The politics of disdain: cultural heritage education in Rio de Janeiro

Diego Santos Vieira de Jesus

ESPM-Rio, Brazil

Abstract

The aim of the article is to examine the situation of cultural heritage education in Rio de Janeiro. The main argument indicates that the cultural heritage education is neglected in the city. The abandonment of the tangible heritage and the disregard for the intangible heritage are associated to the lack of significant experiences recorded in the citizens' memories. This situation is linked to the lack of major efforts by the government in cultural heritage education, which creates a scenario where heritage does not appear significantly in the reinterpretations of the past by a vast part of the population to the point of establishing links of affection, essential for the conservation of heritage assets. The abandonment of cultural heritage by the public institutions and the neglect of civil society in relation to the "places of memory" are accentuated in Rio de Janeiro by the pressure of the increased demand for housing spaces and formal and informal commerce, which has particularly accelerated the destruction of tangible heritage, and the action of elites that highlight specific past experiences linked to them and try to impose their specific memory on other social segments, which does not generate the identification between a huge part of the population and the cultural heritage. The solution for the crisis becomes harder with the lack of economic resources to promote cultural heritage initiatives and even preserve cultural assets, the misuse of money devoted to cultural heritage because of corruption schemes and the maintenance of a pragmatic perspective on education that directs efforts for functional activities and lacks the critical view about past political, economic and social issues.

Keywords: Cultural heritage; Cultural heritage education; Creative economy; Rio de Janeiro; Brazil.

1. Introduction

The relevance of Rio de Janeiro in the formation of the Brazilian state is evident. The city has a lot of historic gardens, parks, urban complexes, buildings, facilities, natural landscapes, integrated goods and collections protected by the National Historic and Artistic Heritage Institute (IPHAN, its acronym in Portuguese). In political terms, Rio de Janeiro was the capital of the Viceroyalty, the Imperial Court and the Republic. When Portugal was invaded in the context of the Napoleonic Wars and the Portuguese imperial family arrived in the city in 1808, Rio de Janeiro has begun to intensify an economic and cultural life, with the creation of public libraries; scientific, philosophical and literary academies; schools and theatres. The city also felt the effects of urban and architectural remodelling. Thousands of migrants arrived in Rio de Janeiro, as well as foreign goods and commercial and economic facilities which changed Rio's daily life and transformed the city into a cosmopolitan centre. Following the Proclamation of the Republic in 1889, Rio de Janeiro developed an eclectic art nouveau-inspired architecture that influenced the entire country. The city was also the site of internationally popular cultural events related to samba, soccer, street

carnival and religion. In addition to having a recognized Architectural and Artistic Heritage, Rio de Janeiro was the first urban area in the world to have the universal value of its urban landscape recognized by the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) in 2012, with the title of World Heritage as Urban Cultural Landscape (IPHAN, 2014b).

In 2012, the Rio World Heritage Institute (IRPH, its acronym in Portuguese) was created as a structured body in the Mayor's Office of the city of Rio de Janeiro. IRPH's objectives are to manage the UNESCO's World Heritage Site; participate in the process of formulating the public policy and guidelines of the Mayor's Office; advise the IRPH's head on the direction, coordination and strategic management of the Mayor's Office regarding cultural promotions; protect and promote the city's cultural heritage (Carioca Cultural Heritage); supervise and authorize the licensing of works related to the cultural heritage of the municipality and its ambience; plan, coordinate, develop and supervise programs, projects and other technical actions necessary for the protection, conservation and preservation of tangible and intangible assets that are part of the city's Cultural Heritage, in compliance with current legislation; and promote actions that prevent the evasion and destruction of goods and documents of cultural value (IRPH, 2016).

