


The political-pedagogical projects of heritage education: An analysis of heritage education proposals present in UNESCO's international documents

 <https://doi.org/10.56238/sevned2024.018-056>

Ana Carolina Fernandes Gonçalves¹ and Caesar Luiz de Mari²

ABSTRACT

This text is a product of the research carried out for the Master's Degree in Education, whose object is the pedagogical political project presented by UNESCO for heritage education, through the initiatives encouraged by it for the preservation of cultural and natural heritage. From a qualitative research of documentary analysis of UNESCO's recommendations, declarations and conventions, it was possible to reconstruct the proposals and political 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, whether as a support for the creation of sustainable networks for traditional communities, responsible exploitation of cultural tourism by public and private agents, and scientific and pedagogical responsibility in the preservation of material and immaterial cultural assets. The contribution of this text is, in the end, a reflection on the importance of establishing criteria to evaluate the impacts of these political pedagogical projects on the public it targets.

Keywords: Heritage education, UNESCO, Cultural heritage, Political-pedagogical project, Evaluation.

¹ Federal University of Viçosa. Viçosa, Minas Gerais (MG), Brazil.

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

E-mail: carolfernangon@gmail.com

² Federal University of Viçosa. Viçosa, Minas Gerais (MG), Brazil.

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

E-mail: cezar.demari@ufv.br



INTRODUCTION

Heritage education is understood, in a general sense, as an educational action within a program or project for the preservation of tangible and intangible cultural heritage. Initially, such educational activities were carried out as complementary activities of the preservation program and a return of this program to society, as can be observed in museum education initiatives and archaeology projects. However, the contribution of educational activities shifted in the list of priorities from the expansion of the concept of cultural heritage, when it began to encompass the set of assets denominated as immaterial, such as knowledge, celebrations, language and ways of life.

Currently, heritage education is at the center of many preservation projects, being systematized in national formal and non-formal education programs, such as the National Plan for Education and Heritage prepared by the Spanish government (MINISTERIO DE EDUCACIÓN, CULTURA Y DEPORTE, 2015) and the Brazilian guidelines established in the Ordinance 137/2016 of the National Institute of Historical and Artistic Heritage (IPHAN, 2016a), an end activity in local tourism programs, such as projects conducted by NGOs, Secretariats and Institutes, such as the community-based tourism project in Caiçara territory (BARROS and RODRIGUES, 2019) but, above all, one of the preservation methodologies when conducted in and by the local community, as is the case of the Participatory Inventory methodology created by IPHAN (IPHAN, 2016b).

As an object of study, heritage education is complex and slippery, since it is offered by various agents, such as schools, museums, tourist services, printed materials, in a formal and non-formal way. In addition, it has varied methodologies defined according to the patrimonial asset involved and also varied objectives, which require constant critical evaluation, since it can be at the service of both a project of emancipation and the conservation of exclusionary and subordinating hegemonic narratives, as denounced by Nestor Canclini (CANCLINI, 1994).

Due to its multidisciplinary nature, the academic literature on Heritage Education is also diverse. There are studies that deal, in general, with its history and systematization (DEMARCHI, 2016; FRANCO, 2020; HORTA et al, 1999; LACERDA, FIGUEIREDO and PEREIRA, 2015; MARCHETTE 2016; OLIVEIRA, 2019; VALECILLO, 2017), its planning as a political program (FLORÊNCIO, 2019; FONTAL 2016, VALECILLO 2012), school and tourist experience reports (BARROS and RODRIGUES, 2019; MACHADO et al, 2009; MELO and 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.

The *Heritage Letters*, as they are known, are international documents and are also incorporated into different groups of documents, produced by different national, regional and international organizations (see if the meaning I gave when changing the text is correct). In general, under this epithet



are grouped recommendations, declarations and conventions of UNESCO for Member States on the preservation of tangible and intangible natural and cultural heritage, but also recommendations of organized civil society such as *the International Council of Museums - ICOM*, *the World Council on Monuments and Sites - ICOMOS*, *the International Center for the Study of the Preservation and Restoration of Property Cultural - ICCROM*, *International Society of Modernist Architects - ISMA*, and governmental organizations such as *European Council - EC*. In addition to a contract or an official communication, these documents express the consensus and divergences regarding heritage preservation. According to Jurema Machado, former president of IPHAN:

These letters are the main representatives of the effervescence of thinking about heritage, more frequent and innovative in these thirty years than in those that followed. Far from being a finished recipe, or an "application manual" of conservation theory, the charters reflect, like the instruments of UNESCO, the consensus possible at a given historical moment, a consensus that generally originates 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).

In this text, the results of documentary research, whose primary source are these *Heritage Letters*, will be presented synthetically, with the aim of identifying the political role that heritage education assumes in international relations, through bilateral and multilateral agreements between countries and between countries and international organizations, more specifically UNESCO, responsible for providing Technical advice and management of international programs for the protection of world heritage and its own fund for this purpose.

To conduct it, a qualitative research of textual analysis of 21 documents on heritage preservation produced by UNESCO between the years 1930 and 2015 was carried out, which directly mention education as an important initiative within the recommended or agreed safeguard measures in relation to the various situations of threats such as armed conflict, terrorism, lack of resources, time, industrialization, modernization, subordination and prejudice. In all, there are 11 recommendations, 03 declarations, 05 conventions, 1 letter and 1 pedagogical kit.

This corpus was subjected to an interpretative analysis of three levels of depth. In the first and most superficial level, the reading of the *corpus* sought to identify the concept of education and the project for it, expressed in the documents and its relationship with the forms and methodologies identified by the researchers as *heritage education*; in the second level, the analysis considered the authors of the documents, local, national and international political actors, to highlight the political use of these heritage education projects; and, finally, in the third analytical level, we seek to locate these political-pedagogical projects for heritage education within the globalized scenario of international politics, in which the National States establish relations of cooperation, using the *glocal* concept. In this work, in each section, the results of the analysis at each level will be presented, with the data and synthesis tabulated,

accompanied by their discussion, followed by a suggestion presented as the final product and contribution of the research.

