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Abstract
Since the beginning of the 5th Republic, social demands have influenced the demand to reform the place of culture in education as a way of developing better access to French culture for all students. In recent decades, the rising number of immigrants has created administrative districts characterized by geographic contrast, social inequalities, and diverse populations, increasing the need for artistic education. This article proposes to approach the political measures that allowed the development of arts teaching in primary schools in France to understand the cultural pedagogical practices provided in primary school. In doing so, I explore the ways that experimentation with local heritage provides the necessary social dimensions that support students in their understanding of French culture, diminish unequal access to art, and how schools might be used as a tool in the process of cultural democratization.


**Introduction**

This article proposes to approach the political measures that allowed the development of arts teaching in primary schools in France, keeping in mind the failure of the state policy. The momentum of the current policy did not rise up to the hopes cherished by, the first prime mister of culture (1958-1969), André Malraux (1901-1976). A writer, intellectual, and politician, Maoaulraux was instrumental in the cultural policy of France; favoring both the construction of cultural infrastructure and advocating for access to the arts for all French people. In the spirit of Malraux then, it is the responsibility of the state to ensure and provide access, for its citizens, to culture and works of mankind. Sociologists’ assessments, however, underline that all cultural policies have failed to shake inequalities. According to Donnat (2009), a quarter of the French never go to cultural events. This observation is important to keep in mind to understand the paramount social role of the school in the democratization of culture, particularly in regard to artistic education. The school system must indeed ensure its social mission regarding the access to culture. Accessing culture, participating in cultural activities, and being in contact with artistic works is not a function of what happens outside of an educational setting, rather it is achieved by learning the fundamentals through course subjects, such as math and French.

This article considers how social demand may cause mutations that lead to the redefinition of a contract that helps to free up the educational reproduction of social and cultural inequalities. In considering the History of arts' implementation in the French education system, this article considers, respectively, the interest of the local environment, for the transmission and the use of cultural heritage, when taking into account the cultural pedagogical practices provided in primary education. This article explores the multicultural dimension possibilities allowed by artistic education before establishing an experimentation of a local culture initiation.

Focusing the interest on the consideration of local heritage for the transmission and use of its cultural heritage, within the context of the implementation of the history of arts in the French education system, we take into account the cultural pedagogical practices provided in primary school, before seeing the establishment of experimentation, and finally, highlight the possibilities of the multicultural dimension allowed by the cultural pedagogy.

**Background of Arts Education in France**

The convocation to reform the place of French culture in education, since the beginning of the 5th Republic, is the result of a long process encouraged by social demands to develop better access to the culture. Beginning around 1959 with Malraux, a spirit of work was filled with the will to assure cultural transmission “to all French”. The principles guiding this project
underlined the state’s aim to find a way to allow people full access to cultural practices and to ensure transmission of culture to “all French”.

The successive cultural education measures in France led up to the introduction of the “History of arts” in the curriculum, implemented in grade school and high school, at the beginning of the 2008-2009 school year. According to Poteau and Blaize (2003), prior to 2008, attempts to update the organization of skills in the cultural field included the Tasca-Lang plan; eponymous of Ministers of the Culture and Education that focused specifically around artistic education. The subsequent History of the Arts constituted the desire to bring artistic education up to date and was the result of a long process of the state's evolution.

In 2004, the sociologist Philippe Urfalino defined this period by talking about it as the invention of cultural policy. Indeed, throughout the seventies, politics focused on issues related to the cultural domain and developed action planning, especially in the construction of institutional infrastructure. The momentum of those policies did not live up to the expectations carried by Malraux. Several decades of ministerial interaction and close examination were necessary before seeing the idea that the school may be a player in the dissemination and democratization of culture. In spite of some efforts, such as the Duhamel mandate at the ministry between 1971 and 1973, interministerial relations initiated a crippling attitude that prevented any change (Gentil & Girard, 1995). This political context is illustrated by Jean-Marie Domenach’s words during a congress dedicated to Duhamel's ministry (1971-1973), at which point the Esprit Review Director talked about “intolerable relationships” (p.233-234 ) to qualify the crippling effect of these interministerial relations:

"C'est le ministère le plus anti-cultural qui existe (...). Notre rapport sur l'enseignement a été suivi d'une demande de rendez-vous au ministère de l'Education nationale qui n'a même pas répondu, malgré plusieurs rappels.

