

International Journal of Human Sciences Research

MATERIAL AND IMMACTERIAL CULTURAL HERITAGE UNDER THE BIAS OF RURAL SPACE

Clara Heinzmann

PhD in Sustainable Rural Development
by: Universidade Estadual do Oeste
do Paraná – UNIOESTE
<https://orcid.org/0009-0000-2926-3611>

Cleverson Aldrin Marques

PhD in Sustainable Rural Development by:
Universidade Estadual do Oeste
do Paraná – UNIOESTE
<https://orcid.org/0009-0008-6486-9473>

All content in this magazine is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution License. Attribution-Non-Commercial-Non-Derivatives 4.0 International (CC BY-NC-ND 4.0).



Abstract: The culture of a people is in its identity, through which it manifests its beliefs, knowledge, arts, beauties, actions, sayings, festivals, creativity, among other aspects that are part of its daily life. Such manifestations form its cultural heritage that may or may not be conserved. They can be eternalized through constructions, paintings, sculptures, symbolism, handicrafts, photographs, films, books, among many other physical means, palpable, seen, and in some cases archived, characterizing material cultural heritage. The manifestations that are passed on through generations in the form of sayings, as well as the way of doing things, practices, experiences, prayers, traditions and customs, in short, manifestations that cannot be measured, quantified, form the intangible cultural heritage. Material cultural heritage is, in a way, easier to identify, map, quantify, describe. They are palpable, can be exposed, appreciated, kept, restored, while intangible cultural heritage has a more implicit identification, often being devalued by its own people and, finally, forgotten. Thus, the present study, through a bibliographical research, brings an approach on the tangible and intangible cultural heritage under the bias of the rural space. In the end, it is concluded that changes in rural areas, agro-industrialization and the use of natural resources for economic and social maintenance are among the main elements of rupture and cultural re-signification, that is, the cultural dimension of rural architecture ends up becoming lost in the rubble caused by the territorial ordering process.

Keywords: Cultural heritage. Material and immaterial heritage. Rural space.

INTRODUCTION

There are two different forms of cultural identity, one occurs when a given community tries to recover its historical past in a shared culture that can be represented by reaffirming

the identity. The other conception is based on recognition among individuals and on their common claims. Thus, historical processes sustain the fixation of certain identities and the generation of new identities.

In this sense, cultural heritage encompasses important aspects such as the collective memory formed by experiences and inventions, thus, its conservation is fundamental for favoring and public enjoyment of cultural goods. The maintenance of heritage, in a broad sense, is part of a larger process that is the conservation and recovery of memory, thanks to which groups maintain their cultural identity.

In the case of rural space, therefore, it is understood that this heritage is a set of elements constituted by forms of society and nature, with striking cultural and technical characteristics that show materiality and symbolism through identity. In this context, the rural space constitutes a rich material, immaterial and natural cultural heritage built and materialized by social relations and the foundation of territoriality, however, it is also based on migration, on interpellations between urban and rural, considering that culture is not restricted by boundaries of space but by ways of life.

MATERIAL AND IMMATERIAL CULTURAL HERITAGE

The world we live in is full of places where shapes and images are present that have the function of bringing some meaning to memory. Some of these shapes and images recall people and events that were significant for a given community, such as the cultural heritage of a certain territory historically produced through everyday territorialities.

Territoriality acquires a very particular value, as it reflects the multidimensionality of the territorial "lived" by the members of a collectivity, by societies in general. Men

“live”, at the same time, the territorial process and the territorial product through a system of existential and/or productivist relations. (RAFFESTIN, 1993, p. 158)

Thus, culture causes the feeling of belonging to the individual and his social group, and territoriality and identity reveal territorialized everyday life, both economically, culturally and politically: hence the importance of preserving cultural heritage in the midst of historical territorialities and cross scale.

All territorialities (economic, political and cultural) corresponding to a social group are part of its heritage, as they manifest the ways of life, social relations, values, beliefs, buildings, crops, etc., in a given space, in a certain time (SAQUET; GALVÃO, 2009, p. 106).

This way, we can understand the heritage formed by memory, history, buildings (spatial forms), images, daily habits, identities, etc., all aspects and processes that are established in time and space, in short, in each territory. The territory, therefore, contains the natural and social heritage that is usually rebuilt over the years. And, as there is no territory without the conjugation of social and natural processes, this means that territory and heritage are together. Thus, when studying them, we need to consider the following components in each territory: “a) power relations; b) circulation and communication networks; c) the identities; d) nature)” (SAQUET; BRISKIEVICZ, 2009, p. 4).

