

Searching the Roots of Patrimony and It's Appliance in Tourism Field

KORSTANJE MAXIMILIANO E.*

*Korstanje Maximiliano E., Aiest – University of Palermo, Argentina

ABSTRACT

In XIX century many anthropologists left their homes in quest of exotic customs and habits to discover. In parallel with the colonialism process, anthropology played a pivotal role in providing to politicians valuable information about the natives. The ethnographies not only were read by academicians in the continent but also by colonial officials who were strongly concerned in knowing further about aborigines. Let us reminds that this does not mean anthropology worked necessarily as an instrument of hegemony but in this slippery matter the boundaries seem to be blurred. One of the concerns characterized the first ethnologist was the compulsory need to protect the non-Western cultures of the inevitable disappearance due to capitalism advance. Enrooted in the belief that exotic cultures will decline at the time industrialism advances, Europe paternalism triggered an uncanny obsession in academicians for protecting and collecting devices and artifacts of remote Australia, Africa and even South America. In the continuum of development and civilization, Europe must save the rest of the globe from their backwardness. This romantic sentiment associated to a wider colonization process give as a result the rise of anthropology as a discipline. Concepts such as patrimony or heritage, coined originally by lawyers, were present in the first exponent of this academic wave. Of course, this point is well known by historians and anthropologist, the fact is that not only these beliefs survive in anthropology nowadays but also were replicated to tourism fields. Under such a context, the present critical essay is aimed at debating in detail what we really understand when refer to patrimony?

KEYWORDS: *Tourism, Anthropology, Protection, Patrimony.*

INTRODUCTION

At the beginning of XIX century, first anthropologists were enrooted in the belief that the advance of industrialism not only would be irreversible but also would generate disappearance of many non-western cultures. The first ethnologies, as Harris put it, were lawyers interested in questions of heritage, lineage and patrimony (Harris, 2006). Based on the yearnings to create a discipline which helps native to alleviate the negative effects of industrialization, they certainly contemplated the odds to collect as much as possible lore, customs, artifacts, devices and habits of these cultures in bias of extinction. The inception of otherness was ethnocentrically accompanied with a much more deep-seated issue associated to paternalism. The line of history created societies with different degrees of development and civilization. Theory of survivals in Harris argues that certain social institutions can be randomly replicated from generation to generation regardless the time. "Survivals" as he called to these construes do not have an accurate function in social life, however they persist. Previous assumptions might help understanding why the term Patrimony has endured in the line of time.

In parallel with the Darwinism and eugenics Social Sciences emphasized on the divergence of human beings. Following the example of animals that Darwin illustrated, humanity was segmented by different types of races which distinguished from others by a supposed degree

of intelligence. For being a theory elaborated in North-Europe, it was not surprising to note eugenicists emphasized on the idea whites and Anglo-Saxons showed to have a top-ranked level of intelligence while blacks and Asians were considered with less rationality or even under the line of humanity. A recent research carried out by S. Eriksson in regards to the admiration of British visitors in XVIII and XIX centuries for Sweden. Her paper very well focuses on certain social construes linked to cleanliness, neatness and civilization associated to Norse archetypes and how such a depiction determined the way of thinking in citizenship throughout England and beyond (Eriksson, 2010). Of course, this is often well-known by everyone who dedicates to the study of history, but does this something to do with tourism? Why we frequently come across with the term patrimony in tourism fields? We are ever really understood what does it mean?, can we know the ethimological roots of the word Patrimony?.

The relationship between patrimony and development appears to be a wide-spread paradigm present in the whole part of specialized literature. Underpinned in the proposition that tourism helps hosts alleviating problems such as poverty or even improving the distribution of wealthy, experts currently promote tourism beyond the boundaries of Europe, preferably in lands with shortages of economic resources. That way, patrimony can be comprehended as an effective measure to save the heritage of hosts and allows a further commercialization of their culture respects to foreign visitors. The latter with a favorable currency exchange and purchasing power would revitalize the economy of residents. A discourse of this caliber sometimes works and sometimes fails.