It was the most anti-cultural ministry that existed [...]. Our department report on education was followed to request for appointment to the Ministry of Education which has not even responded, even after several reminders.

(Gentil & Girard, 1995, p. 233-234)

This lack of communication is one of the elements responsible for the disillusion of the Council for Cultural Development. According to Sophie Gauthier (1992), the failure in implementing this political process illustrates that it was a missed opportunity for collaboration between the cultural and the political. Without wanting to go back too much on political anecdotes, it is important to keep in mind that they illustrate the difficulties experienced in the development of effective policies. Notwithstanding, this period was
characterized by the development of cultural infrastructures around the country, which contributed to the decentralization of the culture, thus making it easier to access. Despite the increase of cultural infrastructures, an improvement in availability, and a less elitist attitude, French cultural practices were still characterized by inequity.

Jean Caune’s (2006) suggests, through his cultural concept of democratization, that artistic education is a tool for democracy that enables equitable cultural participation across physical space and social class. While cultural politics had the ambition to reduce the inequality access of art to “the great cultural works of humanity”, as Malraux said various assessments of “French cultural practices”, make it still possible to notice "the permanence of social inequalities in access to art and culture" (Observatory of Cultural Policies, 2005).

In his latest analysis, (Donnat, 2009), describes that a quarter of the French people do not visit any cultural places such as museums, theaters or cinemas. Donnat suggested that the Internet could represent better access to knowledge and hopefully further democratize culture. Although the growth of ICT and information networks access certainly allows a free utilization, it remains correlated to practices and uses within the family. The same goes for the reproduction of cultural families’ practices, a Habitus, in Bourdieu’s sense, for the use of these means of communication. In few words, all cultural politics do not undermine tenacious inequalities.

It should be underlined that the failure of the cultural democratization measures is attributable to politicians themselves. This political orientation took place in the context of the centralization process. That is to say that these measures were sent down from the top of the pyramid, from Paris. The success of the cultural democratization with school has to pass by the basis of the school system (with the strengthening of the implication of educative stakeholders (e.g., teachers, organizations, artists) (Mazière 2015). The decentralization process started in the eighties with four measures. These measures, according to the laws of 1982, 1983 and 1985, allowed transferring responsibilities and started to include more local dimension. This political phenomena had an impact on education: French districts for instance were now responsible for educative cultural actions in school infrastructures.

The ongoing challenges, resulting in a lack of success in, leads to a focus on the school system, as the only common way to reach every child and how the institution of school might be used as a tool in the process of cultural democratization. Indeed, the school system has to ensure this societal mission, which is not outside of scholarly issues and that constitutes a fundamental point in teaching. So, the question of the cultural heritage transmission appears in the French school post-massification context, as a preponderant mission. With the failure of the decentralization process, the educative stakeholders are now expected to act.
Research Context

The study is based on a sampling of primary schools to understand cultural educative practices in terms of cultural heritage transmission and uses by teachers. Primary school is composed of pre-elementary schools and elementary schools in the island of Corsica. In this research, I utilized the territory (e.g. rural and urban schools) to analyze the structuring of inequalities in terms of cultural access.

Metropolitan France has twenty-six academies and this present work is based on one of its administrative districts, the Corsican academy. This insular district includes eight districts and is characterized by geographical contrasts, social inequalities, and a multiculturalism situation, particularly due to the arrival of Italians, Portuguese, Polish and Romanians but also Maghrebins especially Moroccans and Tunisians. According to the last official census of the French population in 1999, Corsica is the fifth among metropolitan areas for immigrant populations (INSEE, 2005). Corsica is composed of 10% of immigrants and can be defined as a land of immigrants. This situation favors the observation of the life of all these minorities living-together in the context of cultural affirmation – an identity island. This island has indeed a story, and a language of its own that has been taught in schools since 2002.

