

Participatory archaeology and community empowerment in Brazil

Arqueología participativa y empoderamiento comunitario en Brasil

Pedro Paulo A. FUNARI

Department of History
Campinas State University, Brazil
ppfunari@uol.com.br

Renata S. GARRAFFONI

Department of History
Parana Federal University, Brazil
resenna93@gmail.com

Recibido: 15-08-2016

Aceptado: 15-10-2016

ABSTRACT

Can material culture change people's perception and empower communities? This question, which has been at the center of our reflections over the last few decades, also guides the present text. What follows here is fruit of an intellectual partnership that raises the issue of the importance of collaborative work between universities and communities. The aim of this paper is to show how, through collective research in the historical center of the city of Curitiba, where the Paraná State Museum is located, and using museum material, the principles of public archeology can guide us in the construction of more pluralist narratives on the city's past, raising issues of memory, exclusion and empowerment. Through these reflections, we seek to contribute to a contemporary debate on the importance of material culture in the construction of spaces for dialogue and human rights guarantees.

KEY WORDS: public archaeology, community empowerment, heritage, Brazilian archaeology.

RESUMEN

¿Puede la cultura material cambiar la percepción de la gente y dar poder a las comunidades? Esta cuestión, que ha sido el centro de nuestras reflexiones a lo largo de las últimas décadas, también guía este texto. Lo que se presenta a continuación es el fruto de una colaboración intelectual que plantea el tema de la importancia del trabajo cooperativo entre universidades y comunidades. El objetivo de este trabajo es mostrar cómo, a través de la investigación colectiva en el centro histórico de la ciudad de Curitiba, donde se sitúa el museo del estado de Paraná, y con el uso de material museístico, los principios de la arqueología pública nos pueden guiar en la construcción de narrativas más plurales sobre el pasado de la ciudad, planteando temas de memoria, exclusión y empoderamiento. Mediante estas reflexiones pretendemos contribuir al debate contemporáneo sobre la importancia de la cultura material en la construcción de espacios para el diálogo y la garantía de los derechos humanos.

PALABRAS CLAVE: arqueología pública, empoderamiento de la comunidad, patrimonio, arqueología brasileña.

SUMMARY: 1. Brazilian archaeology: a historical overview. 2. Participatory archaeology and community empowerment. 3. Case study. 4. The Paraná State Museum –a brief summary of its history. 5. PET Honors Program in History. 6. The Brotherhood of the Rosary and Afro-Brazilian Culture. 7. Concluding Remarks.

Introduction

Can material culture change people's perception and empower communities? This question, which has been at the center of our reflections over the last few decades, also guides the present text. What follows here is fruit of an intellectual partnership that raises the issue of the importance of collaborative work between universities and communities. We write from Brazil, a country that is continental in size and in which, despite some progress on the social agenda, inequality and racial prejudice continue to be rampant in many spheres of life. In the following pages, we discuss collaborative work experiences that took place in Curitiba, capital city of the southern Brazilian state of Paraná, and were made possible through an exchange of ideas with the Paulo Duarte Laboratory of Public Archeology, Campinas State University, in the southeastern Brazilian state of São Paulo. We have chosen this partnership between the undergraduate honors program (PET) belonging to the History Department at the Paraná Federal University and the Paraná State Museum (Museu Paranaense) as a case study that took place in 2015. It was made up of activities based on a material culture perspective which, when situated within public debate on the construction of memory, becomes an important tool for reflections on social exclusion and for producing new, empowering narratives on the past. Furthermore, it is perspective that converges and enables dialogue with colleagues at the Laboratory of Public Archeology, promoting a transformative experience of collaborative work.

In order to reconstruct our experience here, we begin with a brief historical overview of the development of archeological thought in Brazil, whose contradictions lay at the root of our quest for less normative approaches to the past. Brazilian history is marked by the passage of authoritarian regimes and this is why, in different moments, the struggle for pluralism and humanism within our discipline has also become a political struggle for inclusion and democracy. We then go on to introduce a more recent scenario of archeological research in the country, the context in which our work in Curitiba was carried out. Lastly, we present an ex-

perience involving UFPR history students, the Paraná State Museum (Museu Paranaense) and the community, in an attempt to problematize the absence of Afro-Brazilian culture within the museum's walls.

Our purpose here is to show how, through collective research in the historical center of the city of Curitiba, where the Parana State Museum is located, and through the use of museum material, the principles of public archeology can guide us in the construction of more pluralist narratives on the city's past, raising issues of memory, exclusion and empowerment. Through these reflections, we seek to contribute to a contemporary debate on the importance of material culture in the construction of spaces for dialogue and human rights guarantees.

