Patrimony and heritage are considered important material aspects of Western society. Issues of social cohesion are often addressed by developing heritage as a mechanism of progress and education in shared critical values (Bourriaud, Schneider & Herman 2002; Collier & Ong, 2006). Over years, the concept not only gained acceptance in popular wisdom, but also credibility as an altruist activity that helps communities which were historically relegated by nation-state to live better (Smith 2006 45). News segments as cultural tourism, creative tourism are based on the allegory of heritage which is conducive to the exploitation of culture as a main commodity (du Cros, 2001; Jamal & Hill 2004). While aboriginals appeal to heritage to improve their conditions of life, no less true is that some other risks associated to conflict between ethnicities and nations surface (Comaroff & Comaroff 2009; Korstanje 2012). Some emergent voices have exerted a radical criticism on tourism-heritage simply because it echoes old cognitive frames and stereotypes proper of colonialism, where the meeting native-European is given under a “representative dissonance” that leads to interpret “natives” as well as their values as inferior to Europeaness (Bandyopadhyay & Morais, 2005; Korstanje 2012; Tzanelli 2015b).
As this backdrop, it is not accident to note how Western media over-value the destruction of ancient museums, for example in hands of ISIS jihadists as a scandal, whereas many other moral disasters are covered. One might speculate that heritage has gained recognition as the bulwark of West (Cuccia & Cellini 2007). However, this leaves an ethical and philosophical dilemma, since whenever the Western media see acts of vandalism against museums as crimes it is set against a backdrop of redemptive punishment. This raises more critical questions. Is heritage so important for the material culture of the West? Why is a future-oriented society so concerned with the past?

The main thesis of this essay-review is based on the legacy of Huizinga’s works. Originally, Huizinga (1999) draws the attention to the roles played by allegories not only as mechanisms of escape, which serve to balance the daily frustrations of daily life, but as ideal types that give non-specialists a sense of belonging. These new found allegories prevent social fragmentation (Huizinga 1999). However, the Middle Ages was based on a strong atomization of power where cruelty and violence placed the peasant as little more than a slave. They, medieval peasants, were oppressed by the application of coactive manners, which ranged from torture to assassination. This prevented internal insurrections or acts of dissidence, which would have compromised the governance of the kingdom. A plunder economy reigned from the Roman Empire through much of the Middle Ages, but, as Huizinga points out, an ‘archetype of chivalry’ facilitated the constructions of nobility as heroes to emulate. That way, the ruling elite not only enhanced its legitimacy but were followed and respected as examples of courage, altruism and wisdom.

Nonetheless, nobility exerted a considerable violence over its feudal population, stimulating internal conflicts among neighbours when all resources of the region or kingdom were exhausted.
Although, knights and nobility were cruel, jealous, competitive, even in some conditions making unjust decisions, the discourse of chivalry was aimed at revitalizing all peasants’ suffering in order for the system not to collapse. The cultural values echoed by popular opinion, were opposed to the day-to-day behaviour of medieval officialdom. This ideological discourse efficiently worked in two senses. On one hand, it conferred to ordinary people some hope of frustrating disasters which happened because the king was not familiar with the situation. On the other, though, its policies resulted in real reasons for expanding suffering and conflict, since the nobility needed to maintain a decent image before the community (Huizinga, 1999). Huizinga leaves us an illustrative lesson; ideology plays a pervasive role by reconfiguring the fields of politics, exerting a dissuasive control over population and potential insurgencies. With the advance of a bourgeoisie, where the attachment of people to their masters blurred, peasants move from slavery to become a work-force where their labour is paid for. Modernity is reached, in labour terms, when anyone has the liberty to work for a range of employers, rather than being apprentices and inextricably interlinked to their masters, as in earlier times. The ideals of chivalry and religion reinforced the hegemony of kings by the imposition of ideological discourses that changed the sense of reality. In this essay-review, one might ask to what extent the current obsession for heritage and literature play the same role as the ideals of chivalry in medieval times. At the same time, it is necessary to discuss and reconsider the problems and main limitations of heritage theory in the field of tourism knowledge. This essay review explores a new pathway towards the sociology of heritage.

