

PATRIMONY, SUSTAINABILITY AND DEVELOPMENT RECONSIDERED: A CRITICAL REVIEW

Korstanje Maximiliano Emanuel
University Argentina John F. Kennedy

Development and sustainability are terms under a hot debate in anthropology academy today and for a long time more. For one hand, the anthropology for development will argue that societies are located in a continuum in search for rationalization and social evolution; for the other hand, neo-Marxist anthropologists (known as well as anthropology of development) will emphasize the idea that some countries monopolize a major grade of capital with the aim to dominate politically to others weaker counties. By utilizing the ideology in educating undeveloped countries for an efficient economic resources administration, First World deploys a combination of financial assistance and ideological discourses enrooted in the paradigm of development, heritage, cultural tourism and sustainability to keep the control in a changing world. Likewise, the development not only is a troublesome concept -in part very difficult to grasp- but also comprises a mechanism to create a bridge between material exploitation and human's necessities. The present paper insists in the importance of development critical in these types of issues.

Keywords: *Development, Patrimony, Sustainability, Tourism, Hegemony.*

JEL Classification: *L83, M1, O1*

INTRODUCTION

Popular wisdom valorizes the patrimony as one of factors that help alleviating poverty and protecting the environment in developing countries. It is important to note that *Ecological economics* published in Europe by Martinez Alier was of course the pioneer work in these types of issues. Taking its cue from Polanyi, Kapp and Roegen, Martinez Alier traces the history of ecological publications since 1880 to 1950 (Alier, 1987). The protection and sustainability have been expanded to the four corners of globe in last years. For further understanding, let clarify



readers that between 1975 and 1985 two well-known senior researchers introduce patrimony as a neologism in the study of tourism. J. Heytens, in 1978, argued that tourist patrimony should be the essence for the development of tourist resources in order for residents to enhance local destinations. Shaped by a broader articulation of human and material resources, the patrimony roomed in the specialized literature to the development of other no lesser polemic term, *Tourist Capital* (Heytens, 1978:115). A couple of years later, to be exact in 1982, P. Gray contended that tourist patrimony was a pre-condition for the enhancement of tourism in zones with needs of betterness (Gray, 1982: 32).

In tourism and hospitality fields the concept of patrimony has been currently developed accompanied of other two terms: development and sustainability (Goodwin, 2002). Now, even if countless studies devoted considerable attention in sustainability in the process of touristification (Boullon, 1985; Vitry, 2003; Silva Santo, 2003; Schluter, 2008) (Nadeau et al, 2008; Alvarez and Korzay, 2008; Franch et al, 2008; Dwyer, 2008; Dos Santos and Antonini Oliveira, 2004; Blake et al, 2008; Altman and Finlayson, 2003; Santana Talavera, 2006; Moscardo, 2007; Sdrali and Chazapi, 2007; Blake et at, 2008; Gronau and Kaufman, 2009; Pearce, 2008; Alves and Hilal, 2009; Singal and Uysal, 2009; Bagri, Gupta and Babu, 2009; Lade, 2010; Lacher and Nepal, 2010), less attention was given to the influence exerted by colonialism in the configuration of idea of protection. Our thesis is colonialism that characterized the European expansion thru XIXth century paved the pathways in conjunction with academic disciplines such as philosophy, ethnology and anthropology to create a pervasive image of colonized folks. For one hand, concerns related to disappearance of non-western cultures have been contrasted with a sentiment of paternalism enrooted in a much broader sentiment of superiority based in civilization and rationality. Similar thoughts endured the passing of years. Concepts as patrimony, development, heritage and sustainability seem to be more than forms of alienation, they play a pivotal role not only to drawing the boundaries between self-hood and otherness but also by perpetuating the spirit of colonialism.

