

**THE DEPARTMENT OF HISTORICAL HERITAGE OF SÃO PAULO UNDER  
LUIZA ERUNDINA'S ADMINISTRATION: CONCEPTUAL ISSUES**

***O DEPARTAMENTO DO PATRIMÔNIO HISTÓRICO DE SÃO PAULO NA  
ADMINISTRAÇÃO DE LUIZA ERUNDINA: QUESTÕES CONCEITUAIS<sup>1</sup>***

***EL DEPARTAMENTO DE PATRIMONIO HISTÓRICO DE SÃO PAULO BAJO LA  
ADMINISTRACIÓN DE LUIZA ERUNDINA: CUESTIONES CONCEPTUALES***

Sergio Ricardo RETROZ<sup>2</sup>

**ABSTRACT:** The Department of Historical Heritage (DPH), an agency in the city of São Paulo linked to the Municipal Department of Culture (SMC), developed its heritage preservation activity partially linked to the concept of urban environmental heritage. During the municipal administration of Luiza Erundina, the SMC, entrusted to Marilena Chauí, started to work with the concept of cultural citizenship. The DPH, in those years under the direction of Déa Ribeiro Fenelon, began to reconcile the concept of urban environmental heritage with that of cultural citizenship, which provided a fertile field of work and conceptual development of the heritage.

**KEYWORDS:** Heritage. Cultural public policies. Memory. Citizenship.

**RESUMO:** *O Departamento do Patrimônio Histórico (DPH), órgão do município de São Paulo ligado à Secretaria Municipal de Cultura (SMC), desenvolveu sua atividade de preservação patrimonial parcialmente ligada ao conceito de patrimônio ambiental urbano. Durante a administração municipal de Luiza Erundina, a SMC, confiada à Marilena Chauí, passou a trabalhar com o conceito de cidadania cultural. O DPH, naqueles anos sob a direção de Déa Ribeiro Fenelon, passou a conciliar o conceito de patrimônio ambiental urbano com aquele de cidadania cultural, o que proporcionou um campo fértil de trabalho e de desenvolvimento conceitual do patrimônio.*

**PALAVRAS-CHAVE:** *Patrimônio. Políticas públicas culturais. Memória. Cidadania.*

**RESUMEN:** *El Departamento de Patrimonio Histórico (DPH), organismo de la ciudad de São Paulo vinculado a la Secretaría Municipal de Cultura (SMC), desarrolló su actividad de preservación del patrimonio parcialmente vinculada al concepto de patrimonio ambiental urbano. Durante la administración municipal de Luiza Erundina, el SMC, encomendado a Marilena Chauí, comenzó a trabajar con el concepto de ciudadanía cultural. El DPH, en esos años bajo la dirección de Déa Ribeiro Fenelon, comenzó a conciliar el concepto de*

<sup>1</sup> This article is a partial result of a doctoral research, funded by CAPES.

<sup>2</sup> University of São Paulo (USP), São Paulo – SP – Brazil. Graduated in History (USP), Master's in History (FGV) and PhD in Museology (UNIRIO/MAST). ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2933-0260>. E-mail: [sretroz@yahoo.com.br](mailto:sretroz@yahoo.com.br)

*patrimônio ambiental urbano com o de cidadania cultural, o que proporcionou um campo fértil de trabalho e desenvolvimento conceitual do patrimônio.*

**PALABRAS CLAVE:** *Patrimônio. Políticas públicas culturais. Memória. Cidadania.*

## **Introduction**

With these pages I seek to show the meeting of two concepts in the work activities of a heritage body. On the one hand, the concept of urban environmental heritage, forged by intellectuals such as Ulpiano Menezes de Bezerra and Eduardo Yázigi in urban planning and heritage bodies in the city and state of São Paulo. On the other hand, the concept of cultural citizenship, thought and put into practice by Marilena Chauí<sup>3</sup> when she was in charge of the Municipal Department of Culture (SMC). The venue for this meeting was the Department of Historical Heritage (DPH) of the City of São Paulo, under the direction of historian Déa Ribeiro Fenelon. And the time when this happened was that of the municipal administration of Mayor Luiza Erundina, between 1989 and 1992.

The concept of cultural citizenship, implemented at the SMC, reached its subordinate body, the DPH, whose work had already been guided by the concept of urban environmental heritage. In our understanding, the meeting of these concepts in the DPH provided a fertility of ideas around the heritage and the repositioning of the body's technicians in the face of the work they performed.

