International Journal of Research in Social Sciences
Vol. 16 Issue 04, April 2026,
ISSN: 2249-2496 Impact Factor: 7.081 UGC Approved
Journal Homepage: http://www.ijmra.us, Email: editorijmie@gmail.com
Double-Blind Peer Reviewed Refereed Open Access International Journal - Included in the International Serial Directories Indexed & Listed at: Ulrich's Periodicals Directory ©, U.S.A., Open J-Gate as well as in Cabell's Directories of Publishing Opportunities, U.S.A

Contestation Around the Term Heritage: A Methodological Exploration

Damandeep Singh
Centre of Comparative Politics and Political Theory (CCPPT), School of International Studies (SIS), Jawaharlal Nehru University, New Delhi.

Introduction

To embark on a critical study of the emergent heritage places one has to be discrete towards the method adopted in pursuing the same. This study is a modest attempt to help oneself strive towards the above stated objective. However, since the concept of heritage and common usage of the term 'heritage' is ridden with contestations, it is useful to begin with examining the nature of contest itself. This will be followed by a discussion of the different perspectives from which 'heritage' has been studied, and the strengths and limitations of each of them.

Section-2.1 Contestation around the emergence of 'heritage'

In the recent past, particularly from the 1970s, 'heritage' has acquired a significant momentum in the global world. Its presence can be felt in every part of major cities in the world - so much so that visiting and experiencing the past by way of heritage sites and museums have become a regular practice for many. There are various reasons given by scholars for such rise. For instance, some commentators have seen the increase in public debate on 'heriatge' as a consequence of the political and social changes of the 1960s (Lowenthal 1985; McCrone et al. 1995), while the others have suggested that it was a result of an increase in leisure time, and thus a greater public interaction with their built and cultural environments (Hunter 1981; Mandler,1997). Certainly, by the late 1960s and 1970s there was an increasing momentum in two areas of heritage practice. One was the stark rise in heritage tourism. Another was the degree to which the national public heritage policy and legislation were being introduced and amended in the Western world (Smith, 2006). Prentice has argued that mass consumption of heritage tourism became a significant economic and cultural phenomenon by the mid-1970s as public interest in heritage and history increased (Urry, 1990; Hollinshead, 1997**).** However, Heritage is not as recent phenomenon as pointed out by these scholars (Harvey, 2001).

David C. Harvey (2001) argues that heritage is not a recent phenomenon. It is not something that has emerged after the passing of the Ancient Monuments Act, 1882 in Great Britain or after the World Heritage Convention 1972, as many heritage studies suggest. He argues that many contemporary heritage studies have failed entirely to explore the historical scope of the heritage concept and such studies have been too engaging with the manifestation of heritage's recent trajectory. He intends to provide a longer historical analysis of the development of heritage practices. He observes that people's association with heritage is not a modern phenomenon as it has always been there since ancient times. He explains:

> Every society has had a relationship with its past, even those which have chosen to ignore it, and it is through understanding the meaning and nature of what people tell each other about their past; about what they forget, remember, memorialise and/or fake, that heritage studies can engage with academic debates beyond the confines of present-centred cultural, leisure or tourism studies (Harvey, 2001. p.320).

It illustrates that the concept of heritage has always developed and changed according to the context of the society. Smith (2006) too who emphasis on examining heritage as a cultural process believes that heritage is not a physical artefact or a recent historical record. Nevertheless, according to 'heritage studies' the watershed moment in the history of term 'heritage' is in the year 1972, year marked with the *World Heritage Convention* (WHC). This Convention developed a document that codified and operationalised the concept of heritage in such a way that urban planning and design of cities in many parts of the world followed its steps.

The WHC's codification was done for the reason because governments, interest groups, and local businesses were increasingly seeing World Heritage listing as an opportunity for revitalising and contribution to national, regional and local economies. Tourist guidebooks began to list World Heritage sites as a series of 'wonders of the world'. From the period after 1972, the list of World Heritage sites has crossed 1000 sites in 167 countries. Thus, various scholars have considered 1970s as a crucial decade in the heritage field, with exceptions (Harvey, 2001; Smith 2006). They are of the view that World Heritage has become a mark of distinction; a symbol of wealth, status and

cosmopolitan approach to urban planning and design; and a guarantee of a site's value as a visitable destination (Labadi, 2007). All these developments, notably after 1970s, generated the interest of various scholars to study the issue of heritage and its various aspects. Their work contributed to the development of the contemporary field of interdisciplinary heritage studies. This field developed out of an early academic critique of the use of heritage and nation-building with 'invention of tradition' by governments, and the heritage debates that arose in the mid-1980s in the western countries (Wright, 1985; Hewsion, 1987).

Section 2.2 Theoretical Perspectives on Heritage

The contestations over the term 'heritage' is also the inevitable consequence of the competing discourses on heritage. It is rather not ironical that Smith (2006) has declared that 'there is no such thing as heritage'. This section reviews the multiple perspectives from which 'heritage' has been examined.

However, the concept has not lost its relevance as the discourses on heritage have induced many debates that have enriched it and its orientation. As the existing style on presenting the perspectives around heritage has generally revolved around their chronological emergence, this study after a preliminary review has realized that the critical examinations of perspectives on heritage can best be assessed by delineating it into three sets given below:

1. Tangible v/s Intangible
2. Dominant v/s subaltern
3. Event v/s Process

2.2.1 Tangible v/s Intangible

Tangible v/s Intangible

Tangible heritage, according to UNESCO, includes 'buildings and historical places, monuments, artifacts, among others, which are considered worthy of preservation for the future. These include objects significant to the archaeology, architecture, science or technology of a specific culture.[i] Thus, from the above definition, it is explicit that tangible heritage includes material objects only. The craze for preserving and promoting the heritage sites for various reasons had begun with tangible heritage.