DEVELOPMENT AND HEGEMONY

The problems of patrimony and development have been broadly examined by many studies in tourism fields. For instance, G. Moscardo explains that numerous evaluations have stressed out the negative consequences of development in tourism considering the following fourth aspects: a) modest or no profitability of residents (Kiss, 2004), b) negative

impacts on culture (Forstner, 2004), c) Real-Estate speculation that leads resident to an inaccessibility to lands (Vail and Hultkrantz, 2000) and d) damage to natural heritage and patrimony (Briassoulis, 2002). In addition, M. Nihalani certainly argues that development based on the paradigm of sustainability seems to be fruitful for involving community because it revitalizes the renewable and non-renewable resources to enlarge the threshold of economic benefits and reducing costs (Mihalani, 2008). Gronau and Kaufmann repeatedly discussed to what extent the tourism industry can be considered a sustainable activity instead of sustainable development. These scholars consider that earlier paradigm predicting how more sustainable tourism evolves, seems to be at least debatable. The process of globalization where dissimilar markets are rushed to compete in unequal conditions should be other premise that proponents of sustainability and development have very tough to explain. The overdependence of destinations as well as the hegemony of few tourist wholesalers in the market places the question of development and sustainability in serious problems (Gronau and Kaufmann, 2009). As this argument given, Moscardo realizes it is strongly necessary to have a sufficient understanding about the effects of development in communities (Moscardo, 2007). Nonetheless, the whole of these studies do not follow the historiography and evolution of development in the threshold of time. Afterwards Truman discourse in 1949 two antagonist waves surfaced by discussing about potentialities of development in underdeveloped societies in social Science and even in Anthropology.

Anthropology and Ethnology have been in a quandary very hard to resolve. For one hand, some anthropologists contended that technological facets of societies follow a linear evolution wherein communities pass to next phase of industrialization only adapting the basic assumptions of neo-liberal economy. The exchange of thoughts and knowledge would promote development and of course improve the condition of life of lay-people. Rather, other scholars convincingly warned there are societies with greater and lesser degree of capital. Those countries characterized by a high concentration of capital are aimed at dominating other weaker countries (to sustain their own survival) by means of financial control of loans that encourages the neo-liberalism (Escobar, 1995; Escobar, 1997; Grillo, 1985; Hobart, 1993; Viola, 2000; Esteva, 2000; Isla, 2005; Zamora and Garcia, 2008). Assumptions of this nature still are being discussed critically in anthropological literature over 40 years. One of the characteristics of ideology is not related in such to false consciousness or the dissemination of certain message, but in the scripted discourse which creates a situation of continuous necessity. Following this wave, the needs

of being a developed country are not only an illusion but also the platform to soliciting loans in international organism as IMF (Rist, 1996).

The higher rates under peripheral countries should be subject at time of soliciting a financial aid as well as the lack of control of international banking system in the loans play a pivotal role to create a linkage of dependence between developed and developing or undeveloped countries. The ongoing indebtedness in combination with lack of control by International Financial Organisms contributes to solidify the previous economic imbalances that ushered solicitants to their current conditions. Whenever a program of development or sustainability has not success enough, the involving experts reply this happens because non-developed countries have social pathologies associated to political instability, cultural corruption and lack of rational thought to administrate their own resources. A discourse of this caliber seems to be nourished highlighting all cultural deficiencies of solicitant country as a prerequisite to justify the complete failure of applied program (Cardelli and Rosenfeld, 1998). Many other scholars like Schnapper denounces this moot point are of course triggered by the doctrine of rationalization which highlight the process of development should be based on an efficient administration of resources. The exacerbation of rationalization and efficiency in administrative issues is often associated to the needs for centralizing a considerable degree of material resources at the time others less important may be privatized. Nonetheless, one of the points the anthropology for development is unable to explain is why in spite of the more and more money invested, countries in Third World are worse.