According to the previously mentioned United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, cultural heritage is of fundamental importance for the memory, identity, creativity of peoples and the richness of cultures, and is divided into:

World Cultural Heritage: comprises monuments, groups of buildings or sites that have exceptional and universal historical, aesthetic, archaeological, scientific, ethnological or anthropological value.

World Natural Heritage: means exceptional physical, biological and geological formations, habitats of endangered animal and plant species and areas that have exceptional and universal scientific, conservation or aesthetic value. (UNESCO, 2023, s.p.)

The Federal Constitution of 1988, in art. 215 and 216, expanded the notion of cultural heritage by recognizing the existence of material and immaterial cultural assets and also by establishing other forms of conservation such as Registration and Inventory, in addition to Listing, instituted by Decree-Law no. 25, of November 30, 1937, which is mainly suited to the protection of buildings, landscapes and urban historic complexes.

According to “Instituto do Patrimônio Histórico e Artístico Nacional”, material heritage is made up of a set of cultural assets classified according to their nature, which is divided into archaeological, landscape and ethnographic; historic; fine Arts; and applied arts (IPHAN, 2023).

Regarding material goods:

We can observe them and describe their shape, color, dimensions, appearance, state of conservation, smell, sound, place where they are kept or coordinates of their limits, among countless other characteristics that differentiate them as objects, buildings or landscapes (CABRAL, 2011, p. 06).

Thus, listed assets of a material nature can be immovable such as historic cities, archaeological and landscape sites and individual assets; or furniture, such as archaeological, museological, documentary, bibliographic, archival, videographic, photographic and cinematographic collections.

Cultural assets of an intangible nature, on the other hand, concern those practices and domains of social life that manifest themselves in knowledge and ways of doing things; the most diverse celebrations; scenic, plastic,

musical or playful forms of expression; and in places such as markets, fairs and sanctuaries that host collective cultural practices.

In this sense, for “intangible assets, on the contrary, can only be truly known at the times they are executed or, indirectly and partially, through the presentation of their records or products” (CABRAL, 2011, p. 12).

Another noteworthy aspect is that intangible heritage is transmitted from generation to generation, constantly recreated by communities and groups based on their territory, their interaction with nature and their history, generating a sense of identity, and can contribute to promote respect for cultural diversity and human creativity (IPHAN, 2023).

Intangible goods are references; therefore, they are senses attributed to tangible or non-tangible supports. They can be in objects as well as in social practices, in physical spaces as well as in socially constituted territories. They are like the three historical relics and family legacies, real estate, jewels and works of art, or photographs, narratives, events and objects of personal affective value (ARANTES, 2001). Thus, it is important to understand that space is prior to territory, and that territory is formed from space: the actor, by appropriating a space, concretely and abstractly, territorializes the space and its culture (RAFFESTIN, 1993), constituting different patrimonies.

It is not the space that forms an identity, but the political force and cultural value of the social groups that reproduce in it and their ability to produce a certain scale of identity, territorially mediated and reproduced.

CULTURAL HERITAGE UNDER THE BIAS OF RURAL SPACE

In addition to understanding the complexity and breadth of cultural heritage, for the purpose of this study, the definition of rural space is essential. The concept of rural

space can be considered, in a broader sense, as a result of society-nature relations. Space can be rural or urban, rural space:

[...] as being the presence of specific productive functions, such as agriculture and agroindustry; lower demographic density, which means less human occupation of the territory as a whole; an administrative political delimitation of territorial boundaries, as this interferes not only with productive activity but also with the issue of taxes and municipal services; the space where there is less artificialization of local ecosystems; and, finally, the marked presence of culture as an element of social distinction in relation to other places, since different places delimited as rural can, in fact, be impregnated with an urban culture (PANIS, 2009, p.78)

The complexity of spaces and times, however, characterizes this dimension of interaction between space, territoriality and temporality as a process inherent and incorporated into the local culture that permeates and feeds the complexity of all the elements considered in its own definition.

Rural space is understood, therefore, as a set of elements made up of forms of society and nature, with striking cultural and technical characteristics that show materiality and symbolism through identity bias (FRO-EHLICH, 2004).

In this context, the rural space constitutes a rich cultural, material, immaterial and natural heritage built and materialized by social relations and the foundation of territoriality, however, it is also based on migration, on interpellations between urban and rural, considering that culture does not restricted by boundaries of space but by ways of life.