PROPOSALS FOR HERITAGE EDUCATION IN UNESCO DOCUMENTS

To understand what the international consensus understands by education related to the safeguarding of heritage, an analysis of 21 documents was carried out, summarized in chart 1, in which the extracted data are organized chronologically. Such data refer to the conception 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 first observation that can be made from the data collected is about the chronological change in the meaning that heritage education undergoes over time (chart 1, column 1). This change does not only concern the objectives of education, but the very conception of heritage preservation. According to these data, it is possible to observe that the change in the way heritage education is understood is derived from the conceptual transformation of heritage and the displacement of responsibility for its safeguarding, as will be shown below.

Table 1. Comparative table of the term "education" used in UNESCO documents relating to the safeguarding of cultural and natural heritage.

Concepção de educação	Tipo de patrimônio	Responsabilidade	Objetivo	Frase chave	Documentos
1930-1960 Educação do público	Patrimônio cultural material local	Educadores, museus e outros órgãos ligados à preservação do patrimônio cultural local	Sensibilização: Educar o público para evitar a depredação e compreender a importância da sua proteção.	"Despertar e desenvolver o respeito"	Carta de Atenas de 1931 (IMO, 1931) Convenção de Haia de 1954: (ONU, 1954) Recomendação da UNESCO de 1956, Nova Delhi (UNESCO, 1956) Recomendação da UNESCO de 1960, Paris (UNESCO, 1960) Recomendação da UNESCO de 1962, Paris (UNESCO, 1962)
1960-1970 Programas Educativos	Patrimônio Cultural Material e Natural Mundial	Estado	Formação: Inserir o patrimônio cultural no currículo escolar como uma educação cívica.	"Estimular nos cidadãos o interesse e o respeito pelo patrimônio cultural e natural de todas as nações"	Recomendação da UNESCO de 1964, Paris (UNESCO, 1964) Recomendação da UNESCO de 1968, Paris (UNESCO, 1968) Convenção de Paris de 1970 (UNESCO, 1970) Convenção de 1972, Paris (UNESCO, 1972) Recomendação de 1976, Nairóbi (UNESCO, 1976) Recomendação de 1978, Paris (UNESCO, 1978)
1980 Ensino do Patrimônio cultural	Patrimônio Cultural Imaterial local	Estado	Integração: Inserir o patrimônio cultural no currículo escolar como parte da cultura nacional e local.	"Ensino Integral do patrimônio da Humanidade" para "revalorização".	Recomendações da Conferência Mundial de Políticas Culturais 1982 (UNESCO, 1982a) Declaração do México de 1982 (UNESCO, 1982b) Recomendação de 1989, Paris (UNESCO, 1989)
1990 Programa internacional de educação patrimonial	Patrimônio Cultural, Material e Imaterial, e Natural Mundial	UNESCO	Atuação: engajar a juventude na defesa do patrimônio a partir da práxis	"Conhecer, Estimar, Atuar"	Kit pedagógico (UNESCO, 2012)
2000 Política de Proteção	Patrimônio Cultural, Material e Imaterial, e Natural local, nacional, regional e Mundial.	Estado com Parcerias (ICOMOS, centros de categoria 2, Estados, voluntariado)	Mobilização: a educação é incluída como uma das medidas de proteção do patrimônio imaterial executada pelo Estado e comunidades.	"Educação, conscientização e fortalecimento das capacidades"	Declaração universal sobre a diversidade cultural de 2001 (UNESCO, 2001) Declaração de Paris de 2003 (UNESCO, 2003a) Convenção de 2003, Paris (UNESCO, 2003b) Convenção de 2005 (UNESCO, 2005) Recomendação de 2011 (UNESCO, 2011) Recomendação de 2015, Paris (UNESCO, 2015)

Source: GONÇALVES, 2022a (adapted)



The first initiatives to safeguard material and local heritage – generally understood as monuments and architectural ensembles – between 1930 and 1960, proposed an educational measure to raise awareness among the population, which should be carried out by local agents, museums and educators, with the aim of defending the safeguarding action (Table 1, line 1), as can be seen in the recommendation 1960 UNESCO specific policy to make these institutions more accessible to the public, including school visits:

- a. Creation in each of the museums, of posts of specialists in education in charge, under the authority of the director, of the use of the museum for pedagogical purposes;
- b. Creation of educational services in museums that can obtain the collaboration of the teaching staff;
- c. Creation at the local, regional or provincial level, of bodies in which museum directors and faculty participate with the aim of better using museums for pedagogical purposes;
- d. Adoption of any other measures that allow coordinating the requirements of education with the means available to the museum. (UNESCO, 1960)

It can be inferred, from these data, that the proposal to raise awareness of heritage education arose from the need to justify to society and to the State the cost of preserving material goods destroyed by war, neglect and abandonment, by the modernization of cities and by speculation in the real estate market. This need is also observed by geographer Simone Scifoni, when she analyzes, in the Brazilian context, the function of education in Mario de Andrade's pioneering discourse on the preservation of cultural heritage, pointing to the uniqueness, or even eccentricity, that such an idea would have had in 1930 (SCIFONI, 2019). For the researcher, for whom awareness is an "idea out of time", it actually contributes to the commodification of culture and the transformation of educational work into a formation of consumers who justify public spending. (SCIFONI, 2017).

However, from the 1960s onwards, but 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 citizenship education (Table 1, line 2). Heritage education thus acquired a formal and scholastic character when it was included in school curricula with the aim of forming a cosmopolitan citizenship that recognized the universal value of cultural assets that should be considered for all humanity (UNESCO, 1972). The proposal for the formation of heritage education, therefore, seems to derive directly from the international cooperation plan to safeguard heritage assets of value to humanity, whose effort 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 programmes ARTICLE 27

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



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

To get an idea of the impact of this Convention, in the USA, for example, where heritage education has been 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 for the *Dictionnaire critique des enjeux et concepts des 'éducations à*, Angela Barthes informs that in 1978 the theme "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 school curriculum (BARTHES, 2017).