For European and American ethnocentrism, "Being developed seems not to be criteria enough to be in better conditions", a country should deserve to be developed (Schnapper, 1988). Similarly, Corbalan (2004) brings into question how United States duplicated between 1980 and 1990 the financial assistance to Latin America and Africa without any type of control. That way, United States not only changed the ideology of conquest but also replaced the old discourse of race and evolution by other newer intended to emphasize on governability. The concept of governability plays similar hegemonic role than rationality in former century. The thesis here is who manages the interest rates of loans can surely control the world. This begs a more than interesting question which is the role played by tourism in this process?

TOURISM: A WAY OF DEVELOPMENT OR A MECHANISM OF ALIENATION

As previously explained, Caton and Almeida Santos showed that modern tourist's experiences are in-depth embedded in certain depictions which are of course created during the colonialism. The image of third world as pristine, savage, fascinating but dangerous determine the presence of discursive strategies related to the exoticization of hosts that were found to be so prevalent in qualitative-related assessments of pictures took by visitors at destination. Triggered by racial and cultural constructions, students represent to "the other" following a specific binary combination associated with: traditional/modern, subject/object, master/servant, center/periphery and devious/lazy (Caton and Almeida Santos, 2008: 23). After all, this work evidenced how the old stereotypes coined in XIXth not only have been lasted in the threshold of time but also reinforced the logic of hegemony between center and periphery.

These last remarks lead us to a classical work authored by Turner and Ash who found that tourism very well replicates and of course continues the ideology of slavery and imperialism. The continuous concentration of capital in few hands rushes implicitly people traveling towards scarcely populated areas with the end of satisfying all their repressed necessities. Basically, tourist consumption not only allows "golden hordes" to consume all available resources at destinations but predispose peripheral societies into a vicious circle enrooted into poverty (Turner and Ash, 1975). Following this, R. Bianchi warns about the current tendency to envisage the cultural practice of tourism as a place wherein individuals create their own identities prioritizing a false hope of independence and self-actualization facilitated thanks to tourism consumption. This utopia determines a freedom to consume and of course the odds to be consumed; anyway, this freedom entails a cost. What neoliberal theories do not explicitly admit is whenever one group gains a huge profitability other is substantially deprived (Bianchi, 2009).

Up to day, scholars have agreed tourism plays a pervasive role in the revitalization of local resources. Like nationalism, tourism exploits commercially the heritage in order for residents to experience a pride for their local and national customs. The exclusiveness of the commercialized relic and staged authenticity boosts a sentiment of belonging. However, negative effects emerged associated to the speculation of lands and real estate, inflations, conflicts between hosts and guest and rise local resentment against tourists (Kala, 2008: 66). Certainly, E. De Kadt considered that not always development leads hosts to improve the life of

their communities. In accordance partially to Marxian scholars, De Kadt (1992) was convinced that countries where colonialism had a strong presence show less chances to achieve a real economic liberty than others where colonialism had been absent. To cut the long story short, one of problems of this critical perspective, it is hitherto has not be continued by other scholars. Tourism academy seems to remain reluctant to accept the current problems of sustainability and development's theories and their detractors have not drawn the sufficient attention from other academicians.

THE TROUBLING CONCEPT OF PATRIMONY

The relationship between patrimony, sustainability and development have been a wide-spread paradigms present in the whole part of specialized literature. Like anthropology many years back, in tourism and hospitality fields the scholarship currently deems that patrimony can be comprehended as an effective measure to save the resources of a community which are in danger. Ethimologically, the term patrimony derives from the Latin Patrimonium which signifies what one might be inherited by lineage of father. This word was originally applied on disputes related to heritage and rights of offspring in receiving goods and households from father or grand-father. Let us reminds readers that economy and hierarchal administration in Ancient Rome follows a model based on the patriarchal archetype (Lima-Paul, 2003) wherein term patrimony was not linked to the protection, at least in a direct way.