Under such a context, the present work delves into the history of patrimony, a term coined originally by lawyers, gradually passed from Anthropology to tourism. Furthermore, it is important to discuss to what an extent Patrimony is convenient to be used current scientific research. Like in XIX century, even though considerable attention was given hitherto to the capitalism aftermaths over environments and social bondage, less attention was paid to the pivotal role plays conceptualizations such as Patrimony or development in this process. Our thesis is that far-away of absorbing the commercialization of natural resources; both seem implicitly to be functional to the hegemony of market and industrialization. These and other concerns drew on the necessity to look first into the Ancient Rome where this term was originally coined.

THE PATRIMONY IN ANCIENT ROME

Ethimologically, the term patrimony comes from the Latin *Patrimonium* which signifies what one might be inherited by lineage of father. This word was applied on disputes related to heritage symbolizing the 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 the model of the patriarchal archetype (Lima-Paul, 2003). Even if the females were not relegated to home like in Greece, the fact was that their role in public life was extremely constrained. With background in mind, forms of heritage were driven by two different channels in accordance to the genre: *agnatus and cognatus*. The former refers to the masculine line of descendant while the latter the feminine ones. Exclusive rights of patrimony might be only applied on the agnatus (observing the combination patri derives from father or protector and onium from the verb to receive).

The word protector connoted to a much broader cultural value associated to not only the heritage but also religion. The sacred fire was a providence of the family in honor to male ancestors who bestowed a much broader protection of the unexpected threats families could face -ranging from protection in the war to a poor harvest-. The cult of ancestor was widespread throughout Ancient Rome and included slaves and clients as a part of patrimony. The main priest who warranted the "sacred fire" being constantly burned was the father in who converge as well the authority and power. Fustel de Coulanges assumes that whether this fire went out, involving family would suffer a general social condemn to the extent of

disintegration. Whenever a woman would be desired by a man, she would pass from her father's authority toward her husband by means of a strict ceremony known as *matrimonium* (current matrimony that really means what derives from the mother) (Coulanges, 2005). However, once dead the father, his debts were transferred to sons and daughters generationally. As nowadays, in Ancient Rome the patrimony was ritually composed by assets (debenture of a third party in favor of me) and debts (debentures in favor of a third-party).

Needless to say, this idea corresponds with our modern way of conceiving financial patrimony of companies and corporations. Nevertheless, there was no term that associates to the need of nurturance. In other words, Romans had few notions and laws related to the patrimony as synonymous of protection in the "Twelve Tables". For example, table four shows *Si pater filium ter Venus dicit filius a patre liber esto* that means if the father sold his son in three times, son is automatically freed from father. This phrase was often utilized to the divorce between fathers and sons because of patrimony disputes. Unlike other tribes of Ancient times, the Roman Right allowed to the debtor to be subject to the patrimony of other creditor (owner). *Res intra patrimonium and res extra patrimonium* were the tents of jurisprudence in Roman Empire. The former symbolized all private objects and persons which can be commercialized in day-to-day life while the latter was linked to the public objects and persons who or which cannot be changeable in commerce. Example of this was not only the Forum, but also a square or the monuments that characterized the splendor of imperial towns.

In sum, patrimony had a wider juridical connotation intertwined to heritage and politics with the end of reinforcing the authority of males over females that had nothing to do with environmental protection (Robert, 1992) (Paoli, 2007). After further examination, in Ancient Rome it is possible to find roots of the nurture of heritage related but this was connected to the war and territorial expropriation; after every conquest, the Generals collected and delivered towards the largest cities all types of merchandising, or work of arts which furnish their homes, temples and squares (LIV. XXI, 60) (Liv. XXXIV, 43) (Gerlomini, 2004). 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, in the regency of Constantine (312 DC) jurisprudence began to prohibit expressly the commercialization of master of pieces (González-Varas, 2003:45-65) (Ballart-Hernández, 2001:80). However, things do not last forever and once the Empire has fallen, Europe experienced a set of intestine army disputes among the dukedoms constituted the new geography of the old continent. The Renaissance surfaces with the end of recovering the lost humanistic values characterized not only Greece but also Rome.

The logic of rationality should illuminate the European social imaginary which was submerged in the darkness because of civil wars, despotic monarchists, and serious economic imbalances. Enrooted in the belief that Europe (but above all Italy) was the heir of magnificence of Roman Empire, Venetia and Florence predisposed to play a crucial role in the commanding of commerce emphasizing on the displacement as a new form of education (Burckhardt, 1985: 149-159). Even if some scholars have indeed lost the sight on this point, the Renaissance seemed to be the prerequisite for the Grand-Tour surfacing during XVI and XVIII respectively; 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 (Sigaux, 1965:27) (Khatchikian, 2000: 70) (De la Torre, 1980: 13). It is note-worthy to point out that the Renaissance paved the pathway towards the modern capitalism and our current conceptualization of Patrimony. Of course, in the next

section we will focus on the relationship between division of labor and capitalism as a new form of multiplying and weakening the social bondage.