1. Brazilian archaeology: a historical overview

Brazilian archaeology is one of the earliest, even though this may seem unreasonable. It is indeed difficult to accept that Brazil was early on concerned with archaeology, but Napoleon played in this respect, as in many others, a special role. Brazil was part of Portugal for several centuries, producing first Brazil wood, and then sugar cane and precious metals and stones in the first three centuries of colonization, starting in 1500. Napoleon's onslaught in Europe menaced old regime monarchies everywhere and the Portuguese crown decided, with the decisive support of the British, to move the capital of the colonial power from Lisbon to Rio de Janeiro in 1808, a unique move from centre to periphery in modern times. All the arrays of power were then established in the former colony, elevated to part of the United Kingdom of Portugal, Brazil and Algarves and siege of power, as the capital and centre of all the other institutions, such as the court, library, museum and much more. Within a few years though the powerful Napoleon was defeated and the Portuguese court faced the challenge of returning to Lisbon. After some hesitation, John the 6th decided to go back to Europe, leaving the heir to the throne in Brazil, Peter, who would in 1822 declare Brazil independent from Portugal. Peter the 1st. established

Brazilian archaeology, bringing to the country the first archaeological artifacts, such as Egyptian mummies and other material (Funari and Funari 2010). Later, Peter decided to return to Portugal and reclaim his throne, as Peter the 4th of Portugal, leaving his son Peter the 2nd as emperor of Brazil, reigning from the 1830s until 1889.

Archaeology flourished during this period. Peter the 2nd was an enlightened absolutist, in the mold of Peter the Great of Russia, his namesake. Inspired by him, he founded his own Petersburg (Petrópolis) and all the arrays of ancient glory, thanks to archaeology. If Moscow was the third Rome, as considered by Peter the Great and the Russians, Rio de Janeiro was to be Rome in the tropics, and archaeology was the tool for this. Peter the 2nd married a Neapolitan princess and got archaeological material from Pompeii, Etruria, and much more. The National Museum in Rio de Janeiro aimed at rivaling with the British and Louvre Museums and thus sidelining former colonial power Lisbon. The Emperor established the Brazilian Academy (*Instituto Histórico e Geográfico Brasileiro*, literally the Brazilian Historical and Geographical Institute) a counterpart to the French Académie (Ferreira 1999; 2010). In this program archaeology played a special role, aiming at establishing both Old World (Classical and Egyptian archaeology) and New World roots (prehistoric archaeology). For several decades, archaeology was at the centre of the Brazilian imperial ideology and this explains its early development. The demise of the monarchy led to a steep decline of archaeology during the early oligarchic republic (1889-1930). The imperial thrust was followed by a deep *horror indigenae*, or fear of native roots, pushing archaeology to a most humble endeavor pursuit. In the 1930s the strong influx of nationalism gave a new impetus to history and heritage: the colonial ideal should serve to build the nation. The colonial period was chosen as the one defining Brazilian society, particularly during the fascist New State dictatorship period (1937-1945), but archaeology as a scholarly endeavor started in this period as a reaction against this move (Funari 1999).

Paulo Duarte (b. 1899, d. 1984) was a key figure in this move (Funari and Silva 2007). Duar-

te was a democratic political activist during the later years of the oligarchic republic and contributed to the founding of the first Brazilian university, the University of São Paulo (1934), modeled on a humanist approach to scholarship. Among the scholars in this academic endeavor, the young Claude Lévi-Strauss (b. 1908, d.2009) played a vital role, as did Jean Gagé (b. 1902, d. 1986) and Fernand Braudel (b. 1902, d.1985), all of them later to become leading French intellectuals. Democrat Duarte did not stand through dictatorial rule (1937-1945) and preferred exile. During this period, his humanist ideals led him to American and French anthropology and to the struggle for human rights, particularly concerning native peoples. *Musée de l'Homme* served as the model for considering indigenous peoples as equally important as any other humans. Upon returning to Brazil, Duarte spearheaded a movement for Indian rights and as a consequence of prehistoric archaeology, during the liberal period between 1945 and 1964. He mobilized ordinary people around popular science courses on prehistory, archaeology and the American man, as it was then called (but man in Portuguese means, as in French *homme*, a human being). He was able to set up a Prehistory Commission and then a Prehistory Institute, which he was able to link with the University of São Paulo, a very important move, so that archaeology could for the first time become a scholarly endeavor in Brazil. Due to his friendship with Paul Rivet (b. 1876, d. 1958), Duarte was able to lure for the first time professional archaeologists to Brazil, Joseph (died 1977) and Annette Laming-Emperaire (b. 1917, d.1977), disciples of Rivet and leading pre-historians who studied rock art as evidence of human culture, as opposed to the traditional high and low art (Poloni 2008). This was part of the humanist move stemming from Lévi-Strauss, Marcel Mauss and André Leroi-Gourhan, all of them stressing, in different ways, how humans are all capable of representing the world through symbols. Again, prehistory was not only a subject worth pursuing for intellectual reason, but also as statement on humanity itself: we are all culture bearers. It is not coincidental, that rock art played a special role in this, for drawing in caves and inscriptions on rocks reveal the

most human capacity of communication. All humans master language.

Duarte and his humanist archaeology flourished for a while. Thanks to his efforts and to allies engaged in similar pursuits, congress approved the first and only law protecting archaeological remains, in 1961⁴. However, the country would suffer under military rule for long twenty-one years (1964-1985) and humanism, prehistory and archaeology would direly be affected. The country faced a wave of persecution, exile, killings, missing people (Funari 1994a). Former liberal presidents were persecuted (two of them died almost simultaneously Juscelino Kubitschek the 22nd August 1976 and João Goulart the 6th December 1976), three of the most recent presidents were persecuted during the period (Fernando Henrique Cardoso went into exile; Lula was harassed; Dilma Rousseff was put into jail and tortured). Duarte and the Pre-History Institute he founded were also victims: Duarte was expelled from the University in 1969 and the Institute was assigned to an ally of the authorities.

