2). Heritage education acquired a formal, academic character by being included in school curricula to develop a cosmopolitan citizenry that



recognized the universal value of cultural assets, which should be considered by all humanity (UNESCO, 1972). Therefore, the proposed heritage education seems to derive directly from the international cooperation plan to safeguard heritage assets of value to humanity, an effort that needs to be understood and defended. Education even appears in the 1972 Convention, under the term “educational program,” as a clause of the international cooperation agreement:

#### VI – Educational Programs

##### ARTICLE 27.

1 – The States Parties to this Convention shall endeavor, by all appropriate means, including through education and information programs, to strengthen their peoples' respect for and attachment to the cultural and natural heritage defined in Articles 1 and 2 of the Convention.

2 – They undertake to inform the public widely of the threats to such heritage and of the activities carried out in the implementation of this Convention (UNESCO, 1972).

To get an idea of the impact of this Convention, in the USA, for example, where heritage education was already carried out in parks and museums, since 1932, in a non-formal way, according to a survey carried out by Cathleen Ann Lambert, from the 1970s onwards, heritage education was offered in schools through the “Architects in Schools” program, with classes in urban planning and architecture (Lamber, 1996). In France, according to the entry in the *Dictionnaire critique des enjeux et concepts des “éducations à”* (“Critical dictionary of the objectives and concepts of ‘education à’”), Angela Barthes and others report that, in 1978, the theme of “local heritage” was included, in a transdisciplinary way, in history, geography and arts classes, in accordance with the 1972 UNESCO Convention, and, in 1980, “heritage classes” were included in the primary education curriculum (Barthes et al, 2017).

However, times change, and political challenges arise. Identity and its relationship to culture and way of life became an important marker claimed in UNESCO's discourse beginning in 1980, when countries on the periphery of capitalism, now independent due to the post-war decolonization process, became UNESCO Member States. This demand from peripheral peoples profoundly altered the meaning of “heritage,” which now includes intangible assets such as language, celebrations, and traditional knowledge. This recognition was incorporated into UNESCO's discourse beginning with the 1982 Mexico Declaration, the result of the consensus reached at the 1982 MONDIALCULT cultural policy meeting.

Heritage education, already included in school curricula as a cross-cutting theme or discipline and as a clause for participation in international cooperation initiatives, came to mean more than just educating cosmopolitan citizens. It was seen as a way to foster social integration through the recognition of cultural identity and the strengthening of ties with ancestral traditions. The proposed integration of heritage education appears to be directly linked to the need to defend the intangible cultural manifestations, especially of colonized peoples, whose culture was erased and buried in the process of colonial elite domination.

Education is the quintessential means of transmitting national and universal cultural values, and should seek the assimilation of scientific and technical knowledge without detriment to the capabilities and values of the people.

What is currently required is a comprehensive and innovative education that not only informs and transmits, but also educates and renews, that allows students to become aware of the realities of their time and environment, that fosters the blossoming of personality, that fosters self-discipline, respect for others, and social and international solidarity; an education that empowers

organization and productivity, for the production of truly necessary goods and services, that inspires renewal and stimulates creativity (UNESCO, 1982).

The economic policy of the 1990s had a strongly developmentalist international agenda, following the promulgation of the 1986 UN Declaration on the Right to Development, which led to the adoption of the Human Development Index (HDI), created by Pakistani economist Mahbub ul Haq and Indian economist Amartya Sen, in reports from the United Nations Development Program (UNDP), and the sustainable perspective (eco-development) by Ignacy Sachs (Machado; Pamplona, 2008).

Developmentalism in the field of culture led UNESCO to direct international cooperation agreements toward the promotion of creative industries, to promote human development through sustainable development, as expressed in the report “Our Creative Diversity: Report of the World Commission on Culture and Development” (UNESCO, 1995). In heritage preservation policies, these objectives are the result of increasing pressure from the Organization of American States (OAS) to define and regulate cultural tourism, finally included in the 2005 Convention, opening up opportunities for public and private investment in tangible and intangible heritage, with a view to generating revenue.

UNESCO's educational initiative during this period was more assertive, as it abandoned its role as advisor, producing recommendations and mediating international cooperation agreements to take on the role of educational agent, creating its own heritage education program to engage youth in the task of safeguarding heritage. Heritage education, in this context, took the form of youth and civil society involvement as stakeholders in heritage preservation policies, assuming a co-participation in the management of World Heritage safeguarding. The proposed role of heritage education, in this case, appears to have a direct impact on the economy by stimulating participation in the cultural tourism market, whether as a qualified workforce for restoration, as a political agent for protection, or as a supplier of cultural products and services, as evidenced by the themes of the UNESCO Pedagogical Kit booklets:

Book 1 - Educational Approaches to World Heritage  
Book 2 - The World Heritage Convention  
Book 3 - World Heritage and Identity  
Book 4 - World Heritage and Tourism  
Book 5 - World Heritage and the Environment  
Book 6 - World Heritage and a Culture of Peace (UNESCO, 2012).

UNESCO's international program differs from national heritage education programs, particularly in its practical approach and its emphasis on employability training rather than the more academic and conceptual curricula proposed by government initiatives.

The first decades of the 21st century, from the perspective of UNESCO documents on heritage preservation, represent the culmination of debates that began in 1980. Cultural diversity was recognized in the 2001 Declaration, intangible heritage was finally defined in the 2003 Convention, and the means to protect it were agreed upon among Member States in the 2005 Convention. Heritage education ceased to be a means of safeguarding and became an end activity, as it was recognized as a strategy for mobilizing communities to define and manage their cultural heritage. The proposed mobilization of heritage education, therefore, appears to be linked to a larger sustainable development project, which includes traditional communities and their tangible and intangible heritage autonomously



in preservation policies and the cultural market. As explicitly stated in Article 10, paragraph c, of the 2005 Convention:

Article 10 – EDUCATION AND PUBLIC AWARENESS

The Parties shall:

[...]

(c) strive to encourage creativity and strengthen production capacities through the establishment of education, training, and exchange programs in the field of cultural industries. Such measures shall be implemented in such a way as not to hurt traditional forms of production (UNESCO, 2005).