The urban space, on the other hand, appears as a public place and

By excellence, it comprises all sorts of individual and collective actors, institutionalized and daily configured territorial uses, diverse memories and

discursivities, attributed and constructed meanings, experiences and experiments, symbolic and concrete appropriations, among others. And that, also, simultaneously, comprises a complex and intense network of social relations – antagonistic, complementary, parallel, convergent, symbiotic, parasitic, consensual, conflicting; reflecting different standards of dialogue and negotiation (SILVA, 2023, p. 3).

The urban space, in its essence, brings together materialities and immaterialities, which presupposes actions and relationships that involve the social agents that produce and consume it, creating and recreating it according to their specific practices.

The social memory of people living in the countryside is structured on their experiences and habits, and their rural identity is not only based on the agricultural production relationship, but also on the amalgamation of cultural traits referring to the inhabitants' bond with the rural landscape, with the land, and relationships of friendship and trust with the other members of the community [...] The affective bonds that the individual develops over a space can also be analyzed based on the geographic concept of place, which helps to understand the more subjective relationships of the individual with their living space (PRETO; MONASTIRSKY, 2014, p. 45).

The contemporaneity of culture makes natural the dissemination of “urban symbolic elements, artificial to places, which are being (re)absorbed and (re)incorporated into the local culture” (PANIS, 2009, p.78).

[...] material heritage, representing the forms built and perpetuated in the landscape, constituting an inheritance in the spatial arrangement of the place; intangible heritage, as the intellectual product, techniques, religiosity, accumulated and reproduced knowledge, cultural elements that are reproduced by local inhabitants, representing a symbolic and identity set; and, natural heritage, represented by elements of nature socialized and transformed

through the technical application of local communities, which alter the spatial arrangement according to the needs of its reproduction. To this extent, these components of cultural heritage represent memory and landscape, impregnated with symbolic and identity elements of local culture (PANIS, 2019, p. 79)

The place is, therefore, at the base of these constituting and formative elements of cultural heritage assets, it is from this that relationships are established and completed in memories, experiences, experiences, permeated by nostalgia and memories (SANTOS, 2006).

The rural cultural heritage has correlations between all the architectural, infrastructural and environmental elements referring to the various segments of engineering and architecture, coexisting in the rural landscape in which they are inserted:

It is considered rural heritage: The old mansions and slave quarters, colonies and scattered workers' houses built with traditional techniques of rural architecture or with alternative materials and construction techniques, all vernacular architecture, old rural chapels, mills and machine houses, the machinery itself deactivated, old production and energy equipment (monjolo, water wheels, etc.), old structural elements and systems (bridges, dikes, dams, etc.), the physical space destined to local cultural manifestations (squares, squares, squares, villages, etc.) (FERRÃO, 2007, p. 94).

Thus, rural heritage must also consider the various artistic and/or cultural manifestations, the varied and specific forms of expression, food, clothing, domestic and work utensils, among other elements constituted in these spaces. By grouping urban and rural memories with popular memories, these embody the cultural identity of a territory.

ELEMENTS OF RUPTURE OF THE RURAL CULTURAL HERITAGE

Regarding the difficulties for the

conservation of cultural assets, these are related to the modes of production and consumption, the lack of more effective public policies and social exclusion and territorial expropriation. In this construction, sustainability is the only possible alternative for the conservation of rural cultural heritage.

The market increases technologies that are not always adequate - and that most of the time come into conflict - with the specificities necessary for the conservation of a building or artistic or historic site and lacks instruments capable of evaluating the sustainability of heritage assets, mainly in the elaboration of criteria and guidelines (CORTES; VALE, 2021, p. 34).

Like sustainable development, conservation of cultural heritage needs to be integrated into the contemporaneity of the social group to which it refers. The needs for cultural appreciation of these assets are currently interconnected with economic, social, political and environmental enhancement, as already mentioned.

In this sense, the “refunctionalization” of cultural heritage as a necessity for its maintenance, point to economic demands as alternatives for this construction.

Initially, because the set of objects, the forms constituting the material portion, which have lost their original functionality tend to be replaced [...] they are not just elements of the landscape, but are forms with specific functions. Thus, if the material heritage built in these rural communities obtains new functionalities, it will likewise have the possibility of remaining in existence, otherwise, they will be replaced to give way to new forms-contents, to meet specific demands of the place, especially economic demands. (CORTES; VALE, 2021, p. 36).