## **Urban Environmental Heritage**

Throughout the 1970s and 1980s, it was conventional to speak of cultural heritage, instead of architectural heritage and historical heritage, expanding the values related to goods. The patrimonial value of a given asset was no longer validated only by its artistic and architectural quality or by its relationship with historical events and political characters, but also the anthropological and social dimension. Heritage migrated from a meaning linked to the discourse of the nation, to a meaning linked to different locations and social groups, consolidated migration, in the Brazilian case, in the Federative Constitution of 1988. Heritage became associated with issues of memory and the environment, considered important to the

---

<sup>3</sup> Professor of Modern Philosophy at USP since 1986. Her research on the history of philosophy focuses on topics such as democracy, politics, rights, citizenship and class struggles. Source: Curriculum Plataforma Lattes do CNPq. Available: <http://lattes.cnpq.br/1116101797671415>. Access: 25 June 2021.

quality of life in cities. It began to be understood as a social fact intertwined with urban dynamics and, therefore, its preservation should be considered in urban planning.

According to Juliana Prata (2009), the concept of heritage went through three phases. The first, named by the author as monumentalist, is marked by the constitution of the icons of the nation and the properties preserved in isolation, due to their exceptional value. The second, called the historicist center, in vogue in the period after World War II, is when European nations mobilized to reconstitute their historic centers. Finally, the phase of the contemporary city, in vogue from the 1970s onwards:

There is an understanding that the view of the monument, as an isolated building, even considering its “surroundings” or neighborhood, no longer accounts for the urban dynamics in the 1970s – metropolises and industrialization. And it is not enough to treat the urban complex as a great monument. Other elements come into play, such as social mobilization against the destruction of certain goods, the social demand for the issue of memory, the environmental issue, the quality of life and the participation of civil society in political decision-making processes (PRATA, 2009, p. 20, our translation).

The concept of urban environmental heritage, forged in the 1970s and 1980s by São Paulo intellectuals in public agencies of the State, merges these new understandings of heritage and points to a preservation practice aligned with international discussions. The new concept is based on the recognition of heritage as a material reference for the reproduction of memory, as well as its value in preserving the environment and guaranteeing quality of life. In this way, the new concept goes beyond the traditional concepts of exceptionality and the valuation of isolated assets of remarkable value, starting to understand the heritage as a whole and in preservation actions by areas of interest.

A milestone in this conceptual development of heritage was the holding, in 1974, of the Course on Restoration and Conservation of Monuments and Historic Sites, promoted by partners IPHAN, CONDEPHAAT and USP (ANDRADE, 2012). The course had great names of intellectuals and heritage preservation agencies in Brazil, in addition to the participation of Hugues de Varine, at the time secretary of the International Council of Museums (ICOM). Varine's (2013) contribution was related to his conception that heritage was composed of three elements: environmental heritage, created by nature and by human intervention; the intangible heritage, constituted by knowledge, beliefs and customs; and cultural goods, composed of objects, artifacts and constructions forged by man or nature. Varine, inspired by the thought of Paulo Freire, admits the existence of an educational aspect of heritage and places society as a primordial subject that has a lot to say to the managers of cultural

institutions. An advanced idea, perhaps a very advanced one, for a country that was still ruled by a military dictatorship that kept a check on society's participation in government decisions.

Fundamental in the dissemination of these ideas expressed by Varine is the book by Carlos A. C. Lemos, entitled *O que é patrimônio histórico* (What is historical heritage), whose first edition dates from 1981. Lemos builds an idea of heritage configured in the links between environment, knowledge and artifact, in a reformulation of the Varine's tripod, as said, composed of environmental, intangible and cultural assets. Lemos is concerned with the preservation of popular uses and customs and with the overcoming of a heritage built by the “ruling class”. He is attentive to the social value of cultural assets and, in this, he affirms his understanding of urban environmental heritage:

The urban nucleus is a cultural asset composed of a thousand and one artifacts related to each other, ranging from those for individual use, passing through others of family utility, starting with housing, to others of collective interest. Thus, we see that an urban conglomerate is summarized in a place where infinite activities are carried out concurrently, carried out through infinite artifacts arranged in space according to their functions or attributions, and to the understanding of what “urban environmental heritage” is only the goods or things, movable or immovable, are of interest, which characterize or allow the good performance of the gregariousness existing there (LEMOS, 2000, p. 47, our translation).