It is important to note that in France the recruitment of first degree teachers takes place after a Masters degree. Recruitment of primary school teachers is managed by each academy and based on competitions that consist of common and optional tests. This initial formation is modeled on tests where nominees have to choose between options: Sport, Music, Visual Arts, or Dance. So, in the initial formation, all beginning teachers still need to receive training in the arts. According to the Academic Statistics, among the eligible candidates for oral examinations, for instance, in 2012, 29% had received an initial formation in Visual Arts and 18% in 2013. Whereas the teachers’ role is paramount as an intermediary in the process of facilitating access to the arts, it is critical to ensure quality training that involves high quality teachers. Thus, this role should reinforce the objectives of teacher training with contact with participants in artistic education.

In the past, students attended school four-days per week, with Wednesdays reserved for training sessions provided by different educational advisors in the Corsican district. The Reform of the Scholar Rythms, enacted in September of 2014, reduced the hours per day but increased the school calendar to 5 days a week. Participation in sports and creative activities became the responsibility of parents and were expected to occur in the hours after the shortened school day. However, such activities have variable costs, depending on the municipality, challenging equal access to educational opportunity. Moreover, the reform has hampered the organization of the Wednesday training seminars, an essential ingredient to transmitting knowledge and providing advice to teachers on establishing cultural partnerships.
Training seminars provides teachers with the opportunity to develop a professional posture as well as an awareness of the common purpose to ensure efficient transmission. Thus, the success of partnerships depends on the shared understanding of the purpose of higher education between the different actors. Symbolically, there is a common place that was created with arts and education. Artistic education is indeed a place of synergy where different stakeholders are for the students' benefices.

The cultural and ethical significance of this phenomenon is not lost to Rheingold:

The tools for cultural production and distribution are in the pockets of 14 year olds. This does not guarantee that they will do the hard work of democratic self-governance: the tools that enable the free circulation of information and communication of opinion are necessary but not sufficient for the formation of public opinion. Ask yourself this question: Which kind of population seems more likely to become actively engaged in civic affairs? (2007, para. 2).

**Teaching History of Arts**

Teaching the History of Arts regularly provides students some historical benchmarks. But teachers have to be attentive to their pedagogical approach to be sure that they are focusing on history of arts. Indeed, according to the General Inspector of National Education on the occasion of the seminar to INRP in 2011, some cautions should be taken.

"De ne pas faire de l'Histoire pour les Arts et des Arts pour l'Histoire mais véritablement de l'histoire des Arts"

[“Not to do History for Arts, and Arts for History, but really history of arts”]

The History of Arts assembles knowledge and skills to all students from primary school to second degree. It not only constitutes a pedagogical opportunity for teachers but also an intercultural exchange that appears to be a bridge toward diversity. This is why it is possible to think that artistic teaching is linked with a “Civic and Moral Education” program. Viewing and interpreting artworks encourages debate and exchange of views among students, develops argumentation skills, facilitates an intercultural comprehension, By emphasizing the intercultural dimensions of various works of art, and recognizing various objects of art as equal, students become enlightened citizens of Others. The initiation to cultural diversity, through contact with works of art, promotes the acquisition of skills and civic attitudes, thus establishing, “a true civic course made up of values, knowledge, practices, and behaviors which aims to promote effective and constructive participation in social and professional life exercising freedom and mindfulness of other’s rights” (Ministère de l’Education Nationale, 2005, Socle Commun de Connaissances et de Compétences, p. 20) [Department of Education].
The 2006’s UNESCO report suggests that, “the arts are both the manifestation of culture as well as the means of communication of cultural knowledge” (Unesco, 2006). In considering several esthetical expressions, art’s approach develops mutual respect. Thus, with Arts Education, individual and collective aptitudes are developed. Knowledge of artworks increases an awareness of cultural heritage and develops social and cultural knowledge that can be shared in school. Art and Cultural education represents a way to make culture an accessible social tool that can be used for social reproduction’s beneficience (Bourdieu & Passeron, 1970). Especially for those who do not have the chance to view art or engage in cultural family outings, arts education holds possibility to transform and shape individuals from amateur to art lover. Explained by Ragon (1971) “l’amateur d’art a appris lentement et très longuement à déchiffrer les signes qui constituent à la fois un langage et une histoire” [“amateur art learned slowly and very long to read signs that constituted both language and history” (p. 94)]. It is a long process of knowledge building that requires learning how to read, to feel, and to express the background of an artwork regardless of their social origin:

In order for children and adults to participate fully in cultural and artistic life, they need to progressively learn to understand, appreciate and experience artistic expressions by which fellow humans – often called artists – explore, and share insights on, various aspects of existence and coexistence. As it is a goal to give all people equal opportunities for cultural and artistic activity, artistic education needs to be a compulsory part of educational programs for all. Arts education should also be systematic and be provided over a number of years as it”(Unesco, 2006, Road Map for Arts Education, p. 4).