French sociologist Robert Castel notes that the Middle Ages and modernity represent two great contrasting worlds (Castel 2010 & 2015). While medieval life exists under the precarious economy of subsistence and combats of plunder, modernity
appears to offer a stable way of life, which paradoxically is based on an atmosphere created by the mass media of ongoing risks and threats. While medieval pilgrims used religions to subdue their frustrations, and enhance their ontological security, modern workers are subject to a platform of diverse changes, radical shifts and financial crises that threaten their livelihood. The paradox lies in the fact that modern workers live today more securely, while their means of work has been radically altered in favour of neo-liberal economics. The current inflation of risks, which modern citizens face, rests on the decline of social trust and the attachment to in-groups. As these social risks increase through the deeper processes of depersonalization, a new cohesion is sought to mediate between citizenry and institutions.

Castel adds, modernity introduces the contract, which is enrooted in law-making, in an attempt to break the authority of masters over apprentices, and in so doing, the work became a transaction. Over centuries, diverse social protections were amassed by unions (Castel 2010 & 2015). During the 1970s sociologists, including Guy Debord (1983) and Dean MacCannell (1976) captivated the interest of tourism knowledge researchers; their insights focused on the connection of entertainment, spectacle and tourism. The theatricalisation of daily life, widely studied by Debord in his book, *The Society of Spectacle* hints at how societies in the thrall of mass media create an industry of entertainment as a disciplinary mechanism of control. MacCannell delves into the idea that tourism is a more complex institution than the totem, and is, instead, a valid instrument in order for society to be kept united. Following Durkheim, MacCannell argues that the tribal mind confers its legitimacy to the totem, which is symbolically presented as important platform for members of society to understand their environment. Needless to say those in secularised societies, totems are created from reified forms of consumption, such as tourism. MacCannell writes that tourism
revitalises the daily frustrations of work-time, and offers a fertile ground for the quest of a new status, with new situations. Simply because what tourists seek seems to be associated with a unique experience, authenticity becomes the pillar of tourist consumption.

Gazing at even non-Western cultural rituals, Western tourists feel they are consuming an authentic experience; they experience a performance which rests on a fiction (MacCannell 1973; 1976; 1984; 1988; 1992; 2001; 2009; 2011; 2012). Though MacCannell is widely criticised by other sociologists, for example John Urry, particularly for his obsession with structural analysis, MacCannell offers an argument which seems to illuminate consumer society. Modern tourists visit museums and make themselves open to historical knowledge because the act of being there gives status to them. In this vein, Paul Virilio & Marc Augé, like MacCannell, claim that tourism blurs the boundaries of time and space, producing empty-places. Non-Western societies are geographically allotted to spaces, and hence are disciplined according to the expansion of markets. Unless the Other meets all the aesthetic requirements for a Westernised demand, tourism merely symbolises an inter-cultural meeting which never starts (Augé, 1998; Virilio 2007). Anyway, this begs a more than interesting point, where then does heritage consumption align with this economic decline?

Mary Louis Pratt (2007), in her book Imperial Eyes dissects the genesis of European imperialism to a cultural matrix centred in the needs of classification. The old centre-periphery dependency was originally forged by the scientific gaze which promoted emergent enterprises in overseas territories. While the discovered others was during long time an object of fear, curiosity and admiration, no less true was that these expeditions cemented the colonization of Americas in the name of science. Literature
and stories of the new world engaged Europeans with a much deeper fictional matrix which served to index new lands, profits and trades to imperial powers.

As the previous argument given, French ethnographer Marc Augé (1998) takes the leaps of imagination to trace the cultural roots of travels. He found that the rise and expansion of novels adjoined to literature can be considered the epicentre of travels through XIXth and beginning of XXth centuries. The sense of curiosity is instilled by the introduction of imagined landscapes on the audience which portrays these far away worlds in the periphery. With the advance of tourism, as an industry that commoditizes otherness, Auge adheres to the thesis that the meaning of travels blurred. Rather, Charlie Mansfield (2015) reminds that Western civilization was based on the power of ocular-centrism, the gaze which tested reality through the sense of sight. The needs of “being there” which characterized the interests of social sciences was determined by two chief factors: *authenticity and curiosity*. While the former signalled to movement inspired in a precedent narrative or text, written by others who had visited the place, authenticity corresponds with the fabrication of experiences around travels. Undoubtedly, modern tourism as well as the world of Heritage resulted from *travel writing and novels.*