Despite the conceptual advance of urban environmental heritage, according to Andréa Tourinho and Marly Rodrigues (2016) this practice has so far been unable to significantly influence the procedures and methodology of preservation. These continued to prioritize an action aimed at reading the city, preserving the urban environment as an image, to the detriment of a preservation that considers heritage as a social fact, created by collectivities, linked to sociocultural issues, made in the relations between the material and the symbolic. The concept, although innovative according to these authors, weakened over time and, in the 1990s, practically disappeared from heritage discourses, which preferred to talk about intangible heritage and cultural landscape. However, the authors join Ulpiano Bezerra de Meneses – an intellectual who worked at CONDEPHAAT, the state council for the decisions of tipping, and contributed to the conceptualization of urban environmental heritage, mainly in its understanding as a social fact – in the defense of resuming this heritage concept, considering in preservation practices the “social yearnings for the recognition of diverse identities” (TOURINHO; RODRIGUES, 2016, p. 89, our translation).

The concept of urban environmental heritage, however, penetrated specific conservation initiatives, carried out by public bodies in the city of São Paulo, including the

work of the DPH. The application of the concept in preservation practices took place at the initiative of some technicians, working in municipal bodies, concerned with including the preservation of heritage in the range of concerns of urban planning, despite the difficulty of fully developing such attempts in an environment marked by authoritarianism and institutional inflexibility.

The first heritage protection initiatives in the city of São Paulo took place in the 1970s, by the General Planning Coordinator (COGEP)<sup>4</sup>, created in 1972 with the aim of thinking about the reurbanization of the city with a view to implementing the subway (PRATA, 2009). Supported by the Basic Urban Plan of the Municipality of São Paulo (PUB), of 1968, which foresaw the creation of the so-called special zones, the Z8, COGEP began to elect zones that, in the opinion of the technicians, required further analysis to understand their function in the city (ANDRADE, 2012). The COGEP classified the Bela Vista, Luz and Brás neighborhoods as special zones, as they are considered areas in the process of deterioration, demanding further studies to define their performance in the development of the city, in view of the historical value of certain buildings. The modernization of the city, with the implementation of the subway, the opening of expressways and the construction of viaducts, was seen as a solution for the recovery of the so-called degraded areas. However, in the 1960s and 1970s, given the international context, cities could no longer be modernized without considering the historic centers and the appreciation of old neighborhoods, in a notion of heritage, according to Andrade (2012, p. 63), still in “the process of understanding, digestion and maturation”.

COGEP's methodology of inventorying the city's cultural assets leads to the DPH, not least because the bodies came to work together on what would be the first inventory produced by the DPH, carried out in the second year of its creation. This is the Inventory of the Urban Environmental Heritage of the East Metro Zone, prepared between 1977 and 1978, designed and coordinated by COGEP, with the DPH responsible for the preservation, conservation and revitalization studies (ANDRADE, 2012). The inventory aimed to select the cultural assets that should be preserved in the construction works of the subway on the Brás-Bresser axis. In the selection criteria, priority was given to the construction of factories and workers' villages in the late 19th and early 20th centuries, a period in which the city's first industrialization took place in that region. According to Andrade, architectural, formal or aesthetic styles were at no

---

<sup>4</sup> Like COGEP at the municipal level, the State Secretariat for Economy and Planning (SEP) sought to implement the concept of urban environmental heritage in planning under the responsibility of the state government. At the federal level, we cannot forget the Integrated Program for the Reconstruction of Historic Cities (PCH), created in 1973, and the National Cultural Reference Center (CNRC), from 1975, both connected with this conceptual expansion of heritage and which merged in 1979 into IPHAN.

time criteria for the selection of cultural assets, which was always guided by the representativeness of these assets for local history, a priority in harmony with the concept of urban environmental heritage, as the author states:

The representative character of the local history, taken as the main argument, approach and selection criteria, as well as the dedication to the study of the urban set, the recognition of an environment to be preserved as a testimony of history [used in the Brás-Bresser axis], are elements that point us to the concept of “urban environmental heritage” in the process of affirmation in this period (ANDRADE, 2012, p. 134, our translation).