In summary, Heritage Education has taken on diverse meanings in the international discourse on heritage preservation, varying according to the expansion of the concept of heritage itself and the political and economic objectives included in safeguarding projects and programs. Although these differences appear chronologically in documentary analysis, these meanings and objectives are not mutually exclusive and do not disappear over time, as can be seen in the various typologies created to describe the diversity of Heritage Education.

Spanish researcher Olaia Fontal Merillas (2016) and Ecuadorian researcher Zaida Garcia Valecillo (2013) used different markers to describe heritage-related educational practices, such as “approaches,” “models,” and “strands.” For Valecillo (2013), the pedagogical perspective adopted by educators can be observed in pedagogical projects, such as the “focus” given to heritage. There are four approaches (Table 2, column 3) described by Valecillo (2013):

- Heritage education;
- Heritage education;
- Heritage education;
- Heritage education.

When a project incorporates pedagogical practices related to heritage, it is considered a valuable teaching resource. This approach is exemplified in the 1999 Basic Guide to Heritage Education by IPHAN (Horta; Grumberg; Monteiro, 1999), which serves as a key reference in the field of Heritage Education. Within this guide, teaching sequences are designed to facilitate direct engagement with, manipulation of, and observation of heritage assets, particularly those that are material in nature (Horta; Grumberg; Monteiro, 1999). A notable illustration of this method can be found in Guimarães Júnior's (2020) analysis of heritage education sequences featured in elementary school textbooks. The author underscores the importance of teaching resources, such as colored images, to foster observation, interpretation, and reflection, along with itinerant visits and digital museum tour activities that necessitate enhanced preparation and training for educators (Guimarães Junior, 2020).

In pedagogical approaches to heritage, it is often represented in curricular content, typically as a cross-cutting theme within History, Arts, Sociology, and Geography classes. This is achieved through theoretical didactic sequences that explore the aesthetic, historical, and anthropological significance of heritage. A critical and insightful examination of the incorporation of cultural heritage into the history curriculum can be found in the work of Mendes and Nunes (2021), which highlights the insufficient representation of topics related to traditional cultures, such as forest communities and quilombolas. It emphasizes the need for a more direct engagement with cultural heritage and advocates for enhanced teacher training in this area.

On the other hand, when the pedagogical proposal focuses on heritage education, it is seen as a moral or political principle mobilized to engage the individual in its defense. An example of this approach is the UNESCO Pedagogical Kit, which aims to train young people to work in heritage protection, presenting legislation, the pros and cons of tourism, and the need to respect diversity and promote peace (UNESCO, 2012). Another well-illustrative material for this approach is the *Creative Manual for Heritage Education*, produced by the State Institute of Historical and Artistic Heritage (IEPHA) for teachers, in which the educational purpose can be seen in the guidelines given to educators:

The preservation of cultural heritage should be a constant concern of the educator leading the activities. They should stay informed about the importance of preservation so they can discuss it with their group and reinforce the necessary care for heritage assets, especially during visits and field exploration (IEPHA, [2015?], p. 25).

Finally, there are also heritage education projects per se, where the processes of patrimonialization and identification are taken as pedagogical objectives, as in the Participatory Inventories methodology created by IPHAN, in which the practice provides communities with the opportunity to identify their heritage, semanticize it based on their practices, and plan the best way to preserve it. An interesting participatory inventory project used in heritage education is the final product of Santos's (2019) dissertation, which recreates an ancient religious procession with children and the image of a saint who participated in it, through the recovery of community memories.

Fontale (2016) distinguishes educational models based on the didactic approach adopted in pedagogical projects. She described eight didactics adopted in these educational initiatives (Table 2, columns 4 and 5):

- Transmissive model;
- Conceptual model;
- Receptive model;
- Contextual model;
- Investigative model;
- Constructive model;
- Relational model;
- Procedural model.

In the transmissive model, heritage is regarded as an object of knowledge that is conveyed by educators through the delivery of data, facts, and dates. This approach is prevalent in school education, particularly in history classes. Conversely, the conceptual model defines and explicates heritage theoretically, utilizing concepts and principles akin to theoretical artistic education, where the asset is characterized by technical criteria. Both didactic approaches are typically found in formal and theoretical education, where heritage serves as a cross-cutting theme or topic within the curriculum. The predominant discursive genres in this context are informative and dissertative, as exemplified by the critical analyses of textbook content by Guimarães Júnior (2020) and Mendes and Nunes (2021).

The receptive model approaches heritage by considering the learner's prior knowledge, often gained through visits to archaeological sites, monuments, exhibitions, and museums. In contrast, the contextual model presents heritage in situ, highlighting its connections to the natural, social, and cultural environment. This method is typically employed during field trips, guided tours, and tourist itineraries.

Both approaches closely align with informal pedagogical practices, such as Museum Education and pedagogical tourism, utilizing the discursive genre of heritage interpretation. This is evident in the work of Silva et al. (2016), which outlines the design of a tourist itinerary aimed at educational outcomes for visitors, as well as in the IEPHA Creative Manual ([2015?]), where didactic sequences consider the body and territory as integral components of the heritage recognition journey.

In contrast, the didactic approaches typical of investigative and constructive models align more closely with pedagogical projects focused on technical and professional training. In the investigative model, heritage is interpreted through anthropological, historical, and geographic perspectives, which can be seen in various forms such as courses, inventories, reports, and academic dissertations. This approach is exemplified in the work of Marchette (2016), who argues that heritage education corresponds with the development of a city's master plan, as access to heritage assets serves as a significant educational tool for the community. Conversely, the constructive model emphasizes immersive learning, where students engage in heritage-related practices, including workshops that teach a craft, a dance, or a language, always with an awareness of the heritage's significance and the necessity of its preservation. This model is championed by Lacerda et al. (2015).

Engagement is the pedagogical objective of social projects that target youth and the community as protagonists in the heritage safeguarding process, from the designation process, management, and tourism exploration, such as that experimented by Barros and Rodrigues (2019) with the Caiçara community in Paraty, and the participatory inventory conducted by Santos (2019) with the community and children around Serra do Brigadeiro in the Zona da Mata region of Minas Gerais. In the relational model, pedagogical strategies are articulated to encourage the participation of the involved community through forums, projects, and volunteer work. In the procedural model, preservation agencies, whether public or private, mediate the process of identifying heritage assets, enabling practices of self-recognition and self-management of cultural heritage by the communities. Both models are related to pedagogical practices known as sociocultural animation.