THE DIVISION OF WORK

Readers who wishing have clear what has to do the division of work with patrimony should undoubtedly dwell on the work of Emile Durkheim who one last century ago, was concerned about the advance of mercantilism on day-to-day life. For our French sociologist, there are two types of solidarities in societies, mechanic and organic. The former is often proper of primitive association wherein predominates the tradition and religion as a social institution which encompasses all aspects of social life. These kinds of groups are characterized by lower degree of specialization in their tasks and the appliance of repressive or penal right. The latter, inversely, is understood as a sign of modernism and mass-production with higher degree in the division of work and co-dominance of civil rights in relations of commerce. The agreement is the social institution which holds the organic solidarity among workers and owners. Proliferation of professions was accompanied with a divergence in the yielded goods. Nonetheless, Durkheim's thesis deemed the rise of industrialism in combination with the secularization of religion threatened the social bondage in modern societies increasing the possibilities of alienation and other pathologies (Durkheim, 2004: 85-125).

In prospective, Max Weber argued that the capitalist spirit is born from pietism in United States of America. Determined by the presence of predestination, Protestants correspond with a new type of ascentism which encouraged the work and sacrifice. The main thesis of Weber is that the bureaucracy as an instrument of legal-rational logic operates monitoring how the process and its outcomes converge in the economic production. As a result of this, there is a diversification of products disseminated to all potential consumers. In contrast with Marx, for Weber the platform for modern capitalism seems to be the capacity to be in follow-up of resulted stocks of goods and commodities (Weber, 1985:160-169).

From the point of view of Maurice Halbwachs, the origin of "industrial civilization" can be detached in three different aspects: a) the ambition for utility, b) the tendency for the constant competition, and c) a much broader process of control which promotes the efficacy in the administration of resources. Unlike the posture of Weber, Halbwachs affirms the genesis of capitalism is resulted from "America's discovery" (Halbwachs, 1954: 67-83). For Amitai Fanfani, Capitalism dates back to the Renaissance and the advances with technology in transport. Whatever the case may be, capitalism characterizes for the following features: a) a disproportionate incumbency to all aspects of daily life, b) the rise of individualism, c) it privileges the hedonism and materialism in detriment of cooperation, d) searching the mobility of capital administrating and transforming the environmental and human resources (Fanfani, 1933:36-45). Ultimately, W. Sombart realized that two times tables innate of Accounting are the ancestor of our modern capitalism because of two main reasons. For one hand this instrument describes an on-going process of debiting and crediting whereas for the other, it allows comparing the outcomes and find some potential deviations (Sombart, 2005: 53) The above mentioned theoretical frame-work reveals that in the threshold of time, involving societies seemed to make some diversifications in regards to their relationships of productions. In a similar vein, the term patrimony was subject to several diversifications from the original meaning given by Ancient Romans to current connotations associated to nurturance, surveillance as well as protections of customs, traditions and heritage. Fernandes-Correa is not wrong whenever emphasizes that the term patrimony has been expanded in whole Western cultures to the extent being utilized to denote certain concerns by arts and architecture-related issues, and of course, giving origin to a much broader sense enrooted in the notion of *monument* (Fernandes-Correa, 2006:140). In addition, Argentina is earlier witnessed at applying the term patrimony for conservative goals to protect the environment. From a political perspective, the inception of tourism is associated to the

creation of two organisms: National Commission of Museums, monuments and Historical Places and Administration of National Parks. Nowadays, law number 25.197 (sanctioned almost recently in 1999) sees the jurisdiction of both institutions for intervening in cases of Cultural Patrimony (Schluter, 2003:46). Under such a context, the present critical essay is aimed at debating in detail what we really understand when refer to patrimony?.