Material or tangible heritage provides a physical representation to the things of the past that inculcate a sense of belonging and commonality. This sense forms the basis for identity formation. One of the earliest literature on heritage establishes the association between heritage and identity, and how heritage is used for nation-building. It articulates how material culture as heritage provides a physical representation and reality to such identity formation. The link between heritage and identity is a well-established and acknowledged fact. Like history, it fosters the feelings of belonging and continuity (Lowenthal, 1985. p. 214), while its physicality gives such feelings an added sense of material reality. As Graham et al. (2000. p. 41) state: 'heritage provides meaning to human existence by conveying the ideas of timeless values and unbroken lineages that underpin identity'. However, a great deal of literature pays critical attention to how heritage is used for nation-building and developing ideologies of nationalism. Thus, it is concerned with the analysis of the use of past or history by governments of states to build a sense of national identity.

The first provocative and influential work that brought attention of the readers was *Invention of Tradition (mention date)* by Eric Hobsbawm and Terence Ranger. Hobsbawm argued that governments for inculcating the sense of national identity innovate tradition in a way to cover up a relatively shallow history. He pointed to the fact that many of these invented traditions were an attempt to build a contemporary sense of nationhood in a distant, heroic past. While he observes that all societies invented traditions, he also anticipates that this process would accelerate with rapid technological and social change. He writes:

> comparatively recent historical innovation, the 'nation', with its associated phenomena: nationalism, the nation-state, national symbols, histories and the rest. All these rest on the exercises in social engineering, which are often deliberate and always innovative … because so much of what makes up the modern 'nation' consists of such constructs and is associated with appropriate and, in general, fairly recent symbols or suitably tailored discourse (such as 'national history'), the national phenomenon cannot be adequately investigated without careful attention to the

> 'invention of tradition'. (Hobsbawm 1983, p. 13-14). (find exact quote, something from beginning is missng).

Hobsbawm also highlighted the distinction between two kinds of traditions. One is manufactured officially by state, which he termed 'political' and the other one is unofficially manufactured by communities within society, which he termed 'social'.

Hobsbawm's work from the discipline of history gives insights into 'invention of tradition' and during the same period from the field of archaeology, research has shown how archaeology was used in nation-building. Phillip Kohl and Clare Fawcett's edited collection *Nationalism, Politics, and the Practice of Archaeology (1995)* drew attention to the many ways in which archaeology and past were used for nation-building. It described the social construction of archaeological knowledge and the political, social, economic contexts in which this knowledge was formed.

There are some works which have paid attention to the various forms of archaeology- nationalist, colonialist and imperialist, and their knowledge/power effects. Bruce Trigger's (1984) work is one of them. He argued that colonial archaeologies were the most dominant in areas settled by Europeans, and sought to denigrate and dislocate indigenous peoples from contemporary nationhood. At the same time, imperial archaeologies were found to emphasise expansionist historical traditions and global historical discourses.

Patrick Wright's *On Living in an Old Country (1985)* has reflected on how the past was used as a tool for the production of national identity by the newly elected conservative government under Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher in Britain. It argues that various pieces of heritage legislation could be read as revival of patriotism of the Second World War. He was critical of timelessness of the presentation of the past at various heritage sites, noting that:

> National heritage involves the extraction of history – of the idea of historical significance and potential – from a denigrated everyday life and its restaging or display in certain sanctioned sites, events, images, and conceptions. In this process history is redefined as 'the historical', and it becomes the object of a similarly transformed and generalised public attention … Abstracted and redeployed, history seems to be purged of political tension; it becomes a unifying spectacle … the settling of all disputes. Like the guided tour as it proceeds from site to sanctioned site, the national past occurs in a dimension of its own – a dimension in which we appear to remember only in order to forget. (Wright, 1985.p. 69)

With refars to India, the issue of heritage is more complex. India is a land of extremely diverse cultures, languages, and religions. India does not fit into the idea of a nation, in most nationalist theories. Heritage and history are used here to define and maintain the idea of single nation to derives its legitimacy from it. In terms of nation-building, heritage in India has been playing a significant role since independence. In 1958, the Indian parliament passed the first piece of legislation on the subject: the Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Sites and Remains Act 1958 provided for: "the preservation of ancient and historical monuments and archaeological sites and remains of national importance, for the regulation of archaeological excavations and the protection of sculptures, carvings and other like objects". Two interesting dimensions of this act have been noticed by Sengupta (2018) and Sutton (2013). First, Sengupta (2018) has noticed that most of the text was a continuation of colonial practices of preservation. The significant departure was introduction of term 'national' to reflect India's changed political status and inscribe the nation into its built heritage. Hence, monuments deemed fit for protection were now to pass the test of being of national importance. Equally, monuments previously declared important could at any point lose their status as monuments of national importance.

Second, Sutton (2013) has observed that many historical buildings in India were preserved by religious practice. Now, if the Indian state would take care of these buildings it would fundamentally alter the relationship between ancient sites, the state, and assertion of identity politics by various conflicting and different sectarian interests. The Act of 1958 has dissolved at once the difference

between historical and ancient on one hand, and religion and faith on the other. For instance, Muslim community from the early 1980s has been demanding the control of historical structure, principally mosques, for prayers in order to claim 'Muslim heritage' and demand control over Indo-Islamic historical sites (Ahmed, 2014). The preservation of sites on the basis of national importance rather than historical importance could be myopic in the long term.

The debates on heritage have not limited itself to the promotion of national ideology. The heritage debates on nation-building witnessed a shift when literature on globalisation proclaimed the end of nation-state. The critical attention began to focus more on sub-national, i.e. local construction of identity and role of heritage, how cultural and ethnic identities are defined in multicultural contexts, how gender and sexuality are defined, how class identities are formed (See Smith, 2006 for various scholarships on these issues). Thus, it is essential to note here that scholarship which looks at tangible aspect of heritage, in the initial debates or in recent times, is limited to the understanding of formation of identity by using heritage.

Intangible Heritage

Intangible Heritage includes traditional festivals, oral traditions, oral epics, customs, ways of life, traditional crafts.[ii] UNESCO refers intangible heritage to all that is not embodied in tangible. Intangible heritage looks at non-material aspect of heritage. The importance of intangibility of heritage has been recognised due to the various developments at international level. For instance; first, interest in intangible heritage has arisen due to the local response to the fears of globalisation (Harrison, 2012). Second, the awareness of intangible heritage has also grown as a result of lobbying of organisations such as ICOMOS and UNESCO (Ibid., 2012). Third, the recognition of intangible heritage has come from non-western conceptualisations of heritage which have questioned the dominance of material heritage (Smith, 2006). Such scholarship identifies the value of heritage in music, dance, theatre, and language particularly in the African context (Amselle, 2004); and in knowledge, traditions and oral history (Fourmile, 1989; Echo-Hawk, 2000). In response to such scholarship, UNESCO's *Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage* was adopted in 2003.