A preliminary response is hinted by geographer James S Dungan (1978) who in parallel with MacCannell, explained that tourism functions upon what he termed “the culture shock”. Based on phenomenology, he understands while some societies accepts strangers, others are hostile to them. Whatever the case may be, strangers should be subject to a rite of passage under the patronage of a native. Since tourists pay for that sponsorship, they are condemned to see the world (not as a native) but as a guest. The same serves to explain the paradox of authenticity, which is discussed in the following lines,
If the tourists emerge from a visit to a foreign country with his own categories largely intact, the experience will have done little to demystify his reified worldview. The tourist furthermore may return from his travels with his previous reified, stereotyped images of the peoples and places visited. This may be due in part to the tourist business, which profits from providing the tourists what that with he wished to see. (Duncan, 1978 275)

Indeed, the commercialized hospitality places tourists into a tramp, simply because at the same time they launch far from home to appreciate the world as it stands in other geographies, he is marked as an strangers. Once he is accepted by native as “other who is different to us”, typically native should offer hospitality in order for him not suffer any harm. In so doing, he will never experience the world as a native, and here is where inauthenticity lies.

One of the pioneers who had widely studied the decline of welfare state (in complement with Castel) was Peter Taylor Gooby (professor of Social policy at the University of Kent UK). Per his viewpoint, the world as it was known by our grand-parents set the pace to new fragmented cosmologies, where neither states nor governments can provide the necessary resources for their citizens to meet their basic rights. Doubtless, this opens the doors to new risks for social security politicians are unable to resolve worldwide (Taylor-Gooby 2004). In perspective he argues that limited by the number of active workers in the system; the welfare state is in a process of disappearance. Two main factors are of paramount importance in the decline of labour opportunities. The first and most important aspect he associates with the introduction of technologies which reduce the number of available jobs. It raises the dilemma of competence within the labour market. Workers need to take responsibility for their own retraining in emerging technologies to maintain their competitiveness in the labour
market. Secondly, medicine and health improvements extend life expectancies resulting in an ageing society. This means that the tax-paying workforce is smaller than its retired workers. What are the economic shifts West experienced after this crisis?

Given these changes in the economic matrix, marketers and specialists understood the needs of changing the core and margins of capitalist economy. Although originally liberal economists envisaged consumption from a pejorative perspective, from 70s decade on programs encouraged consumption as the pathway towards development. As brilliantly K Donohue (2003) documented, the age of consumers and excess of devotion on consumerism was introduced by the biased belief demand is more important than supply. If economy was stagnated in the stage of industrialism, where producerists monopolized the means of production, it should be radically altered in order for states to find solutions to poverty. Those strong regulatory programs which characterized the economy of welfare should be abandoned for some other liberal ways which expanded profits by means of demand expansion. Demand, of course, not supply should be the touchstone of any global and competitive liberal economy. For doing so, capital-owners not only echoed the claims of Marxism on market-and-stock crisis in 30s decade, adjoined to the rise and expansion of poverty worldwide, but they appealed to transform literature according to the needs of instilling a psychological need on citizens. Beyond the received critiques, Donohue adds, the proposed radical change paved the ways for the advent of new sustainable forms of production which was based on what people wanted as the first option. This means that every resource can be transformed in a commodity which will be successfully exchanged according to its costs. One day, specialists did not hesitate in commoditizing culture and cultural consumption as a fertile ground towards capitalist expansion (Donohue 2003). However, far from reaching stable cycle of production-consumption, cultural consumption faced serious
obstacles because the number jobs naturally plummeted. This observation led Jeremy Rifkin to claim the end of work. The productivity of post-capitalist economies is growing exponentially, though it cannot be materialised in further jobs for people. Since the workforce have problems to secure their economic resources, for example, they have no pension when they face retirement, they are more insecure than in other periods of time, such as the Middle Ages discussed earlier in this paper (Featherstone 2010; Castel 2010; Sennett, 2011; Bauman 2007; 2013; Korstanje 2015).