THE ANTHROPOLOGY OF CENTURIES XIX AND XX

Even though we can find a previous background, the beginning of anthropology seems to be no older than XIXth century. To be more precisely, this comes from the process of European colonization and expansion throughout the world. With this in mind, it is important to see how the encounter between European and non-Europeans was fraught with prejudices, stereotypes and tensions. Rather, pioneer anthropologists were interested in studying these new and exotic cultures from an objective perspective. The sharp differences among the "primitive and civilized societies" generated a symbolic gap which lasted up to date. In other words, many anthropologists left their homes in quest of exotic customs and habits to discover. In parallel with the colonialism process, anthropology played a pivotal role in providing to politicians valuable information about the natives. The ethnographies not only were read by academicians in the continent but also by colonial officials who were strongly concerned in knowing further about aborigines. Let us reminds that this does not mean anthropology worked necessarily as an instrument of hegemony but in this slippery matter the boundaries seem to be blurred.

Besides, anthropological field-work in primitive cultures allowed indeed incorporating a wider range of methodologies and knowledge which shift the way of making Science in Europe. Thanks to the pertinent contributions of B. Malinowski who argued the needs and importance for social scientists of being there to envisage the habits of natives in the site was opposed to the classical tradition that focused on formal social relationship. This changed the basis of the discipline and pushed to positivism towards a secondary subordinated role. That way, the discipline was influenced by two main thoughts that determined how the otherness will be interpreted from that moment onwards: a) a fright of certain cultures disappears due to the advance of modernism, and b) a subsequent tendency to conceive the European societies as complex and problematic while non-European ones were homogenized as pristine, monotonous and harmonic. These two combined ideas can be found in the text authored by Tylor, Boas, Durkheim, Mauss, Racdliffe-Brown, Malinowski Evans-Pritchard and other founding parents (Racdliffe-Brown, 1975) (Pritchard, 1977) (Mauss, 1979) (Boas, 1982) (Malinowski, 1986) (Tylor, 1995) (Durkheim, 2003). The apotheosis of these theses were very well refuted by the process of decolonization (dated during the mid of XX century) that showed the supposed harmony founding parents have come across was no other thing than the product of military control which immobilized the resources of natives for the war and economy.

One of the concerns characterized the beginning of anthropology was the compulsory need to protect the non-Western cultures of the inevitable disappearance due to capitalism advance. Enrooted in the belief that exotic cultures will decline at the time industrialism advances, Europe paternalism triggered an uncanny obsession in academicians for protecting and collecting devices and artifacts of remote Australia, Africa and even South America. In the continuum of development and civilization, Europe must save the rest of the globe from their backwardness. This romantic sentiment associated to a wider colonization process give as a result the rise of anthropology as a discipline. Concepts such as patrimony or heritage, coined originally by lawyers, were present in the first exponent of this academic wave. Of course, this point is well known by historians and anthropologist, the fact is that not only these beliefs survive in anthropology nowadays but also were replicated to tourism fields. These lines automatically wake up us from a long slumber as to how the term patrimony was in introduced in the specialized literature of tourism-related research?.

THE PATRIMONY IN TOURISM FIELDS

Philosophically speaking, tourism entails the odds of returning to home. Unlike others phenomena as pilgrimage, tourism relates to a displacement with necessary infrastructure to come back safe. The protection in tourism plays a pivotal role in assuring a well-functioning of the industry. For that reason, the surveillance and protection will be two important pieces to understand further in the configuration of tourism as commercial activity. 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 which need to be improved (Gray, 1982: 32).

Nowadays, a diverse wide range of Spanish-speaking scholars see in tourist patrimony a genuine wherewithal to preserve the resident's resources in the process of touristification embedded in a cold globalization that affects social bondages of emerging countries. Heritage and local resources play a pivotal role since allows hosts consolidating their identity. Once knowing who they are, they would be able to negotiate in equal conditions with foreigners (investors and tourists). Otherwise, the involved community will start facing serious socio-economic problems explained by an asymmetric liaison between hosts with the forces of production and investment. Problems of pollutions in combination with real-estate speculations wreak havoc in the core of community creating a negative depiction about visitors. Furthermore, the current discourse insists that these shortcomings stem from an unquestionable cultural alienation (Vitry, 2003) (Aguirre, 2004) (Dos-Santos and Antonini, 2004) (Mondino, 2004) (Espeitx, 2004) (Toselli, 2006). Their scientific findings are supported by micro-studies which dwell on detailed descriptions of the changes a certain community has experienced. By the way, the cultural typology of tourism and heritage permits 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.