Table 2 – Approximation between the meanings and objectives found in international documents on heritage safeguarding and descriptions, made by Fontal (2016) and Valecillo (2013), of Heritage Education

Conception	Objective	Focus	Model	Approach	Strands
Public Education	Awareness	Heritage as a teaching resource	Receptive/Contextual	Museum education, Heritage interpretation	Non-formal education
Educational Projects	Training	Heritage as curricular content	Transmissive/Conceptual	Formal and theoretical education	Formal education
Heritage Teaching	Integration	Heritage as an ethnic/ethical/political principle	Constructive/Investigative	Technical and professional education	Technical and professional education
Social Engagement	Action/Mobilization	Heritage as praxis	Relational/Procedural	Sociocultural animation	

Source: Table adapted by us (GONÇALVES, 2022).

Beyond heritage approaches and teaching models, Valecillo (2013) also describes three strands of Heritage Education, considering the form it takes depending on the circumstances in which educational practice occurs. For the researcher, heritage education can take the form of curriculum design, when planned for basic and higher education; it can be understood as museum education, with itineraries and trails designed for educational tourism in various types of museums and in tourist services in monuments, parks, and historic cities, where there is physical or virtual contact with heritage assets; and as heritage interpretation, when information is offered to the public through lectures, brochures, videos, labels, totems, and others (Valecillo, 2013). Taking these three aspects as a basis, we propose the inclusion of heritage interpretation in a larger category, that of education for technical and professional training (Gonçalves; De Mari, 2022), to include, in addition to interpreters, tourist guides and cultural animators, whose job is to mediate the public/heritage relationship, the necessary training of restorers, analysts and masters of the trade, thus comprising all the training of qualified labor, both for research, interpretation, preservation and restoration work of heritage, as well as for the crafts and arts of the creative economy for the sustainability of heritage.

The result of the approximation of political proposals for heritage education and pedagogical descriptions shows the existence of four different proposals, summarized in Table 2. It could be organized into three strands: non-formal education (Table 2, line 1) – carried out by public and private institutions related to heritage preservation projects –, formal education (Table 2, line 2) – carried out by the national or regional education system – and professional and technical education (Table, lines 3 and 4) – defined by international consensus and determined in cooperation agreements.

## THE POLITICAL PROJECTS OF HERITAGE EDUCATION

Based on the proposals found in the analysis of UNESCO's international documents and their comparison with the heritage focus and its models, with pedagogical approaches across heritage education strands, a pattern of three pedagogical proposals was observed, politically distinguished by the agency responsible for designing and operationalizing them as a political project. The agencies range from local (communities, non-governmental organizations (NGOs), private companies, municipal departments) to national or regional (national government and regional councils, such as the Council of Europe) to international, UNESCO (Table 3).

Table 3 – Summary of the discussion on the results of the documentary research and comparison with the literature on heritage education

Political-Pedagogical Projects	Public Sector	Field of Activity	Education Strand	Area of Activity
<b>Local</b>	Economy	Tourist market	Non-formal education, focusing on heritage as a teaching resource	Museums, Exhibitions, Parks,
				Sites, parks and reserves
<b>National or Regional</b>	Education	Educational System	Formal education, focusing on heritage as an object of knowledge and an	Basic and Higher Education Curriculum
				Teacher Training

			ethical/aesthetic/political principle of life	
<b>International</b>	Culture	Heritage safeguarding entities and bodies	Technical and Professional Education, focusing on heritage as a professional exercise and way of life	Qualification of workforce for preservation and restoration
				Training in traditional arts and crafts

Source: Our authorship.

This pattern outlines a public education plan aimed at raising civic and democratic awareness, working directly with heritage through itineraries, trails, and guides with environmental and historical responsibility, within a local political plan for cultural tourism, promoted by the agents responsible for local heritage management (Table 3, line 1). This political-pedagogical project is most common in scientific publications, where the following actors are found: schools, universities, NGOs, Cultural Centers, Heritage Centers, and IPHAN regional secretariats. These institutions describe initiatives by local actors who, alone or in coordination, develop and execute a heritage action plan with the local community.

Another political-pedagogical project outlined focuses on citizenship education, based on recognition and respect for cultural diversity. It is designed as a school curriculum for the education of children and young people, and as a teacher training curriculum for teaching, aiming to ensure formal heritage education within a regional or national education program (Table 3, line 2). This political-pedagogical project model is the subject of research by Olaia Fontal and the Spanish Heritage Education Observatory. One example is the aforementioned *Plan Nacional de Educación y Patrimonio* (National Plan for Education and Heritage), of the Spanish government (Ministerio de Educación, Cultura y Desporte, 2015), as well as the integrated heritage education model outlined in Ordinance number 137/2016 of the National Institute of Cultural Heritage (IPHAN, 2016a), in which heritage education is offered as a complementary curriculum in full-time education. Or even in the incorporation of Cultural and Natural Heritage in books and teaching materials via National Guidelines for broad and diverse use, such as the IPHAN Basic Heritage Education Guide (Horta; Grumberg; Monteiro et al, 1999; IPHAN, 2016a), also followed by IEPHA.

Finally, a professional and technical education program for the training of workers in the creative economy also appears to be a political project, encompassing technical training in conservation and restoration, tourism services, planning and management of heritage assets, as is explicit in the UNESCO Heritage Education Program and also in the professional master's degree of IPHAN and public universities, in professional courses for cultural tourism and heritage management, also including training in traditional crafts and arts (Table 3, line 3).

While technical and professional training initiatives are frequently executed by national or local entities, the framework for the political-pedagogical project focused on heritage education emerges from international consensus. This consensus is grounded in UNESCO's recommendations, declarations, and international conventions, as well as the Heritage Charters that address issues such as restoration, tourism, authenticity, and other related topics. These charters are developed by international professional organizations, including the International Council of Museums (ICOM), the International Council on Monuments and Sites (ICOMOS), and the International Centre for the Study of the Preservation and

Restoration of Cultural Property (ICCROM). Such political projects are often discussed in academic articles that explore community-based tourism, where arts and crafts play a significant role in the tourist experience, particularly in relation to the 2003 and 2005 UNESCO Conventions.