Soon after the military coup (the first of April, 1964), a National Archaeological Program (Pronapa) was set up in Washington, DC, in close coordination with the new Brazilian military authorities and under the leadership of the Smithsonian Institution, under Clifford Evans and Betty Meggers. Pronapa set up a surveying program active all over the country, particularly concerned with strategic areas, contributing to the effort of controlling the territory in the context of the Cold War. The empirical and theoretical tenets were most anti-humanist, promoting the concept that natives were lazy and the country dully poor, due to natural conditions (Noelli and Ferreira 2007). The first five years (1965-1970) were followed by a second period in the Amazon basin (Pronapaba), where there were guerilla fighters against the dictatorship. During the long dictatorial rule, a network of archaeologists brought up in those dire circumstances shaped the field, hindering freedom and humanism.

The struggle against the dictatorship gathered pace in the 1970s and in 1979 an amnesty conceded by the military enabled several exiles to return, political parties were soon legalized and direct elections for state officials in 1982

enabled a wider range of political and scholarly activities. The end of military rule in March 1985 thus marked a new phase for the country and for archaeology. The discipline had an odd position within academia. During the last few years of dictatorship, the humanities and social sciences played an increasing role in developing critical thinking and independent-minded scholarship. Sociologist Fernando Henrique Cardoso, upon returning from exile, contributed with several others –economists, anthropologists, political scientists, and philosophers– to the development of independent and well-informed scholarship. Archaeology however was affected by two factors: the need for funding and for permission by state offices to carry out fieldwork. This meant that funding was channeled to fieldwork concerned with empirical and government-friendly approaches and subjects. Permission for fieldwork was also biased. It is interesting to note that anthropology faced similar constraints, considering that both disciplines dealt with natives (dead or alive) and with areas with guerrilla fighters, but anthropologists never shunned from confronting power and indeed were at the forefront of the democratic movement inside and outside academia (Funari 1994b).

Duarte, however, was expelled from the university but he established a strong intellectual position in favor of humanism, the respect for human rights, and a discipline in close relationship with anthropological interpretation of material culture. The influx of French archaeology was thus particularly relevant for both theoretical and practical reasons. In terms of interpretive influence, the anthropological and semiotic approaches enabled the flowering of interpretive frameworks emphasizing native ingenuity, in clear opposition to the official line of Pronapa that Indians were backward inhabitants of a stagnant rain forest environment. Furthermore, field methods introduced by the French included attention to natural archaeological layers (in opposition to artificial ones used by Pronapians) and to elaborate methods of recording rock art (in opposition to the lack of attention to this evidence by Pronapians, who were not at ease with symbols at all). Then again, in terms of practical issues, the French had a democratic context back home and fos-

tered the collaboration of Brazilian scholars with a wider intellectual setting and last but not least providing much needed funding. This explains the early innovative work of Niède Guidon, a former pupil of Duarte, who was exiled in Paris, got in touch with a plethora of intellectuals and was able to return to Brazil in the 1970s and set up a pioneering Museum of the American Human in the most remote and poor area of the country: this was a scholarly and political move at the same time. Others were also exploring the opportunities opened by the demise of authoritarian rule, as the case of maroon archaeology developed early on by Carlos Magno Guimarães in the early 1980s in Minas Gerais or the study of Jesuit Missions in Rio Grande do Sul by Arno Álvarez Kern in the same period. French humanist archaeology was also important in the development of classical archaeology in Brazil, thanks not least to Haiganuch Sarian, Brazilian member of the French School at Athens, who introduced a plethora of French-speaking leading archaeologists and scholars as lecturers contributing to bringing up a new generation with critical thought, again from the 1980s. A few names reveal a lot about the importance of those influences, such as Jean Bottero, Elena Cassin, Renée Ginouvès, and Tony Hackens.

The restoration of civilian rule (1985), the new constitution (1988) and the devolution of powers to states and municipalities led to new developments in academia in general, with strong effects in archaeology. During the dark years of discretionary rule, consultation with the people was not in the agenda, but one of the first symbolic acts of the new civilian government was to declare the archaeological remains of Palmares, the large 17th c. maroon, national heritage. This was a clear hint of the new compromises of democratic rule with society and particularly with those left out of official history, particularly those exploited, such as Africans, Indians, but also other persecuted people, such as witches, Jews and Muslims, all members of the famous 17th polity. The new democratic constitution established a series of general principles affecting environmental and heritage protection and thus concerning archaeology in new and revolutionary ways (Alfonso 2009; Funari 2002; Funari 2004; Ta-

manini and Peixer 2011). During military rule, dams, roads, highways, nuclear stations, and everything else were built with no injunction protecting the environment or heritage. Freedom led also to the passing of an increasing array of legal requirements for any public or private building intervention and this resulted in a huge increase in the number of archaeological surveys, and tests and digs mandated by law. In the last fifteen years or so, field archaeology has multiplied as never before and several private cultural research management (CRM) firms sprouted in the country. This means that archaeology is now a practice reaching all the 27 states and the Federal District of the Union, a most popular endeavor, as attested by its presence in a number of publications available in newsstands all over the country (Caldarelli and Santos 2000; De Blasis and Robrahn-González 2003; Schaan and Bezerra 2009).