The cultural heritage is intimately related to the development of creative economy, which refers to goods and services based on texts, symbols and images and the diverse set of activities based on creativity, talent or individual and collective skills. It includes products that incorporate intellectual property (Miguez, 2007). The preservation of cultural heritage is fundamental to the development of a creative city such as Rio de Janeiro, as it can enable the recuperation of urban spaces by emphasizing arts, differentiated services and entertainment to attract creative professionals; re-appropriating, restoring and rehabilitating the present with a view to a future of renewed social relations in the city; and leading to the apprehension of traditional knowledge, transversal to various fields, aiming at socioeconomic development. Despite the importance of preserving and valuing cultural heritage for the development of Rio de Janeiro as a "creative city", the physical and symbolic decline of national and local cultural heritage in the city is evident. Management deficiencies and poor technical knowledge in the supervisory bodies lead to the physical and symbolic decline of the cultural heritage, which occurs concomitantly with the pressures exerted by private groups and the disorderly urban expansion, often for the purpose of commercial use of space. Moreover, the neglect and depreciation of tangible heritage and the disregard for intangible heritage may be indicative of the lack of an intense heritage education process and the domination of cultural heritage by the elites, which make it difficult for the vast majority of the population to identify with cultural heritage (Jesus, 2017).

The proposals for the development of educational actions aimed at the use and appropriation of the cultural heritage assets were introduced in Brazil in the first Seminar on the Educational Use of Museums and Monuments, held in July 1983, at the Imperial Museum in the city of Petrópolis, in the state of Rio de Janeiro. From the initial proposal on, numerous experiences and activities have been carried out in different contexts and places of the country, which have shown results in the recovery of collective memory and self-esteem of communities in the process of disruption, local development and innovative solutions for the preservation of cultural heritage. The development of heritage education programs, involving not only the school and university networks, but also local community organizations, families, businesses and, especially, the responsible authorities, contributed to the expansion of a new vision of Brazilian and Carioca Cultural Heritage in its diversity of tangible and intangible manifestations as the primary sources of

knowledge and learning. This could be used and explored in the education of children and adults, inserted in the curricula and disciplines of the formal education system, or as an instrument of individual and collective motivation for the practice of citizenship and the establishment of an enriching dialogue between generations. The basic principle of heritage education is the direct experience of cultural goods and phenomena, to reach their understanding and appreciation, in a continuous process of discovery (Horta et al., 1999). However, many of these initiatives faced political, economic and technical limitations all over Brazil, including Rio de Janeiro.

The aim of the article is to examine the situation of cultural heritage education in Rio de Janeiro. The main argument indicates that the cultural heritage education is neglected in the city. The abandonment of the tangible heritage and the disregard for the intangible heritage are associated to the lack of significant experiences recorded in the citizens' memories. This situation is linked to the lack of major efforts by the government in cultural heritage education, which creates a scenario where heritage does not appear significantly in the reinterpretations of the past by a vast part of the population to the point of establishing links of affection, essential for the conservation of heritage assets. The abandonment of cultural heritage by the public institutions and the neglect of civil society in relation to the "places of memory" are accentuated in Rio de Janeiro by the pressure of the increased demand for housing spaces and formal and informal commerce, which has particularly accelerated the destruction of tangible heritage, and the action of elites that highlight specific past experiences linked to them and try to impose their specific memory on other social segments, which does not generate the identification between a huge part of the population and the cultural heritage. The solution for the crisis becomes harder with the lack of economic resources to promote cultural heritage initiatives and even preserve cultural assets, the misuse of money devoted to cultural heritage because of corruption schemes and the maintenance of a pragmatic perspective on education that directs efforts for functional activities and lacks the critical view about past political, economic and social issues.

2. Theoretical framework

2.1. Cultural heritage

The preservation of cultural heritage aims at protecting memory by giving relevance to the context and existing social relations in a specific place. A great part of the population still thinks of heritage as a frozen image of the past that attests to a collective construction. However, the notion of cultural heritage evokes varied dimensions of culture as images of a living past, because they are collectively significant in their diversity. A good is endowed with heritage value because of the attribution of meanings it has to a social group, which justifies its preservation. These meanings may vary according to different economic, social and cultural groups, since every receiver can be a producer of meaning and every reading is an act of appropriation (Tomaz, 2010).