However, times change and political challenges follow one another. Identity and its relationship with culture and way of life became an important marker in UNESCO's discourse from 1980 onwards, when countries on the periphery of capitalism, from then on independent due to the decolonization process initiated in the post-war period, entered as Member States in UNESCO. This claim of peripheral peoples profoundly changed the meaning of heritage, which now includes intangible assets such as language, celebrations and traditional knowledge, included in UNESCO's discourse from the 1982 Declaration of Mexico, the result of the consensus created at the meeting for cultural policies, the *Mondialcult* of 1982.

Heritage education, already included in school curricula, as a cross-cutting theme or discipline, as a clause to participate in international cooperation actions, came to mean more than an education of the cosmopolitan citizen, since it was seen as a way to provide opportunities for social integration, through the recognition of their cultural identity and strengthening of ties with their ancestral traditions. The proposal for the integration of heritage education seems to be directly linked to the need to defend immaterial cultural manifestations, especially of colonized peoples, whose culture was erased and buried in the process of domination by the colonial elites.

Education is the means par excellence for transmitting national and universal cultural values, and it must seek the assimilation of scientific and technical knowledge without detriment to the capacities and values of peoples.

What is needed today is an integral and innovative education that not only informs and transmits, but also forms and renews, that allows students to become aware of the reality of their time and their environment, that favors the flourishing of the personality, that forms in self-discipline, respect for others and in social and international solidarity; an education that enables students to organization and for productivity, for the production of goods and services that are really necessary, which inspire renewal and stimulate creativity (UNESCO, 1982).

The economic policy of the 1990s had a strongly developmental international agenda, after the promulgation of the 1986 Declaration of the Right to Development by the UN, which led to the adoption of



the economic index of human development (HDI), created by the Pakistani economists, Mahbub ul Haq and the Indian Amathya Sen, in the reports of the United Nations Program for Development (UNDP) and the sustainable perspective (ecodevelopmentalism) of Ignacy Sachs (MARCHADO and PAMPLONA, 2008).

Developmentalism in the field of culture led UNESCO to direct international cooperation agreements to the promotion of creative industries in order to promote human development through sustainable development, expressed in the report *Our Creative Diversity* (UNESCO, 1995). In heritage preservation policies, these objectives are the result of the increasing pressure from the OAS to define and regulate cultural tourism, opening up the opportunity for public and private investment in tangible and intangible heritage, with a view to generating revenues finally included in the 2005 Convention.

UNESCO's educational initiative in this period was more assertive, since it abandoned the position of advisor producer of recommendations and mediator of international cooperation agreements to assume the role of educational agent, creating its own heritage education program, with the aim of engaging youth in the task of safeguarding heritage. Heritage education in this context took the form of youth and civil society as stakeholders in heritage preservation policies, assuming co-participation in the management of the safeguarding of World Heritage. The proposal for the performance of heritage education, in this case, seems to act directly on the economy by stimulating the participation of the cultural tourism market, whether as a qualified labor force for restoration, a political agent of protection or as a supplier of cultural products and services, as the themes of the handouts of the Pedagogical Kit prepared by UNESCO show:

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 Environment Book 6 - World Heritage and Culture of Peace
(UNESCO, 2012)

As can be seen, UNESCO's international program differs from national heritage education programs, especially in the practical approach and appeal to the formation of employability to the detriment of more academic and conceptual curricula, proposed by government initiatives.

The first decades of the twenty-first century are, from the point of view of UNESCO documents on heritage preservation, the culmination of the debates that began in 1980. Cultural diversity is recognized in the 2001 Declaration, intangible heritage is finally defined in the 2003 Convention, and the way to protect it is agreed among the Member States in the 2005 Convention. Heritage education is no longer a means-activity in the safeguarding process to be an end-activity, since it is recognized as a strategy for mobilizing communities to define and manage their cultural heritage. The proposal to mobilize heritage education, therefore, seems to be linked to a larger project of sustainable development,



which includes traditional communities and their tangible and intangible heritage in an autonomous way in preservation policies and in the cultural market. As stated in Article 10 of the 2005 Convention:

The Parties shall:

[...]

(c) Strive to encourage creativity and strengthen production capacities through the establishment of education, training and exchange programmes in the area of cultural industries. Such measures should be applied in such a way that they do not have a negative impact on traditional forms of production.

(UNESCO, 2005)

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

The Spanish researcher Olaia Fontal Merillas (2016) and the Ecuadorian Zaida Valencillo (2012) used different markers to describe educational practices with heritage, such as "approaches", "models" and "strands". For Valencillo (2012), the pedagogical perspective adopted by educators can be observed in pedagogical projects as the "focus" given to heritage. There are 4 approaches (chart 2, column 3) described by Valencillo (2012):

- Education with heritage;
- Education of (about) heritage;
- Heritage education;
- Heritage Education.

When the project provides for a pedagogical practice with heritage, it is taken as a didactic resource. This focus appears, for example, in *IPHAN's 1999 Heritage Education Guide*, one of the main references in Heritage Education. In it, the didactic sequences are thought of from the direct relationship, manipulation and observation of heritage assets, mainly material (HORTA, 1999), an illustrative work of this approach is the analysis made by Guimarães Júnior (2020) on the didactic sequences of heritage education in textbooks for elementary school, in which the author points out the use of didactic resources such as color images as a means of observation, interpretation and reflection, visit itineraries and digital tour activities through museums, requiring greater preparation and training from the teacher (GUIMARÃES JUNIOR, 2020).