The second revolution resulting from freedom has been in scholarly archaeology. Higher education was very late in Brazil, in relation not only to Europe, but even considering Spanish colonies: the first Universities in the Spanish America were founded in the 16th c., while the first two Law schools in Brazil were set up as late as the 1827, a few years after independence (1822). Strange as it may be, even when Rio de Janeiro was capital of the Portuguese Empire (1808-1821), no higher education plan was set up, for the Portuguese court was from the start keen to return to Portugal as soon as the menace from Napoleon was over (1815), even if it stayed in Rio several more years deciding what to do. The Brazilian monarchy (1822-1889) was grounded on slavery and higher education developed late, with some isolated schools of medicine and engineering. The oligarchic republic (1889-1930) continued this tradition of isolated schools, the first university was founded in 1934, as already mentioned, thanks to the efforts of some intellectuals. Other universities followed, supported by the Union, states, and religious denominations (such as several Pontifical Catholic Universities, and later Protestant ones). Graduate courses were established during military rule, following the American system of MAs and PhDs, so that when civilian rule was reestablished in 1985 scholarship was already gathering strength. Archaeology was

established as a graduate course, first within history or other sciences, such as social sciences. The first graduate course on archaeology as such was established at the University of São Paulo in 1990. Academic archaeology has increased exponentially and several hundred MAs and PhDs have been produced, several of them in close contact with archaeology abroad and well-acquainted with both theoretical and empirical discussion in Europe, the USA, and beyond.

2. Participatory archaeology and community empowerment

Recent developments in Brazilian archaeology in prehistoric, historical, underwater, classical, and beyond may be found in a recent publication (Funari 2014) and some literature on those subjects is included in the references. We will focus on participatory archaeology and community empowerment in the quarter of century. Archaeology has been changed by society, or rather by its engagement with social groups. Environmental legislation introduced gradually since 1985, at national, state and local texts, included archaeology in all building activities. Later it has been added interaction with indigenous, maroon and local community in general. Several activities may be mentioned and we list some of them:

- Maroon archaeology and interaction with black population and activists since the 1980s;
- Indigenous archaeology;
- Archaeology of the subordinate, including backland people (such as *Canudos* community, late 19th cf. Zanettini 1996);
- Public archaeology (*Revista de Arqueologia Pública*, since 2004);
- Gender archaeology;
- Archaeology in school context;
- Archaeology and ethnic communities;
- Archaeology and religious communities.

Unicamp (Campinas State University) has an important role in innovative programs in public archaeology that inspired one held at

Paraná Federal University. At Unicamp a social inclusion program includes the best high students from poor areas of the metropolis in scholarly activities in university laboratories. The Public Archaeology Laboratory has been developing activities with high school students since 2013. Brazilian education is imbalanced, as most of the pupils go to free schooling, while the middle and upper echelons have the opportunity to a much better education in paying private schools. Considering this appalling situation, Campinas State University has been establishing several programs to foster social inclusion, sometimes also with the support of other scholarly agencies, such as the Brazilian Science Foundation (CNPq). One of them aims at including the best pupils in free high schools at Campinas, a city with more than one million inhabitants, so that they can participate in laboratories and research centers at the university (Almeida and Moraes 2016). The Public Archaeology Laboratory has thus established a program for pupils to explore archaeology as a way of understanding the world in its materiality. It has been fostering the critical understanding of archaeology. The Laboratory has included those pupils in another program, sponsored again by the Brazilian Science Foundation, on producing a booklet for children explaining archaeology, its scope, subjects, and goals. This program produced an innovative book for kids, including such subjects as natives, slaves, and people oppressed by dictatorship.

Based on these successful experiences, Paraná Federal University carried out an innovative program, this time with undergraduate students, Parana State Museum and local community, the case study we shall discuss next⁵.

3. Case study

The case study that follows here materialized through a partnership between the PET-History Department honors program, directed at that occasion by one of the authors (Garraffoni)⁶ and the Paraná State Museum (*Museu Paranaense*), an institution run by the Paraná state government. A brief introduction of both of them is helpful here, in order to better understand the context of our considerations. As

mentioned above, we discuss our partnership within the present reflections because it has been completely inspired in the principles of the aforementioned public archeology and expresses quite well how the relationship between two different universities, the Campinas State University and the Paraná Federal University, can promote and develop networks and debates that are important for society as a whole.

4. The Paraná State Museum –a brief summary of its history

The Parana State Museum (Museu Paranaense) was founded in 1876, during the imperial period of Brazilian history, in Curitiba, the capital of a peripheral province situated in the country's southern territories –in fact, the last to be established before the Proclamation of the Republic was made. The region itself was constituted as a place of transit between the southern and southeastern parts of the country, at about 100 kilometers distance from the coast (Carneiro 2015: 07).