The 1988 Brazilian Constitution defines as "cultural heritage" a set of goods of a tangible and intangible nature, taken individually or jointly, which have reference to the identity, action and memory of the different groups that form Brazilian society. The document broadened the concept of heritage established in 1937 by replacing the name "Historical and Artistic Heritage" with "Brazilian Cultural

Heritage", which enlarged the definition of recognizable assets, particularly intangible ones. Asset management and documentation are responsibilities of the public administration. However, according to the 1988 Constitution, the partnership between government and communities is necessary for the promotion and protection of cultural heritage. The IPHAN tries to ensure compliance with the legal frameworks and manage the Brazilian Cultural Heritage and the assets recognized by UNESCO as World Heritage. To perform such tasks, the Institute develops, through partnerships with federal state governments, the National System of Cultural Heritage, which seeks to ensure articulated and more effective actions; regulation with common conceptualizations, principles and general rules; and institutional strengthening and structuring of the national information system. The characteristics of each group of national goods guide the management of Cultural Heritage into Intangible Heritage, Tangible Heritage, Archaeological Heritage, and World Heritage (IPHAN, 2014a).

Intangible cultural goods relate to the practices and domains of social life that manifest in knowledge, crafts and ways of doing; celebrations; scenic, plastic, musical or playful forms of expression; markets, fairs and shrines that host collective cultural practices. Such goods are passed from one generation to the other and can be recreated by communities and groups depending on the environment, interaction with nature and history, as well as foster a sense of identity and continuity and contribute to the promotion of respect for cultural diversity and human creativity. Tangible cultural heritage, on the other hand, is composed of a set of cultural goods classified according to their nature: archaeological, landscape and ethnographic goods; historic goods; fine arts; and the applied arts. Such goods may be historic cities, archaeological and landscape sites and individual goods, as well as archaeological, bibliographic, archival, videographic, photographic and cinematographic collections (IPHAN, 2014a).

The notion of intangible cultural heritage potentially encompasses expressions of all social groups and is clearly endowed with a strong anthropological bias. It includes circuits of cultural consumption, production and diffusion organized through their own dynamics and logic, as well as their agents, creations, publics, problems and specific needs. All these elements must be considered in the cultural policies as references of memory and identity that Brazil produces for itself and in dialogue with other nations. This allows the recognition of cultural diversity, which shows how the concept of intangible cultural heritage is already configured as the product of a new conception of development linked to the democratization of culture. In this conception, the aim is not to guarantee access to resources, information and cultural instruments to different social groups based on homogeneous and ethnocentric notions, but the appreciation of the multiple development processes that integrate different social groups (Cavalcanti & Fonseca, 2008). Moreover, working in a participatory manner leads to a need to rethink the state model and its relationship with civil society. By admitting the shared responsibility within the possibilities of each actor, it is also assumed that the results will be achieved by an interaction process, not only by the will of public managers or social actors. Such work implies an improved capacity for articulation, negotiation and mediation by government agencies. Similarly, civil society needs to review the role of the state as a paternalistic provider or an authoritarian and repressive agent and understand it as a legitimate and established power responsible for preserving memory. The conception of the past as the heritage of the nation and the foundation of the possibility of the future pointed to the need to preserve it for the enjoyment of future generations. In the nineteenth century, the notion of heritage was essentially historic and artistic. The idea of "cultural heritage"

is more recent, seen as the result of a process of narrative, symbolic and political construction and elaboration, which occurs mediated by a set of technical knowledge, political wills and the responsibility of the governments for keeping the memory by considering the density or historical continuity of the cultural heritage good (Silvestrin, n.d.).

From the perspective of cultural heritage specialists, the separation between tangible and intangible cultural heritage should only be used as a didactic resource, because the tangible dimension cannot be conceived without the intangible meaning it carries, nor the intangible dimension makes sense with no reference to the physical support, so that both dimensions coexist in a cultural good. However, the terminology that separates the two dimensions has been incorporated into public policies to reinforce a false dichotomy between them and reiterated by preservation policies, which, since 2000, have underlined IPHAN's major role in the federal government and even in academy in terms of theoretical thinking about cultural heritage in Brazil. By invoking the false dichotomy in policy making, there is a disarticulated or inharmonious use of protection mechanisms according to the dimension of tangible or intangible heritage good to which they are primarily intended. Instead of complementing each other to provide more effective and comprehensive protection, these policies are implemented in an exclusive way: either tangible or intangible is protected. While many understand that the 1988 Constitution would have split the concept of "cultural heritage", a broader perspective sees in the document the reaffirmation of the integrity and indivisibility of cultural heritage by recognizing the intangible dimension. Thus, the fact that the state has a different regimental structure and actions to deal with the tangible and intangible dimensions of heritage does not mean that such policies should oppose or be mutually exclusive. On the contrary, they must interact to strengthen the protection of heritage (Telles, 2010).