The unfettered expansion of Roman Empire promptly disseminated throughout the known world as well as the smuggling of statues and other relics. The collection of pieces innate to other lands was being intensified meanwhile Rome expanded its own hegemony. After all, in II century (B.C) craftsmen ceased to create handicrafts because they were imported from Eastern cities. For example, the Conquest of minor Asia contributed with golden and silver pieces for an amount of 18 millions of denarius (Robert, 1992:246). To the best of our knowledge, through the regency of Constantine (312 DC), the jurisprudence began to ban expressly the mass-commercialization of master-pieces (González-Varas, 2003:45-65; Ballart-Hernández, 2001:80). For other hand, the Renascence will play a crucial role in the onset of the current meaning of patrimony and European ethnocentrism (Burckhardt, 1985: 149-159). Renaissance seemed to be the prerequisite for the Grand-Tour surfacing during XVII and XVIII respectively (Enlightment); associated to a hierarchal order that emulated the hegemony of an feudal aristocracy the Grand Tour as

well as painting or architecture represented the power of nobility over the rest of peasants and of course the rights of lords to possess such territories (Sigaux, 1965: 27; Khatchikian, 2000: 70) (De la Torre, 1980: 13). With the advent of tourism as a mass-activity, the patrimony has been recycled in its original sense according to the social scaffolding of our societies and ephemeral ways of production.

CONCLUSION

In current specialized literature one might speculate that patrimony is associated to other new neologism as sustainability. The latter term has been coined as a result of the ecological aftermaths of late-capitalism in earth and non-renewable resources (Vitry, 2003; Aguirre, 2004; Dos-Santos and Antonini, 2004; Mondino, 2004; Espeitx, 2004; Toselli, 2006; NanThakumar et al, 2008; Gronau and Kaufmann, 2009). In addition, some scholars emphasize on the paramount importance of culture in the process of heritage's preservation to the extent to suggest the concept of sustainability revitalizes the natural assets of landscapes threatened by the advance of capitalism. Starting from the premise that tourism helps hosts appreciating their own patrimony, this industry paves the pathways towards a much broader understanding of what does heritage and sustainability mean (Esposito and Calvezani, 2006)

Basically, expansion of US hegemony in the world has been accompanied with the promise of development as a cure for all problems of Third World. The tergiversation of some words played a pivotal role in this process. This happened for example with patrimony and heritage, two concepts originally created in Ancient times and finally developed by anthropology amidst of XXth century. What surely proponents of theory of development have not taken in consideration are the following points: a) the needs of a territories wherein converges ethnicity and blood-hood, both preconditions for the advent of Nation-States and consequent colonialism in XIXth, b) after the process of decolonialism (from 1960 to 1970) many peripheral countries were of course bereft in a difficult economic situation, c) notion of development has been expanded to the world by scholars and experts as a cynic solution of problems peripheral countries come across with, d) an uncontrolled issuance of loans of IMF and other financial institutions not only did not improve the poverty in periphery but also created a stronger dependence. The highest accumulated rates of loans generated a vicious circle where developing countries ended to soliciting new credits to pay the rate of older ones. Ultimately, the tourism echoed of this discourse emphasizing the needs of

pour countries for implementing a process of touristification to better their economies. Of course, whenever criticisms of development pointed out on inefficacy of theory of development to improve the conditions of non-western civilizations, some anthropologists and scholars replied that failures in the financial aids have been a consequence of structural and cultural glitches such as politic inestability, politic corruption and cultural backwardness.

The existent cultural typology of heritage allows residents revitalizing the expectances of visitors who are anxious to meet with aborigines and know further about their habits. In fact, tourists seek the authenticity they suppose not to find in their homelands. A speech of this nature points out that sustainable tourism is feasible whether every part accepts their liabilities and honor the participations of other by means of appropriate plans for development (Silva-Santos, 2003). This shows as if terms as patrimony, cultural heritage, development and sustainability are inextricably intertwined for politic purposes. Under such a context, one might realize that the lack or paucity of critical studies along with the macro-sociological role of development and patrimony in creating material dependence (hegemony) between North and South should be one of the priorities of scholars in next years.