One might speculate, in a moment of the civilization where the rational administration of resources demonstrated their inability to protect existing environs, sustainable tourism is a term inextricably utilized for ecological purposes. However and not for this, the implementation of financial aids for developing the sustainability of tourist-receiving destinations is less hegemonic or symmetrical than others policies. This unspoken issue still legitimates the hegemony of first over second and third world. Influenced by Turner and Ash's criticism, it emerged a wave that looks a solution for the negative unexpected effects of tourism in hosts (Herrán, 1983). Necessities of alleviating these aftermaths in societies with lower degree of industrialization bridged the patrimony with sustainability. Once again, the otherness was subordinated to the arm of Western Paternalism. In spite of this, many scholars devote considerable attention in examining the prophylactic role can play the patrimony in tourism.

Not to go far-away, for Norrild, the patrimony is understood as a part of heritage defined by means of customs, tradition, lore and identity whose symbolic character explain the reasons why million of dollars are invested yearly for conservative aims. The passion for protecting certain values in detriment of others, for this scholar, is related as to much more valuable these objects are for involved societies. Of course, societies select part of their

history and patrimony as valuable whereas other side is buried in the darkness of oblivion. Her contributions appear to be important and illustrative because it represents the idea that not only sustainability but also patrimony are part of a politic process subject to eliciting power (Norrild, 2006:9). This merits the term of patrimony being re-signified and debated in the line of critique point of view.

The anthropologist L. Prats considers that there exists terms emptied from any signification which only are used to reproduce certain stereotypes. These words are susceptible of ideological manipulation such as cultural tourism, development, sustainability, patrimony and interpretation. In consequence, at the time politicians decided to honor a site or certain monument as a part of heritage, many other respects of the same involved culture is forgotten. For her stand-point, the patrimony should be understood not only as a mechanism of indoctrination but also as a social discourse which gives legitimacy to certain values refusing others (Prats, 2003:128).

In a like manner, Jimenez-Guzman argues that the Canonic Right was an earlier discipline which discovered the patrimony and applied this notion to define questions related to property of people; this shares certain resemblance with the adoption of this term in specialized literature. Anyway, there are substantial differences between juridical and tourist patrimonies. Starting from the premise that patrimony in such is "*a conjunction of goods which belong to certain group or individuals*", he realizes that tourist patrimony characterizes to be shaped by intangible goods whereas in jurisprudence the patrimony only is used to denote certain value. That follows, three aspects can be viewed from the real meaning of what patrimony is or at least should be: goods, possessions, and utility (Jimenez-Guzman, 1986:111). This means that it almost impossible or at least very difficult to compare the assets of a person with the natural resources of a community. A problem of this caliber triggered the construes of two other concepts: *tangible and intangible heritage*.

In accordance with many other centuries, as a construal the culture became in a perfect excuse that legitimates previous archetypes whenever programs in development fail. Under the lens of experts, possible imbalances in the applied policies are justifiable by the juxtaposition of cultural incompatibilities in regards to politic corruption, economic backwardness or ethnic territorial disputes with neighbors for the common-resources. Once again, the paternalism still remains unalterable to the eyes of a third world that are witness of the eternal gap between industrialized and under-industrialized societies. This moot point implies a double controversy; for one hand, failures in touristification's programs is often intellectualized by hosts as an example of a supposed lack of rationality creating a dependant relationship with tourist-delivering States. For another hand, in tourist-receiving countries we can observe a hostile reaction against tourists and everything they represents increasing the possibilities of physical attacks. A point well-studied by the risk perception theory applied on tourist destinations in our times after September 11.

J. O. Fonteles sets forwards a model to understand how the process of touristification is gradually taking form. From the point of view of author, touristification of communities follows three different but connected phases. The first one starts at time the hosts are encouraged to accept this activity as a pathway towards improvement and development. The second phase is accompanied by real-estate speculation. Hosts are pushed to sell their properties lower than they are resold by investors. This cycle not only spoils the ethos of residents but also dangers the possibilities to access to better conditions of life. Beyond the socio-cultural impacts which endure many years in involved zone, unplanned tourism has serious and appalling effects for environment. Persons are often comodified as exotic features that are frequently dehumanized by the tourist gaze. Visitors, following his explanation, are not interested in a social bondage for further understanding with residents, they exotize the presence of otherness by means of different stereotypes. Commitment with hosts ends at the time foreigners embarked to return at home (Fonteles, 2004).