As the previous argument given, Richard Sennett (2011) sheds the light on these smatters delineating an analogy between the industrial-ethos and postmodernism. During industrialism, workers planned a long career scheme within an organisation. The work was not only steady but it granted a just retirement after 30 years of service (Sennett 2011). Today this has changed. Those employees who work in a company for more than 3 years are psychologically labelled as ‘less tolerant to change’, obstinate, or as problems. Recruiters valorise entrepreneurship, creativity, change and open-mind instead of other individual assets as intelligence, skills and expertise. Thus, those workers with weaker ties in earlier companies have more opportunities to be selected than others who have spent considerable part of their career in only one company. The labour market has experienced a rapid and dynamic flexibilisation, where people co-manage their own risks. They are pressed to embrace “change for change itself” as a valid sign of experience. That way, capital-owners have gradually reduced and alleviated their social costs. At the time, profits of corporations have increased, serious vulnerabilities of workforce surfaced. As Zygmunt Bauman puts it, competitiveness among workers for a job leads to a much more problematic process of depersonalisation, where workers are transformed in consumed-objects.
Since information technologies stimulate the mass-consumption through different networks and media, individuals merge their identity with the consumed-commodities. Consuming is not only a distinctive sign of belonging; it becomes the main cultural value of post-industrial society (Bauman 2011; 2013). As Christopher Lasch noted, the decline of trust encouraged by capital-market, produces a gap which is fulfilled by a narcissistic character, since the attachment between children and parents weakened, the gap is filled by consumerism (Lasch 1991). Here, though, cultural heritage may rescue workers from this self-branding since it offers a past to which an authenticating link can be imagined that transcends membership of a consumption cycle. Last but not least, M. E Korstanje (2015) calls attention on the role played by social Darwinism in the configuration of capitalism’s ideological discourse, where the survival of the richest is valorised as a the maxim archetype to follow.

Heritage management has been defined as a process “by which heritage managers attempt to make sense of a complex web of relationships surrounding in a manner which meets the values of interests of many of the key stakeholders” (Tucker & Emge, 2010: 42). For tourism-related scholars, the adoption of heritage serves as a non-exploitative form of production, which results in less contamination and the possibility natives play a leading role by offering visitors more sustainable products (as creative-tourism, or cultural tourism). At a closer look, this happens in the daily life, since many oppressed tribes which were historically debarred from wealth distribution process enhance their position by the introduction of heritage-or-cultural tourism. This point was widely documented in works as Altman 1989; Davis & Weiler 1992; Moscardo & Pierce, 1999; Azeredo-Grunewald 2002; Ryan & Huyton, 2002; Clark (2010) among others. In tourism fields, needless to say, the concept of heritage was adopted by P Gray who in 1982 argued on the needs of introducing “heritage” in
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order for culture to be transformed as an efficient instrument for community. While, Gray adheres, heritage helps local to enhance their condition of life, less contaminant forms of production are prioritized in which case, not only the environment is protected but peoples allude to political stability by means of poverty-relief programs. From that moment on, tourism-heritage was fleshed out as an economic vehicle to make the life of community better. Most certainly, in parallel, the concept of sustainability (or even development) focused on reversing all negative effects of tourism in the environment. Undoubtedly, culture plays a leading role as the main commodity of heritage-tourism contributing to the preservation of sites, reaffirming local attachment for tradition (Duman & Kozak, 2009). In this vein, Moscardo & Phillips (1999) acknowledges that heritage tourism allows consumers to imagine a social landscape, depending on their inner-world. If the tourists need to consume culture, or heritage, fieldworkers should pay attention to those expectances, narratives and discourses which are intersected and exchanged between hosts and guests. The co-produced knowledge seems to be subject to wider constructions sometimes are not designed in the visited community. This discussion opens the doors to the limitations of heritage-tourism when it is commoditized without hearing the voices of local producers. The importance of heritage-tourism to natives is twofold. On one hand, the cultural background community offers to tourism entails ongoing re-negotiations which feds up “creativity” and “tolerance” in both sides. Secondly, co-ethnic businesses promote a climate of respect ensuring a fairer distribution of wealth (Williams & Shaw, 2011). However, as it will be clarified in next lines, heritage tourism exhibits some profound limitations which merit to be discussed.