According to Carneiro (2015: 07), the province was characterized by low population density and little economic importance, yet, being in a strategic location, its development took impulse from the yerba mate crop and the formation of an elite of yerba mate grower. It was precisely this economic growth at the end of the 19th and beginning of the 20th century that led Curitiba and surrounding areas to constitute a new political leadership in the region; for these purposes, it became necessary to encourage the creation of cultural institutions such as museums, libraries, schools, theaters, and public archives. The University of Paraná dates back to this period, the early 20th century. It became part of the federal system of higher education in 1950, taking on the name “Federal University of Paraná”.

The Parana State Museum was a fruit of this late 19th and early 20th century political project to modernize Curitiba. It was, according to Carneiro (2014: 07), ‘the fruit of the voluntary interests of two intellectuals, the Paraná state judge Agostinho Ermelino de Leão and the medical doctor José Cândido da Silva Muriçi’, originally from the state of Bahia. Initially

named the Curitiba Museum (a proposal from 1874), it was conceived as a museum of natural history and a place to keep and to exhibit objects that were returning from large international and national fairs in which the state of Paraná sought to take part, to mark presence and construct itself as a site of historical memory. According to Carneiro, the first museum inventory reported almost 600 objects which had been donated by the local aristocracy as well as material that scholars and volunteers had collected such as paintings, weapons, artifacts from the diverse range of indigenous peoples of the region and archeological material, medals and coins.

Throughout its existence, the Paraná State Museum changed its location several times, leading to a loss of material and data. Nonetheless, it remains the most important institution for the conservation of historical and archeological material in the state, and is currently located in *Largo da Ordem*, the heart of the city's historical center⁷.

5. PET Honors Program in History

The PET Program (literally, Program for Tutorial Education; in practice, similar to Honors Programs which encourage high achievement among undergraduate students) is a national program under the auspices of the Brazilian Ministry of Education. Its central purpose is to promote interaction between academia and society, encouraging the advancement not only of students but of the three principles which guide Brazilian public universities: Teaching, Research and Extension (the latter understood as community outreach). The Program attempts to provide differentiated educational challenges to the students who take part in it and each group includes some who receive a scholarship and others who take part in the program voluntarily, as well as a member of faculty who serves as the group tutor and supervises all its activities. It is a dynamic program based on constant dialogue between tutor, students and community, a challenge for the formulation of innovative strategies for university education articulated with the critical spirit of students, encouraging the development of citizenship

and sensitivity for their future role as educators and researchers.

The UFPR History Department applied for acceptance to the Ministry of Education PET program in the early 1990s and was successfully admitted, allowing the program to be initiated in 1992. Thus, over its more than two decades of work, the PET UFPR History program has served a large number of students under the supervision of different tutors. Together they have devoted their efforts to developing a plurality of activities meant to contribute to the wider participation of historians within their social and political contexts. The program has organized numerous events, as well as publications and debates on relevant themes and projects involving the extra-academic community⁸. Over the course of the years, the program underwent a series of modifications. It was duly benefitted by the greater infrastructure endowed by the federal government over the last five years, making it possible to develop longer projects. This is the context that enabled our dialogue and work with the Parana State Museum, through a series of projects that we will elaborate upon below.

The partnership began at the end of 2013, through a series of conversations between Renato Carneiro Jr, diretor of the Parana State Museum, and one of the authors, Renata S. Garraffoni, tutor of the PET History Program in that occasion. At the time, the Parana State Museum was putting together a big project for the creation of data banks and online access to the permanent collection; the idea of bringing PET program participants closer to the museum and the type of activities it carried out seemed pertinent to the goals of both potential partners. Students would become acquainted with uncatalogued museum material and help to organize it. Yet student contact with daily work at the institution brought a series of discoveries and perhaps, most importantly, sparked theoretical discussion and reflection on the materiality of the past, choices to be made, working with memory and heritage, that is, it brought diverse and fundamental aspects of public archeology to the forefront. With these concerns the diversity of collections and relevance of material as a challenge, and given the support that was made available on the part of highly profes-

sional team, we chose three themes, guided by students' interests, for deeper research: arms and weapons, clothing and numismatic.

Research was carried out over the course of 2014 and results were very significant: we produced a catalog of Roman coins as well as reflections on classical culture within the Paraná State Museum, and consequently, within the context of the city of Curitiba and the state of Paraná as a whole (Garraffoni, Carlan, Carneiro Jr. 2015). We also aided in the restructuring of the museum's exhibition circuit, such as a new wing in which industrialization is discussed, also bringing the issue of women workers and thus, discussions on gender and labor, into the museum. Ways to store the arms and weapons collections were also updated. All these activities were accompanied by research carried out by students and by talks that were open to the public on the significance of material culture in building memory and narratives on the past.