## **THE PROBLEM OF CITIZENSHIP IN POLITICAL-PEDAGOGICAL PROJECTS OF HERITAGE EDUCATION**

As previously noted, while heritage education is designed and executed at various scales, its actions occur within the same cultural context, ultimately manifesting as global political-pedagogical projects. These initiatives involve an interplay between local and global actions and stakeholders. Recognizing this characteristic is essential for assessing the impact of the political-pedagogical project, as it helps avoid two undesirable extremes. The first is the tendency to select didactic approaches from a more globalized perspective, which may misrepresent heritage itself or propagate hegemonic discourse, resulting in the continued marginalization of already silenced cultures. The second is the adherence to radical values and practices that may be found within traditional thought and community activities, which can constrain and disrespect individuals' minds and bodies, giving rise to issues such as misogyny, ableism, racism, and other forms of discrimination.

These undesirable excesses, according to our interpretation, are side effects of what Canclini (1994) called “ambivalences in the uses of heritage,” which are directly linked to the “imaginary of preservation.” In Canclini's (1994) assessment, it is impossible to escape ambivalences in the use of heritage and their conflicting interests, and the only solution is to try to anticipate them when designing preservation plans. Both the market and the government, or even society, have conflicting initiatives: the market has economically sustainable strategies for safeguarding, but alienates cultural assets as commodities; government guardianship is more responsible, but the State uses it as nationalist propaganda; civil society's protest force is powerful, but only emerges in times of crisis.

Under these conditions, a viable solution would be to evaluate political-pedagogical projects for Heritage Education. To avoid such undesirable effects, these projects need to be evaluated simultaneously in their local, national, and global aspects. According to Lourenço (2014, [s. p.]), the concepts “glocal” and “glocalization” convey “the need for a careful reading of the complexity of the local-global relationship, in which the globalization of the economy and the digital revolution play a decisive role.” For this glocal evaluation, however, some questions raised by the critics should be considered.

Geographer Simone Scifoni (2017), in her article “Challenges for a New Heritage Education,” emphasized that heritage education is a social right, as it empowers individuals to embrace their culture and enables them to use it as a tool to exercise citizenship, participating in the translation of their own history and culture. However, the geographer noted that this practice needs to be detached from the immediate goals of heritage registration and included in the education system, not as an imposition, in which cultural objects are predetermined, but as a construction, in which cultural references exist and represent the culture of a given group, democratically and inclusively (Scifoni, 2017).

In her article “Knowing to Preserve: An Idea Out of Time,” Simone Scifoni (2019) revisits the possibility that the political use of heritage education can distance it from its purpose. Sensitization,



understood within the formula “raising awareness [educating] to preserve,” is used as a resource for politically justifying certain decisions regarding the collective good. This heritage education has contributed to symbolic violence through the imposition of dominant narratives and the attribution of responsibility for neglect and negligence toward heritage to the community, when, often, this is an omission by the protection service, fueled by pressure from the real estate and tourism markets. Within this logic, a political-pedagogical project of heritage education could not, therefore, rely on technical proposals and principles that are outdated and depoliticized, which confuse pedagogical objectives with political strategies of symbolic domination.

Juciene Ricarte Apolinário (2012) draws attention to the interdisciplinary aspects of heritage education and criticizes its approach within the discipline of history, as a study limited to a temporal perspective limits the objective assumptions of building citizenship. Heritage education, according to the author, needs to connect the global and the local, confronting not only diverse temporalities but also overlapping territorialities (Apolinário, 2012). Following a similar critical line, João Lorandi Demarchi (2016), supported by a bibliography shared by researchers in the field, such as Edgar Morin, Paulo Freire, Liev Siemovich Vygotsky, and Boaventura Souza Santos, advocates a heritage education that works together with the local community and considers not only the other as a subject but also other pedagogies, surpassing banking education and enabling the development of understanding, pertinent knowledge, and presence.

Based on these observations, a political-pedagogical project for heritage education aimed at fostering citizenship should be interdisciplinary, forward-looking, and inclusive of diverse voices and pedagogical approaches. It must also integrate various epistemologies that extend beyond traditional curricula. From a glocal standpoint, such a project for heritage education must, above all, be grounded in fidelity. This means that heritage education must remain faithful to the community that owns the heritage. To prevent biased and decontextualized interpretations of the practices that have shaped it, as well as to avoid alienation of the community, appropriate instruments are essential. To achieve this, it is crucial to develop skilled interpreters, including both professionals trained in safeguarding universal codes and members from the originating community, as effective dialogue must flow in both directions—internally and externally.

To ensure fidelity to local culture, this project should be grounded in a study of the community, identifying who performs the pedagogical function within it—that is, who the master, the wise man, is for that community, what legitimizes them as such, and what pedagogical practices they perform—to position this social actor as a heritage educator.

To ensure fidelity to pedagogical systematization, it is necessary to propose a national plan, for example, the project should not neglect cultural dynamics in the name of universalization, such as that found in the structure and functioning of school education. Heritage education is, above all, a popular education, even when it is included in the school curriculum. Therefore, it would be important for it to reproduce the experience of approximation between subject and object and not the separation between them, as is assumed in philosophical and scientific experience, that is, it is the heritage and its community that should determine the pedagogical approach and not the system, which should only reproduce it as faithfully as possible, exchanging the classroom for the field or the workshop, the lesson for the ritual, the test for the celebration.

Finally, to ensure fidelity to universal principles, such as Human Rights, the objective of the heritage education project should be to reveal contradictions without, however, announcing or judging them. In this ideal perspective, it would create conditions for the community itself, the project's target audience, to be able to reflect on and find solutions to its own contradictions, updating itself through internal consensus, driven by its own leaders and intellectuals. That is, the evaluation criteria—right or wrong, adequate or inadequate—are not given a priori, based on references external to the community that owns the heritage, but are the result of debates and agreements made internally, among its members, and also externally, between the community and other agencies.

Finally, if, as André Comte-Sponville (1999, p. 17) defines fidelity in his *Little Treatises on the Great Virtues*, “fidelity is a virtue of memory, and memory itself is a virtue,” then being faithful is, ultimately, not forgetting. Therefore, evaluating a political-pedagogical project based on its fidelity is to test the memory of that project and its ability to remember the cultural values of the local community, the political-economic interests of its citizens, and the international rights of human beings and the environment.