Systematic training designed to teach all children how to interpret artworks is a workable way for schools to avoid socio-cultural acts of segregation. The recommendations of ONU underline the fact that research should be increased in artistic and cultural education to promote the development of educational policies related to this subject. According to UNESCO (2006), there is a need “to promote a common understanding among all stakeholders of the importance of Arts Education and its essential role in improving the quality of education” (p. 9). Furthermore, artistic education places students in creative situations, associating the plastic approach with cultural heritage elements that aim to develop creative and initiative senses, to increase children’s emotional intelligence, moral values, critical reflection, and the freedom of creative expression. To sum up, providing art infusion in schools helps to build common reference points for all, and a shared interest in cultural heritage resulting in the reduction of social inequalities in terms of culture, which means that to give the same opportunity to all pupils.
In addition, contact with art creates interesting situations from an educational point of view. The interdisciplinary interests and skills that are developed during an interpretive debate of a painting, for example, allows classroom debate between students. As I had noted in qualitative observations, some transversal skills, such as listening and cooperating with others, are directly activated. Moreover, arts’ implementation in the classroom is a way to avoid the overloading of education programs. The Arts present a common point of disciplinary fields. When students exchange views or explain what they think, or understand about an artwork, they use and develop their language skills. This is why artistic education contributes to the citizen’s complete formation. Artistic education uses three type of approaches: cognitive one for students to get to know works of art, a plastic one for students to create with educative stakeholders (artists, teachers), and a sensitive one for students to be able to express their emotions towards the artworks. This approach favors the valorization of cultural diversity with the use of artifacts from different cultures.

Artistic education should consider a “plurifocal approach”; using both cognitive approaches that identify art as an object of knowledge and a sensitive approach that recognizes how art is a way of culturally interpreting with different cultural scales. It is paramount to build interculturality as part of the process of democratization. It is important for schools must to define its role in this social renewal, where diversity means richness.

**Uses of Local Cultural Heritage**

Each culture has its own characteristics, artistic expressions, and cultural practices. The United Nations Educational Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) considers the showcasing, protection, and promotion of human creation, as a means to encourage the difference in contributing to the promotion of cultural diversity (Centre régional de documentation pédagogique de Besançon, 1999). According to Héritier & Dockes-Lallement (2003), heritage is a result of a socio-historic process in which artifacts, having survived time, increase with each new generation (Centre interdisciplinaire d’études et de recherches sur l’expression contemporaine, 1986). Thus, the creation of and residual artifacts is one of the elements used to characterize a human society for its affirmation and definition over another.

Artistic education, then, is a means of transmitting knowledge and appreciation of art between generations and cultures while also allowing for an understanding and an appropriation by students of their environment and their local cultural heritage. This approach is a valorization of local scale, known as “know thyself,” which offers an opportunity to openness and not an identity frontier to hide behind.

Cultural heritage is relayed by international institutions like UNESCO, which influence and promote cultural practices at school, as a way to increase relationships with others, in
understanding that the students can develop a better sense of the world’s diversity, avoiding judgments that value one cultural heritage over another, because all of them belong to the set. Art education is central in educational issues related to building the child’s conscience, the young citizen, of common heritage. As written in the French Syllabus the History of arts (Bulletin officiel n° 32 du 28 août 2008, Organisation de l’enseignement de l’histoire des arts), the school has to assure a mission to provide education according to the principle of multiculturalism of cultural heritage. Despite the difficulties brought about by multiculturalism, the schools must abide by the French syllabus. Artistic education then, becomes a way to include, promote, and answer the question of education and the recognition of cultural diversity by including the notion of diversity in practices the Heritage Education. For teachers, using local examples, such as monolithic statues in comparing them with national examples provides a possible entry point into doing so.