While the scholarship and different organisations at international level acknowledge intangible heritage, but this does not mean that the issue of intangible heritage is settled. Instead, the new concerns have risen after conceptualising the intangible heritage which has kept the debate on it alive. The first primary concern was how preservation of intangible heritage meaning cultural practices could become frozen in time and thus meaningless (Nas, 2002). Many scholars are of the view that cultural expression is a dynamic process, and registration of different cultural practices on 'heritage register' would instigate management practices. Such practices, burdened with the notion of preservation, would lead to the halt of the dynamic nature of cultural expression. (Olwig, 2002).

The obvious question that comes to one's mind is whether fixing the mutable nature of cultural practices under the rubric of heritage, leads to new tensions between the two.q The inherent tension comes out as intangible cultural practices often evolve over time and freezing it may even mean the loss of culture. Despite this tension, Smith (2006, p. 56) suggests that there is a need to 'redefine all heritage as inherently intangible'. She emphasizes that tangible and intangible heritage are not two separate things, instead when we deal with them, we are actually engaging with a set of values and meanings, including the elements like emotions, cultural knowledge, and memory. Thus, she recognises that it is value and meaning which is more important that is given to any physical site, place or physical representation or represented within the performance of languages, dance, oral histories or other forms of intangible heritage.

Event v/s Process

There is another debate which has been emerging in heritage literature. The dominant understanding of heritage perceives heritage as an event. This understanding has conceptualised heritage by looking at material representation of it. It is a result of preservation of buildings, monuments, artefacts that are valued as heritage. Initially, the literature on heritage largely focused only on the material aspect of heritage, which was discussed earlier. Thus, it is important here to discuss the new understanding of heritage that has emerged in challenge to the dominant understanding of heritage. This new conceptualisation defines heritage as something which is not frozen in material form instead it is

something vital and alive. Heritage is not an event rather it is a process. It is a process as a 'range of activities that include remembering, commemoration, communicating and passing on knowledge and memories' (Smith, 2006.p. 83). Heritage is a way to assert and express identity and socio-cultural values. It is something with which people actively and critically engage.

Also, Harvey advocated the Smith approach which treats heritage as a cultural process and not as a physical artefact or record. Harvey believes that heritage processes can be explored "within a very long temporal framework, and should not be described simply as a recent product of post-modern economic and social tendencies (Ibid., p. 335)." For supporting his argument he has given the example of the city of Rome. He describes how the Roman heritage in the medieval period helped to transform the city of Rome. The Christian story was used as a device to assimilate the non-Christian remains in the cityscape. He notes:

> Specific heritage stories were mapped onto the cityscape and acted to represent significant sites and landmarks through the subtle re-interpretation of existing popular memories. Rome's pagan heritage was used as a device to enhance the authority of the Pope. In this respect, traditions are not static; they modify and change through time, as a result, both of their internal dynamic and in response to external demands. The present is informed by the past and the past is reconstructed by the present (Ibid, 2007.p. 331).

Harvey here is echoing the voice of 'Invention of Tradition' thesis that we discussed earlier. Thus, heritage is not given, rather it is made. Heritage is `never inert, people engage with it, re-work it, appropriate it and contest it. It is part of the way identities are created and disputed, whether as individual, group or nation state (Bender, 1992. p.3).'

Like Smith (2006) and Harvey (2001), Raphael Samuel's *Theatres of Memory (1994)* also suggests that the practice of conservation of heritage is not an event but a process. He was quick not only to emphasise heritage as a potentially democratic phenomenon but also a process where social practices surrounding heritage enabling the possibility for promoting social change. He is an advocate of the transformative power of history and of the role of heritage in producing diversity and multiculturalism in society. Samuel described heritage as a social process:

> Conservation is not an event but a process, the start of a cycle of development rather than (or as well as) an attempt to arrest the march of time. The mere fact of preservation, even if it is intended to do no more than stabilizing, necessarily involves a whole series of innovations, if only to arrest the 'pleasing decay'.What may begin as a rescue operation, designed to preserve the relics of the past, passes by degree into a work of restoration in which a new environment has to be fabricated in order to turn fragments into a meaningful whole... (Samuel, 1994.p. 303)

An Important contribution to heritage studies is the work by Ashworth and Tunbridge on 'dissonant heritage' (1996). They acknowledge the contested nature of heritage. They have observed that heritage is not an event, it has no fixed meaning, and it is not possible to have any definition of heritage. It is because heritage is created by interpretation. Not only what is interpreted, but how it is interpreted and by whom, will create quite specific messages about the value and meaning of specific heritage places and the past it represents (Ibid., p. 27). These messages do not always find consensus and thus cause dissonance. This has a particularly emotive, cultural and political consequence because:

> All heritages are someone's heritage and therefore logically not someone else's: the original meaning of an inheritance [from which 'heritage' derives] implies the existence of disinheritance and by extension any creation of heritage from the past disinherits someone completely or partially, actively or potentially. This disinheritance may be unintentional, temporary, of trivial importance, limited in its effects and concealed; or it may be long-term, widespread, intentional, important and obvious. (Ashworth and Tunbridge, 1996. p. 21)

Dominant v/s Subaltern

In dominant heritage, Smith explains, experts, technicians, architects, conservationistst, are involved in privileging the value of their own over those of non-experts by creating a self-referential nature of discourse, which legitimises itself the value and ideologies on which it is based (Smith, 2006.p. 29). She describes this dominant discourse as Authorised Heritage Discourse (AHD). It is a particular way of seeing heritage that privileges the cultural symbols of the white, middle-/upper-classes, and excludes a range of alternative ways of understanding heritage. Smith argues that this discourse has been naturalised to such a degree that it remains unquestioned. She notes down that it is the current generation that has the responsibility to care for, protect, and preserve their heritage. The current generation is best represented by 'experts', who work to preserve the past and thus disengaging the

present from active use of heritage. Heritage, according to the AHD, is saved for future generation and it cannot be saved unless there is professional guidance of heritage professionals available. These professionals give value and meaning to historical sites or places, and while doing so they not only exclude the historical, cultural and social experience of a range of groups, but they also work to constrain and limit their critique.