## FINAL CONSIDERATIONS

An analysis of UNESCO's documents revealed that, during the 74 years between the first and last documents issued, the notion of a political-pedagogical project crystallized in agreements, eventually taking the form of national and international heritage education methodologies and programs. Educational proposals shifted from a peripheral role within preservation policies to a strategic role in the protection and promotion of heritage assets, responding to experimentation and new demands. The heritage charters that comprise the corpus analyzed embody UNESCO's initiative, through recommendations to member states and the establishment of multilateral agreements between them, to encourage the protection of cultural heritage as a policy linked to sustainable economic development. In these action plans, educational proposals have, over time, assumed an increasingly prominent role in fostering a specific economy through the training of consumers and producers of cultural goods and services, considering the actors and their roles in these agreed plans.

Based on this historical development pattern of heritage education, from a supplementary action plan to a central strategic plan, it was possible to detect the multiterritoriality present in political-pedagogical projects, which incorporate local, national, regional, and global interests that can often be conflicting. This glocal nature of the projects, therefore, creates a political-pedagogical difficulty in consolidating, within a single project, relative competencies and skills, respecting both cultural expressions of identity and universal rights. The suggestion put forward in this work, to maintain the glocal balance of these projects, is the adoption of a project evaluation criterion that considers the fidelity of the action plans to the memory of the community served, not only to their values but also to their practices of transmitting these values and their mechanisms for updating, recreating, and incorporating new values. In other words, the idea is to observe whether the political-pedagogical project for heritage education encompasses not only identification and appropriation but also critique as part of the culture to be preserved and promoted.

The evaluation of heritage education projects has become a significant concern in both political and academic spheres. The Spanish government, recognized for having one of the most advanced education and heritage policies in the European Union, established a key tool through its 2012 National Education and Heritage Plan. This plan serves various functions, including the monitoring and evaluation of heritage education initiatives across the country. The Spanish Heritage Education Observatory (OEPE) is in the process of creating an international network of researchers focused on this topic, particularly concerning the quality of educational projects (Ministerio de Educación, Cultura y Deporte, 2015). In Brazil, similar efforts are underway with the São Paulo Heritage Education Network at the University of São Paulo (USP) and the Cultural Diversity Observatory at the Federal University of Minas Gerais (UFMG). These institutions unite researchers dedicated to analyzing the impact of educational initiatives and pedagogical models, especially those shaped by the 2010 National Culture Plan implemented by IPHAN. This plan introduced a specific political-pedagogical project for heritage education in 2016 (IPHAN, 2016a) in partnership with the Ministry of Education, particularly through the Secretariat of Continuing Education, Literacy, Diversity, and Inclusion (SECADI) as a complement to full-time education, and the Secretariat of Higher Education (SESU) as part of the university extension program. However, the dissolution of SECADI and the reduction in extension scholarships beginning in 2020 severely compromised the heritage education program, limiting its scope primarily to the Heritage Houses managed by IPHAN and to specific, isolated initiatives conducted by public and private agencies involved in education, tourism, and heritage preservation. As a result, substantial efforts will be required to reorganize heritage education starting in 2023, coinciding with the revival of protection and diversity policies anticipated by the current administration.

## REFERENCES

- APOLINÁRIO, Juciene Ricarte. Reflexões sobre a Educação Patrimonial e experiências da diversidade cultural no ensino de História. In: TOLENTINO, Átila Bezerra (org.). *Educação patrimonial: reflexões e práticas*. João Pessoa: Superintendência do Iphan na Paraíba, 2012. p. 56-65.
- BARROS, André Loureiro Ribeiro de; RODRIGUES, Camila Gonçalves de Oliveira. Educação diferenciada e turismo de base comunitária nos territórios caiçaras de Paraty (RJ). *Ambiente & Sociedade* [on-line], São Paulo, v. 22, 2019. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1590/1809-4422asoc0295r1vu19L1AO>.
- BARTHES, Angela *et al.* Sous la direction: Nicole Tutialk-Gullon). *Dictionnaire critique des enjeux et concepts des “éducations à”*. Paris: L’Harmattan, 2017.
- CANCLINI, Néstor García. O patrimônio cultural e a construção imaginária do nacional. *Revista do Patrimônio Histórico e Artístico Nacional*, Rio de Janeiro, Iphan, n. 23, p. 95-115, 1994. Disponível em: [http://portal.iphan.gov.br/uploads/publicacao/RevPat23\\_m.pdf](http://portal.iphan.gov.br/uploads/publicacao/RevPat23_m.pdf). Acesso em: 18 ago. 2022.
- COMTE-SPONVILLE, André. *Pequeno Tratado das Grandes Virtudes*. São Paulo: Ed. Martins Fontes, 1999.
- DEMARCHI, João Lorandi. Perspectivas para Atuação em Educação Patrimonial. *Revista CPC*, São Paulo, n. 22, p. 267-291, jul./dez. 2016. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.11606/issn.1980-4466.v0i22p267-291>.

FLORENCIO, Sônia Rampim. Política de Educação Patrimonial no IPHAN: Diretrizes Conceituais e Ações Estratégicas. *Revista CPC*, São Paulo, n. 27 especial, p. 55-89, jan./jul. 2019. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.11606/issn.1980-4466.v14i27espp55-89>.

FONTAL MERILLAS, Olaia. Educación patrimonial: retrospectiva y prospectivas para la próxima década. *Estudios Pedagógicos*, Valdivia, v. XLII, n. 2, p. 415-436, 2016. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.4067/S0718-07052016000200024>.

FRANCO, Francisco Carlos. *Educação, patrimônio e cultura local: concepções e perspectivas pedagógicas*. Curitiba: CRV, 2020.

GONÇALVES, Ana Carolina Fernandes. O “Espírito de Nairóbi” contra a “Águia americana”: disputas hegemônicas no processo de construção da educação patrimonial pela UNESCO. 2022. 186 f. Dissertação (Mestrado em Educação) - Universidade Federal de Viçosa, Viçosa. 2022. Disponível: [https://bdtd.ibict.br/vufind/Record/UFV\\_0772cdd541cf07a7dd6beb0ead725adc](https://bdtd.ibict.br/vufind/Record/UFV_0772cdd541cf07a7dd6beb0ead725adc). Acesso em: 5 dez. 2022.