To cut the long story short, the importance of patrimony should be discussed in details because its functionality is beyond the utility. If we believe that the term patrimony is used to note how goods and product are commercialized and also implies certain profit for owners, it is contradictory to think the same construal will protect the stakeholder interests beyond the interests of owners. The diversification of this polemic term has been followed in accordance with the diversification of economy. For that, we find a lot of meaning which can be given to this such as tourist, cultural, juridical, gastronomic and historical patrimonies. To put this in brutally, many classifications of patrimonies are equaled to have many resources to stock for potential sales. By keeping with the segmentation of consumer's tendencies, we run across with a multiplication of the meaning the words have in lay-language. It is not surprising that the grammar as well as language can be frequently manipulated by the economy and material lines of production. The emphasis put on the needs of preserving local resources is analogically comparable to the ways a factory organizes their commodities and distributes their products. In brief, we have not broken the bubble.

THE DEVELOPMENT

Whether the question of patrimony is troublesome hitherto, development seems to be no less polemic. Historically, the word was coined by American President Truman who in a political discourse of 1949 said that developed countries were due to help and give assistance to all countries which are unable to access covering their population basic needs. From that day onwards, anthropology of development debated in depth to what an extent while some societies export pleasure and style of life forging a global identity, others societies adopt these guides internally increasing the dependence and shaping new hybrid cultures. This point in part explains the reasons as to why a much more migrants depart from home in search of an opportunity in United States and Europe (Escobar, 1997) (Viola, 2000) (Esteva, 2000).

In addition, Esteva (2000) and Escobar (1997) acknowledged that development can contribute improving material situations in the case of stakeholders had not subject to a previous economic dependence. But this usually happens because undeveloped societies incur in an excessive need to receive financial assistance in many cases based on high interests impossible to return at a later date. As a whole, financial facilities put at disposal of the under-developed countries gave birth to a debt almost impossible to break. However, afterwards Adam Smith liberal doctrine predicts that any country that is under-developed can change its situation whether maintain a fluid commerce and interaction with developed countries. Even if this appears to be an inadequate theory, many scholars still admit that development only may be possible accompanied with others follow-up measures (Esteva, 2000). Thinkers in Europe and United States as well as International Financial Organism emphasizes on development and rationalization as vehicles towards progress, betterness and sustainability. In prospective, tourism appears not to be the exemption; since this industry has been configured as a massive industry, many peripheral countries viewed in this activity a way to attract great volumes of outsider investments; but sometimes at a higher cost for solicitants.

In our current days, an uttermost part of tourism fields is enrooted in the belief that development not only generates employment but also reduces the gap between industrialized and unindustrialized countries. This new device of indoctrination supposed aprioristically a natural inability of hosts for accomplishing the proposed anfractuous programs. Once and once again throughout the history from last 50 years, Third World with expectance of improving its own situation applied for unrestricted loans that not only worsened their situation but also reinforced the line of hegemony (Esteva, 2000) (Viola, 2000) (Corbalan, 2004). Notwithstanding, a critical point of view in regard to this concern leads us to criticize sustainable tourism because of the following reasons:

- 1) Sustainability emerges as an economic practice which reinforces previous historical relationships between masters and slaves. Rational administration of resources is an idea born in the core of Mediterranean World and contributed to the European ethnocentrism of XIX century. With no scientific basis, the otherness in the rest of the globe was perceived as irrational and uncivilized.
- 2) Since the middle of XX century, to be more exact, after the Second World War, Development as well as sustainability seems to be based mistakenly on the prejudice that the world are splitted in two: developed and undeveloped societies
- 3) From the perspective of eurocentrism, human beings are considered in a continuum transit towards evolution. Rationalization is one tool to arrive at that aim.
- 4) For neo-Marxian anthropologists, sustainable tourism intervene in moral issues on eastern societies valorizing western cultural values regarding rational administration, efficiency and effectiveness creating (involuntarily or not) a bridge between humanity and wildness. On contrary, for other scholars tourism helps developing countries to better their situations and social conditions; glitches in the implementation of development programs are in contingency with culture issues and not with the process in such. As readers can figure out, this is a surface manifestation of a much more deep-seated issue which should still be debated in tourism fields and beyond.