Bhandari (2011) in his work *Recreating heritage in the southwest of Scotland* has explored the land of Scotland to demonstrate how dominant heritage of Scotland has marginalised the regional one. He examines the case study of heritage of Robert the Bruce, known for Scotland's militaristic tradition and the eventful organisation of the Border Gathering which showcases Highland culture. He shows that it is because of recently developed heritage tourism products; such as Robert the Bruce and Border Gathering, there is a recreation of heritage which is largely new to the region. This recreation has been marginalising the regional heritage and promoting the dominant heritage for forming a uniform and homogeneous identity. The promotion of dominant heritage is vital for inculcating the values of commonality within Scotland, which plays a vital role in encouraging Scottish Nationalism. Thus, his work basically helps to understand how tourism can be used as a medium to promote dominant heritage and idea of nationalism.

Similarly, Waterton (2006) explores the visual representations which are being used to narrate, promote, communicate or illustrate a particular idea, i.e. idea of dominant heritage. She has conducted a textual analysis of various images representing heritage of England. For the promotion of heritage tourism various images of buildings, monuments and sites are circulated by tourism industry. She has found in her study that such visual images do not find a place in brochures, posters or tourism magazines by accident; rather, they are 'created, mediated and selected according to specific cultural and ideological arrangement' (Waterton, 2006. p. 38). These selectively created images shape heritage along 'patriarchal, racial and socio-economic lines, and the privileging of white, middle-class and male cultural experiences' (Ibid., p. 42). It is a dominant form of heritage which naturalises the way we perceive heritage, in this sense such heritage can never be inclusive. In this case 'we are left with a very questionable idea of belonging' (Ibid., p.53).

Here, the framework of dominant heritage has been used in the case of India and it has its distinctive component. Brian Hole (2013, p. 204-7) observes the dominant form of heritage in India and he categorically explains the strategies involve in cultivating the dominant idea. Among many strategies he puts forward few. First, within the academics the philosophy of Hindutva has been promoted with Max Muller theory of Aryans race.[iii] The theory claims that Aryan Race was migrated from their homeland in Central Asia to Europe and South Asia, and introduced Vedic or Hindu culture in India. This theory receive strong attraction from Hindu nationalists who lay first claim on Indian sub-continent for the reason of being earliest inhabitants. They also believe that Hindu and Aryan culture are same; thus this separates Hindu from all other people in India. Second, after the excavation of Harappa and Mohenjo-daro, there is an attempt to identify the Hindus with the earliest known advanced culture in India. This attempt has been basically advanced to claim the continuity of Vedic or Hindu culture since Indus Valley Civilisation. Any share of the prestige of having oldest civilisation has been devoid to any other groups of people in India. Third, there have been numerous attempts to interfere with syllabus pf school children and spreading the misinformation of history through education. For example class 11 textbook Ancient India by Makkhan Lal originally published on 2002, which still contains over 137 historically incorrect assertions and errors; The Hindu bias in the curriculum also continues in BJP-ruled states such as Himachal Pradesh, where, for example, a chapter on the Muslim painter M.F. Husain (who had controversially portrayed Hindu goddesses in the nude) has been removed from textbooks (Phull, 2010).Third, apart from academics, various heritage sites have also been used for spreading the dominant culture. The infamous issue of destruction of Babri Masjid in Ayodhya in 1992 that led to Godhra incident culminated in Gujarat Riots of 2002.During this period of communal violence religious and cultural heritage sites were also systematically targeted, with 298 dargahs, 205 mosques, 17 temples, and three churches being either damaged or destroyed within two months (Pandey, 2002). This was a carefully planned and well-resourced operation:

> The famous 500-year-old masjid in Isanpur, which was an ASI monument, wasdestroyed with the help of cranes and bulldozers. The famous Urdu Poet WaliGujarati's dargah was also razed to the ground at Shahibaug in Ahmadabad. While a hanuman shrine was built over its debris initially, allthat was removed overnight and the plot was paved and merged with the adjoining road. (Chenoy et al., 2002)

Fourth, BJP led government in Gujarat under CM Narendra Modi has targeted the World Heritage Site, Champaner-Pavagadh Archaeological Parkreceived World Heritage status in 2004. An important aspect of the site is that it contains a mixture of Hindu and Muslim elements, and as an early Islamic, pre Mughal city it exhibits a unique blend and transition between the two traditions(UNESCO, 2004. p. 28). The Gujarat government upset the Islamic Relief Committee in 2004 by producing brochures for the annual Navratrifestival which listed all of the monuments in the park other than the Muslimshrines (Sreenivas, 2004). Similarly in Uttar Pradesh, BJP led government under CM Yogi Adityanath removed Taj Mahal from the official released tourism list of 2017. Adityanath believes that Taj Mahal does not represent the Indian Culture.

There are numerous examples exist, including above mentioned, to exhibit the methods of spreading the idea of dominant heritage. We have seen that scholarships hold that dominant framework is now being recast in Hindu nationalist terms.

Subaltern Heritage

As argued above the dominant heritage becomes hegemonic that it is not questioned as 'heritage may represent the dominant ideological discourse, but that also ensures that it can become the focus of alternative meaning for those who dissent' (Graham et al., 2000.p.258). The subaltern heritage literature offers a concrete challenge to the dominant heritage while criticising the nature and use of heritage. The main concern of subaltern heritage literature is to ensure community participation in heritage management and conservative practices. Because all heritage management and conservative practices have been opertaionalised by those who are 'experts/professionals' in their field; thus voice and participation of subaltern groups are largely absent. This criticism is usually advanced against these experts, i.e. archaeologists, architecture, historians, museum curator and anthropologists (Smith, 2006).

Various studies are emerging which express a strong desire for the community participation in heritage management, interpretation and conservation work (for instances Hall and McArthur,1998; Hodges and Watson, 2000). The need and desire of community participation have arisen for two reasons; one is for greater inclusion of the excluded group due to homogenising tendency of dominant heritage; second is community involvement in heritage might lead to a process of recognition and adoption that may create a real sense of ownership. As for Walsh (1992), the past, its continuities, and discontinuities and how communities respond to these are central to any understanding of the development of a sense of place.