In spite of pedagogical benefits and even a societal necessity, the implementation is hard. Artistic education in France is not reserved to specialist teachers with the exception the city of Paris. Indeed, for the primary schools of the capital, there is a specific faculty that has been reserved for artistic education in the town since 1865 (CIEP, 1975, 9). Outside of this exception, the teachers must adapt to different situations resulting from the application of teaching arts. In addition to the teaching of fundamentals (mathematics, French), primary teachers are responsible for insuring the artistic education in their classroom, by cultural outings and artistic projects with artists. Thus, it concerns all of the educative community (artists, teachers, organization), wherein everyone is an architect of a collective educative work. Establishing how students see and understand is facilitated by the interactive creations between education and the arts to promote heritage learning. This can be accomplished through the implementation, strengthening, and development of partnerships equitably across education academies. Development ought to be planned to set up a link between the “educational system and the cultural environment” by the establishment of synergies with cultural structures, for instance (Unesco, 2006).

In France, there are around 40,000 historical monuments, including 10,000 castles and 6,000 museums, and more than 1,200 of them are labeled “Museum of France” (Centre régional de documentation pédagogique Besançon, 1999). Museums have more than fifty million visitors per year. Most of them are composed by people with the financial and cultural wherewithal (Dupuis, 2008). Through the establishment of collaborative projects between cultural institutions and schools, 2008’s governmental statistics underline that the school groups’ part represents 28% of visitors. However, it should be stressed in that regard that there are important inequalities in the academic scale. Indeed, all classrooms do not have the same devices (Bureau des actions éducatives culturelles et sportives, 2010), an observation that could especially encouraged the parental consumerism used in their school choice.
The social mission of the school in its role of dissemination and implementation of cultural practices, such as museum visit, is a paramount point. However, these cultural structures have to increase their attractiveness to the school and become more accessible for students as places that inspire and develop curiosity. If some museums (e.g. The Anthropological Museum of Corsica in Corte and Fesch Museum in Ajaccio) have established some play circuits in their collections, it is paramount that strategies and measures are taken to preserve an equitable democratization for all schools. This constitutes an example of the innovative teaching method that uses the island’s scale, including its unique history, culture and language, that deserves to be expanded. Indeed, the two examples of these museums’ practices are relatively new. However, transportation is more or less supported by municipalities, and thus access is not equal for all students. The question of equality is paramount in the process of democratization and a major approach to heritage education.

It must be concluded then, that the set of partnerships between institutions has diversified because of the expectations of the public, who are visiting museums and come from all areas of society. As Henri de Rohan underlines:


Il y a 30 ans, jamais on ne sortait pour aller au musée. Aujourd’hui, il n’y a pas un élève, qui au cours de sa scolarité, n’a pas été en contact avec une œuvre d’art.” [30 years ago, we did not go to the museum. Nowadays, there is no pupil, who in schooling, has not been in contact with an artwork]


In spite of this growth, Donnat (2009) underlines unequal hotlines in cultural practices at the national level. Ministerial guidance, including the artistic education plan and Cultural Action in School, constitute guidelines designed to develop local initiatives at a national scale crossing a step further in this dynamic “de franchir une étape supplémentaire dans cette dynamique” Chartes pour une éducation au patrimoine. (2002).

Such a plan was based on a charter called “adopter son patrimoine” [adopt its cultural heritage] that encouraged students to be “véritables acteurs au sein de leur environnement” [real actors in their environment] (Chartes pour une éducation au patrimoine, 2002). It aimed at developing, in addition to cultural outings, the appropriation of a cultural heritage element. This measure is an example of the plan for arts education and cultural action in schools to go further than just watching artworks in outings. If children go to museums frequently as part of schools programs, there is a need to further strengthen the image interpretation as a way to enter artworks. Such practice is underlined and developed by Anne Boutet de Monvel (1974). She advocated, starting at an early age, interactions with art reproductions and museum outings to increase the process of cultural heritage appropriation. So, with school, there is a
way to supplement the current inequalities of cultural access for students who come from families distant from the school culture. Through the frequentation of artworks in and out of school, the process of getting students accustomed to engaging with works of art should begin with primary schools, because of the fact that children are very receptive to visual learning.