REFERENCES

- Aguirre, J.A. (2007). Deseables y Posibles: participación comunitaria, patrimonio histórico-cultural, calidad ambiental y desarrollo turístico sostenible. *Pasos: revista de turismo y patrimonio cultural*, Vol. 5, No.1, pp.1-16.
- Acerenza, M.A. (1991). *Administración del turismo: conceptualización y organización*. México, Editorial Trillas.
- Altman, J. & Finlayson, J. (2003). Aborigines, tourism and sustainable development. *The Journal of tourism Studies*, Vol. 14, No.1, pp.79-91.
- Alvarez, M. & Korzay, M. (2008). Influence of politics and media in the perception of Tureky as a tourism destination. *Tourism Review*, Vol. 63, No.2, pp.38-46.
- Alves, S. & Hilal, de A.V. (2009). Tourism Development: sustainable or sustained? Intercultural reflections on the case of Praia do Forte-Bahia, Brazil. *Pasos. Revista de Turismo y Patrimonio cultural*, Vol. 7, No.3, pp.503-514.
- Bagri, S., Gupta, B. & Babu, G. (2009). Environmental Orientation and Ecotourism awareness among Pilgrims, Adventure tourists, and leisure tourists. *Tourism*, Vol. 57, No.1, pp.55-68.
- Ballart-Hernández, J. (2001). *Gestión del Patrimonio Cultural*. Barcelona, Editorial Ariel.

- Barthes, R. (1997). *Mitologías*. Mexico, Ediciones Siglo XXI.
- Bianchi, R. (2009). The Critical Turn in Tourism Studies: a Radical Critique. *Tourism Geographies*, Vol. 11, No.4, pp.484-504.
- Blake, A. et al. (2008). Tourism and Poverty Relief. *Annals of Tourism Research*, Vol. 35, No.1, pp.107-126.
- Boullon, R. (1985). *Planificación del Espacio Turístico*. México, Trillas.
- Briasoullis, H. (2002). Sustainable Tourism and the questions of the Commons. *Annals of tourism Research*, Vol. 29, No.1, pp.1065-1085.
- Burckhardt, J. (1985). *The Culture of Renaissance in Italy*. Madrid, Editorial Sarpe.
- Cardarelli, G. & Rosenfeld, M. (1998). *Las participaciones de la pobreza: programas y proyectos sociales*. Buenos Aires, Editorial Paidós.
- Carson, D. et al. (2009). Heritage as a motivation for four-wheel-drive tourism in desert Australia. *Journal of Heritage Tourism*, Vol. 4, No.3, pp.217-225.
- Caton, K. & Almeida Santos, C. (2008). Closing the hermeneutic circle?: photographic encounters with the other. *Annals of Tourism Research*, Vol. 35, No.1, pp.7-26.
- Corbalán, M.A. (2004). Intervención y disciplinamiento: función política de los organismos internacionales de crédito. Ciclos, año XVI, Vol. XVI, No. 27. pp.1-15.
- Dos Santos Correa, R. & Antonini Oliveira, B. (2004). La gastronomía típica de la Isla de Santa Catarina, Brasil: su identidad como atractivo para el turismo cultural. *Estudios y Perspectivas en Turismo*, Vol. 13, No.1 and 2, pp.89-110.
- Dwyer, L. (2008). "Destination competitiveness and policy making for poverty reduction". Sustaining Quality of Life through Tourism. June 24-28. Conference VIII.
- Escobar, A. (1997). Antropología y Desarrollo. *Revista Internacional de Ciencias Sociales*, No. 154. UNESCO.
- Escobar, A. (1995). *Encountering Development: The Making and unmaking of the Third World*. Nueva Jersey, Princeton UP.
- Espeitx, E. (2004). Patrimonio Alimentario y turismo: una relación singular. *Pasos: revista de turismo y patrimonio cultural*, Vol. 2, No.2, pp.193-213.
- Esposito, M. & Calvezani, A. (2006). The World Heritage and Cultural Landscape. *Pasos: revista de Turismo y Patrimonio Cultural*, Vol. 4, No.3, pp.409-419.
- Esteva, G. (2000). "Desarrollo". En *Viola Andreu (Compilador). Antropología del Desarrollo*. Barcelona, Editorial Paidós.
- Forstner, K. (2004). Community Ventures and Access to markets: the role of intermediaries in marketing rural tourism products. *Development Policy Review*, Vol. 22, No.5, pp.497-514.
- Franch, M. et al. (2008). 41 tourism (landscape, leisure, learning and limit) responding to new motivations and expectations of tourist to improve the competitiveness of alpine destination in sustainable way. *Tourism Review*, Vol. 63, No.1, pp.4-14.