This experience forged in the DPH a methodology for an inventory of the city, independently tested by the agency in the neighborhood of Liberdade, in 1978, work that would later serve as a model for the General Inventory of Environmental, Cultural and Urban Heritage of São Paulo (IGEPAC), started in 1983 and developed by the agency to date. In other words, we can verify in a central activity of the DPH, the IGEPAC-SP, developed by the then Division of Preservation, the affiliation to the concept of urban environmental heritage.

### **Cultural Citizenship**

The DPH, as a heritage body subordinated to the Municipal Department of Culture (SMC), was linked to cultural policies implemented by municipal management. During Luiza Erundina's administration, between 1989 and 1992, the SMC was entrusted to Marilena Chauí, who was already having discussions about cultural policies within the Workers' Party (PT). Chauí conceived the concept of cultural citizenship for SMC, based on the expansion of rights. The new concept is based on the right to participate in the conduct of public policies, possible through participatory management. The right of access to the city's cultural assets, such as theaters, cinemas, libraries and museums. In the right to enjoy the means of production of culture, in order to allow the most diverse groups of society to find the material means for the reproduction of their culture. In the right of recognition of each citizen and each collectivity as subjects capable of producing culture, overcoming an idea of culture normally linked to erudition.

If, on the one hand, cultural citizenship condenses a series of cultural policy guidelines, it is also intended to be a new political culture. In other words, it aims to engender in society a typically citizen political culture, of political participation and openness to the constant creation of new rights, based on demands arising from society itself. In this sense,



cultural citizenship is thought of as a set of citizenship values, based on participation and on the legitimacy of the struggle for rights.

Chauí also understood memory as a right of citizens and different social groups and, in this aspect, located memory in the field of socio-political-cultural disputes. Regarding the intersection between memory and heritage, Chauí (1994 (1979), p. 19) denounces the constant destruction of the “material supports of memory”, which ends up compromising spatial references, preventing the citizen from retracing the path of its trajectory. The author understands the “material supports of memory” not only as the landscape references of the city and objects belonging to social groups, but also as the conditions of material existence, since the author is based on a Marxist reading of society. This concept of “material supports of memory”, therefore, merges the material and immaterial dimension of heritage. This becomes even clearer when Chauí (2006, p. 114) explains that “memory supports” are monuments, documents, collections and objects as forms of “objectified expression of collective memory”. These memory supports, in Chauí's view based on Krisztoff Pomian's reading, would be admitted as historical and cultural heritage in the category of semiophores, being these things whose values are not measured by their materiality, but by their symbolic force, by the ability to " establish a mediation between the visible and the invisible, the sacred and the profane, the present and the past, the living and the dead” (CHAUÍ, 2006, p. 117, our translation), and, for this reason, intended for exhibition and contemplation. Therefore, Chauí attaches importance to guaranteeing social conditions for the transmission of memory, as well as the preservation of physical references in the city, in order to allow the reactivation of the memory of individuals and social groups.

These ideas by Chauí are in harmony with the ideas of Déa Ribeiro Fenelon, who assumes the direction of the DPH and the presidency of CONPRESP, the municipal preservation agency. Fenelon brings the guidelines and values of cultural citizenship to the municipal heritage bodies. It points to the overcoming of a technical discourse of heritage dissociated from its political context, and, in this sense, recognizes the various social forces that guided the preservationist practices carried out until then. In contrast, Fenelon aims to give a collective meaning to heritage, with a view to cultural citizenship, and does so by correlating citizenship to the bases of the concept of urban environmental heritage, when referring to memory, quality of life and the environment:

When we propose the debate and reflection on historical heritage policies, we want to treat it not only in the restricted scope of intervention techniques or of identification and preservation criteria and their operational concepts.

In addition to these aspects, it is necessary to politicize the theme, recognizing the historical conditions in which many of its premises were forged - and articulating them with the struggles for quality of life, for the preservation of the environment, for the rights to plurality and, above all, for the right to cultural citizenship. With this we hope to resume a sense of historical heritage that allows us to understand it as a social and cultural practice of several and multiple agents (FENELON, 1992, p. 31, our translation).