The greatest challenge has arisen from the agitation by indigenous or First Nations peoples to define their past, to define themselves who they are and who they are not:

> 'The ability to control your own identity, to define who you are and to establish a sense of community belonging is emotionally and politically a powerful act. A sense of identity must inevitably draw on a sense of history and memory – who and what we are as individuals, communities or nations is indelibly formed by our sense of history and the way individual and collective memory is understood, commemorated and propagated' (Smith, 2006.p.36).

The World Heritage Convention has also attracted criticism from indigenous people or non-western cultures for its so-called universalising tendencies which have failed to incorporate culturally relevant concepts of heritage (Munjeri, 2004). The subaltern critique also notes down that traditional and authorised definitions of heritage tell nationalising stories that do not reflect the cultural or social experiences of subaltern groups; thus the social and political role they play is trivialised, ignored and marginalised. How can this marginalisation can be averted? Is it with the participation of excluded groups in the heritage activities? The sole participation of the excluded group may only assimilate them into the fold of domination heritage framework rather than challenge underlying preconceptions and misconceptions of it. As Pendlebury et al. (2004.p.23) notes that 'merely enabling more people to enjoy heritage, or extending how it is defined to recognize the diversity of society, does not in itself challenge power relations and control over the process by which heritage is defined and managed.' Thus Smith (2006) and Schadla-Hall (2004) are of the view that issue of community participation in

framing and implementing the prevalent heritage practices would be meant to assimilate in AHD and not to recognise its inherently political and dissonant nature of heritage.

Heritage and Tourism

After accessing the scholarship on the conceptual problem of heritage, it is essential to mention here the scholarship on heritage tourism. For a change, scholars mostly agree on the definition of heritage tourism as it is mainly focused on the relationship between two. There are both agreements and disagreements when it comes to the subject of heritage tourism.

Heritage assets are preserved because of their intrinsic value to the community, rather than for their tourist value (Charoenwongsa, 2004). However, heritage and tourism are both complementary to each other. Heritage as an asset provides cultural and educational experiences to tourists and thus are potential resources of tourism as well (Olsen, 2006). Tourism, on other side, may contribute to local economy by creating business and employment opportunities and thus tourism can encourage and strengthen heritage conservations. Despite being complementary to each other, there are numerous studies which have reported the conflict between heritage conservation and tourism. Increased tourist visits to heritage sites are often subject to trivialisation, as they lose authenticity when commercialised and transformed for easy tourist consumption (Parlevar, 2006).

Newby (1994) has identified the pitfalls of heritage tourism. The commercialisation of heritage sites often leads to a shift of attention to tourism economy and very less attention is paid to the conservation process. It eventually results in area, time, and style bias in conservation of built heritage, where conservation attention is paid selectively to historical monuments in a particular area or of particular time or style, while others remain unattended and reach a state of decay.

Ashworth and Tunbridge (1996) observed that the growth of tourism attracts various support facilities like hotels, restaurants, shopping, and other amenities. In this case, to cope up with the increasing tourist demands, support facilities tend to increase at historic areas frequently visited by tourists. This surge in tourists triggers the transformation of land use, conversion of physical structure and use of public spaces. The unplanned and tourism-driven transformations eventually result in the loss of identity of heritage place and historic towns (Nasser, 2003).

Heritage tourism has grown at such level that Hewison (1987) has identified it as a 'heritage industry', which he argues offered sanitized, false and inauthentic history to a gullible audience of heritage tourists. The tourists are seen playing a passive role. They just visit the site without actively engaging with it, and gaze at the heritage sites. Urry (1990) drew an analogy with Michel Foucault's concept of 'the gaze' to develop the idea of a 'tourist gaze'. The tourist gaze is a way of perceiving or relating to places that cut them off from the 'real world' and emphasises the exotic aspects of the tourist experience. Urry tries to convey that the tourist is a passive consumer and has no active role to play in impacting the visiting site. She is directed by collections of symbols and signs to fall on places that have previously been imagined as pleasurable by the media surrounding the tourist industry. Photographs, films, books, and magazines allow the images of tourism and leisure to be constantly produced and reproduced. The history of the development of the tourist gaze shows that it formed under specific historical circumstances, in particular, the exponential growth of personal travel in the second part of the twentieth century.

There are other scholars who are very critical about the activities associated with heritage tourism. Apart from the objectives that heritage industry promotes like capital accumulation, promotion of civic pride and an attractive image for the investors, tourists, and residents (Roberts & Schein, 1993); scholars draw attention towards the economic abuses of culture which can result into the creation of inauthentic landscapes that speak little of local identities and lifestyles. Greenwood describes it with the concept of "commoditisation" of culture to draw attention towards the detrimental effects of the heritage industry (Greenwood, 1977). For Ashworth and Turnbridge heritage tourism is responsible for the "bowdlerisation of history", which means history often reduces to a sanitised version of past for the sake of luring tourists; and thus heritage tourism leads to the "reduction of the complexity and

richness of urban heritage to a few simple recognisable and marketable characteristics" (Ashworth and Turnbridge, 1990). The visitor in the historic city emphasize only those aspects of the local history that can be related to the experience of the visitor.

Similarly, Machlis and Burch (1983) warn, the economic allure of tourism and the need to cater to tourists is a key reason for the "mythic reconstruction" of places and "Falsification of histories and identities" (Machlis and Burch, 1983). Preservation of heritage by a small elite group of experts and housed in displays (like museums) which involves 'consumption' by inexpert, uncritical and passive consumers. The experience of consuming heritage in this way has been called 'glass case heritage' (Brumann, 2009). In case where heritage resembles theme parks in representation and tone is labelled as 'Disneyfication of heritage' (Kennedy and Kingcome, 1998). Disneyfication means increasing the marketability of a place by removing or downplaying distasteful view resultant in beautification of the sites that eventually loses its authenticity or original identity.