- Gray, P. (1982). The Contribution of Economic Tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research*, Vol. 9, No.1, New York, Pergamon Press.
- Grillo, R. (1985). Applied Anthropology in the 1980s: retrospect and prospect. In R. Grillo and Rew A. (Eds.) *Social Anthropology and Development Policy*, Londres: Travistock.
- Gronau, W. & Kaufmann, R. (2009). Tourism as a Stimulus for Sustainable Development in Rural Areas: A Cypriot Perspective. *Tourism: an international multidisciplinary Journal of Tourism*, Vol. 4, No.1, pp.83-95.
- Goodwin, H. (2002). The case for responsible tourism. In T. Jenkins (Eds.) *Ethical tourism*, London: Hodder and Stoughton.
- Harris, M. (2006). *The Rise of anthropological theory, a history of theories of culture*. Mexico, Siglo XXI.
- Heytens, J. (1978). Les Effects du Tourisme Dans les Pays en Vie de Développement. Implications Economiques. Financières et Sociales. Les Cahiers du Tourisme. Centre des Hautes Etudes du Tourisme. Provence: Universidad de Marsella.
- Hobart, M. (1993). *An Anthropological Critique of Development*. Londres, Routledge Ed.
- Isla, A. (2005). Cultura política y desarrollo: controversias en torno a un proyecto de producción comunal. In Isla, Alejandro y Colmegna, Paula (comp.) *Política y Poder: en los procesos de desarrollo*. Buenos Aires, Editorial de las Ciencias.
- Lacher, G.R. & Nepal, S. (2010). From Leakages to Linkages: local-level Strategies for capturing tourism revenue in Northern Thailand. *Tourism Geographies*, Vol. 12, No.1, pp.77-99.
- Lade, C.M. (2010). Potential Barriers to Visitation: A Rural cultural Heritage Museum Case. *E-Review of Tourism Research*. Vol. 8, No.3, pp.82-93.
- Lima-Paul, G. (2003). Patrimonio Cultural regional: estudio comparativo sobre la legislación protectora en las 32 entidades federativas mexicanas. *Revista Derecho y Cultura*, Vol. 9, pp.43-98.
- Kadt, De E. (1992). *Turismo: ¿pasaporte al desarrollo?* México, Editorial Endymion.
- Kala, N. (2008). Host perception of Heritage Tourism Impact with Special Reference to the City of Jaipur. *South Asian Journal of Tourism and Heritage*, Vol. 1, No.1, pp.66-73
- Khatchikian, M. (2000). *Historia del Turismo*. Lima, Universidad San Martín de Porres.
- Kiss, A. (2004). Is community-based Ecotourism a Good use of biodiversity Conservation funds? *Trends in Ecology and Evolution*, Vol. 19, No.5, pp.232-237.
- Maccannell, D. (1988). Tourism and cultural Identity. In T. Teodorov (Eds.) *El Cruzamiento entre Culturas*, Madrid: Ediciones Jucar.
- Martinez Alier, J. (1985). *Ecological Economics*. Oxford, Blackwell.