In pedagogical approaches to heritage, it is translated as curricular content, in general, as a transversal theme of History, Arts and Sociology classes, in theoretical didactic sequences on the aesthetic, historical, anthropological value of assets. A critical, illustrative analysis of how cultural



heritage has been incorporated into the history curriculum, for example, can be found in the work published by Mendes and Nunes (2021), in which a critical observation is made regarding the lack of more topics related to traditional cultures, such as forest peoples and quilombolas, and an indirect approach to cultural heritage, which requires greater teacher training.

On the other hand, when the pedagogical proposal focuses on education for heritage, it is taken as a moral or political principle mobilized to engage the subject in its defense. An example of this approach is the proposal of the *UNESCO Pedagogical Kit*, whose objective is to train young people to work in heritage protection, presenting the legislation, the pros and cons of tourism, the need to respect diversity and promote peace (UNESCO, 2012). Another very illustrative material of focus is the *Creative Manual for Heritage Education* produced by IEPHA for teachers, in which it is possible to visualize the educational purpose in the guidelines given to educators:

The preservation of cultural heritage must be a constant concern of the educator who is conducting the activities. They must keep themselves informed about the importance of preservation in order to dialogue with their group and reinforce the necessary care for heritage assets, especially at the time of visitation and exploration in the field. (IEPHA, undated, p. 25)

Finally, there are also heritage education projects when the processes of heritage and identification are taken as pedagogical objectives, as occurs in the Participatory Inventories methodology created by IPHAN, in which the practice gives communities the opportunity to identify their heritage, semantize them from their practices and plan the best way to preserve it. An interesting work of participatory inventory used with heritage education is the final product of Santos' dissertation in the recreation of an old religious procession with the children and the image that participated in it, through the recovery of the community's memories (SANTOS, 2019).

Fontal (2016) distinguishes models of education, based on the didactic approach adopted in pedagogical projects. She described eight didactics adopted in these educational initiatives (chart 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 worked as an object of knowledge transmitted by the educator through data, facts and dates. This approach is common to school education, especially in



history classes. In the conceptual model, heritage is defined and explained by a theoretical approach, through concepts and principles, as in theoretical art education, in which the asset is defined by technical criteria. Both didactics are more common to formal and theoretical education, in which heritage is part of the curriculum as a cross-cutting theme or topic of a syllabus and the common discursive genre is informative and essay, such as those textbook contents critically analyzed by Guimarães Júnior (2020) and Mendes and Nunes (2021).

On the other hand, the receptive model approaches heritage based on the student's previous knowledge, usually acquired through excursions to archaeological sites, monuments, exhibitions and museums. While in the contextual model, it is usually presented *in situ*, revealing its relationships with the natural, social and cultural environment, as it usually happens in field visits, guided tours and tourist itineraries. These approaches are closer to non-formal pedagogical practices, such as Museum Education and pedagogical tourism, in which the discursive genre adopted is heritage interpretation, present in the work of Silva, Neves, Neves and Arruda (2016), in which a tourist route is prepared for the educational purposes of tourists, or the *Creative Manual* of IEPHA (undated), in which the didactic sequences contemplate the body and the territory as part of the journey of heritage recognition.

On the other hand, the didactic approaches common in investigative and constructive models are closer to pedagogical projects of technical and professional training. In the investigative model, heritage is scientifically translated through anthropological, historical, and geographical relationships, as can be seen in courses, inventories, reports, and academic dissertations. This model is present in works such as that of Marchete (2015) for whom heritage education coincides with the elaboration of the city's master plan, since access to heritage assets is a form of education for the population. On the other hand, the constructive model is based on immersion learning, in which students learn by participating in practices related to heritage, such as workshops aimed at transmitting a craft, a dance, a language, always aware of its heritage value and the importance of preserving it, this model is described and defended, for example, by Lacerda, Figueiredo and Pereira (2015).

Engagement is the pedagogical objective of social projects that have as their target audience the youth and the community as protagonists of the heritage safeguarding process, from the process of listing, management and tourist exploitation, such as the one experienced by Barros and Rodrigues with the Caiçara community in Paraty (2019) and the participatory inventory made by Santos (2019) with the community and children. In the relational model, pedagogical strategies are articulated to stimulate the protagonism of the community involved through forums, projects and volunteer work. While in the procedural model, preservation agencies, whether public or private, mediate the process of identifying heritage assets, providing opportunities for self-recognition and self-management of cultural heritage by communities. Both are related to the pedagogical practices known as sociocultural animation.

Table 2. Approximation between the meanings and objectives found in international documents on heritage safeguarding and the descriptions made by Fontal (2016) and Valencillo (2012) of Heritage Education.

CONCEPÇÃO	OBJETIVO	ENFOQUE	MODELO	ABORDAGEM	VERTENTES
Educação do público	Sensibilização	Patrimônio como recurso didático	Receptivo/ Contextual	Educação museal, Interpretação do patrimônio	Educação não formal
Projetos Educativos	Formação	Patrimônio como conteúdo curricular	Transmissivo/ conceitual	Educação formal e teórica	Educação formal
Ensino do patrimônio	Integração	Patrimônio como um princípio étnico/ético/político	Construtivo/ investigativo	Educação técnica e profissional	Educação técnica e profissional
Engajamento social	Atuação / mobilização	Patrimônio como práxis	Relacional/ Processual	Animação sociocultural	

Source: GONÇALVES, 2022a (adapted).

In addition to the heritage approaches and didactic models, Valencillo (2012) also describes three strands for Heritage Education, considering the form it takes depending on the circumstances in which the educational practice occurs. For the researcher, heritage education can take the form of curriculum design, when it is planned for basic and higher education; as museum education, with itineraries and trails designed for pedagogical tourism in various types of museums and in tourist services to monuments, parks, historic cities, in which there is physical or virtual contact with heritage assets, and as an interpretation of heritage when information is offered to the public through lectures, folders, videos, labels, totems, and others (VALENCILLO, 2012). Based on these three strands of Valencillo, we propose the inclusion of heritage interpretation in a higher category, to education for technical and professional training (GONÇALVES, 2022b), 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 trade, thus comprising all the training of qualified labor, both for research, interpretation, preservation and restoration 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 the policy proposals for heritage education and the pedagogical descriptions points to the existence of four different proposals, summarized in chart 2, which could be organized into three strands: non-formal education (chart 2, line 1) - carried out by public and private institutions related to heritage preservation projects -, formal education (chart 2, line 2) - executed by the national or regional education system -, and professional and technical education (table 2, lines 3 and 4) - defined by international consensus and determined in cooperation agreements.