The archaeological heritage allows the identification of knowledge and technologies that indicate the process of human adaptation to the environment and the production of Brazilian traditional knowledge. It has been under legal protection since 1937, and specific protection was established in 1961. The 1988 Constitution recognized archaeological assets as Union Heritage, so the destruction, mutilation and physical destruction of archaeological cultural heritage are punishable by law. The world heritage refers to cultural and natural assets considered important for humanity. Their preservation was encouraged by the Convention Concerning the Protection of World Cultural and Natural Heritage, adopted in 1972 by UNESCO. States signatories to the Convention indicate cultural and natural assets to be inscribed on the World Heritage List. Applications are evaluated by the Convention's advisory bodies, and their final approval is made annually by the World Heritage Committee. Brazil ratified the Convention in 1978 (IPHAN, 2014a).

In Brazil, city governments have the power and duty to legislate on local cultural heritage. If the city laws do not clash with federal and federal state legislation, the city government may, through its own legislation, detail the matter thanks to its legislative autonomy. A city with more than 20,000 inhabitants has an obligatory master plan, according to the 1988 Constitution. This plan presents the intended directions in terms of urban development and protection of the cultural heritage. If the city has less than 20,000 inhabitants, the Organic Law also provides for guidelines for the development and protection of cultural heritage. Citizens can also contribute to the preservation of cultural heritage, as they have the right to request the protection of what they consider having historic, artistic, architectural, environmental or

affective value for their city. According to the 1988 Constitution, any citizen may bring a popular action aimed at annulling an act that harms the cultural heritage. Governmental or non-governmental institutions and community associations may bring public civil actions, aiming at punishing those responsible for harmful acts to cultural heritage, including the requirement of reparation of the caused damage. In addition, respectful attitudes towards the community and the city bring positive values, such as not destroying monuments or urban facilities; not throwing garbage on the streets; reporting irregular occupations in areas of environmental protection; and protesting against interventions that interfere negatively on the landscape (INEPAC, 2016).

2.2. *Cultural heritage education*

Cultural heritage education refers to a permanent and systematic process of educational work centred on cultural heritage as the primary source of individual and collective knowledge. The objects and expressions of cultural heritage become the starting point for the pedagogical activities of observing, questioning and exploring all their aspects, which can be translated into concepts and knowledge. From the experience and direct contact with the evidence and manifestations of culture, the cultural heritage education seeks to lead children and adults to an active process of knowledge, appropriation and appreciation of their culture. It enables them to make better use of these assets, as well as the generation and production of new knowledge in a continuous process of cultural creation, which involves the development of observation skills, critical analysis, comparison, deduction, hypothesis formulation and problem solving. The critical knowledge and the conscious appropriation of cultural heritage are parts of the process of sustainable preservation of these assets, as well as the strengthening of feelings of identity and citizenship. The knowledge of the elements that make up the cultural diversity, which comes from the multiple ethnic and cultural groups that form the national and local cultures, also contributes to the respect for difference, as well as the multiplicity of expressions and ways in which culture manifests itself in diverse regions (Horta et al., 1999).

The ongoing dialogue in the cultural heritage educational process encourages and facilitates communication and interaction between communities and the agents responsible for the preservation and study of cultural assets, enabling the exchange of knowledge and the formation of partnerships for the protection of cultural goods. This process leads to the development of self-esteem of individuals and communities and the appreciation of their culture, as proposed by Freire (1996) in his idea of empowerment for the exercise of self-affirmation. As Horta el at. (1999) argue, cultural heritage education brings learning situations about the cultural process and, from its manifestations, the student's interest in solving significant issues for his/her personal and collective life arises. The heritage and the environment in which it operates offer opportunities to provoke students with feelings of surprise and curiosity. Studying the remnants of the past motivates students to understand and evaluate the way of life and the problems faced by those who preceded them, as well as the solutions they found to deal with these problems and challenges. They may compare these solutions with the ones used today for issues such as housing, sanitation, water supply, lighting, health, food, transportation and so many other aspects. When the students compare these solutions and discuss the origins of the identified problems, they may design solutions for the future problems in an exercise of critical awareness and citizenship (Horta et al., 1999).