GONÇALVES, Ana Carolina Fernandes; DE MARI, Cezar Luiz. Educação patrimonial: entre a preservação e a formação profissional. Título. In: *IX Simpósio Internacional Trabalho, Relações de Trabalho, Educação e Identidade - SITRE*, 2022 [on-line]. Anais IX SITRE 2022– ISSN 1980-685X. Disponível em: <chrome-extension://efaidnbmnnnibpcajpcgclefindmkaj/https://sitre.appos.org.br/wp-content/uploads/2022/08/GT-16-Trabalho-e-formacao-profissional-nos-campos-da-informacao-e-da-cultura.pdf>. Acesso em: 15 dez. 2022.

GUIMARÃES JUNIOR, Jaime de Lima. *Um olhar sobre a Educação Patrimonial no Ensino de História: Atividades prático-pedagógicas nos livros didáticos*. Trabalho de Conclusão de Curso (Licenciatura em História) - Universidade Federal Rural de Pernambuco, Recife, 2020. Disponível em: [https://repository.ufrpe.br/bitstream/123456789/3120/1/tcc\\_jaimedelimaguimaraesjunior.pdf](https://repository.ufrpe.br/bitstream/123456789/3120/1/tcc_jaimedelimaguimaraesjunior.pdf). Acesso em: 15 nov. 2022.

HORTA, Maria de Lourdes P.; GRUMBERG, Evelina; MONTEIRO, Adriane Q. *Guia Básico de Educação Patrimonial*. Brasília: Instituto do Patrimônio Histórico e Artístico Nacional, Museu Imperial, 1999. Disponível em: [http://portal.iphan.gov.br/uploads/temp/guia\\_educacao\\_patrimonial.pdf.pdf](http://portal.iphan.gov.br/uploads/temp/guia_educacao_patrimonial.pdf.pdf). Acesso em: 28 nov. 2022.

INSTITUTO ESTADUAL DO PATRIMÔNIO HISTÓRICO E ARTÍSTICO – IEPHA. *Manual Criativo – Educação para o Patrimonial Cultural*. [2015?]. Disponível em: <http://www.iepha.mg.gov.br/images/EDITAIS/Material---Educao-para-o-Patrimnio.pdf>. Acesso em: 15 nov. 2022.

INSTITUTO DO PATRIMÔNIO HISTÓRICO E ARTÍSTICO NACIONAL – IPHAN (Brasil). *Portaria nº 137/2016*, de 28 de abril de 2016. Estabelece diretrizes de Educação Patrimonial no âmbito do Iphan e das Casas do Patrimônio. Brasília, DF: IPHAN, 2016a. Disponível em: [http://portal.iphan.gov.br/uploads/ckfinder/arquivos/Portaria\\_n\\_137\\_de\\_28\\_de\\_abril\\_de\\_2016.pdf](http://portal.iphan.gov.br/uploads/ckfinder/arquivos/Portaria_n_137_de_28_de_abril_de_2016.pdf). Acesso em: 18 fev. 2021.

INSTITUTO DO PATRIMÔNIO HISTÓRICO E ARTÍSTICO NACIONAL – IPHAN (Brasil). *Educação Patrimonial: Inventários Participativos*. Manual de Aplicação/IPHAN. Texto: Sônia Regina Rampim Florêncio *et al.* Brasília-DF: IPHAN, 2016b. 134 p.: il. color.; 21 cm. Disponível em: [http://portal.iphan.gov.br/uploads/publicacao/inventariodopatrimonio\\_15x21web.pdf](http://portal.iphan.gov.br/uploads/publicacao/inventariodopatrimonio_15x21web.pdf). Acesso em: 15 nov. 2022.

LACERDA, Aroldo Dias; FIGUEIREDO, Betânia Gonçalves; PEREIRA, Junia Sales; SILVA, Marco Antônio. *Patrimônio cultural em oficinas: atividades em contextos escolares*. 1ª ed. Belo Horizonte: Fino Traço, 2015.

LAMBERT, Cathleen Ann. *Heritage Education in the Postmodern Curriculum*. 1996. 420 f. Theses (Historic Preservation) - University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA. Disponível em: [https://repository.upenn.edu/hp\\_theses/420](https://repository.upenn.edu/hp_theses/420). Acesso em: 15 nov. 2022.

LOURENÇO, Nelson. Globalização e Glocalização. O difícil diálogo entre o global e o local. MULEMBA. *Revista Angolana de Ciências Sociais* [on-line], Luanda, v. IV, n. 8, [s. p.], 2014. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.4000/mulemba.203>.

MACHADO, João Guilherme Rocha; PAMPLONA, João Batista. A ONU e o desenvolvimento econômico: uma interpretação das bases teóricas da atuação do PNUD. *Economia e Sociedade*, Campinas, v. 17, n. 1, p. 53-84, abr. 2008. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1590/S0104-06182008000100003>.

MACHADO, Jurema. Feito em casa: o Iphan e a cooperação internacional para o patrimônio. *Revista do Patrimônio Histórico Nacional*, Brasília, n. 35, p. 245-284, 2017. Disponível em: [http://portal.iphan.gov.br/uploads/publicacao/revpat\\_35.pdf](http://portal.iphan.gov.br/uploads/publicacao/revpat_35.pdf). Acesso em: 18 fev. 2021.

MARCHETTE, Tatiana Dantas. *Educação patrimonial e políticas públicas de preservação no Brasil*. 1. ed. Curitiba: Intersaberes, 2016.

MELO, Alessandro de; CARDOZO, Poliana Fabiula. Patrimônio, turismo cultural e educação patrimonial. *Educação & Sociedade*, Campinas, v. 36, n. 133, p. 1059-1075, out.-dez. 2015. Disponível em: <chrome-extension://efaidnbmnnnibpajpcgclefindmkaj/https://www.scielo.br/j/es/a/6DS4HvLb67DQC7ZnxHHQSzy/?format=pdf>. Acesso em: 30 jul. 2025.

MENDES, Ruan Carlos; NUNES, Rogério Maciel. Patrimônio Cultural e Educação Patrimonial: Analisando Livros Didáticos de História. *Escritas do Tempo*, v. 3, n. 7, p. 238-257, abr. 2021. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.47694/issn.2674-7758.v3.i7.2021.239257>.