THE POLITICAL PROJECTS OF HERITAGE EDUCATION

From the proposals found in the analysis of UNESCO's international documents and the comparison of these with the focus of heritage and models, with pedagogical approaches from the

strands of heritage education, it was observed the pattern of three pedagogical proposals that are politically distinguished by the agency responsible for designing and operationalizing them as a political project. Such agencies vary between local - such as communities, NGOs, private companies, municipal secretariats -, National or Regional - such as the government of the National State and regional councils such as the Council of Europe - and even international - such as UNESCO itself (Table 3).

Table 3. Synthesis of the discussion on the results of documentary research and comparison with the literature on heritage education.

PROJETOS POLÍTICO PEDAGÓGICOS	SETOR PÚBLICO	CAMPO DE ATUAÇÃO	VERTENTE DE EDUCAÇÃO	ÁREA DE ATUAÇÃO
Local	Economia	Mercado turístico	Educação não formal com foco no patrimônio como recurso didático.	Museus, Exposições, parques,
				Sítios, parques e reservas
Nacional ou Regional	Educação	Sistema Educacional	Educação formal com foco no patrimônio como objeto de conhecimento e princípio ético/estético/político de vida.	Currículo do Ensino básico e superior
				Formação Docente
Internacional	Cultura	Entidades e órgãos de salvaguarda do patrimônio	Educação Técnica e profissional com foco no patrimônio como exercício profissional e modo de vida.	Qualificação de mão de obra para preservação e restauro
				Formação em artes e ofícios tradicionais

Source: authorship.

In this pattern, there is the design of an educational plan for the public, with the objective of sensitizing the citizen and democratic conscience, working directly with the heritage through itineraries, trails and guides with environmental and historical responsibility, within a local political planning of cultural tourism, promoted by the agents responsible for the management of the local heritage (chart 3, line 1). This political pedagogical project is the most common in scientific publications, in which schools, universities, NGOs, Culture Houses, Heritage Houses, regional secretariats of IPHAN are found as agents. In them, initiatives by local actors are described, who, alone or coordinated, prepare and execute a heritage action plan with the local community.

Another political project outlined is focused on education for citizenship based on the recognition and respect for cultural diversity, designed as a school curriculum with the objective of training children and young people and as a teacher training curriculum for teaching, with the aim of guaranteeing formal heritage education, within a regional or national education program (chart 3, line 2). This model of political project is the object of research by Olaia Fontal and the observatory of Heritage Education of Spain, and one of its examples is the aforementioned National Plan for Heritage and Education of the Spanish government (MINISTERIO DE EDUCACIÓN, CULTURA Y DEPORTE, 2015), but also the model of integrated heritage education designed in Ordinance 137/2016 of IPHAN (IPHAN, 2016a), in which it is offered as a curricular complement in full-time education . Or even, in didactic materials, whose wide and diversified use such as the *IPHAN Heritage Education*



Guides and (HORTA, 1999; IPHAN, 2016) and IEPHA, and in the incorporation of Cultural and Natural Heritage in textbooks, via National Guidelines.

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

Although such technical and professional training projects are often carried out by national or local agents, the design of this political pedagogical project is the result of international consensus whose premises are based on UNESCO's recommendations, declarations and international conventions and *Heritage Charters* of restoration, tourism, authenticity among other topics, produced by international professional councils such as ICOM, ICOMOS and ICCROM. These political projects are common in scientific articles that deal with the theme of community-based tourism, in which arts and crafts are part of the tourist circuit, in view of the UNESCO Conventions of 2003 and 2005.

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

As previously noted, Heritage Education, although it is planned and executed on different scales, the actions take place in the same cultural territory and, therefore, end up taking the form of glocal pedagogical political projects, that is, initiatives in which local and global actions and agencies are superimposed. Considering this characteristic can be fundamental to evaluate the impact of the political-pedagogical project in order to avoid, at the same time, two undesirable excesses. The first would be the selection, supported by a more globalized perspective, of didactic approaches that mischaracterize heritage itself or that reproduce the hegemonic discourse, whose contribution would only be to maintain the state of subordination of cultures that are already silenced. The second would be the maintenance of radical values and practices, which may exist within traditional thinking and community practices, which constrain and disrespect minds and bodies, such as misogyny, ableism, racism, and others.

These unwanted excesses, according to our interpretation, are collateral effects of what Canclini (1994) called "ambivalences in the uses of heritage", which are directly linked to the "imaginaries of preservation". In the assessment of Canclini (1994), it is not possible to escape the ambivalences in the use of heritage and its disputes of interests, and the only solution is to try to predict them when designing preservation plans. Both the market, the public power or even society have conflicting initiatives: a market has economically sustainable strategies for safeguarding, but alienates the cultural good as a commodity; the tutelage of the public power is more responsible, but it uses it as nationalist



propaganda; the force of contestation of civil society is powerful, but only appears in moments of crisis.

Under these conditions, a viable solution would be the evaluation of the pedagogical political projects for Heritage Education. To avoid such unintended effects, projects need to be evaluated simultaneously in their local, national and global aspects. According to Lourenço (2014, n.p.), the concepts of 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 posed by the critics should be considered.

Simone Scifoni (2017), in her article *Challenges for a new heritage education*, stressed that this is a social right, insofar as it is the empowerment of the subject of their culture and the possibility of using it as a tool to exercise citizenship, participating in the translation of their own history and culture. This practice, however, the geographer noted, needs to be detached from the immediate purposes of the work of listing and included in the education system, not as an imposition, where cultural objects are predetermined, but as a construction, where cultural references exist and represent the culture of a certain group, in a democratic and inclusive way.