When cultural heritage education is considered, a special kind of learning takes place, because it does not happen through the means of the traditional teacher-student relationship, but through objects, places and experiences that engage intellect, emotions and senses. Organizations such as museums – that preserve, display and interpret cultural heritage – may offer opportunities to discover the past and think about how it has defined the world today. They create opportunities that turn learning into a memorable experience by giving the students access to knowledge they might never find so powerfully in the classroom or books. Another important aspect is the economic benefit of the cultural heritage sector, which is inseparable from its educational mission and impact. The people who visit museums and heritage sites do so to experience something new regarding knowledge, enjoyment, inspiration and entertainment. An increase in visitor numbers requires a qualified workforce, such as teachers, enablers, demonstrators, technicians, interpreters, storytellers, administrators, programmers, performers, fundraisers, project managers, evaluators, researchers, community workers, volunteers and visitor assistants, all of whom have a part to play in making sure that visitors have the best possible experience. Cultural heritage can generate income and jobs, which also highlights that the workforce that deals with it needs training and support to promote changes in the economic, educational, demographic and technological environments (GEM, 2019).

The cultural heritage sites and museums can be regarded as guardians of qualified information and trusted sources of knowledge. The perceived openness to many different points of view brings the potential for rediscovery and reinterpretation by curators, educators and visitors. Alongside the opportunities for informal learning, museums and heritage sites may work closely with schools and universities to help students learn outside the classroom, based on observation, dialogue and a direct physical relationship with objects and spaces. New demands are made of students, who operate with different rules that break them free from the routine of the classroom and develop cognitive abilities, confidence, motivation and problem-solving and communication skills. Besides, cultural heritage education helps defining local identity and reinforcing a sense of belonging. Sites of historical interest, collections and archives provide students with material evidence of how the locality has developed over time and give them insight into the events, personalities and historical processes that have formed its character. This may enhance the students' sense of rootedness and belonging. In many places around the world, museums and cultural heritage institutions are gradually embracing alternative histories and reaching out to marginalised communities in ways that would have been uncommon in the past. The commitment to inclusivity builds new audiences and compels museums and heritage attractions to reappraise what they do and deliver their public programme in new ways. This may involve the co-production partnership with local people; the inclusion of trails, games and activities for all ages and abilities; and the support for social causes in their community (GEM, 2019).

3. Methodology

The bibliographic research consisted of reading, selecting and organizing topics on the general aspects that define cultural heritage and cultural heritage education. The next step was the research of the political and economic context that motivated the crisis of the cultural heritage education in Rio de Janeiro and evaluate how barriers for the full potential of this education were created and consolidated. At this step, I used information released by governmental institutions, such as IPHAN, to identify the main guidelines

for heritage education and the obstacles for its implementation in the city. After mapping Rio's situation, it became possible to indicate ways to overcome some of these obstacles and implement cultural heritage education initiatives in schools and universities.

4. Results and analysis

The creative economy was conceived in the city of Rio de Janeiro as a means for urban transformation, social inclusion and development of cultural capital. With the support of the national and federal state governments, the city administration sought to articulate with the creative industries and cultural producers to develop a space for the establishment of professionals, the appreciation of diversity and the generation of preconditions for the activities of companies, as seen in the recuperation of degraded areas such as the Port Zone (Aprigio, 2015). Creative industries can reinforce values and traditions that identify a community, so that, in addition to the culture's role of social cohesion and inclusion, such reinforcement can strengthen tourist attractiveness, fundamental to a city like Rio de Janeiro. The creative economy could contribute not only to the rational and sustainable cultural tourism, but to the preservation of cultural heritage and the environment for the benefit of local populations (Oliveira et al., 2013). At the same time, the appreciation of cultural heritage allows the attraction of creative professionals, stimulates the critical view of past mistakes to project the future and brings the knowledge of past techniques and initiatives, necessary for the socioeconomic development of many creative sectors in the city.