- Mihalani, M. (2008). Tourism Vision of 2020: Sustainability and it's Applications. *South Asian Journal of Tourism and Heritage*, Vol. 1, No.1, pp.81-86.
- Moscardo, G. (2007). Sustainable Tourism Innovation: Challenging basic assumptions. *Tourism and Hospitality Research*, Vol. 8, No.1, pp.4-13.
- Nadeau, J. et al. (2008). Destination in a country image context. *Annals of Tourism Research*, Vol. 35, No.1, pp.84-106.
- Nanthakumar, L. (2008). Tourism Development Policy, Strategic Alliances and Impact of Consumer Price Index on tourist Arrivals: The case of Malaysia. *Tourismos: an international multidisciplinary Journal of Tourism*, Vol. 3, No.1, pp.83-98.
- Pearce, D. (2008). A needs-functions model of tourism distribution. *Annals of Tourism Research*, Vol. 35, No.1, pp.148-168.
- Rist, G. (1996). Le développement histoire d une croyance occidentale. Paris, Prensa de la Fundación Nacional de Ciencias Políticas.
- Robert, J.M. (1992). *The Pleasures in Rome*. Madrid, Edaf.
- Santana Talavera, A. (2006). *Anthropology and tourism. New hordes for old customs*. Barcelona, Ariel.
- Schnapper, D.N. (1988). Modernidad y Aculturaciones a propósito de los trabajadores emigrantes. In T. Tzvetan (Eds.) *Cruce de Culturas y mestizaje cultural* (pp. 173-205), Madrid: Ediciones Jucar.
- Schluter, R. (2008). *Tourism: an integrated view*. Buenos Aires, Argentina.
- Sdrali, D. & Chazapi, K. (2007). Cultural Tourism in a Greek insular Community: the residents Perspective. *Tourismos: an international multidisciplinary Journal of Tourism*, Vol. 2, No.2, pp.61-76.
- Singal, M. & Uysal, M. (2009). Resources Commitment in Destination Management. The case of Abingdon, Virginia. *Tourism*, Vol. 57, No.3, pp. 329-344.
- Silva Santo, L.M. (2003). El Quibe en la mesa bahiana: la influencia árabe en la gastronomía de Bahía, Brasil. In G. Lacanau and J. Norrild (Eds.) *Gastronomía y Turismo: cultura al plato* (pp.267-274), Buenos Aires: CIET.
- Toselli, C. (2006). Algunas reflexiones sobre el turismo cultural. *Revista Pasos: revista de turismo y patrimonio cultural*, Vol. 4, No.2, pp.175-182
- Turner, L. & Ash, J. (1975). *The Golden hordes: International Tourism and the pleasure Periphery*. Londres, Constable Edit.
- Vail, D. & Hultkrantz, L. (2000). Property Rights and Sustainable Nature Tourism: adaltation and mal-adaptation in Dalarna (Sweden) and Main (USA). *Ecological Economics*, Vol. 35, No.1, pp.223-242.
- Viola, A. (2000). La Crisis del desarrollo y el surgimiento de la antropología del desarrollo. In Antropología del Desarrollo, Barcelona: Paidós.
- Vitry, C. (2003). Fiesta Nacional de la Pachamama: el ritual de alimentar a la tierra. In G. Lacanau and J. Norrild (Eds.) *Gastronomía y Turismo: cultura al plato* (pp. 227-244), Buenos Aires: CIET.

Korstanje Maximiliano Emanuel

Zamora, R. & García, M. (1988). *Sociología del Tiempo libre y consumo de la población*. La Habana, Editorial de Ciencias Sociales.

SUBMITTED: OCT 2011

REVISION SUBMITTED: JAN 2012

ACCEPTED: FEB 2012

REFEREED ANONYMOUSLY

Korstanje Maximiliano Emanuel (maxikorstanje@fibertel.com.ar) is a Lecturer of University Argentina John. F. Kennedy, Department of Social Psychology, Av. Dorrego 169 2 Floor Depto F. CP 1414 Buenos Aires.