Given the positive results of these experiences and the increased flow of visitors to the Parana State Museum, in 2015, while the PET



Figure 1. Church of the Brotherhood of the Rosary –detail (photo Renata S. Garraffoni).

was involved in research on Black Brotherhoods in Curitiba, we had our first opportunity to discuss Afro-Brazilian presence within the museum's exhibition circuit. Prior to this, we had worked to define a strategy of research and integration between the museum and the other institutions. The project had a collective character, bringing academia, students and community together for discussions and work on material culture and its multiple meanings. It went beyond merely researching and cataloging museum artifacts, as we had attempted to explore the wealth of material culture available for the teaching of Afro-Brazilian culture within schools, furthering debate on the fight against racism and prejudice. This is precisely the experience we will delve into here.

6. The Brotherhood of the Rosary and Afro-Brazilian Culture

Among the many activities that the PET History program carries out, we had a collective research project in which all program participants, scholarship students and volunteers, are engaged. The 2015 theme, chosen by students, was the Church of the Brotherhood of the Ro-

sary, located in *Largo da Ordem*, the historical center of the city of Curitiba (**Figures 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5**). The church was founded in 1737 by enslaved Black people. The general goal of our research was to collect written and material documentation on the Church and thereby access aspects of Afro-Brazilian culture present in Curitiba since the colonial period. We also looked at the process of restoration of the Church in the 20th century, as part of the modernization context commented above. Thus, our tasks had included registry of material and intangible heritage: the former, dealing specifically with material which pertains to the architectural transformation of the church in *Largo da Ordem*, and the latter, referring to Black culture and religiosity in Curitiba.

For such purposes, the study that was carried out in 2015 was constituted as interdisciplinary research, a dialogue between history and archeology, and most specifically, public and landscape archeology. It examined issues regarding the church's surroundings, changes in the *Largo* area over the centuries, materiality as a possibility for multiple narratives on culture and the past, and the construction and silencing of memory and historical patrimony. Discussions were carried out in the quest



Figure 2. Church of the Brotherhood of the Rosary (photo Renata S. Garraffoni).



Figure 3. The Church at the *Largo da Ordem* (photo Renata S. Garraffoni).

for broader social debate on the effacement of memories of Afro-Brazilian struggle and daily life in the region, since prevailing perceptions in the city of Curitiba promote the biased notion that it was settled and built by European immigrants, and those of German, Polish and Ukrainian backgrounds in particular.

Activities were carried out collectively, students were divided into three axes of research: one was historiographic (how Black brotherhoods have been studied in Brazil and Curitiba-specificities), the second group conducted a search for available written documentation (to our surprise, there was very little written material and what we did find was largely on the burial of Brotherhood members) and a third group devoted the architectural transformation of the Church.

Through these meetings we were able to discuss historical aspects of Afro-Brazilian presence in the region and had the opportunity to carry out field research, particularly on-site landscape observation with the archeologist and fellow UFPR faculty member Laércio Brochier (a member of the Anthropology Department). Upon finalizing these activities, we went on

to organize a workshop that targeted the community: in 2016, students, together with some faculty who had been invited, took part in three days of debate. The first day was marked by the participation of UFPR history department professor Carlos Lima, who has several publications on the topic of Black Brotherhoods and gave a talk emphasizing the importance of these studies in providing greater visibility to Afro-Brazilian culture in the state of Paraná. On the second day, students from the PET History program presented data collected during 2015 and on the third day, workshop participants, led by professor Joseli Mendonça, made a visit to the historical center of the city that was meant to bring the Afro-Brazilian presence there into focus: with the help of newspaper clippings from the period, participants sought to localize meeting places, small businesses and stores, providing a new perspective on life in that part of the city. Although material signs of Afro-Brazilian presence were no longer visible at most of the points included on the route and had to be reconstructed through written documentation, the walk ended at the Church of the Brotherhood of the Rosary; it was there



Figure 4. *Largo da Ordem* –Historical area (photo Renata S. Garraffoni).

that we could discuss not only the historical and architectural relevance but other aspects of Afro-Brazilian culture, including religiosity, festivities, work, conflict, resistance and daily life.

The workshop was not restricted to university students only. We were able to enjoy the presence of representatives from the Museum and from the May 13th Society, as well as numerous others who were involved in the Black movement. The encounters raised conflicting ideas as well as spirited discussion on memory and heritage and a portion of those who took part got involved in the wider ongoing collaborative Paraná State Museum/PET History project.

Throughout 2016, several meetings were carried out with students and community members so that we were finally able to promote changes in the museum's exhibition circuit. If, as we mentioned earlier, at the start of our involvement, Afro-Brazilian presence had been sadly limited to a torture instrument that was on display, activities such as those we have described herein, and partnerships between students, community and the museum based on the principles of the importance of material culture

for the reconstruction of more pluralist notions of the past, have been fundamental to the development of new sensibilities and narratives. This has led to further visits to the museum to work with storage rooms' material including artifacts from dances and religious festivities, ceramic pieces from archeological digs in *quilombos* (marrons) communities, Brotherhood saints and photographs of daily life in the city during the early twentieth century. It has represented an opening up of public debate, and has changed the way Museum's storage rooms material is understood and handled, bringing items that had been ignored or neglected into new light –for study and for exhibition purposes– and giving them a role in the articulation of new narratives.