**Experimentation with Local Heritage**

Families from higher social and economic classes provide more cultural accessibility than those with lower incomes. Schooling then, can provide a common institution where mastery is possible through recurrent contact with the arts (Boutet, 1974). Artistic education, in general, and the history of arts, more specifically, has an interdisciplinary aspect, making the appropriation of students' cultural heritage possible, with the help of their environment. Including encounters with artworks, as a pedagogical strategy, provides an opportunity to consider how classroom practices become paramount to the acquisition of cultural fluency.

The latest legislation, throughout the education system, (Bulletin officiel n° 32 du 28 août 2008, Organisation de l’enseignement de l’histoire des arts), proposes activities to develop sensorial skills with the objective that students will be able to read an artwork and demonstrate an awareness of heritage. Since this official legislation in 2008, questions remain regarding how to introduce artworks from all areas and all civilizations and how to teach the history of the arts. Anne-Marie Boutet de Monvel (1974) wonders how to get students to understand the visual arts and how they may benefit from the enrichment that emerges from their interactions. U.N.E.S.C.O suggests that this learning constitutes a long process, across the school, as specified in 2006 in Road Map for Arts Education: “Arts education should also be systematic and be provided over a number of years as it is a long term process”.

The scholar sequence, for arts education, has three steps: (1) knowledge acquisitions by infusion, (2) plastic practices and investigations to develop references, and (3) a long and progressive process toward heritage awareness. Thus, the first cycle of teaching time is conducive to the development of structuring elements that grasp the concept of heritage, through linking different currents and times, and through investigating works and artists from the perspective of history. Eventually, the child is able to identify various aspects of his/her heritage and becomes aware of other cultures. So, the beginning of the 21st century is a turning point, a time when a new definition of artistic education occurred in including the cultural component, missions, and values of the educational system.

Since June, 2001 (Ministère de l’éducation nationale, 2001) [Department of Education, June, 2001], the official programs favors the inclusion of visits to museums and cultural structures as part of a project-based pedagogy. The reduction in funding and decentralization of politics, however, increases inequalities between French districts. This evolution has placed increasing
emphasis on the role of the teacher, and his responsibility in the democratization of culture, via the practice of teaching history of the arts.

Looking at an isolated rural school, in Corsica, we can acknowledge how the teacher becomes a key element in the transmission of knowledge to build cultural heritage. The teacher put in place a cultural exploration across the village with his classroom. This pedagogical experience allowed for the underlining of some educational tracks in a 2nd and 3rd degree classroom in different steps.

After a talk with the teacher, it is possible to sum up that this experimentation is based on elements of the local environment. The aim of the lesson was to develop specific attitudes that afforded students opportunities to build their appropriation by looking at their environments.

Initially, students were asked to represent their village through drawing. Next, the teacher facilitated a collective collaboration, on the board, that provided specific vocabulary associated with the student’s representations including (1) sculpture, fountain, memorials, church, (2) material identification including cement, stone, and wood and (3) locating the construction in time. The students and teacher then left the classroom to speak with locals to inform their work, leading to modification of their initial design (figure 1).

Figure 1. Observation of a meeting to “discover the village”
This experimentation shows how the local dimension makes it easier for the teacher to share and to build the class in the arts field. The local dimension is indeed more noticeable and accessible for individuals and promotes an exchange between students and teachers because local elements are in their common reality. To help teachers, the official instructions give a list of artworks’ references but they are subject to change. Teachers are in fact free to use elements from the local dimension and encouraged to making links between local, national and international dimensions as well. Teachers used local architecture, and more specifically churches, which were then compared to others in France. For example, the church of Murato, (figure 2) is a local example that illustrates a broader set associated with Romanesque art, particularly with its link to two buildings in Saint Lazarus of Autun, two of the most famous works of Romanesque art in France. At the same time, it promotes knowledge of local history, as noticed at the bottom of the page with the text, “in those days, otherwise” (figure 3).
Figure 2. Church of Murato Romanesque, twelfth century (source: CRDP, 2006, p. 48-49)
A similar case can be made for pre-historic sites. As noted by a teacher from one of the CM1 classes, ‘I spoke to them [students] about the sites that we have here. I try to make a connection where it is possible, we do not speak about Lascaux’. Thus, the teacher uses certain prehistoric works in combination with artistic demonstrations from the same time period. The teacher creates a link and a contextualization of works using a global cultures approach. Local works are then incorporated to construct a global image of what is cultural heritage through using a comparative and working example rooted in the local.