Another angle of the concept and way of understanding the interpellations between rural and urban spaces, and sustainability can be the concept of “naked space” or “non-urban space”, which can encompass rural and urban

environments, or forests, without thereby whether it is characterized as city, countryside or forest.

The “naked space” (non-urban space) can encompass rural as well as urban, or forest environments, without it being characterized as city, countryside or forest. It is about interpreting the natural environment [...] respecting its essence. On the other hand, when introjecting the idea of “naked space” one can immediately formulate specific questions about urban space and also about rural space. [...] The non-urban space, today synonymous with rural space, ends up being seen as the “surplus space” in the territory, the space that has not yet been urbanized, has not yet turned into a city. This idea is detrimental to rural and urban development because it distorts the sense of territorial organization as a possibility of promoting sustainability based on respect for the vocation of rural, urban and non-urban spaces (FERRÃO, 2007, p. 90).

The “naked space” must not be seen only as a space for potential urbanization, but as a possibility of balance for the construction of responsible urban, ensuring a space for sustainable development.

“Naked space” – much more than just rural space – encompasses all the possibilities for occupying the territory that go beyond the traditional urban setting. Thus, we can speak of APAs (Environmental Protection Areas), Agricultural Parks, River Parks, Heritage Parks, National Forests or Conservation Units, in the same way that we can speak of the rural environment traditionally characterized today, as possibilities for occupation of the “naked space” (FERRÃO, 2007, p. 92).

A balance is needed between traditions, modes of expression, thought, economic production and life, built throughout the history of societies and innovation, which in the same way has been built and is built throughout the recent history of societies. Thus, Sachs (2002) propose that, in order to

universalize technological innovations in different processes, it is necessary to transform the knowledge of peoples and ecosystems in the light of ethnoscience.

The study of knowledge and concepts developed by any society about the natural world, about species. It is the study of the role of nature in the system of beliefs and adaptation of man to certain environments, emphasizing the cognitive categories and concepts used by the peoples under study. (DIEGUES, 2000, p. 10)

Thus, the role of ethnoscience is the study of other realities, of knowledge of relationships and interactions, of the use and management of natural resources by local communities over time, of all the cultural processes involved in people-nature relationships, normally affected by processes impactful.

Among the changes in rural areas, agro-industrialization and the use of natural resources for economic and social maintenance are among the main elements of rupture and cultural re-signification. The cultural dimension of rural architecture ends up getting lost in the rubble caused by the current territorial ordering process, based on the idea that the continuous and excessive growth of cities is synonymous with economic development.

This scenario has been explored for some time, [...] mainly in aspects related to agro-industrial production, but also when it comes to regional development plans. The “naked space” ends up being studied from the need to provide structure to it, or, what is more common, the need to provide structure to cities. Thus: the field occupied by agricultural crops, railroads and roadways, dams and other works of engineering art are examples of activities that engineers and architects have been developing for some time on the “naked space”, leaving it increasingly naked (in the sense of figurative), since its “non-urban essence” is relegated, often completely mischaracterizing it. The cultural dimension of Rural Architecture

and non-urban space ends up getting lost in the rubble caused by this current territorial ordering process – based on the idea that the continuous and disproportionate growth of cities is synonymous with socio-economic development. (FERRÃO, 2007, p. 92).

Among the social and territorial impacts caused by the construction of a hydroelectric plant is the compulsory displacement, which is characterized by the fragmentation of the relationships of belonging of those affected with their place of residence and with the elements that are part of their way of life (MERA et al, 2018; HEINZMANN, 2022).

Thus, the change of territory generates impacts on the family economy and on the workforce, compromising the means of subsistence, in addition to generating economic and social results, it still produces the rupture of social relations, the cultural re-signification and the feeling of belonging to the place and territory of everyday life.

The loss of the bond of belonging to the land also brings consequences such as the loss of cultural identity, the bonds of belonging and place built with the community. This disruption not only generates material damage, but also the loss of intangible assets. In this regard, it is clear that hydroelectric plants are installed in social spaces of riverside populations, where they produce their subsistence through fishing and farming. The hydroelectric plants occupy the spaces of sociocultural reproduction of the expropriated families, which generates conflicts, because on the one hand there are those who appropriate the geographic space for the generation of electric energy and, on the other hand, there are the owners and not - landowners, whose means and way of life was expropriated (HEINZMANN, 2022, p. 128).

There are also great impacts with regard to the identity of families and their communities, as there is a rupture in social relations, in addition to cultural re-signification and the feeling of territorial belonging.