In the article *Knowing to preserve: an idea out of time*, Simone Scifoni (2019) returns to the possibility that the political use of heritage education can move it away from its purpose, when awareness, taken within the formula "sensitize[educate] to preserve" is used as a resource for political justification of certain decisions about the collective good, as this heritage education has contributed to symbolic violence through the imposition of dominant narratives, the imputation of responsibility for neglect and neglect of property to the community, when it is often an omission of the protection service itself, stimulated by the pressure of the real estate and tourism market. Within this logic, a political pedagogical project of heritage education could not, therefore, be based on technicist proposals and temporally outdated and depoliticized principles, which confuse pedagogical objectives with political strategies of symbolic domination.

Juciene Ricarte Apolinário (2012), in turn, draws attention to the interdisciplinary aspects of heritage education and criticizes the approach only for the content of history, as the study closed in the discourse about the past limits the presupposed objectives of citizenship construction. Heritage Education, according to this author, needs to connect the global and the local, confronting different temporalities. Following a similar critical line, João Lorandi Demarchi (2016) defends, supported by a bibliography common to researchers in the area, such as Edgar Morin, Paulo Freire, Liev Siemovich Vygostky and Boaventura Souza Santos, a heritage education that works together with the local community and considers not only the other as a subject, but other pedagogies, thus overcoming banking education, allowing the development of understanding, pertinent knowledge and presence.



According to these observations, the political pedagogical project for heritage education, in order to guarantee the exercise of citizenship, would need to be interdisciplinary, open to the future and guarantee the participation of the *other* and their pedagogy, bringing the other epistemologies not contemplated by the traditional curriculum. From the glocal point of view, therefore, a political-pedagogical project of Heritage Education needs, at the very least, to be faithful. In other words, heritage education could not avoid fidelity to the community, owner of the heritage, and it was necessary to have instruments to prevent both biased and decontextualized interpretations of the practices that gave rise to it, as well as the alienation of its owner, the community. For this, it is necessary to train good interpreters, both professionals specialized in the universal code of safeguarding, and professionals from the original community, since the dialogue is two-way, from the inside out and from the outside in.

To ensure fidelity to the local culture, the project should be based on the study of the community with the identification of who performs the pedagogical function in it, that is, who is the master, the sage for that community, what legitimizes it as such and what are the pedagogical practices performed by him/her, and position this actor as the heritage educator.

To ensure fidelity to pedagogical systematization, it is important when proposing a national plan, for example - the project should not neglect cultural dynamics in the name of universalization, such as the one we find in the structure and functioning of school education. Heritage education is, first and foremost, a popular education and, even when it is provided for 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 presupposed in philosophical and scientific experience. In other words, it is the heritage and its community that 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, in order to ensure fidelity to universal principles, such as Human Rights, the objective of the heritage education project should be able to reveal the contradictions, without, however, announcing or judging them. In this ideal perspective, it would create conditions for the community itself, the project's audience, to be able to think and find solutions to its own contradictions, updating itself through internal consensus, conducted by its own leaders and intellectuals. That is, the evaluation criteria, of right or wrong, of adequate or inadequate, are not given *a priori*, based on foreign references to the community that owns the heritage, but are the result of debates and pacts 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 Treatise on the Great Virtues*, "fidelity is a virtue of memory, and memory itself as a virtue", then to be faithful is, in the end, not to forget. Therefore, to evaluate a political pedagogical project by its fidelity is to test the memory



of that project, its ability to remind the cultural values of the local community, the political-economic interests of citizens and the international rights of human beings and the environment.

FINAL CONSIDERATIONS

The analysis of the documents prepared by UNESCO revealed that during the 74 years that passed between the first and the last document issued, the notion of political-pedagogical project was crystallized in the agreements until it took the form of methodologies, national and international programs of heritage education. Education proposals have shifted from a peripheral role within preservation policies to a strategic role in the protection and promotion of heritage assets, in response to experimentation and new demands. The heritage letters that make up the *corpus* analyzed materialize the agency's initiative, through recommendations to member states and the agreement 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 assume, over time, an increasing role in the promotion of a certain economy through the formation of consumers and producers of cultural goods and services, when considering the actors and their roles in these agreed plans.

Based on this pattern of historical development of heritage education, from a supplementary action plan to a central strategic plan, it was possible to detect the condition of multiterritoriality present in political-pedagogical projects, which incorporate local, national, regional and global interests, which can often be conflicting. This glocal nature of the projects, therefore, creates a political-pedagogical difficulty in consolidating, in the same project, relative competencies and skills in respect for both cultural expressions of identity and universal rights. The suggestion launched in this work, in order to maintain the glocal balance of these projects, is the adoption of a criterion for evaluating the projects that considers the fidelity of the action plans in relation to the memory of the community served, not only of its values, but of its practices of transmission of these and its mechanisms of updating, recreation and incorporation of new values. In other words, the idea is to observe whether the political pedagogical project for heritage education contemplates not only identification and appropriation, but also criticism as part of the culture to be preserved and promoted.