CONCLUSION

The history maintains a similar function with religion. The fact is that religion seems to be replaced by the action of history. Events happened in past are more credible than others. The older the testimony, the better for historians and scholars no matter how true this may be. Why nobody questions the Titanic's catastrophe in our days?, why we accept events occurred many centuries back without qualms?. Undoubtedly, the past not only has fascinated human beings as long as they stand on the earth but also provided them with a mythical model to understand the world wherein they live. Guidelines as events happened in the time founding parents existed are sacred values that determine how the social imaginary interprets now the future. This would explain the reasons behind the love of tourismology for heritage and customs.

Our main thesis here is that the logic of capitalism overrides the needs of protection and upends their meanings. Whereas many scholars suggest that patrimony works as a sustainable mechanism of protection for non-western or emerging countries, we strongly believe an affirmation of this caliber should be re-visited. Certainly capitalism emerged in our world thanks to a double dynamic, for one hand, it requests for novelty to elaborate new channels of consumption but at the same time, these goods should be placed in several compartments which allowed an easily transactions. Thus, the past and future converge in a field of modern world like tradition.

The former comes in tradition its maximum expression while the latter copes with market to the contingency. As previously mentioned, the current discourse in tourism fields is aimed at exacerbating the benefits patrimony frequently offers. Inasmuch as the market erodes the local resources of community, much fast it will be interested in preserving symbolically the otherness. Precisely, the paradox lies in concerns for exotic landscapes or places corresponds with an all-encompassed process of annihilation on natural resources. This very well explains how despite the Mass-Media disseminates new and cautions relating to environment protections or scholars presents papers in international Congress regarding the Global Warming, the pollution in the atmosphere has been triplicated in last decade. The public opinion is strongly interested in common-well being regarding a hazard of this magnitude, but few practical measures have been really taken by citizenships of the industrialized nations.

Of course, this is only an example of what represents the capitalism and its influence in our day-to-day life. It is unfortunate that the tourist patrimony would be an exemption to this

dynamic. To date, the present paper was intended to explore and describe how has been the evolution of the term patrimony and how and why this has been adopted by Academy and used in tourism to denote conservation, sustainable administration and protection of biology. From this point of view, ethimological studies can be fruitful to understand critically the meaning of words and the usage the line of time corrodes.

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 (1): 1-16.
- Ballart-Hernández, J. (2001) *Gestión del Patrimonio Cultural*. Barcelona, Editorial Ariel.
- Boas, F. (1982). *Race, language and culture*. Chicago, University of Chicago Press.
- Burckhardt, J. (1985). *The Culture of Renaissance in Italy*. Madrid, Editorial Sarpe
- Corbalán, M. A. (2004). "Intervención y disciplinamiento: función política de los organismos internacionales de crédito". Ciclos, año XVI, Volumen XVI (27):1-15.
- Coulanges, F. (1985). *La Ciudad Antigua*. Madrid, Edaf.
- De la Torre, O. (1980). *Tourism, social phenomenon*. México, Fondo de Cultura Económica.
- Dos Santos Correa, Roselys y Antonini Oliveira, Bianca. (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. (1 and 2):89-110.
- Durkheim, E. (2004). *La División del Trabajo Social*. Buenos Aires, Ediciones Libertador.
- Eriksson, S. (2010). "A rarity show of modernity: Sweden in the 1920s". *Annals of Tourism Research*. Vol. 37 (1): 74-92.
- Escobar, A. (1997). "Antropología y Desarrollo". Revista Internacional de Ciencias Sociales. Número 154. UNESCO.
- Espeitx, E. (2004). "Patrimonio Alimentario y turismo: una relación singular". Pasos: revista de turismo y patrimonio cultural. Vol 2 (2): 193-213.
- Esteva, G. (2000). "Desarrollo". En Viola Andreu (Compilador). *Antropología del Desarrollo*. Barcelona, Editorial Paidós.
- Fanfani, A. (1933) *Le Origini dello Spirito Capitalistico In Italia*. Milan, Editorial Vita e Pensieri.
- Fernandes-Correa, A. (2006). "Patrimonios, Museus e subjetividades". *Pasos: revista de turismo y patrimonio cultural*. Vol. 4 (2): 135-142.
- Fonteles, J. O. (2004). *Tourism and Socio-environment effects*. San Pablo, Editora El Aleph.
- Gelormini, N. (2004) "Introducción: roma hasta la época de César." En César, Julio Cayo. *Comentarios sobre la guerra de la Galia*. Buenos Aires, Editorial Losada.
- González-Varas, I. (2003) *Conservación de los Bienes Culturales, Teoría, Historia, Principios y Normas*. Madrid, Ediciones Cátedra.
- Gray, P. (1982) "The Contribution of Economic Tourism". *Annals of Tourism Research*. Vol. 9, (1). New York, Pergamon Press.
- Halbwachs, M. (1954). *The Social Classes*. Mexico, Fondo de Cultura Económica.
- Herrán, M. T. (1983) "Columna Gotas". *Journal The Espectador*, Bogota Colombia. 06 de Marzo of 1983.
- 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.
- Jimenez-Guzmán, L. F. (1986). *Teoría Turística: un enfoque integral del hecho social*. Universidad Externado de Colombia, Bogotá.
- Khatchikian, M. (2000). *The History of Tourism*. Lima, University San Martin of Porres Press.
- Lima-Paul, G. (2003) "Patrimonio Cultural regional: estudio comparativo sobre la legislación protectora en las 32 entidades federativas mexicanas." *Revista Derecho y Cultura*. (9): 43-98.
- Livio, T. (1990-97). *Historia de Roma desde su fundación*. Madrid, Editorial Gredos.
- Mauss, M. (1979). *Ensayo sobre los dones: motivo y forma del cambio en las sociedades primitivas*. Madrid, Editorial Ténos
- Malinowski, B. (1986). *Los argonautas del Pacífico Occidental*. Barcelona, Editorial Planeta-Agostini.