It is not accident that cultural products which ranges from literature to art craft operate from a fictional platform, a gap which is fulfilled to avoid social disorganization. From
its inception, nation-states constructed arts to connect with otherness. Since any travel starts with the imagination, painting, novels and culture contributed to “social imagination” necessary to foster “the quest of novelty”. The adoption of travel writing as a new genre of literature played a vital role in the consolidation of tourism. In that way, the expansion of colonialism adjoined to the “reorganization of emotions” were key factors to forge “attractiveness”. Once tourism maturated, in this is the point specialized literature forgets, the old paternalism woken up in colonial times accompanied tourism industry by the consolidation of heritage (Korstanje, Busby & Mansfield 2011; Mansfield 2015; Mansfield & Laidlaw 2016). In fact, in earlier studies, Korstanje discussed critically “the concept of heritage” was coined by anthropology (since the first ethnographers were lawyers) to protect those artefacts, cultures or even tribes, industrialism would override. The pioneer ethnographers developed a romantic vision of “aborigines” where they thought “these primitive cultures” would disappear at time modernity advances. This type of new paternalism not only engaged centre-periphery allegories, but introduced the needs of protection as the main criterion of heritage (Korstanje 2012). For some reasons, the development of heritage was strongly associated to more ethnocentric forms of connection with otherness, where the mainstream cultural values of Europeans as liberty, trade, democracy were never questioned. Once WWII, the doctrine of development ignited this old discourse pressing many under-developed nations to adopt rationalized programs issued by IMF and World Bank. The failure in importing these exogenous models (to protect local heritage or promoting tourism) led United Nations to speak of “cultural glitches”. Of course, using a blaming-the-victim tactic, experts of development acknowledged that those under-developed nations which experienced a traumatic past of colonial oppression or slavery were prone to have cultural problems to
develop democracy, in view of other more compatible cultures (Esteva & Prakash, 1998; Escobar 1988; 1991; 1992; 2011). This seems to be the platform from where Emanuel de Kadt published his book, *Tourism: passport to development?*. In this seminal text, he exerts a radical criticism against the doctrine of development, but without questioning its core. De Kadt (1979) contends mistakenly, that culture is a self-explanatory factor that sheds light on why programs of development and tourism fail. With this in mind, he argues that those nations subject to past trauma, fail to adopt “stable institutions”, which generate a financial dependency once tourism arrived. Instead of bettering their economies, many under-developed nations did not the correct thing in adopting tourism as a main economic alternative. Surfacing claims on theory of development, which can be conjoined to heritage-tourism, rested on stereotyped narrative coined through colonialism, which persisted to date. The idea that capitalism is the best of feasible worlds is the main ideological discourse nourished by heritage-driven consumption. Besides, methodologically speaking, some applied research in heritage tourism rests on two shaky foundations. At a first glance, they pay much attention to what visitors say (by the administration of questionnaires or interviews) instead of pondering other types of less intrusive methodologies as ethnographies or visual analysis content. More interested in protecting the profits of investors than understanding more accurate what heritage means, they are prone to propose new programs and plans to make destinations more competitive. It was unfortunate that this economic-oriented position obscures more than it clarifies. Secondly, the over-confidence given on the utterance of tourists (as the only way of knowing truth) represents a serious problem because of two main reasons. Sometimes, interviewed tourists are not familiar with their inner-world, while in some cases they lie to protect their interests or respond what fieldworkers want. This is the
reason why though widely-used, questionnaires’ and interviews to tourists should be taken as a marginal option in applied-research. While researchers did a correct step interpreting “what tourists like or feel”, others much deeper themes remain unchecked. To put this slightly in other terms, at the time tourists are questioned on what heritage tourism is (for them), they will respond what is acceptable for social imaginary, which oscillates from “a new way of being closer to others”, “educational purposes”, “interests for other cultures and history”, “tolerance for otherness” and so many others answers in the same line. What happens is that analysts classify these responses prioritizing motives of tourists at visiting sites, but ignoring the functionality of heritage within society. Neither tourists, nor fieldworkers understand the alienatory nature of heritage consumption, due to “they look to know only through the lens of tourists”. As stated, not only new alternatives should be re-discussed, but we must pay attention to the role played by culture (heritage) sublimating the frustrations society cannot balance inside. Culture offers an opportunity to peoples who are historically relegated from classical markets and do not belong to nation-states, to amass their own wealth. Philip McMichael (2012) argues that European political elites, by the introduction of colonialism, established an ideological background for legitimizing overseas colonisation. However, this is overturned in the process of decolonization, where local leaders mobilise colonial populations with claims to access the same rights as the political elites in the colonising nation state. McMichael explains that imperial powers allude to the theory of development to maintain the dependency between the centre and its periphery. Administration of the World Bank’s development-related programmes sparked nationalist reactions in the non-aligned countries. To restore the order, a new supermarket revolution surfaced: globalization (McMichael 2012). Is tourism a solution to global poverty?
As J. Comaroff & J. Comaroff (2009) put it, beyond the promises of globalized economies, the industry of heritage can be explained by the needs of finding new sources of exploitation, the ethno-merchandise, where costs are reduced and profits enhanced. To some extent, anthropology as an academic discipline emerged over concerns that non-Western cultures were disappearing. Social scientists in the fields were concerned to create an inventory of different non-European cultures before their extinction. Once these disappearing cultures adopt empowerment to improve their living conditions, their culture is marketed to be sold as a commodity. This new type of identity, though more flexible, objectifies the local inhabitant to the extent to its needs are enslaved to a fabricated past. Basically, cultural tourism not only evokes a vibrant past which does not exist, but confers to local communities the legal mechanism for launching a new self-representation. The value of aboriginal culture is determined by those features that legitimate the West supremacy. Aboriginals may say something if this discourse can be commercialized. This represents a much deeper process of alienation where cultures are disclosed from their original roots. In doing so, the culture is sold attending only to the interests of consumers.