These ideas are in tune with the thinking of DPH technicians and the group of academic intellectuals who started working at the agency. Cássia Magaldi<sup>5</sup>, for example, builds her defense for the preservation of heritage on the pillar of cultural citizenship. The author understands memory as a right of the most diverse social groups and subscribes to the preservation of heritage in the “social function of property” and in the field of social disputes, as is explicit in the text:

And, among the many demands of the multiple agents that produce the city, the one that concerns the preservation of memory is as important as any other: if it is not directly linked to “interests”, it affects the cultural and social identity of the city's inhabitants, on the control of their past in their relations with the present, in their citizenship rights (inseparable from the temporal dimension) that imply the struggle for appropriation and management of urban spaces for all citizens, in the struggle for democracy. If these rights cannot be subordinated to any other, then it is no heresy to claim that it can even override the sacred right of urban land use. Amen (MAGALDI, 1992, p. 24, our translation).

We see this fusion of the concepts of urban environmental heritage and cultural citizenship also in Maria Célia Paoli's<sup>6</sup> thinking. By highlighting the context of conflict and dispute over memory, the author understands that it is the aspects of plural culture that should provoke the notion of heritage as a dimension of a “living past”, in which events and things “deserve to be preserved because they are collectively significant in their diversity” (PAOLI, 1992, p. 25). Preservationist activities, according to the author, referring to architectural heritage, are commonly marked either by an idea of the past as old and outdated, and in this case examples would be preserved from prominently aesthetic categories, or from the past as old and lost, and, in this case, preservation would be guided by nostalgia and fear of loss. In both preservationist senses, one more in search of the exceptional specimen and the other for

<sup>5</sup> Architect specialized in restoration, technician at the DPH since 1983. In 1996, she completed a master's degree in history and in 2001 her doctorate, both titles obtained at PUC/SP. Currently, in addition to her activity at the DPH, she is a professor of Architectural Heritage Protection at Assunção University Center – UNIFAI. Source: Curriculum Plataforma Lattes do CNPq. Available: <http://lattes.cnpq.br/3754466590350089>. Access: 25 June 2021.

<sup>6</sup> Professor at the Department of Sociology at USP since 1988, her research in sociology is focused on topics such as work, citizenship and the city. Source: Curriculum Plataforma Lattes do CNPq. Available: <http://lattes.cnpq.br/6818139016806030>. Access: 25 June 2021.



the totality of preservation, they would fall into the same mistake of ignoring the “inscription of the collective meaning of 'legacy' of the past”, which would point “clearly to a society destitute of citizenship, in its full sense, if by this word we understand the formation, information and multiple participation in the construction of culture, politics, a collective space and time” (PAOLI, 1992, p. 26, our translation).

Paoli proposes, in this sense, that the work of preservation goes through the collective and plural meaning of heritage, in order to contribute to the development of citizenship. This new path would follow a historiographical trend of prioritizing the history of the losers and not that of the winners, which would explain “how much power has disorganized the possession of a sense of collective participation, destroying the possibility of a differentiated public space” (PAOLI, 1992, p. 27, our translation). The author, in defending this new posture in heritage preservation activities, finally incorporates the principles of cultural citizenship:

The recognition of the *right to the past* is, therefore, intrinsically linked to the present meaning of the generalization of *citizenship* by a society that has so far avoided bringing conflict and creativity to the surface as criteria for the awareness of a common past. Recognition that accepts the risks of diversity, of the ambiguity of memories and forgetfulness, and even of the varied deformations of unilateral demands (PAOLI, 1992, p. 27, author's highlights, our translation).

It is possible to perceive, therefore, in the thinking in vogue in the DPH of the period, an idea of patrimony emerged from the concept of urban environmental patrimony, since it is repeatedly mentioned the conciliation between patrimonial preservation and urban planning, the importance of patrimony for memory, for the quality of life in cities, and aim for a preservation that considers the environment as a whole. In this thought, we also see that heritage is understood in the field of social disputes, as well as memory is understood in its relationship with the identity of subjects and social groups in their diversity. Memory and heritage preservation, in this sense, are understood as a right of the most varied social groups, with priority being given to those who are traditionally excluded from this right. In these aspects, heritage focuses on the right of the citizen, it is important in the consolidation of citizenship. Heritage, therefore, is seen from the perspective of cultural citizenship and these ideas become even more explicit when we see the documentation produced by the DPH in the period.