REFERENCES

1. Apolinário, J. R. (2012). Reflexões sobre a educação patrimonial e experiências da diversidade cultural no ensino de História. In Á. B. Tolentino (Org.), **Educação patrimonial: Reflexões e práticas** (pp. 56-65). Superintendência do Iphan na Paraíba.
2. Barros, A. L. R. de, & Rodrigues, C. G. de O. (2019). Educação diferenciada e turismo de base comunitária nos territórios caçaras de Paraty (RJ). **Ambiente & Sociedade**, 22. <https://doi.org/10.1590/1809-4422asoc0295r1vu19L1AO>
3. Canclini, N. G. (1994). O patrimônio cultural e a construção imaginária do nacional. **Revista do Patrimônio Histórico e Artístico Nacional**, 23, 95-115. http://portal.iphan.gov.br/uploads/publicacao/RevPat23_m.pdf
4. Comte-Sponville, A. (1999). **Pequeno tratado das grandes virtudes**. Martins Fontes.
5. Demarchi, J. L. (2016). Perspectivas para atuação em educação patrimonial. **Revista CPC**, 22, 267-291. <https://doi.org/10.11606/issn.1980-4466.v0i22p267-291>
6. Florêncio, S. R. (2019). Política de educação patrimonial no IPHAN: Diretrizes conceituais e ações estratégicas. **Revista CPC**, 27(especial), 55-89. <https://doi.org/10.11606/issn.1980-4466.v14i27espp55-89>
7. Fontal Merillas, O. (2016). Educación patrimonial: retrospectiva y prospectivas para la próxima década. **Estudios Pedagógicos**, 42(2), 415-436. <http://dx.doi.org/10.4067/S0718-07052016000200024>
8. Franco, F. C. (2020). **Educação, patrimônio e cultura local: Concepções e perspectivas pedagógicas**. CRV.
9. Guimarães Junior, J. de L. (2020). Um olhar sobre a educação patrimonial no ensino de História: Atividades prático-pedagógicas nos livros didáticos (Trabalho de Conclusão de Curso). Universidade Federal Rural de Pernambuco, Recife. https://repository.ufrpe.br/bitstream/123456789/3120/1/tcc_jaimedelimaguiaraesjunior.pdf
10. Gonçalves, A. C. F. (2022a). O “Espírito de Nairóbi” contra a “Águia Americana”: Disputas hegemônicas no processo de construção da educação patrimonial pela UNESCO (Dissertação de Mestrado). Universidade Federal de Viçosa, Viçosa. <https://locus.ufv.br/handle/123456789/29782>
11. Gonçalves, A. C. F., & De Mari, C. L. (2022b). Educação patrimonial: Entre a preservação e a formação profissional. In **Anais IX Simpósio Internacional Trabalho, Relações de Trabalho, Educação e Identidade – SITRE** (pp. 1-16). <https://sitre.appos.org.br/wp-content/uploads/2022/08/GT-16-Trabalho-e-formacao-profissional-nos-campos-da-informacao-e-da-cultura.pdf>
12. Horta, M. de L. P., Grumberg, E., & Monteiro, A. Q. (1999). **Guia básico de educação patrimonial**. Instituto do Patrimônio Histórico e Artístico Nacional, Museu Imperial. http://portal.iphan.gov.br/uploads/temp/guia_educacao_patrimonial.pdf.pdf
13. IEPHA. (n.d.). **Manual criativo para educação patrimonial**. <http://www.iepha.mg.gov.br/images/EDITAIS/Material---Educao-para-o-Patrimnio.pdf>. Acesso em 15 de nov. de 2022.



14. Instituto do Patrimônio Histórico e Artístico Nacional. (2016a). *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. http://portal.iphan.gov.br/uploads/ckfinder/arquivos/Portaria_n_137_de_28_de_abril_de_2016.pdf. Acesso em 18 fev. 2021.
15. Instituto do Patrimônio Histórico e Artístico Nacional. (2016b). *Educação patrimonial: inventários participativos*. Brasília: IPHAN. http://portal.iphan.gov.br/uploads/publicacao/inventariodopatrimonio_15x21web.pdf. Acesso em 15 nov. 2022.
16. Lacerda, A. D., Figueiredo, B. G., Pereira, J. S., & Silva, M. A. (2015). *Patrimônio cultural em oficinas: atividades em contextos escolares*. Belo Horizonte: Fino Traço.
17. Lambert, C. A. (1996). *Heritage education in the postmodern curriculum* (Doctoral thesis, University of Pennsylvania). https://repository.upenn.edu/hp_theses/420. Acesso em 15 nov. 2022.
18. Lourenço, N. (2014). Globalização e glocalização: O difícil diálogo entre o global e o local. *Mulemba: Revista Angolana de Ciências Sociais*, 4(8). <https://doi.org/10.4000/mulemba.203>. Acesso em 02 mar. 2022.
19. Machado, J. G. R., & Pamplona, J. B. (2008). A ONU e o desenvolvimento econômico: uma interpretação das bases teóricas da atuação do PNUD. *Economia e Sociedade*, 17(1), 53-84. <https://doi.org/10.1590/S0104-06182008000100003>
20. Machado, J. (2017). Feito em casa: o Iphan e a cooperação internacional para o patrimônio. *Revista do Patrimônio Histórico Nacional*, 35, 245-284. http://portal.iphan.gov.br/uploads/publicacao/revpat_35.pdf. Acesso em 18 fev. 2021.
21. Marchette, T. D. (2016). *Educação patrimonial e políticas públicas de preservação no Brasil*. Curitiba: Intersaberes.
22. Mendes, R. C., & Nunes, R. M. (2021). Patrimônio cultural e educação patrimonial: Analisando livros didáticos de história. *Escritas do Tempo*, 3(7), 238-257. <https://doi.org/10.47694/issn.2674-7758.v3.i7.2021.239257>
23. Ministerio de Educación, Cultura y Deporte. (2015). *Plan nacional de educación y patrimonio*. Secretaría General Técnica. Madrid. <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.
24. Santos, A. D. (2019). *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)* (Dissertação de Mestrado). Universidade Federal de Viçosa, Viçosa. <https://www.locus.ufv.br/handle/123456789/28713>. Acesso em 15 de nov. de 2022.
25. Scifoni, S. (2017). Desafios para uma nova educação patrimonial. *Revista Teias*, 18(48), 5-16. <https://doi.org/10.12957/teias.2017.25231>
26. Scifoni, S. (2019). Conhecer para preservar: uma ideia fora do tempo. *Revista CPC*, 27(especial), 14-31. <https://doi.org/10.11606/issn.1980-4466.v14i27espp14-31>