MINISTERIO DE EDUCACIÓN, CULTURA Y DEPORTE. *Plan Nacional de Educación y Patrimonio*. Secretaría General Técnica. Madrid, 2015. Disponível em: <https://www.culturaydeporte.gob.es/planes-nacionales/eu/dam/jcr:a91981e8-8763-446b-be14-fe0080777d12/12-maquetado-educacion-patrimonio.pdf>. Acesso em: 15 nov. 2022.

OLIVEIRA, Cleo Alves Pinto de. Educação patrimonial no Iphan: análise de uma trajetória. *Revista CPC*, São Paulo, n. 27 especial, p. 32-54, jan./jul. 2019. Disponível em: <https://revistas.usp.br/cpc/article/view/158739/155799>. Acesso em: 30 jul. 2025.

SANTOS, Adailton Damião dos. *Entre o machado do curupira e gameleiras encantadas: conservação da natureza, território e identidades na Serra do Brigadeiro, Zona da Mata Mineira (1976 a 2006)*. 2019. 229 f. Dissertação (Mestrado em Patrimônio Cultural, Paisagens e Cidadania) - Universidade Federal de Viçosa, Viçosa, 2019. Disponível em: <https://www.locus.ufv.br/handle/123456789/28713>. Acesso em: 15 nov. 2022.

SCIFONI, Simone. “Educação e Patrimônio Cultural: reflexões sobre o tema.” In: TOLENTINO, Atila B. *Educação Patrimonial: reflexões e práticas*. João Pessoa: Superintendência do IPHAN-PB, 2012. Disponível em: <chrome-extension://efaidnbmnnnibpajpcgclefindmkaj/http://portal.iphan.gov.br/>



uploads/publicacao/EduPat\_EducPatrimonialReflexoesEPraticas\_ct1\_m.pdf. Acesso em: 30 jul. 2025.

SCIFONI, Simone. Desafios para uma nova educação patrimonial. *Revista Teias*, v. 18, n. 48, p. 05-16, jan./mar. 2017. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.12957/teias.2017.25231>.

SCIFONI, Simone. Conhecer para preservar: uma ideia fora do tempo. *Revista CPC*, São Paulo, n. 27 especial, p. 14-31, jan./jul. 2019. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.11606/issn.1980-4466.v14i27espp14-31>.

SILVA, Marcela de Almeida; NEVES, Sandra Mara Alves da Silva; NEVES, Ronaldo José; ARRUDA, Renato Fonseca. Percurso interpretativo do centro histórico Cáceres/MT, para fins turísticos e de educação patrimonial. *Revista Brasileira de Pesquisa em Turismo*, v. 3, n. 10, p. 435-458, 2016. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.7784/rbtur.v10i3.1053>.

UNESCO. *Recomendação sobre os princípios internacionais aplicáveis a escavações arqueológicas*. 9ª Conferência Geral, 5 de dezembro de 1956. Nova Delhi: UNESCO, 1956. Disponível em: <https://www.icomos.pt/images/pdfs/2021/9%20Recomenda%C3%A7%C3%A3o%20escava%C3%A7%C3%B5es%20arqueol%C3%B3gicas%20-%20UNESCO%201956.pdf>. Acesso em: 20 mar. 2022.

UNESCO. *Recomendação sobre os meios mais efetivos de tornar os museus acessíveis a todos*. 11ª Conferência Geral, 14 de dezembro de 1960. Paris: UNESCO, 1960. Disponível em: [http://portal.unesco.org/en/ev.php-URL\\_ID=13063&URL\\_DO=DO\\_TOPIC&URL\\_SECTION=201.html](http://portal.unesco.org/en/ev.php-URL_ID=13063&URL_DO=DO_TOPIC&URL_SECTION=201.html). Acesso em: 20 mar. 2022.

UNESCO. *Recomendação sobre a salvaguarda da beleza e do caráter das paisagens e dos sítios*. 12ª Conferência Geral, 11 de dezembro de 1962. Paris: UNESCO, 1962. Disponível em: <https://www.icomos.pt/images/pdfs/2021/10%20Recomenda%C3%A7%C3%A3o%20beleza%20das%20paisagens%20-%20UNESCO%201962.pdf>. Acesso em: 20 mar. 2022.

UNESCO. *Recomendação sobre as medidas destinadas a impedir a exportação, a importação e a transferência de propriedade ilícitas de bens culturais*. 12ª Conferência Geral, 19 de novembro de 1964. Paris: UNESCO, 1964. Tradução de Flávio Lopes e Miguel Brito Correia. Disponível em: [https://icomos.pt/images/pdfs/2021/12\\_Recomendao\\_importao\\_e\\_exportao\\_bens\\_culturais\\_-\\_UNESCO\\_1964.pdf](https://icomos.pt/images/pdfs/2021/12_Recomendao_importao_e_exportao_bens_culturais_-_UNESCO_1964.pdf). Acesso em: 20 mar. 2022.

UNESCO. *Recomendação sobre a preservação de bens culturais ameaçados por obras públicas ou privadas*. 15ª Conferência Geral, 19 de novembro de 1968. Paris: UNESCO, 1968. Tradução de Flávio Lopes e Miguel Brito Correia. Disponível em: [https://www.icomos.pt/images/pdfs/2021/13\\_Recomendao\\_obras\\_publicas\\_e\\_privadas\\_-\\_UNESCO\\_1968.pdf](https://www.icomos.pt/images/pdfs/2021/13_Recomendao_obras_publicas_e_privadas_-_UNESCO_1968.pdf). Acesso em: 20 mar. 2022.

UNESCO. *Convenção Relativa às Medidas a Serem Adotadas para Proibir e Impedir a Importação, Exportação e Transferência de Propriedades Ilícitas dos Bens Culturais*. Paris, 12-14 de novembro de 1970. [BR/1972/PI/H/1]. UNESCO, 1970. Disponível em: <https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000160638>. Acesso em: 20 mar. 2022.

UNESCO. *Convenção para a salvaguarda do Patrimônio Mundial, Cultural e Natural*. Paris, 17-20 de novembro de 1972. [WHC.2004/WS/2]. UNESCO, 1972. Disponível em: [https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000133369\\_por](https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000133369_por). Acesso em: 20 mar. 2022.