Among the national cultural heritage sites listed by IPHAN and located in the city of Rio de Janeiro, it is worth mentioning the Rio de Janeiro's Mint (the current National Archive), the Casa de Rui Barbosa, the Municipal Theatre, the National Museum of Fine Arts, the Chácara do Ceu, the National Library, the Botanical Garden and the architectural ensembles (Teles Arc, the Conceição Hill, Quinta da Boa Vista, the XV Square and Guinle Park) (IPHAN, 2014b). Much of Rio de Janeiro's cultural tangible heritage is constituted by churches, chapels, shrines and religious temples, most of which located in the City Centre, such as the Candelaria Church and the São Bento Monastery Church. The tangible cultural heritage is also composed by the historic set of Copacabana Fort; the Tiradentes, Laranjeiras, Guanabara, Itamaraty and Gustavo Capanema Palaces; the Copacabana Palace hotel; the Imperial Palace (Paço Imperial) and the Public Promenade. Some of the city's main sights are parts of the tangible heritage, such as Corcovado Hill and Christ the Redeemer, the Sugar Loaf Complex (consisting of the Sugar Loaf, Urca and Babilônia Hills), the Arcos da Lapa and the Maracanã stadium (Secretaria de Estado de Cultura, 2016). Among the assets listed at the city level are, for example, buildings projected by architect Oscar Niemeyer (IRPH, 2016).

The IPHAN registers as parts of the national intangible heritage in the city of Rio de Janeiro the samba origins: partido alto, linked to daily life and collective creation and based on improvisations; samba de terreiro, which takes place on school courts and samba wheels; and samba-enredo, appropriated by the samba schools to animate the carnival parades. Such rhythms are important not only for Rio de Janeiro's cultural tradition, but also as a reference role for national culture and the affirmation of Brazilian identity (Secretaria de Estado de Cultura, 2016). Among the intangible elements that are part of the carioca cultural heritage, it is worth mentioning the Ipanema Band, the Carnival Bloc Cacique de Ramos, the Cordão do Bola Preta, the samba schools that parade in the city, the Pixinguinha's musical work, the Bossa Nova, the

Choro, the Baile Charme, the soccer crowds of the city's clubs, the traditional bars and pubs, the São Cristóvão Fair, the Mercadão de Madureira, the Ipanema Hippie Fair, the São Sebastião Procession and the rituals that worship the divinity Yemanja, held on the city's beaches. In 2015, it was also declared as a part of the cultural heritage of the city the "carioca condition", the "carioquice" (IRPH, 2016).

However, the neglect and abandonment of the cultural heritage in the city of Rio de Janeiro are evident. It should be highlighted that the process of appreciation of heritage materializes with interventions that can provide and reinforce spatial restructuring and bring new demands in terms of greater government action in the regulation of land use and occupation, so that the expected urban development provides the improvement of life conditions for the local population. However, management deficiencies imply a lack of restoration and preservation, often due to the interests of specific groups and disorderly urban sprawl. Moreover, the population and institutions have not yet been fully aware of the importance of cultural heritage, which has been experiencing problems such as the deterioration of old buildings by the action of time, the increase in destruction processes by the predatory action of vandalism and the loss of heritage's unique character by its use for commercial activities. As in other cities in Brazil, the increased demand for housing spaces and formal and informal commerce has particularly accelerated the destruction of tangible heritage in Rio de Janeiro. Political groups in the city have a pragmatic and functionalist view that promotes urban reforms and eliminates historic references for profit (Jesus, 2017).

The work of supervisory bodies becomes meaningless in view of the amount of abandoned cultural heritage sites. One of the main reasons for such abandonment and the lack of necessary interventions is the little knowledge, by the supervisory agencies, about the geometry, properties and state of conservation of the buildings, the materials that constitute them and the actions to which these buildings are subjected. For example, teams need technical knowledge to identify pathologies, record them correctly and rate whether the degree of damage to a building is irrelevant, medium or severe. However, such knowledge is frequently absent in the supervisory bodies (Silva, 2015). The neglect and depreciation of tangible cultural heritage and the disdain for intangible cultural heritage may indicate that the community does not identify so much with these assets due to the lack of an intense heritage education process and the domination of the cultural heritage by elites. As for the first point, the disregard for the tangible heritage and the neglect of the intangible heritage often happen because the citizens have no significant experiences recorded in their memories. As the government does not make major efforts in cultural heritage education, heritage does not appear significantly in the reinterpretations of the past by a large part of the population to the point of establishing links of affection, essential for the conservation of heritage assets. The abandonment of cultural heritage by the public institutions and the neglect of civil society in relation to the "places of memory" are accentuated in the context of a large city like Rio de Janeiro, characterized by the speed, renewal and continuous assimilation of information. Regarding the second point, certain segments can monumentalize collective memories, tip over certain assets that resemble experiences linked to elites and try to impose their specific memory on other segments by placing an artificial / partial memory on those objects as true. When the government selects a good to be listed or registered without systematically consulting the community and / or without the work of qualified individuals, it risks turning the cultural heritage into the memory of the elites (Knack, 2007). It becomes harder to develop cultural heritage education with the lack of economic resources to promote initiatives and even preserve cultural goods, the misuse of money