So, it is possible to build situations of intercultural dialogue by initiating an encounter with the common heritage of humanity artworks. This method of teaching, with arts as a basis, favors the appropriation by concentric circles from local scale to the universal, as Alain Kerlan (2004) said: “De la singularité à l’universalité”[“From singularity to universality”].

The examples show a valorization and investment in essential characteristics of space around the school and thus active utilization of these elements that ultimately comprise local heritage. Initially, in the classroom, the teacher asked students what they knew about their village. This inventory approach allowed the teacher to explain the notion of heritage. At the end of the first step students drew a map with the elements that they believed to know in their environment. Secondly, the teacher asked the students to check their mental map and to add descriptions, elements about materials, history, legends, etc. When they went to the classroom, they compared their plans and what they had written. This last stage allows build a transversal reinvestment of different skills (evocation language, written skills, appropriation of local heritage, spatial and temporal representations).
The role of culture in school, in general, and especially arts education, is to encourage teachers to bring students into contact with works of art as an expression of the past and a manifestation of different cultures. Civilization’s artworks also constitute testimonies that belong to the historic and cultural. For instance, the utilization of Sub-Saharan artworks with students is an illustration of the interdisciplinary power of art. Indeed, before the evangelization and colonization, nations were almost unknown. The little artworks saved could be considered as historic sources and attested from cultural practices, as sources from a disappeared civilization. These artworks are what defined the cultural heritage of a civilization and their utilization underlines links between art, history and heritage. Since 2002, these transdisciplinary bridges are included in school programs, but this occurrence does not ensure teaching, and it does not mean that every student received instruction in History of Arts. However, the art is useful for anchoring knowledge, and if an artwork used in a classroom could be explained by the recommendations of official curricula, that does not mean that teachers cannot choose other works of art not specified by the officials. Furthermore, it is linked to the academic freedom of the teacher who could be guided by inter-disciplinary and intercultural aspects. Indeed, with a contextualization of an artwork teachers develop the temporal awareness of students, by helping them to establish themselves in time and space. The genesis of links between History and Arts could be explained by the fact that an artistic realization was reflective of a period and the contextualization paramount for their analysis. Indeed, these links could serve as a pedagogical tool for teachers, one that could help them in their practices.

**Conclusion**

Arts education stimulates cognitive development through its interdisciplinary nature (EACEA & Eurydice, 2009). However, teaching arts education requires action, a rally and a collaboration of various human resources towards a common goal. In considering that the teaching of the arts as a teaching disciplines’ heart is a way to renew pedagogy. The interactions of teachers and cultural actors (i.e. artists), artistic education authorizes partnerships encourages interdisciplinary approaches. Moreover, the questions focus on the art of teaching content, the UNESCO report underlines these issues: “Should art be taught as a separate subject or all the skills, knowledge and values they can pass?” (Unesco, 2006, Road Map for Arts Education). Assumptions through educational tracks observed or performed can appear to be the beginnings of a response formulation about the great importance of teaching cultural heritage.

This article has presented how local heritage intersects with artworks to establish knowledge of cultural diversities and a way towards the Other’s knowledge, to build cultural democratization. Not only as a democratization of access but as reversal of the
democratization process. Thus, the aims of artistic education also concern integration, individual cultures, and additionally the diffusion of cultural references. It is why we can speak of a cultural democratization supplementing the concept as previously defined and demystified by Jean Caune and Lescot (2006). It is the responsibility of the school to consider cultural issues. Artistic education represents a tool for cultural democratization, and for students, an opening and cultural enrichment, regardless their origins. These educative practices play an important role in insuring a complete formation of citizen building. Last but not the least, artistic education, based on a cultural heritage in combination of several scales, is a route towards a renewal in school values where knowledge transmission is strengthened.
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