UNESCO. *Recomendação sobre a salvaguarda dos conjuntos históricos e da sua função na vida contemporânea*. 19ª Conferência Geral, 26 de novembro de 1976. Nairobi: UNESCO, 1976. Tradução de Flávio Lopes e Miguel Brito Correia. Disponível em:



<https://www.icomos.pt/images/pdfs/2021/21%20Recomenda%C3%A7%C3%A3o%20conjunto%20hist%C3%B3ricos%20-%20UNESCO%201976.pdf>. Acesso em: 20 mar. 2022.

UNESCO. *Recomendação sobre a proteção dos bens culturais móveis*. 20ª Conferência Geral, 28 de novembro de 1978. Paris, UNESCO, 1978. Tradução de Flávio Lopes e Miguel Brito Correia. Disponível em: <https://www.icomos.pt/images/pdfs/2021/24%20Recomenda%C3%A7%C3%A3o%20bens%20culturais%20m%C3%B3veis%20-%20UNESCO%201978.pdf>. Acesso em: 20 mar. 2022.

UNESCO. *Informe final*. Conferencia Mundial sobre las políticas culturales. México, 06 jul.-06 ago. 1982. [CLT/MD/1]. UNESCO, 1982a. Disponível em: [https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000052505\\_spa?13=null&queryId=3ac67e35-0706-4df2-841d-a360853146a1](https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000052505_spa?13=null&queryId=3ac67e35-0706-4df2-841d-a360853146a1). Acesso em: 22 out 2022.

UNESCO. *Declaração do México, 1982*. Cidade do México, 06 de agosto de 1982. UNESCO, 1982b. Disponível em: <https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000054668>. Acesso em: 20 mar. 2022.

UNESCO. *Recomendação da salvaguarda da cultura tradicional e popular*. 25ª Conferência Geral, 15 de novembro de 1989. Paris: UNESCO, 1989. Tradução de Flávio Lopes e Miguel Brito Correia. Disponível em: <https://www.icomos.pt/images/pdfs/2021/30%20Recomenda%C3%A7%C3%A3o%20cultura%20popular%20-%20UNESCO%201989.pdf>. Acesso em: 20 mar. 2022.

UNESCO. *Our Creative Diversity: Report of the World Commission on Culture and Development*. Paris: UNESCO, 1995. Disponível em: <https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000101651>. Acesso em: 22 out. 2022.

UNESCO. *Declaração Universal sobre a Diversidade Cultural*, 2001. Paris, 02 de novembro de 2001. [CLT-2002/WS/9]. UNESCO, 2002a. Disponível em: <https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000127160>. Acesso em: 20 mar. 2022.

UNESCO. *Declaração Relativa à Destruição Intencional de Patrimônio Cultural*, 2003. Paris, 17 de outubro de 2003. UNESCO, 2003a. Disponível em: <https://www.icomos.pt/images/pdfs/2021/45%20Declara%C3%A7%C3%A3o%20destrui%C3%A7%C3%A3o%20intencional%20-%20UNESCO%202003.pdf>. Acesso em: 20 mar. 2022.

UNESCO. *Convenção para a Salvaguarda do Patrimônio Cultural Imaterial*. Paris, 17 de outubro de 2003. [MISC/2003/CLT/CH/14]. UNESCO, 2003b. Tradução feita pelo Ministério das Relações Exteriores, Brasília, 2006. Disponível em: [https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000132540\\_por?1=null&queryId=bb121606-4122-40d7-9c84-18200dce07ca](https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000132540_por?1=null&queryId=bb121606-4122-40d7-9c84-18200dce07ca). Acesso em: 20 mar. 2022.

UNESCO. *Convenção sobre a Proteção e Promoção da Diversidade das Expressões Culturais*. Paris, 03-21 outubro de 2005. [BR/2007/PI/H/1]. UNESCO, 2005. Disponível em: <https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000150224>. Acesso em: 20 mar. 2022.

UNESCO. *Recomendação sobre as paisagens urbanas históricas*. 36ª Conferência Geral, 10 de novembro de 2011. Paris: UNESCO, 2011. Tradução de Flávio Lopes e Miguel Brito Correia. Disponível em: <https://www.icomos.pt/images/pdfs/2021/52%20Recomenda%C3%A7%C3%A3o%20paisagens%20urbanas%20hist%C3%B3ricas%20-%20UNESCO%202011.pdf>. Acesso em: 20 mar. 2022.

UNESCO. *Patrimônio Mundial nas Mãos dos Jovens: Conhecer, Estimar e Atuar* (Kit Pedagógico para uso dos educadores). Lisboa: UNESCO, 2012. Disponível em: <https://whc.unesco.org/en/educationkit>. Acesso em: 10 abr. 2022.

UNESCO. *Recomendação referente à proteção e promoção dos museus e coleções, sua diversidade e seu papel na Sociedade*. 38ª Conferência Geral, 17 de novembro de 2015. Paris: UNESCO, 2015. Tradução do Instituto Brasileiro de Museus (IBRAM). Disponível em: <https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000247152>. Acesso em: 20 mar. 2022.

VALECILLO, Zaida García. Aprendizaje dialógico y apropiación del patrimonio cultural: una educación patrimonial sostenida en hombros de gigantes. *Revista Teías*, v. 18, n. 48, jan.-mar. 2017: Políticas e Práticas de Educação Patrimonial no Brasil e na América. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.12957/teias.2017.25225>.

VALECILLO, Zaida García. *La Educación Patrimonial en Venezuela desde una Visión Latinoamericana: Una propuesta de modelo teórico*. Orientador: José Carlos Escaño González. Tesis (Tesis Doctoral Inédita) - Departamento de Didáctica de la Expresión Musical y Plástica, Universidad de Sevilla, Sevilla, 2013. Disponível em: <https://idus.us.es/handle/11441/72029>. Acesso em: 3 out. 2022.

**Submitted:** 05/29/2023

**Preprint:** 02/01/2023

**Approved:** 07/07/2025

**Section editor:** Ana Paula Giavara

## **DATA AVAILABILITY DECLARATION**

The underlying content of the research text is found in the manuscript.

## **AUTHOR'S CONTRIBUTIONS**

Author 1 – Data collection, data analysis, and writing of the text.

Author 2 – Project coordinator, actively participated in data analysis and review of the final draft.

## **DECLARATION OF CONFLICT OF INTEREST**

The authors declare that there is no conflict of interest in this article.