- Mondino, de La Cruz, R. (2004). "Patrimonio Natural y Reservas Marinas." Pasos: revista de turismo y patrimonio cultural. Vol 2 (2): 179-192.
- Norrild, J. (2006) "Aspectos generales del Patrimonio". En *Turismo y Patrimonio Gastronómico*. Schluter, R. Buenos Aires: CIET. Pp. 8-48
- Paoli, U. E. (2007). *Vida Cotidiana en la Antigua Roma*. Buenos Aires, Terramar.
- Prats, L. (2003) "Patrimonio + Turismo = desarrollo?". Pasos: revista de turismo y patrimonio cultural. Vol. 1 (2): 127-136.
- Pritchard-Evans, E. E. (1977). *The Nuer*. Barcelona, Anagrama.
- Racdliffe-Brown, A. (1975). *Estructura y función en la sociedad primitiva*. Barcelona, Editorial Península.
- Robert, J. M. (1992). *The Pleasures in Rome*. Madrid, Edaf.
- Schluter, R (2003). *El Turismo en Argentina: del balneario al campo*. Buenos Aires, CIET.
- Sigaux, G. (1965). *Histoire du tourisme*. Ginebra, Edito-Service.
- Silva-Santo, L. M. (2003). "El Quibe en la mesa bahiana: la influencia árabe en la gastronomía de Bahía, Brasil". En *Gastronomía y Turismo: cultura al plato*. Lacanau Gloria y Norrild Juana (coordinadores). Buenos Aires, CIET. Pp. 267-274.
- Sombart, W. (2005). *El Burgués: contribución a la historia espiritual del hombre económico moderno*. Madrid, Alianza Editorial.
- Toselli, C. (2006). "Algunas reflexiones sobre el turismo cultural". Revista Pasos: revista de turismo y patrimonio cultural. Vol 4 (2): 175-182.
- Tylor, E. (1995). "La Ciencia de la cultura". En Kahn J. (Compilador). *El concepto de cultura*. Barcelona, Editorial Anagrama.
- Viola, A. (2000). "La Crisis del desarrollo y el surgimiento de la antropología del desarrollo". En *Antropología del Desarrollo*. Barcelona. Paidós.
- Vitry, C. (2003). "Fiesta Nacional de la Pachamama: el ritual de alimentar a la tierra". En *Gastronomía y Turismo: cultura al plato*. Lacanau Gloria y Norrild Juana (coordinadores). Buenos Aires, CIET. Pp. 227-244.
- Weber M. (1985). *Ensayos de Sociología Contemporánea II*. Ediciones Planeta-Agostini, Buenos Aires.