devoted to cultural heritage because of corruption schemes and the maintenance of a pragmatic perspective on education that directs efforts for functional activities and lacks the critical view about past political, economic and social issues.

From a broader perspective, the search for identification makes it necessary to affirm differences to strengthen equality, especially in the light of the massification of information in a globalized world and the possible homogenization of cultures. However, one of the main challenges facing cultural heritage education is how to discuss these issues with the low-income people who do not have access to the media, or if they do, information is distorted and serves to generalize and trivialize information. Cultural heritage addresses the controversial theme of appreciating the cultural good, which is a part of the game of "memory and forgetting": a choice of what should be preserved is made by the responsible technical bodies, and, based on this choice, policies are developed. When the cultural dynamics is considered, for the preservation and continuation of cultural practices, the participation of society is necessary, since it gives legitimacy to the application of preservation policies. It is the cultural agents' responsibility to create subsidies so that communities can mobilize around the preservation of their cultural heritage, as they enjoy these assets and need to understand and apprehend them to contribute to their preservation. However, there is a risk of appropriation, whereby some groups are led to believe that they are or were producers of a culture that is not their own, or at least part of a distant past and not of their daily lives. Moreover, the object of cultural heritage may not assume the role of what it was in the past, since the context and the relationships are not the same, as well as their meaning. Thus, preserving cultural heritage objects, in some cases, may represent nothing for most people or sometimes mean the oppression that some groups have suffered in the past. Cultural heritage education should be one of the tools used to alleviate these conflicts and understand heritage, because it aims to give conditions for knowledge or recognition (Schwanz, 2006).

5. Conclusion

The appreciation of cultural heritage involves the incentive for what is common to a particular social group in time and space, from the elements belonging to the nature and environment to knowledge, techniques and know-how. The collective memory of a specific group is related to a social identity that makes the group feel part of the place. Despite being remote, memories can produce feelings and sensations that seem to relive moments and facts that underlie and explain the present. In the search for the past and the sense of belonging towards a common trajectory, a city like Rio de Janeiro may even write and rewrite its past, gathering fragments and reorganizing them. In this sense, a preservation policy can have as its object not only the maintenance of the cultural heritage itself, but it may include the resistance to the pressures of the moment, coming from the property owners and even the constituted power. A cultural heritage policy should aim at protecting not only assets, but the universe that constitutes heritage preservation, including the criteria for selecting protected elements, the reasons justifying the heritage protection and the various involved actors, such as society and representatives of the state (Tomaz, 2010).

In the light of the need of a more robust cultural heritage policy in Rio de Janeiro and Brazil, the activities related to the cultural heritage education may be a fundamental part of this policy. They could promote perception exercises through questions, the manipulation of objects, notes, deduction and

comparison aiming to identify the cultural asset, its function and meaning and the development of visual and symbolic perception. The cultural heritage education could also involve the development of drawings, verbal or written description, photographs and maps to strengthen the perceived knowledge, deepen the critical analysis and develop memory and logical, intuitive and operational thought. The heritage knowledge may promote the analysis of an issue, the development of hypotheses and discussions and the incentive for research in libraries, archives, newspapers and magazines to develop the capacities of critical analysis and the interpretation of evidence and meanings. Finally, the appropriation of the acquired knowledge may take the forms of recreation, dramatization and interpretation through different means, such as painting, sculpture, dance, music, poetry or video in classrooms. The aim of the internalization process is to develop affective involvement, self-expression, creative participation and the appreciation of the cultural goods. The cultural heritage education requires greater interaction between museum technicians, heritage institutes and community members, as well as library visits and archival consultation to broaden the focus and know the resources to be explored. When cultural heritage education is developed by schools and universities, the definition of the educational objectives, intended results, desired skills and knowledge by educators is fundamental as a previous step, so that the field work is prepared and the further development of discussions and debates in the classroom is possible. These following steps may involve the elaboration of a final product, such as a video, a photo or text exhibition, and works documenting the experience to enhance the involvement of students with the cultural heritage (Horta el al., 1999).