## DPH Documentation

Some documents from the management of the DPH from this period allow us to see how this link between cultural citizenship and urban environmental heritage operates in the projects and works of the agency. The central element in the conception of heritage management is its indissoluble link with memory, understood as a citizen's right in its diversity of subjects and social groups. The work of heritage preservation, precisely because of its link with memory, escapes from being a mere execution of conservation and restoration techniques, being now understood as interference in the material supports of memory and in the symbolic value of things, the core of the field of culture. The management, in its first planning of activities, recognized the importance of the work traditionally operated by the agency, of restoration and recovery of architectural assets, cataloging and inventory of monuments, collections and buildings and construction of criteria for preservation. It understood, however, that these activities were limited to a practice aimed at architectural preservation, dissociated from the social issues inherent to heritage:

Traditionally, in Brazil, a policy in relation to historical heritage is understood as a policy of cataloguing, identifying and preserving the physical conditions of movable or immovable assets considered significant in historical terms, based on criteria that validate the crystallization of a distant past that can be to be exposed in museological terms. In practice, this policy ends up being limited to an architectural conception of restoration and preservation and, in this conception, cultural and symbolic practices and actions are forgotten or put on the sidelines. The activities developed by the D.P.H. in recent years they have not escaped these limits, despite attempts to the contrary by sectors of the Department itself. Thus, one of the first tasks of this administration is to promote the critique of these dominant conceptions of historical heritage, building a broad notion that encompasses individual and collective practices, doings and memories and, at the same time, enabling this discussion not to be restricted to D.P.H. and S.M.C., but that is primarily done through the participation of sectors of society directly involved and the population in general (SÃO PAULO, 1989, p. 3, our translation).

The concern of the DPH started, in that administration, to be the one linked to memory and to cultural practice, a concern that should be the basis of all the technical operations of preservation that the body would carry out, as it becomes clear when the criticism specifically of the work from the DPH Preservation Division is sharpened:

The Preservation Division, although it has expanded its interest in developing programs to value certain historic parts of the city, has limited itself to continuing the restoration and conservation work of Houses-Museum, when there are funds and willingness to apply them. (SÃO PAULO, 1989, p. 5, our translation).

In the DPH planning document for the year 1991, the agency's actions were distributed by themes and priorities according to the SMC guidelines, which shows that the agency sought to align itself with the goals stipulated by the SMC project, which was designed from the concept of cultural citizenship. The theme “Quality of life in the city: living and dying in São Paulo” had as a priority, in the document, the “Preservation of Urban Environmental and Cultural Heritage”, that is, the preservation of heritage is understood as the main action of the body linked to the guarantee of quality of life in the metropolis. Heritage management in the city of São Paulo started to have the clear objective of containing the developmental movement of urban space, driven by real estate speculation, so thinking about heritage together with urban planning, in order to guarantee quality of life for citizens. These concerns with the quality of life in the city and with the conciliation between urban planning and heritage preservation, in a certain way, resume central ideas of the concept of urban environmental heritage and take us back to the first preservation initiatives of the DPH, in the mid-1970s, frustrated by the authoritarian decisions characteristic of the period of military dictatorship.

Other management documents express central points of the concept of urban environmental heritage, such as guaranteeing the quality of life in the city to the detriment of a pure conformation of space to the development of capital. And these concepts are evidenced from the perspective of cultural citizenship, by recognizing social disputes and prioritizing social strata normally excluded from the right to the city. Among these documents, we highlight one entitled “DPH, Memory, Preservation and Landmarking: contributions to an urban policy” (SÃO PAULO, 1991, n/p.), issued between 1991 and 1992. The document is organized into four parts and works as a compendium of other documents produced during the administration. The first part consists of a descriptive text of the contribution of the DPH to the work of preservation, landmarking and urban policy for the city. The second, called “support texts”, comprises the resolution of the “Historical Heritage and Citizenship Congress: the right to memory”, held in August 1991, and a lecture by Riccardo Mariani. The third contains the CONPRESP restructuring bill and the list of listed assets or under analysis, which makes us believe that the document dates from 1991. The fourth, called Annexes, has a document entitled “DPH: Origins, Activities and Assignments”. We would like to stick to the first and last parts of this document, as they historicize the work of the DPH and CONPRESP and point to the project used in the management.

The text starts from the observation that the city had an expansion process “characterized by violence against the majority of its inhabitants” (SÃO PAULO, 1991, n/p,

our translation). In this process, the poorest strata were constantly expelled from the center and pushed to the periphery, and the works carried out favored the need for the circulation of goods and people, being driven by a logic of capital to the detriment of well-being in the city. The management, faced with this situation, according to the document, was faced with a challenge, since its commitment to the working class implied “reversing an ingrained culture of submission to the designs of the developers”. The fundamental resource for facing this challenge, regarding urban planning, was the elaboration of the Master Plan for the city, the only document written by the management in this sector that still encountered obstacles for approval by the City Council, for relativizing the individual right over property against the rights of “citizens as a whole”, in addition to creating “channels for popular participation in decisions” (SÃO PAULO, 1991, n/p, our translation).