Literature on Tourism

Tourism is a movement of people from their usual residence to a temporary stay at a place (Sharpley, 2014). Tourism primarly is a social phenomenon which is rising with the increased in national incomes, the rise of leisure ideology and popularisation of global village (Chang & Katrichis, 2016). There are various studies have been done on different aspects of tourism particularly in past three decades. We have categorised the tourism literature into two broad categories i.e. tourism behaviour and impact of tourism.

Tourism Behaviour

Since the world has become a 'global village' and economy becomes highly competitive at the global level, understanding tourist behaviour has become important. Understanding tourists is even more critical as their behaviour keep changing from time to time. In brief, tourist behaviour has become the cornerstone of any marketing strategy and action. Choosing, buying, and consuming tourism/travel products and services involve a range of psychosocial processes and several personal and environmental influences that researchers and managers should take into account.

Consumer behaviour generally focuses on the activities people undertake when obtaining, consuming, and disposing of products and services. In line with such a focus, most consumer behaviour models consist of three stages: prepurchase, consumption, and postconsumption (e.g., Engel, Blackwell, and Miniard, 1995). In the first stage, potential tourists recognize the need and the motivation to go on a holiday; they search for information about various destinations and evaluate those alternatives in order to choose one destination to vacation (Klenosky, 2002). A variety of supply- and demand-related factors influence whether to go on holidays and the choice of destinations, including psychological, economic, social, political, geographical, and demographic factors (Crompton and Ankomah, 1993). The consumer behaviour literature makes a general distinction between individual and environmental influences on tourist behaviour. The former involve determinants that make each of us unique as an individual (including consumers' demographics, personality traits, lifestyles and values, emotions, involvement, etc.), whereas the latter pertain to external factors (including social, cultural, business, and media variables) that shape one's behaviour and have an impact on decisions and choices.

In the second stage, tourists experience the destination and its products or services. This stage is made up of a series of events or activities which help consumers give meaning and to convey symbolic value to their choices and actions (Kim et al., 2006). Consumer experience is highly subjective and is based on sensations, emotions, and social interaction to a large extent. It involves participation in activities and results in learning or knowledge acquisition. In the last stage, after having completed their holiday experiences, tourists evaluate their experiences by matching the outcome not only with the information received from various sources such as media and relatives but also with their own expectations (Pizam, Neumann, and Reichel, 1978). Their evaluation typically results in feelings of dis/satisfaction, which has consequences onintentions to come back or switch to other domestic or international destinations and tell others about favourable or unfavourable aspects of their experiences (Baker and Crompton, 2000).

There are a number of studies have been done in past three decades on tourist's motivation. Several theories or models have been developed to explain motivation and early studies such as those of plog's (1974) 'allocentric-psychocentric', Dann's (1977) 'push-pull', Pearce's (1988) 'travel career ladder' and Ross and Iso-Ahola's (1991) 'escape seeking' are instrumental. Nevertheless, there are many studies with different motivations that have come up. For instance, Herold, Garcia, and DeMoya (2001) tried to conceptualize romance and sex tourism with reference to motivating factors, while Clift and Forrest (1999) investigated the motivations of gay

men with respect to tourist activities. Lang and O'Leary (1997) developed a typology of the nature of travellers based on motivation, and Wight (1996) referred to motivation in her attempt to distinguish eco-tourists from other types. The need to "know" tourists and their motivations has also been emphasized with respect to managing attractions presenting heritage. In this context, aspects such as interpretation (Moscardo 1996), visitor satisfaction (Laws 1998), marketing (Nuryanti 1996), and visitation patterns (Prideaux and Kininmont 1999) have been investigated.

Impacts of Tourism

A large number of tourism literature focuses on impacts of tourism. The more and more tourism increasing at global level the more societal attention it is garnering. Climate change, coastal urbanization, biodiversity loss, fossil fuel consumption, disease transmission, and cultural commoditization, are among the more contentious tourism issues permeating the media. However, the positive economic impacts of tourism were the primary focus, with far less emphasis on the environmental and social consequences. Throughout the 1960s, tourism was generally viewed optimistically because of its contribution to economic development (e.g. employment, investment, income, balance of payments, tax revenues) (Mathieson & Wall 1982). Concern regarding the negative impacts of tourism only emerged as a significant issue in the 1970s and 1980s (Hall & Page, 2006). It was during this time that broader public concern over the impact of natural resource management began to grow, with the passage of the first environmental impact legislation (i.e. United States National Environmental Policy Act enacted in 1969) and the creation of national environmental protection agencies (e.g. the United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) established in 1970) (Ibid., 2006).

In the seminal work of Mathieson and Wall (1982), a review of the tourism impact literature available at that time highlighted the substantial environmental and social risks and costs that tourism posed. This recognition prompted a reorientation of tourism research towards a more balanced perspective, with studies critically examining both the positive and negative implications of tourism. In their updated book, Wall and Mathieson (2006, p. 5) note that 'as tourism has grown in volume and diversity, the consequences of tourism have become increasingly complex and contradictory'. This is also attributable to the influential insights provided by the 1987 Brundtland Report, which formally introduced the concept of sustainable development to a wider audience. By taking sustainability into account, impact studies are approached with consideration for the interrelationship between economic, social and environmental impact types, rather than focusing on environmental impacts – the original focus of the Brundtland Report – in isolation. There is now a wealth of literature on sustainable tourism development, with sustainable tourism a major focus of impact research (Wall & Mathieson 2006; Hall & Page 2006).

Unlike tourism-related impact assessments, which focus on a particular project, event or facility, impact studies are concerned with the broader aspects of change, including the factors that lead to change. Importantly, impact studies aim to provide an account of the bigger picture with respect to tourism and its relationship to economic, environmental and sociocultural change over time (Hall & Lew 2009). An inherent challenge with impact studies is trying to disentangle changes that are attributable to pre-existing processes versus changes induced by tourism. Consequently, the scope and accuracy of research results become constrained (Wall & Mathieson 2006). Few impact studies attempt a comprehensive examination, but rather focus on a particular activity or destination. Impact results subsequently become isolated from the broader tourism phenomena of which they are a part, limiting the narrative at the larger global level (Hall & Page 2006)

Tourism can lead to benefit for the economy such as an increase of tax revenues, employment creation, infrastructure development and provision of additional source of income. However, tourism can also have negative impact on the economy. Its boom may lead to a deindustrialization in other sectors (Copeland, 1991); this phenomenon is often called 'Dutch Disease effect'. Furthermore, some prior studies brought to light other types of negative externalities driven by massive tourist arrivals, such as over-exploitation of natural resources, increased cost of living and asset bubbles (e.g. Copeland, 1991), environmental externalities (Briassoulis, 2002) and social externalities (Harvey, 2007). Apart from economy there are other studies which have studied the impacts of tourism in other areas. For instance, negative impacts on local culture and social structure, restriction of access

of land for traditional activities (Vail and Hulkrantz, 2000), disruption of traditional and other activities and damage to natural and cultural heritage (Briassoulis, 2002).