In this sense, the *habitat* and appropriation are related, because appropriation contains belonging relations, through the expression of the material and the immaterial in relation to the place, interspersed by history and the daily relationships built in the environment. Therefore, the cultural heritage of a community is extremely affected when it is forced to move from its place of belonging.

The issue of large dams in particular revolves around economic development to the issue of human rights, which allows putting together the impacts, losses that developmental thinking is incapable of dealing with, which are the intangible losses of immaterial goods, that are not monetizable, nor quantifiable which refer to the cultural and symbolic heritage of a people or social group. The issue refers to the “value” of that which has no value, which is not recognized in the market as a bearer of value and which cannot be monetized or quantified, thus blocking the affected populations’ right to their traditional ways of occupying themselves in the field. territory (LEITÃO, 2011, p. 8).

There is a parallel between cultural issues and the needs for adaptation and change, which are directly related to the ability to create integrated, endogenous processes that do not promote rupture between peoples and their places of belonging, contributing to nourish and conserve these ties directed to a new concept of development.

FINAL CONSIDERATIONS

Culture shapes identity by giving meaning to experience and identity choices in clothing, food, religion, music, etc. Symbolic systems provide new ways to give meaning to the experience of social inequalities, marking the meeting of our past with the social, cultural and economic relations in which we live today.

Cultural heritage, both material and immaterial, can suffer degradation, which can be generated by human actions, or by

nature, or even natural wear and tear due to weathering. Among so many possibilities of degradation and cultural re-signification, in view of the need to conserve cultural heritage, in addition to raising awareness among individuals, decrees, laws and conventions were created over the years.

In this context, the material and immaterial cultural heritage under the bias of the rural space comprises cultural heritage, agricultural and livestock practices, knowledge, religious and festive celebrations, all permeated by symbolism and belonging, pointing to the subjects’ own lifestyle in their places. The loss of these elements, whether due to lack of identification, or even the dissemination of new elements, mainly those based on the urban way of life, can mean the rupture of rural identity, in addition to a loss of belonging that, among other aspects, is capable of to influence deterritorialization.

Among the changes in rural areas, agro-industrialization and the use of natural resources for economic and social maintenance are among the main elements of rupture and cultural re-signification. The cultural dimension of rural architecture ends up getting lost in the rubble caused by the current territorial ordering process, based on the idea that the continuous and excessive growth of cities is synonymous with economic development.