6. References

Aprigio, A.E.R.S. (2015). *A paradiplomacia e a atuação internacional de governos subnacionais*. Dissertation – M.A. in International Relations. Departamento de Relações Internacionais e Administração Pública, Escola de Economia e Gestão, Universidade do Minho.

Cavalcanti, M.L.V.C. & Fonseca, M.C.L. (2008). *Patrimônio Imaterial no Brasil: legislação e políticas estaduais*. Brasília: UNESCO, Educarte.

Freire, P. (1996). *Pedagogia da Autonomia: Saberes Necessários à Prática Educativa*. São Paulo: Paz e Terra.

GEM (2019). The value of heritage education. *GEM website*. Retrieved 27 December, 2019 from https://gem.org.uk/our-work/value-of-heritage-education/

Horta, M.L.P.; Grunberg, E. & Monteiro, A.Q. (1999). Guia básico de educação patrimonial. *Iphan*. Retrieved 27 December, 2019 from http://portal.iphan.gov.br/uploads/temp/guia_educacao_patrimonial.pdf

INEPAC (2016). *INEPAC website*. Retrieved 27 December, 2019 from http://www.inepac.rj.gov.br/index.php/home/instituicao

IPHAN (2014a). Patrimônio Cultural. *IPHAN website*. Retrieved 27 December, 2019 from http://portal.iphan.gov.br/pagina/detalhes/218

IPHAN (2014b). Rio de Janeiro (RJ). *IPHAN website*. Retrieved 27 December, 2019 from http://portal.iphan.gov.br/pagina/detalhes/383.

IRPH (2016). *IRPH website*. Retrieved 27 December, 2019 from

http://www.rio.rj.gov.br/web/irph/principal.

Jesus, D.S.V. (2017). Saudade de mim: patrimônio cultural e economia criativa no Rio de Janeiro. In: Figueiredo, J.L.; Jesus; D.S.V.. (Org.). *Cidades criativas: aspectos setoriais e territoriais*. Rio de Janeiro: E-papers, 157-177.

Knack, E.R.J. (2007). *Modernização do Espaço Urbano e Patrimônio Histórico: Passo Fundo, RS*. Dissertation – M.A. in History. Instituto de Filosofia e Ciências Humanas, Universidade de Passo Fundo.

Oliveira, J.M.; Araújo, B.C. & Silva, L.V. (2013). Panorama da Economia Criativa no Brasil. *Texto para discussão / Instituto de Pesquisa Econômica Aplicada*, 1880, 1-49.

Schwanz, A.K. (2006). Educação patrimonial – A pedagogia política do esquecimento ? *Cadernos do LEPAARQ - Textos de Antropologia, Arqueologia e Patrimônio*, III (5-6), 25-41.

Secretaria de Estado de Cultura. (2016). *Mapa de Cultura RJ*. Retrieved 27 December, 2019 from http://mapadecultura.rj.gov.br/home

Silva, P.N.R. (2015). Imagem do descaso – Como intervir no Patrimônio Construído do Rio de Janeiro? *Petra Consultoria*. Retrieved 27 December, 2019 from https://www.linkedin.com/pulse/imagem-do-descaso-como-intervir-patrim%C3%B4nio-rio-de-roberto-silva?trk=pulse-det-nav_art

Silvestrin, M.L. (n.d.). *Patrimônio Imaterial: fortalecendo o sistema nacional*. Mimeo, 1-22.

Telles, M.F.P. (2010). Patrimônio cultural material e imaterial - dicotomia e reflexos na aplicação do tombamento e do registro. *Políticas Culturais em Revista*, 2 (3), 121-137.

Tomaz, P.C. (2010). A preservação do Patrimônio Cultural e sua trajetória no Brasil. *Fênix – Revista de História e Estudos Culturais*, 7 (2), 1-12.