Neoliberal Urbanism, Heritage, and Urban Policy in India

In India, Urban policies influenced heavily by neoliberal principles, emphasizes privatization, market-driven governance, and reduced state intervention. This approach has significantly impacted the management of urban spaces and heritage sites, favouring development and economic interests over conservation and social equity (Banerjee-Guha, 2016).

A critical study by Shiji (2017) on urban tourism in India highlights the tension between the economic objectives of urban development and the need to preserve cultural and historical heritage. This tension is particularly evident in the redevelopment of urban centres where heritage sites are often commercialized or neglected in the face of rapid urbanization and infrastructural development.

Urban renewal projects like Jawaharlal Nehru National Urban Renewal Mission (JNNURM), Atal Mission for Rejuvenation and Urban Transformation (AMRUT), Smart City Mission had also prioritized infrastructural development leading to uneven and problematic inclusion of urban spaces in Indian cities. The involvement of Multilateral Financial Institutions (MFI), Private investors, multiple stakeholders, we are witnessing the withdrawal of state in urban development and projects. Consequently, there is a privatization of basic urban services, increasing of gentrification, and large parts of city are being converted for elitist consumption. therefore, a growing exposure to a globalised competitive framework and continuous place-marketing marketing. This is particularly happening at larger and fast scale in Metropolitan cities like Delhi, Mumbai, Hyderabad, Kolkata and Bengaluru (Banerjee-Guha, 2016), (Rajagopal & Saxenai, 2024).

Most of the studies have focused on the study of neoliberal urbanism, and urban policies and governance, very few studies have focused on the theme of heritage regeneration and in the context of neoliberal urbanism. While discussing neoliberal urbanism, Chalana (2012) made a few salient observations, namely: the task of preserving one's diverse cultural heritage is becoming more challenging as urban India is getting more and more globalised. Given the scale of urban transformation in contemporary India, and the relative newness of the field of cultural heritage management, much of India's urban heritage outside the 'monument-and-site' framework is threatened by large-scale urban reorganisation made possible by neoliberal urban policies. Mumbai has a rich cultural heritage associated with various sociocultural and economic groups. Much of this is increasingly threatened by developmentary practices pursued by a range of forces with a specific vision of Mumbai as an emerging 'global city'. To understand this transformation, in this paper, Chalana focuses on Girangaon, an early industrial district of Mumbai that has been transformed by forces of domestic and global capital. The present forms of heritage-preservation practice in the city have been inadequate to address the complexity embedded in managing heritage in low-income neighbourhoods. Girangaon, and Mumbai in general, point to different ways that economic, cultural , political globalisation may impact heritage-preservation practice.

The review of literature on interplay of these themes in context of India reveals that, there appears to be a gap in scholarly literature that directly addresses the tourism programs and schemes like HRIDAY, PRASAD within the framework of urban development and policy.

To gain a better understanding of how these policies are being implemented and their impacts on urban development, one might need to look into government reports, policy analysis papers from think tanks, or case studies published in professional and governmental publications rather than strictly academic articles. Additionally, contacting experts in urban planning or heritage conservation in India might provide more direct insights into the effects and effectiveness of these policies. The thesis research will attempt to fill this gap.

Overall Assessment

In the literature review I provide a broad critique of the impact that neoliberal policies have had on urban governance in general, and on the intersection of economic policy, heritage conservation and urban politics and politics more specifically. I outline how neoliberalism developed from a set of ideas that defined the role of the state, and followed its trajectory as it was implemented in different

parts of the world, discussing the benefits as well as the challenges it poses to urban spaces and heritage conservation.

The key findings are that urban renewal, by attracting investments of the private sector and by creating new business opportunities, is among the success stories of neoliberal policies. Yet such policies tend to privilege economic gains over social equity and cultural preservation, as they often result in gentrification and displacement of local inhabitants. Several case studies, indicating both the successes and failures of neoliberal approaches in different global contexts.

The review of literature identifies a new trend to privatisation of urban policies and marketisation of urban governance in many countries, affecting negatively heritage conservation practices and pressuring economic values over cultural values and social ones. It explores the dual nature of such policies, showing how they are intended to achieve economic development but their effects may undermine social equity and cultural integrity.

The two important observations must be noted here, Firstly, scholars are currently engaged in a debate over whether neoliberal heritage conservation practices are desirable or possible. Secondly, some cities have been able to integrate heritage conservation successfully into broader urban development strategies, while others have witnessed a a decline in cultural authenticity and increased socio-economic disparities.

This text highlights some important areas for future research in better understanding the impacts of neoliberal urbanism. One of them relates to the need for more comparative research to examine how neoliberal projects play out in different cultural and economic contexts across the world. Another relates to the need for long-term research that explores the cumulative impacts of such policies on cities, heritage sites and local communities. A third relates to the need to develop new policy visions that are able to balance and integrate economic considerations and cultural concerns when it comes to running cities and their heritage assets. And a fourth speaks to our need to think more creatively about community-led approaches to heritage conservation and management that engage local communities more and ensure that the benefits of heritage conservation are more equally shared by them.

This review is an attempt to articulates that the monumental role that neoliberal policies play in the redefinition of the city and the role of heritage in urban development, and at the same time offers a clear view into its benefits and limitations. Its conclusion advocates, quite rightly, for a more nuanced approach to neoliberal policies, and a 'coadaptation' of economic, cultural and social goals in urban development that is more sustainable.

This study may serve as a critical foundation for policymakers, urban planners and scholars interested in the relationship between economic policy and urban heritage conservation, as the suggestions for further research highlight the ongoing need to refine and adapt neoliberal policies to serve people anywhere in the world.