REFERENCES

- ARANTES, Antônio A. **Patrimônio Imaterial e Referências Culturais**. Tempo Brasileiro/Patrimônio Imaterial, vol. 147, (129-139), Rio de Janeiro, 2001.
- ARCURI, Marcia; LAIA, Paulo Otávio; SUÑER, Rodrigo. Territórios e Patrimônios na lama das negociações: desafios para a museologia comunitária na Barragem de Fundão. **Arquivos do Museu de História Natural e Jardim Botânico da UFMG**, v. 24, n. 1-2, 2015.
- BRASIL, **Constituição Federal 1988**. Disponível em: <https://www.jusbrasil.com.br/topicos/10648364/artigo-215-da-constituicao-federal-de-1988> Acesso em: 03 mai. 2023.
- BRASIL, **Decreto-Lei nº 25**, de 30 de novembro de 1937. Organiza a proteção do patrimônio histórico e artístico nacional. Disponível em: http://www.planalto.gov.br/ccivil_03/decreto-lei/del0025.htm. Acesso em: 22 abr. 2023.
- CABRAL, Clara B. **Patrimônio Cultural Imaterial: Convenção da UNESCO e seus Contextos**. Lisboa: Portugal, 2011.
- CÔRTEZ, Aline Soares; VALE, Marília Maria Brasileiro Teixeira. As inflexões entre a conservação do patrimônio cultural e a sustentabilidade. **Revista Projetar-Projeto e Percepção do Ambiente**, v. 6, n. 2, p. 33-42, 2021.
- DIEGUES, Antônio Carlos. **Os saberes tradicionais e a biodiversidade no Brasil**. NUPAUB-USP, São Paulo, 2000.
- FERRÃO, André Munhoz de Argollo et al. Arquitetura rural e o espaço não-urbano. **Labor & Engenho**, 2007. Disponível em <http://periodicos.sbu.unicamp.br/ojs/index.php/labore/article/view/233> Acesso em: 24 abr. 2023.
- FILHO, Ener Vaneski. A construção da Usina de Itaipu e o surgimento de atores contrahegemônicos. **Revista Paradigma**, Ribeirão Preto-SP, a. XVII, n. 21, p. 205-217, jan./dez. 2012.
- FROELICH, José Marcos et al. Multifuncionalidade do espaço rural na região central do Rio Grande do Sul: análise exploratória. In: congresso da SOBER. 2004. p. 1-13.
- HEINZMANN, Clara. **Migração Ambiental: expropriação territorial pela construção da Usina Hidrelétrica do Baixo Iguaçu – Paraná**. 2022. 158 p. Tese (Doutorado em Desenvolvimento Rural Sustentável). Centro de Ciências Agrárias, Universidade Estadual do Oeste do Paraná, Marechal Cândido Rondon, 2022.
- IPHAN, Instituto do Patrimônio Histórico e Artístico Nacional. Patrimônio mundial – PR. Disponível em: <http://portal.iphan.gov.br/pr/pagina/detalhes/655>. Acesso em: 06 abr. 2023.
- LEAL, Claudia Feierabend Baeta et al. A preservação do patrimônio cultural no contexto do licenciamento ambiental: possibilidades sociais e produção de (des) conhecimento sobre ambiente, cultura e patrimônio. **Revista CPC**, n. 21, p. 8-35, 2016.
- MARTINS, Sandra Cristina Fernandes; ROSSIGNOLO, João Adriano. Fichas de inventário: SICG (Sistema Integrado de Conhecimento e Gestão) do IPHAN – Estudo de caso em patrimônio rural. *digitAR-Revista Digital de Arqueologia, Arquitetura e Artes*, n. 1, 2013.
- MERA, Claudia Maria Prudêncio de; SOARES, Denisa; SPECHT, Suzimary; BLUME, Roni. Da serra/roça para o território campo/lavoura: transformações socioeconômicas e culturais de reassentados rurais atingidos por barragens. **Revista NERA**, ano 21, n. 41, p. 62-84, jan.- mar. 2018.
- MIRANDA, Marcos Paulo de Souza. Lei do Tombamento completa 80 anos, mas continua atual. **Consultor Jurídico**. 09 de dezembro de 2017. Disponível em: <https://www.conjur.com.br/2017-dez-09/ambiente-juridico-lei-tombamento-completa-80-anos-continua-atual> Acesso em: 20 abr. 2023.
- PANIS, Marcelo. O patrimônio cultural e as novas territorialidades turísticas em comunidade rurais: uma realidade emergente no distrito de Rincão da Cruz – Município de Pelotas/RS. **Raega - O Espaço Geográfico em Análise**, v. 17, 2009.
- RAFFESTIN, Claude. **Por uma geografia do poder**. Tradução Maria Cecília França. São Paulo: Ática, 1993.
- SACHS, Ignacy. **Caminhos para o desenvolvimento sustentável**. Rio de Janeiro: Garamond, 2002.

SAQUET, Marcos Aurelio; BRISKIEVICZ, Michele. Territorialidade e identidade: um patrimônio no desenvolvimento territorial. **Caderno Prudentino de Geografia**, nº31, vol.1, 2009.

SAQUET, Marcos Aurelio; GALVÃO, Ana Rúbia Gagliotto. A valorização territorial e multidimensional do patrimônio de Francisco Beltrão (PR). **CAMPO-TERRITÓRIO: revista de geografia agrária**, v.4, n.8, p.98-120, ago. 2009.

SANTOS, Milton. **A Natureza do Espaço: Técnica e Tempo, Razão e Emoção**. 4. ed. 2. reimpr. São Paulo: Editora da Universidade de São Paulo, 2006.

SILVA, Regina Helena Alves da. Arquiteturas do Espaço Público. **Anais do XXVI Simpósio Nacional de História – ANPUH**. São Paulo, julho 2011. Disponível em: <http://www.snh2011.anpuh.org/site/anaiscomplementares> Acesso em: 10 abr. 2023.

UNESCO, Organização das Nações Unidas para a Educação, a Ciência e a Cultura. **Patrimônio Cultural no Brasil**. Disponível em: <http://www.unesco.org/new/pt/brasil/culture/world-heritage/cultural-heritage/>. Acesso em: 10 abr. 2023.

VERDAN, Taun Lima. Ponderações ao Princípio da Informação na Salvaguarda ao Patrimônio Cultural. **Conteúdo Jurídico**. 28 de fevereiro, 2014. Disponível em: <https://www.conteudojuridico.com.br/consulta/artigos/38511/ponderacoes-ao-principio-da-informacao-na-salvaguarda-ao-patrimonio-cultural> Acesso em: 20 mai. 2023.