The heritage preservation initiative is understood in the document under four aspects. The first refers to the quality of life in the city, understanding the landmarking as a way of legitimizing the heritage, a resource considered central to the preservationist activity, but denounced, in the text itself, for its mistaken uses, for traditionally privileging public policies, the landmarks of the “official history” and the examples of “exceptional value”, generating a “decoration” of the city to the taste of the ruling classes. The document understands that the guarantee of quality of life involves the preservation of “physical testimonies of the multiple and contradictory voices of the past”, connecting, once again, memory, in its diversity, with the quality of life. The text also accuses the degradation of the city center as a result of the conjunction between public indifference and real estate speculation, whose keynote is the destruction of properties and construction of new ones, the opening of roads and the consequent compromise of life in its surroundings.

The second aspect of heritage refers to the so-called sacred right to property, characteristic of a “vulgar notion of modernization”, marked by constant urban renewal, by the “clean and razed territory”. The document states that preservation actions are uncomfortable because they violate private property rights and seek to keep the working class in areas of high real estate value. As an example, the document cites the demolished houses on Avenida Paulista that gave way to parking lots, allowing the capitalist exploitation of the property with little benefit to the community.

The third aspect points to the conciliation between preservation and renovation, a factor considered ideal, since these terms are not in opposition, as is commonly understood. The management exemplifies this point by citing SESC Pompeia and Casa das Rosas, admitting that the solution obtained for the latter is open to discussion. It also mentions the

Matarazzo Mansion, which, at the time, had been listed, a decision reversed in 1994, which allowed the demolition of the property, in 1996, for the construction of Shopping Cidade de São Paulo, which opened only in 2015. As can be seen, the document encounters the difficulty of finding examples of conciliation between preservation and renovation, extolling among the examples a conquest subject to criticism and another later nullified, leaving only SESC Pompeia as a valid example. In any case, the conciliation between preservation and renovation is central to the concept of urban environmental heritage and is understood here in the field of social disputes, central to the concept of cultural citizenship.

The fourth aspect, finally, deals with preservation as a tool of democracy, as it guarantees the material survival of references to the memory of communities, in their diversity. As an example of a successful policy, the document mentions the listing of the Portland Cement Factory and the Triângulo working village, in the Perus neighborhood, for making use of the knowledge of the local population, as well as the way in which this population perceives the space and its buildings, for the selection of assets worthy of heritage preservation.

The last part of the document, entitled “The DPH: Origins, Activities and Attributions”, narrates the entire institutional course of the cultural and heritage area in the municipality, with the function of proposing some questions to think about the restructuring of the current DPH and CONPRESP. From the reading, we infer that the institutional trajectory of the city's heritage policy was guided either by the discourse of "official history" and heritage as necessary for the strengthening of national identity, or by an appreciation of art and erudite culture. In view of this, the restructuring of the body should start from questioning the very concept of historical heritage, and the document gives some indications in this regard:

We believe that it is a question of overcoming the old conception – present here since Mário de Andrade's project – which thinks of historical heritage as “the memory of the king” capable of civilizing that of the common people. In the field of architecture, for example, successive definitions point towards the abandonment of the monumentalist conception and the care with isolated buildings of “exceptional architectural and artistic value”: working with the urban space as *a whole*, having its meanings by the *historical, social* and *environmental* importance that they have for citizens, paying particular attention to the issue of *quality of urban life* and the preservation of the physical signs of *social memory* (SÃO PAULO, 1991, s/p, author's highlights, our translation).

The quoted passage concentrates all aspects of the concept of urban environmental heritage at its confluence with cultural citizenship. It considers the cultural value of the

property and its symbolic construction, its importance to the community and relevance as an element of social memory, and its preservation as a guarantee of quality of life in the city. The concept of historical heritage used here is different from the one that understands heritage as an element of “official history”, it moves away from a purely aesthetic valuation and from a conception that understands heritage preservation only as necessary for a reading of the city and its constructive elements. In the sense adopted by the agency, historical heritage is linked to the memory and quality of life of society. It aims, on the one hand, to guarantee spaces of memory and reproduction of narratives in their diversity, on the other hand, it aims at the quality of life for the population as a whole, giving priority to groups normally supplanted by real estate speculation and by managements of governments that pay little attention to collectivities.