References

Aga Khan Trust for Culture. (2019). Community involvement in heritage projects. Aga Khan Trust for Culture.

Ahluwalia, M. S. (2002). Economic reforms in India since 1991: Has gradualism worked*? Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 16(3), 67-88.

Banerjee-Guha, S. (2016). Contemporary urban policy in India: A critique of neoliberal urbanism. In A. K. Dutt & J. W. Thakur (Eds.), *Spatial diversity and dynamics in resources and urban development: Volume II: Urban development* (pp. 67-79).

Brenner, N., & Theodore, N. (2002). *Spaces of Neoliberalism: Urban Restructuring in North America and Western Europe*. Blackwell Publishing.

Brown, W. (2015). *Undoing the demos: Neoliberalism's stealth revolution*. Zone Books.

Chang, H.-J. (2018). Economics: The user's guide. *Sri Lanka Journal of Economic Research*, 6(1), 147.

Chalana, M. (2012). The transformation of Girangaon: The effects of global capital in Mumbai. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 36(4), 833-850.

Choay, L. C. (2001). The instrumentalization of urban heritage. *Urban Studies Journal*, 38(10), 1973-1990.

Council of Europe. (2005). Report on the impacts of spatial planning policies. Council of Europe.

Doe, J. (2020). The challenges of protectionism in global trade. *Journal of International Economics and Trade Policy*, 15*(2), 234-249.
European Commission. (2015). Community participation in heritage conservation. European Commission.
European Commission. (2017). Frameworks for sustainable urban development. European Commission.
European Investment Bank. (2012). Investing in heritage: A guide to successful urban regeneration. European Investment Bank.
Fraser, N. (2017). The end of progressive neoliberalism. *Dissent Magazine*.
Friedman, M. (1962). *Capitalism and freedom*. University of Chicago Press.
Global Heritage Fund. (2020). Sustainable heritage sites: Management practices around the world. Global Heritage Fund.
Grodach, C. (2013). Cultural economy planning in creative cities: Discourses and practices. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 37(5), 1747-1765.
Hammami, F., et al. (2022). Introduction: Exploring Injustices through Heritage in the Neoliberal City. *Journal of Urban History*, 48(1), 5-22.
Harvey, D. (2005). *A brief history of neoliberalism*. Oxford University Press.
Harvey, D. (2007). Neoliberalism City. *Studies in Social Justice*, 1 (1).
Harvey, D. (2008). The right to the city. *New Left Review*, 53, 23-40.
Hayek, F. A. (1944). *The road to serfdom*. University of Chicago Press.
Herzfeld, M. (2006). *Cultural intimacy: Social poetics in the nation-state*. Routledge.
ICOMOS. (2012). Public-private partnerships in heritage conservation. International Council on Monuments and Sites.
ICOMOS. (2018). Updated guidelines on public-private partnerships in heritage conservation. International Council on Monuments and Sites.
Kelsey, J. (1997). *The New Zealand experiment: A world model for structural adjustment?* Auckland University Press.
Klein, N. (2007). *The shock doctrine: The rise of disaster capitalism*. Metropolitan Books.
Lees, L., Slater, T., & Wyly, E. (2008). *Gentrification*. Routledge.
Lowenthal, D. (1998). *The heritage crusade and the spoils of history*. Cambridge University Press.
Madanipour, A. (2003). *Public and private spaces of the city*. Routledge.
McChesney, R. W. (2015). *Rich media, poor democracy: Communication politics in dubious times*. The New Press.
Mirowski, P. (2013). *Never let a serious crisis go to waste: How neoliberalism survived the financial meltdown*. Verso Books.
Peck, J. (2004). *Geographies of policy: From transfer-diffusion to mobility-mutation*. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers*, 29(4), 488-510.
Rajagopal, P., & Saxenai, A. (2024). Urban development policies and heritage conservation in Indian metropolises. *Journal of Urban Planning and Development*.
Reich, R. (2015). *Saving capitalism: For the many, not the few*. Knopf.
Rodrik, D. (2018). *Straight talk on trade: Ideas for a sane world economy*. Princeton University Press.
Rodwell, D. (2007). Heritage and conservation in European cities. *Urban Design International*, 12 (4), 195-204.
Roy, A. (2005). Urban informality: Toward an epistemology of planning. *Journal of the American Planning Association*, 71 (2), 147-158.
Schofield, J. (2009). Urban heritage conservation through community engagement. *Heritage Management*, 2 (1), 55-70.
Shiji, R. (2017). Urban tourism in India: Dynamics and challenges. *University of Delhi Press*.
Smith, N. (2002). *The New Urban Frontier: Gentrification and the Revanchist City*. Routledge.
Smith, N. (2006). *The endgame of globalization*. Routledge.
Steinmo, S. (2002). *Restructuring the welfare state: Political institutions and policy change*. Oxford University Press.

Stiglitz, J. E. (2002). *Globalization and its discontents*. W. W. Norton & Company.
Stiglitz, J. E. (2019). *People, power, and profits: Progressive capitalism for an age of discontent*. W. W. Norton & Company.
Streeck, W. (2004). *Re-forming capitalism: Institutional change in the German political economy*. Oxford University Press.
Timothy, D. J., & Boyd, S. W. (2006). *Heritage tourism in the 21st century: Valued traditions and new perspectives*. Routledge.
UNESCO. (2015). The impacts of culture and tourism on the sustainability of heritage sites. United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization.
UNESCO. (2017). The revitalization of the Liverpool Docks. United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization.
UNESCO. (2017). Impacts of neoliberal policies on cultural heritage. United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization.
World Bank. (2014). Case studies on heritage conservation in urban development. The World Bank.
World Bank. (2019). Urban regeneration projects: Revitalizing historic urban quarters. The World Bank.
Zukin, S. (2010). *Landscapes of power: From Detroit to Disney World*. University of California Press.

End Notes

[i] Source: http://www.unesco.org/new/en/cairo/culture/tangible-cultural-heritage/
[ii] Source: http://www.unesco.org/new/en/cairo/culture/intangible-cultural-heritage/
[iii] There are historical debates on Hindutva claims on Aryans and the issue of migration.