7. Concluding Remarks

The development of the field of Archeology has in Brazil been marked by a number of peculiarities: it was created during the imperial period and, over the course of the 20th century, underwent both humanist and authoritarian



Figure 5. *Largo da Ordem* –Historical area (photo Renata S. Garraffoni).

phases. One legacy, that of Paulo Duarte, who was obliged to resist academic and political persecution, has inspired generations of archaeologists throughout the end of that century. With the democratic opening that began in 1985, Duarte's intellectual legacy was able to inspire new approaches and, with the development of a Public and Post-processual Archaeology, the quest for less normative approaches to the past began to flourish throughout the nation.

The work developed by the Laboratory of Public Architecture at the Campinas State University, targeting children and youth, helps schoolchildren to question the notion of archaeology as something pertaining to the world of

adventure and the exotic, enabling them to understand the importance of material culture in constructing less normative notions of the past and a more pluralist present. The PET-History/UFPR and Paraná State Museum partnership shows how Public Archaeology is important for rethinking relations between institution and community, and questioning memory and racial prejudice. The experiences we have discussed here, albeit briefly, help to demonstrate how material culture is fundamental for empowerment and for questioning the *status quo*, how it aids in the quest for less monolithic narratives of the past and thus, for the construction of a more democratic and inclusive present.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors wish to thank all the UFPR PET History Program students who took part in the above-mentioned activities between March 2015 and August 2016, as well as all the students who were involved in the Laboratory of Public Archeology Project. Furthermore, we are deeply grateful to the Paraná State Museum staff, and to the following colleagues: Carlos Lima, Joseli Mendonça, Laércio Brochier, Renato Carneiro Jr (museum director), as well as Louise Alfonso, Maria Aparecida de Andrade Almeida, Lúcio Menezes Ferreira, Tobias Vilhena de Moraes, Juliana Poloni, Denise Schaan, Elizabete Tamanini and Paulo Zanetini. We also extend our thanks to the institutions that have made our projects possible: CNPq, Capes, Fapesp, MEC-SESU, UFPR and UNICAMP History Departments. We are solely responsible for the ideas.

NOTES

1. To a wider perspective of this debate, see: Santos 2005; Meneses 2007; Simão 2009; Silva 1996, 2007; Saladino 2013.
2. For some others experiences, see Wichers 2010.
3. Garraffoni directed the Program from September 2010 to August 2016, and the pathership with Parana State Museum was stated in 2013. The case study we discuss here was developed in 2015 and the workshop took place in June 2016, the students also presented a paper at ENAF –undergrad’s congress supported by the University –in October 2016, and discussed their experience with the community. During this period, many students took part of the Project –some of them stayed longer, others graduated during the research and leaved the Project: Aguinaldo Henrique Garcia de Gouveia; Alexandre Cozer; Bruna Trautwein Barbosa; Camila Quadros; Carolina Marchesin Moisés; Douglas Figueira Scirea; Felipe Bastos; Gabriel Braga; Ivan Lima; Jean Giordani; Jéssica Lima; Josip Giunta; Karin B. Joaquim; Lauriane dos Santos Rosa; Keleny Brasil; Lucas Engel Sacht; Luccas Abraão de Paiva Vidal; Maria Victoria Ribeiro Ruy; Mariana Fujikawa; Mariana Mehl Gralak; Maurício Mihockiy Fernandez Martinez; Mayume Christine Minatogawa; Michel Ehrlich; Shirlei Batista dos Santos; Suellen Precinotto; Thaís Cattani Perroni; Willian Funke.
4. For details on the history of the Parana State Museum and a critical approach to its exhibition practices, see Becker 2014.
5. For a complete report on the history of the group’s activities, see the ‘Dossiê PET 20 Anos’ published in the periodical *Cadernos de Clio*, a journal organized and published by the PET-História, n. 3 de 2012 (<http://revistas.ufpr.br/cli/article/view/40412/24656>). For more information on the group, see its website: <https://pethistoriaufpr.wordpress.com>.

REFERENCES

- ALFONSO, L.P. (2009): El patrimonio arqueológico y su vinculación a circuitos turísticos no convencionales en Brasil. *Mirada Antropológica*, 8(9): 150-165.
- ALMEIDA, M.A.A.; MORAES, T.V. (2016): PIBIC-EM no núcleo de História e Arqueologia da Unicamp, *Revista de Arqueologia Pública*, 10, 2, 16: 60-68.
- CALDARELLI, S.B.; SANTOS, M.C.M.M. dos. (2000): Arqueologia de contrato no Brasil, *Revista USP* 44, 32-51.
- CARNEIRO, JR.R.A. (2015): Como assim?! Moedas Romanas num museu do Paraná? *Moedas Romanas: coleção acervo do Museu Paranaense* (R.S. Garraffoni, C.U. Carlan, R.A. Carneiro JR., eds.), Curitiba: Samp - Sociedade de Amigos do Museu Paranaense: 7-12.
- DE BLASIS, P.A.; ROBRAHN-GONZÁLEZ, E.M. (2003): Dam Contract Archaeology in Brazil: some prospects and a case study at the Amazonian border, *International Workshop on Cultural Heritage Management and Dams*, BID.
- FERREIRA, L.M. (1999): Vestígios de Civilização: O Instituto Histórico e Geográfico Brasileiro e a Construção da Arqueologia Imperial (1838-1870). *Revista de História Regional*, 4: 9-36.
- FERREIRA, L.M. (2010): *Território Primitivo: A Institucionalização da Arqueologia no Brasil (1870-1917)*. EDIPUCRS, Porto Alegre.
- FUNARI, P.P.A. (1994a): Paulo Duarte e o Instituto de Pré-História. *Idéias*, 1(1): 155-179.
- FUNARI, P.P.A. (1994b): Brazilian Archaeology: Overview and Reassessment. *Boletim do CPA (UNICAMP)*: 281-290.
- FUNARI, P.P.A. (1999): Brazilian archaeology: a reappraisal *Archaeology in Latin America* (G. Politis, B. Alberti, eds.), Routledge, London: 17-37.