In short, the concept of cultural citizenship, to a certain extent, resumes and enhances the concept of urban environmental heritage, by referring to concerns about quality of life, urban planning and memory, in vogue in this concept of heritage. At the same time, the concept of cultural citizenship advances, by bringing to light its core, the right to memory as constitutive of citizenship, by referring to society as a whole, in order to prioritize narratives overshadowed by official memory. The new concept assumes the social disputes at stake and also seeks to contribute to guaranteeing the well-being of subjects commonly ignored in the urban planning of the city. This meeting between urban environmental heritage and cultural citizenship provided a fertile field of work and thought about heritage, fertility that still has a lot to say for heritage preservation practices, especially if we consider the role of heritage in the consolidation of citizenship and of democracy in our country.

## REFERENCES

ANDRADE, P. R. **O patrimônio da cidade**: arquitetura e ambiente urbano nos inventários de São Paulo da década de 1970. Dissertação (Mestrado em Arquitetura e Urbanismo) – Universidade de São Paulo, São Paulo, 2012.

CHAUÍ, M. **Cidadania cultural**: o direito à cultura, Fundação Perseu Abramo, São Paulo, 2006.

CHAUÍ, M. Os trabalhos da memória (apresentação). *In*: BOSI, E. **Memória e sociedade**: lembranças de velhos. São Paulo: Companhia das Letras, 1994 (1979).

FENELON, D. R. Políticas Culturais e Patrimônio Histórico. *In*: SÃO PAULO (SP). Secretaria Municipal de Cultura. Departamento do Patrimônio Histórico. **O direito à memória**: patrimônio histórico e cidadania. São Paulo: DPH/SMC, 1992.



LEMOS, C. A. C. **O que é patrimônio histórico**. Coleção Primeiros Passos. São Paulo: Brasiliense, 2000.

MAGALDI, C. O público e o privado: propriedade e interesse cultural. *In*: SÃO PAULO (SP). Secretaria Municipal de Cultura. Departamento do Patrimônio Histórico. **O direito à memória: patrimônio histórico e cidadania**. São Paulo: DPH/SMC, 1992.

PAOLI, M. C. Memória, História e Cidadania: o direito ao passado. *In*: SÃO PAULO (SP). Secretaria Municipal de Cultura. Departamento do Patrimônio Histórico. **O direito à memória: patrimônio histórico e cidadania**. São Paulo: DPH/SMC, 1992.

PRATA, J. M. **Patrimônio Cultural e Cidade: práticas de preservação em São Paulo**. Tese (Doutorado em Arquitetura e Urbanismo) – Universidade de São Paulo, São Paulo, 2009.

SÃO PAULO (SP). Secretaria Municipal de Cultura. Departamento do Patrimônio Histórico. **Programa de Ação Cultural do Departamento do Patrimônio Histórico para a Gestão 1989-1992: objetivos e projetos prioritários**. São Paulo: DPH, 15 fev. 1989. Acervo: Museu da Cidade de São Paulo.

SÃO PAULO (SP). Secretaria Municipal de Cultura. **DPH: Memória, Preservação e Tombamento: contribuições para uma política urbana**. São Paulo, ca. 1991. Acervo: CEDEM/UNESP, Fundo CEDESP.

TOURINHO, A. O.; RODRIGUES, M. Patrimônio ambiental urbano: uma retomada. **Revista CPC**, São Paulo, n. 22, p. 70-91, jul./dez. 2016.

VARINE, H. **As raízes do futuro: o patrimônio a serviço do desenvolvimento local**. Trad. Maria de Lourdes Parreiras Horta. Porto Alegre: Medianiz, 2013.

### How to reference this article

RETROZ, S. R. O The department of historical heritage of São Paulo under Luiza Erundina's administration: conceptual issues. **Rev. Sem Aspas**, Araraquara, v. 10, n. 00, e021021, Jan./Dec. 2021. e-ISSN: 2358-4238. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.29373/sas.v10i00.15872>

**Submitted:** 20/09/2021

**Required revisions:** 18/10/2021

**Approved:** 22/11/2021

**Published:** 29/12/2021