On one hand, tourism uses cultural protection to re-draw the geography of the world. On the other, indigenous populations construct their sense of belonging in view of what they believe tourists want to hear and see. The merit of this work consists in reminding that this trend not only blurs the boundaries between past and present but also impose new economies based on ethno-merchandise where production never ends. The classical rules of economy teach us that the rise of demands entails a decline in the production. Needless to say, this does not happen with ethno-merchandise. The more the demand for cultural consumption, the better for production; that way, the destination never declines in what it can produce (Comaroff & Comaroff 2009).
Following this, Rodanthi Tzanelli explains that the host-guest meeting is based on a cultural matrix, which corresponds to an ethno-centricity crystallised in a European way of thinking where the Other is subordinated to Western materiality. Subject, this way, to a double circle of hermeneutics, that's sees locals according to the gaze of international travellers, heritage replicates symbolic allegories that deepen the dependency of centre and its periphery. These stereotypes are subtle but stronger, sometimes embedded with the aesthetics of film, tourism, mega-events and other cultural industries (Tzanelli 2004; 2006; 2015ª, 2015b; Korstanje, Clayton & Tzanelli, 2014). This is the reason why, many writers see heritage as the main element of postmodern tourism (Timothy 1997; Timothy & Boyd, 2006; Olsen, 2003; Raj & Morphet 2007; Korstanje, 2012). However, further investigations are needed to expand the current understanding in regards to the function of heritage in our contemporary world.

Has the behaviour of the European holidaymaker changed? Year after year, their grandparents elected to go to the same destinations to enjoy their holidays simply because their main interests were associated with outdoor recreation, rest and relax. Contemporary European tourists are in quest of new sensations, are open to new experiences and novelty, surely in exotic landscapes. As a rule these holiday-makers never return to the same hotel or destination, but needs of social distinction prevail. Story-telling becomes vital in understanding and sharing what is a good experience for these travellers. The idea of distinctive consumption seems to be the touchstone of postmodern tourism or post-tourism as it was coined by Ritzer & Liska (1997).

In this respect, various external factors, which range from mass tourism to the global financial crisis, have had a profound effect. Tourism has become atomised in countless subtypes, for example dark tourism, creative tourism, or disaster tourism.
according to an individualised demand. Sociologically speaking, the precarious situation that the European workforce now faces, with huge youth unemployment in Spain, Italy, Portugal and Greece, is inversely proportional to the resources consigned to the industry of spectacles. Far from being in an atmosphere of certainty, twenty-first century consumers have to increase risk by borrowing money to relax at their dream destination. As Urry and Lash (1993) observe, the stimulation of mass consumption entails a neglected depletion in economic resources that leads to economic instability.