- FUNARI, P.P.A. (2014): L'archéologie brésilienne au cours des vingt dernières années. *Perspective*, 2: 269-287.
- FUNARI, P.P.A.; FUNARI, R.S. (2010): Ancient Egypt in Brazil: a theoretical approach to contemporary uses of the past. *Archaeologies*, 6: 48-61.
- FUNARI, P.P.A.; SILVA, G.J. (2007): Nota de Pesquisa sobre o Projeto de Pesquisa do Acervo de Arqueologia e Patrimônio de Paulo Duarte 06/03/2007. *História e-História*: 1-25.
- FUNARI, P.P.A. (1999): Public archaeology in Brazil, *Public Archaeology* (N. Merriman, ed.), Routledge, London and New York.
- FUNARI, P.P.A. (2002): A Arqueologia Pública na América Latina e seu contexto mundial. *Fronteiras*, 6 (11): 87-96.
- FUNARI, P.P.A. (2004): Public archaeology in Brazil, *Public Archaeology* (N. Merriman, ed.) Routledge, London and New York: 202-210.
- GARRAFFONI, R.S.; CARLAN, C.U.; CARNEIRO JR., R.A. (eds.) (2015): *Moedas Romanas: coleção acervo do Museu Paranaense*. Samp - Sociedade de Amigos do Museu Paranaense, Curitiba.
- MENESES, U.B. (2007): Premissas para a Formulação de Políticas Públicas em Arqueologia, *Revista do Patrimônio Histórico e Artístico Nacional*, 33: 37-57.
- MORALES, M.H.L.B. (2014): *Fragmentos de História : passados possíveis no discurso da arqueologia histórica*. Tese do Museu Paranaense, Curitiba.
- NOELLI, F.S.; FERREIRA, L.M. (2007): A persistência da teoria da degeneração indígena e do colonialismo nos fundamentos da arqueologia brasileira. *História, Ciências, Saúde-Manguinhos*, 14: 1239-1264.
- POLONI, R.J.S. (2008): *A etnografia no Brasil: ciência e sociedade no contexto da democratização*. Universidade do Algarve, Faro (MA dissertation).
- SALADINO, A. (2013): IPHAN, arqueólogos e patrimônio arqueológico brasileiro: um breve panorama, *Revista da Sociedade Brasileira de Arqueologia*, 1/2: 40-58.
- SANTOS Jr., V. (2005): A influência das Cartas Internacionais sobre as Leis Nacionais de Proteção ao Patrimônio Histórico e Pré-Histórico e estratégias de Preservação dos Sítios Brasileiros, *Mneme, Revista de Humanidades*, 6(13): 321-336.
- SCHAAN, D.; BEZERRA, M. (eds.) (2009): *Construindo a Arqueologia no Brasil: a trajetória de Sociedade de Arqueologia Brasileira*. Sociedade de Arqueologia Brasileira, GK Noronha, Belém.
- SILVA, R.C.P. (1996): Compatibilizando os instrumentos legais de preservação arqueológica no Brasil: o Decreto-Lei Nº 25/37 e a Lei nº 3.924/61, *Revista de Arqueologia*, 9: 9-23.
- SILVA, R.C.P. (2007): Os desafios da preservação arqueológica: uma arqueologia da Lei 3.924/61. *Revista do Patrimônio Histórico e Artístico Nacional*, 33: 59-74.
- SIMÃO, L.M. (2009): Elos do patrimônio: Luiz de Castro Faria e a preservação dos monumentos arqueológicos no Brasil, *Boletim do Museu Paraense Emílio Goeldi Ciências Humanas*, 4(3): 421-435.
- TAMANINI, E.; PEIXER, Z.I. (2011): Educação e Patrimônio Cultural: diálogos entre a cidade e campo como lugares de identidades ressonantes. *Tempo e Argumento*, 3: 30-30.
- WICHERS, C.A.M. (2010): *Museus e os descaminhos do patrimônio arqueológico: (des)caminhos da prática brasileira*. PhD Thesis. Universidade Lusófona de Humanidades e Tecnologias. Lisbon.
- ZANETTINI, P. et al. (1996): *Arqueologia Histórica de Canudos*. Editora da UNEB, Salvador.