27. Silva, M. de A., Neves, S. M. A. da S., Neves, R. J., & Arruda, R. F. (2016). Percurso interpretativo do centro histórico Cáceres/MT, para fins turísticos e de educação patrimonial. *Revista Brasileira de Pesquisa em Turismo*, 10(3), 435–458. <https://doi.org/10.7784/rbtur.v10i3.1053>
28. UNESCO. (2003). *Convenção para a salvaguarda do patrimônio cultural imaterial*. Paris: UNESCO. [MISC/2003/CLT/CH/14]. https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000132540_por?1=null&queryId=bb121606-4122-40d7-9c84-18200dce07ca. Acesso em 20 mar. 2022.
29. UNESCO. (1972c). *Convenção para a salvaguarda do patrimônio mundial, cultural e natural*. Paris: UNESCO. [WHC.2004/WS/2]. https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000133369_por. Acesso em 20 mar. 2022.
30. UNESCO. (1970c). *Convenção relativa às medidas a serem adotadas para proibir e impedir a importação, exportação e transferência de propriedades ilícitas dos bens culturais*. Paris: UNESCO. [BR/1972/PI/H/1]. <https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000160638>. Acesso em 20 mar. 2022.
31. UNESCO. (2005). *Convenção sobre a proteção e promoção da diversidade das expressões culturais*. Paris: UNESCO. [BR/2007/PI/H/1]. <https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000150224>. Acesso em 20 mar. 2022.
32. UNESCO. (1982e). *Declaração do México*. Cidade do México: UNESCO. <https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000054668>. Acesso em 20 mar. 2022.
33. UNESCO. (2003). *Declaração relativa à destruição intencional de patrimônio cultural*. Paris: UNESCO. <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.
34. UNESCO. (2002a). *Declaração universal sobre a diversidade cultural*. Paris: UNESCO. [CLT-2002/WS/9]. <https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000127160>. Acesso em 20 mar. 2022.
35. UNESCO. (1982c). *Informe final: Conferência Mundial sobre as Políticas Culturais*. Cidade do México: UNESCO. [CLT/MD/1]. https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000052505_spa?13=null&queryId=3ac67e35-0706-4df2-841d-a360853146a1. Acesso em 22 out. 2022.
36. UNESCO. (1995). *Our creative diversity: Report of the World Commission on Culture and Development*. Paris: UNESCO. <https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000101651>. Acesso em 22 out. 2022.
37. UNESCO. (2012). *Patrimônio Mundial nas mãos dos jovens: Conhecer, estimar e atuar* (kit pedagógico para uso dos educadores). Lisboa: UNESCO. <https://whc.unesco.org/en/educationkit>. Acesso em 10 abr. 2022.
38. UNESCO. (1989). *Recomendação da salvaguarda da cultura tradicional e popular*. Paris: UNESCO. 25ª Conferência Geral, 15 de novembro de 1989. <https://www.icomos.pt/images/pdfs/2021/30%20Recomenda%C3%A7%C3%A3o%20cultura%20popular%20-%20UNESCO%201989.pdf>. Acesso em 20 mar. 2022.



39. UNESCO. (2015). *Recomendação referente à proteção e promoção dos museus e coleções, sua diversidade e seu papel na sociedade*. Paris: UNESCO. 38ª Conferência Geral, 17 de novembro de 2015. <https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000247152>. Acesso em 20 mar. 2022.
40. UNESCO. (1968). *Recomendação sobre a preservação de bens culturais ameaçados por obras públicas ou privadas*. Paris: UNESCO. 15ª Conferência Geral, 19 de novembro de 1968. https://www.icomos.pt/images/pdfs/2021/13_Recomendao_obras_publicas_e_privadas_-_UNESCO_1968.pdf. Acesso em 20 mar. 2022.
41. UNESCO. (1978). *Recomendação sobre a proteção dos bens culturais móveis*. Paris: UNESCO. 20ª Conferência Geral, 28 de novembro de 1978. <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.
42. UNESCO. (1962). *Recomendação sobre a salvaguarda da beleza e do caráter das paisagens e dos sítios*. Paris: UNESCO. 12ª Conferência Geral, 11 de dezembro de 1962. <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.
43. UNESCO. (1976). *Recomendação sobre a salvaguarda dos conjuntos históricos e da sua função na vida contemporânea*. Nairobi: UNESCO. 19ª Conferência Geral, 26 de novembro de 1976. <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.
44. UNESCO. (1964). *Recomendação sobre as medidas destinadas a impedir a exportação, a importação e a transferência de propriedade ilícitas de bens culturais*. Paris: UNESCO. 12ª Conferência Geral, 19 de novembro de 1960. https://www.icomos.pt/images/pdfs/2021/12_Recomendao_importao_e_exportao_bens_culturais_-_UNESCO_1964.pdf. Acesso em 20 mar. 2022.
45. UNESCO. (2011). *Recomendação sobre as paisagens urbanas históricas*. Paris: UNESCO. 36ª Conferência Geral, 10 de novembro de 2011. <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.
46. UNESCO. (1960). *Recomendação sobre os meios mais efetivos de tornar os museus acessíveis a todos*. Paris: UNESCO. 11ª Conferência Geral, 14 de dezembro de 1960. http://portal.unesco.org/en/ev.php-URL_ID=13063&URL_DO=DO_TOPIC&URL_SECTION=201.html. Acesso em 20 mar. 2022.
47. UNESCO. (1956). *Recomendação sobre os princípios internacionais aplicáveis a escavações arqueológicas*. Nova Delhi: UNESCO. 9ª Conferência Geral, 5 de dezembro de 1956. <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.
48. Valecillo, Z. G. (2012). *La educación patrimonial en Venezuela desde una visión latinoamericana: Una propuesta de modelo teórico* (Tese de doutoramento, Departamento de Didáctica de la Expresión Musical y Plástica, Universidad de Sevilla). Sevilla: Universidade de Sevilla. <https://idus.us.es/handle/11441/72029>. Acesso em 03 out. 2022.