Some decades ago, Johan Huizinga (1999) interrogated on the intersection of economy and politics. His point of start was to answer how society keeps united. What are the key factors that prevent the social fragmentation? Following this original concern, he proposes that heritage connotes stability, through its opportunity to discover what has already happened. Heritage, tradition and history denote what have survived through the test of time. For popular parlance, heritage is legitimised by the rights to cultural identity. Heritage consumption is a rite performed in a context of volatility, fluid interaction and ongoing change. Within nation-state, its ideological discourse is aimed at upending the values that rule during the work-time. In a context of change, the tradition, which means what is gone and cannot be changed, persists. Fictions of this calibre are significant for the smooth functioning of society. Status quo keeps its legitimacy over community not only by what ideology says, but what it covers (Korstanje & Escalona, 2014: 176). There is still a widespread belief that we live in a mobile world, but if readers review the international statistics will realize less than 1% of global population is legally allowed to travel for holiday making. This information was easily obtained taking into consideration that while total population of the world reaches 7 billion, World Tourism Organization only estimated 1133 million of arrivals in
This results in almost 0.16 of total population seems to be fit to travel.

One of the most successful aspects of ideology consists in promoting particular in-group values, which corresponds to elite, as universal applicable to all peoples of the world. In this token, privileged groups make the rest of society believe their guiding values not only are desirable but the most suitable and safest gate-ways to progress. Bauman acknowledges that only a minor portion of citizens can afford international travel in exotic and beauty tourist destination, while a whole portion of humankind is left to immobility (Bauman 2011). Workers realise they cannot afford their dream destinations for their next holidays. As a co-manager of their failures and risks, citizens fix their insolvency, and ask banks for a loan. The logic of work-holidays-work has been inverted in holiday-work-holiday. This happens because vacations are not yet the result of one year of work, but a sign of status where people desire to belong.

Beyond the lines of normalcy lie those who are unable to reach this sign of status. Tim Ingold (2000) explains that the opposition between work and leisure rests on a fallacy introduced by industrialism through 19th century. Though the workforce is paid, the obtained capital comes back to the system in forms of leisure consumption. In those cases when the ideological discourse fails, the social change is imposed. This was exactly what occurred when the Middle Age declined, and industrialism appeared. As Riesman puts it, industrial production changed the inner-oriented character which paved the way for the expansions of industrial economies towards the periphery. If tourism, journalism and literature have something in common, it is the interest for the Other, for cultural difference. It is interesting to see how those lives
which are frustrated by this impasse in contemporary society crave outstanding landscapes or unique experiences in heritage tourism. Tourism, in this context, offers a rapid escape towards new and special sensations in order for social order not to collapse. That way, not only conflict is undermined but is channelled towards heritage. Though MacCannell (following John Urry) describes this sentiment of novelty quest, he was unable to give further details on key factors of the issue. The primary problematic aspect readers may object to this essay-review is that identity melts to heritage to produces commodities which are globally consumed worldwide. These new cultural consumptions would somehow legitimize some emergent claims to identity rights. So, this raises a more pungent question, unexplored through this text, what does happen when different or contrasting heritage(s) converge in the same destination?. While heritage is politically manipulated by Anglo-Europeans to expand their values to the world, how does it engage with Mexico, Bangladesh, or Rwanda?

To respond this question with accuracy, we have discussed “cultural heritage”, from a structural viewpoint, as an all-encompassing allegory which is not affected by individual perception. Given this, heritage should be defined as a social institution, regardless of the appropriation, negotiations, or meaning around the term. Of course, no less true is that heritage should be deciphered in connection to capital expansion, in the same way chivalry (in Medieval Times) was intertwined to politics. Heritage today plays an ideological role by revitalizing the frustrations and unmet needs the capitalism system promotes. Last but not least, restrictions for the expansion of capital have been liberated by developed countries, which foment a rapid and fluid commodity-exchange. Individual’s working lives within contemporary economies have become even more precarious than the Middle Ages. The stimulation of consumption, which was accompanied by the introduction of social Darwinism, pits worker against worker in the job market. The end of the welfare state
generates further asymmetries between centre and the periphery (Korstanje & Skoll 2013). Overall, the atmosphere of work is subject to an ongoing change and economic instability. In order for social trust not to decline, an ideological discourse in woven, encouraged by tourism, which fictionalises reality.
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