

DIFFICULT LEGACY: a radical
criticism on the book *Working
Through the Past*

Maximiliano E Korstanje

DIFFICULT LEGACY: a radical criticism on the book *Working Through the Past*

Maximiliano E Korstanje¹

During years United States dominated the international affair and diplomatic relationship in the World. After the collapse of Soviet Union, this northern power enthralled as a real empire which accelerated the process of globalization among central and peripheral economies (Kehoane & Zeckhauser, 2003). Ideologically as professor Geoff Skoll puts it, the enthusiasm of capitalism respecting to communism consisted in expanding the belief that US offered the best of the possible worlds (Skoll & Korstanje 2013; Skoll 2016). In this context, 9/11 not only was a striking blow but also a clear indicator the atmosphere of liberty Americans enjoyed was a simple illusion. Further, Snowden`s scandal and NSA evinced to what extent government introduced intrusive technologies of surveillance that vulnerates the autonomy of private life (Skoll 2014). Lay-citizens were surveilled secretly by the government they voted in which case it suggests a dichotomy between democracy and dictatorship. Although many studies have discussed causes and effects of terrorism, less attention was to its intersection with capitalist system, first and foremost with worker unions. In the present corollary chapter, we place the book *Working Through the Past* under the lens of scrutiny. In this project, which is edited by Teri Caraway, Maria Lorena Cook and Stephen Crowley, the conforming chapters analyze the influence of authoritarian legacies in the way labor is organized, which means how worker unions negotiate with capital-owners.

This book starts from a false premise, which is endorsed to Western intellectuals. Democracy should be estimated as the best possible government in the same way its more direct product, capitalism is. As a wide-spread economic and cultural project, capitalism emerged not only by the liberty introduced by democracy but by the competence of economic agents in the marketplace. Those other countries in Latin America, Asia or Africa who had not experience such a blessing developed authoritarian regimes which prevented the rise of capitalism. Following this explanation, *Working through the Past* Labor and unions in authoritarian are weaker than democratic regimes. As this backdrop, in an interesting introductory foreword, Caraway, Cook and Crowley argue convincingly that we need to speak of “authoritarian legacies” in cases where nations failed to develop democracy or in situations where military coups took place. A more than pertinent question arises, to what extent an event can define the politics of a country in long-run terms?

¹ Department of Economics, University of Palermo, Argentina. mkorst@palermo.edu

It is important to distinguish between authoritarian legacies from historical legacies. The fact is that nations when accept democracy, still are attached to an authoritarian pastime which determines part of the problems they have to negotiate with others. This authoritarian spirit not only continues but also endorses to economic constraints that causes a negative impact in civil society. This is the reason why theorizing on unionization in stage of state-led paternalism as in Eastern Europe or weak democracies as in Latin America, seems to be a deep-seated issue which should be widely discussed. However, to our end, one of the most troubling aspects of this book rests on the ethnocentric view of other non-western cultures. Secondly, editors ignore the connection between terrorism and unionization, as it was explored by Korstanje, Timmermann and Skoll (2015), or by Korstanje (2015). The liberal state disciplined the incipient terrorist cells (anarchists) in form of benefits for worker unions that paved the pathways for the advance of leisure industries and the right to strike. In this vein, terrorism represents the organization of labor by other means. Undoubtedly, we will continue this point in next.

As previous argument given, since worker unions may empowered in atmosphere of cooperation and freedom, authoritarian era labor legacies constrained unions during and after the political transitions. In the first chapter, one of the editors, Teri Caraway notes that in Indonesia the Yukarto era played a negative role restricting the participation of worker union in the formation of governmental policies, but in fact it has not impeded skills for union leaders to achieve collective goals. However, it is noteworthy to add that the participation of workers in unions are meager than in other countries as Argentina or Brazil. Only a small percentage of the entire workforce has been successfully affiliated.

“The weakness of Indonesia ‘largest union in the private sector, combined with intense fragmentation of newly formed union and the poor enforcement of laws that protect the right to organize, have produced a small and fractured labor movement in Indonesia. In addition, the survival of other organization legacy has stifled independent organizing among civil servants, and state enterprise workers. (Caraway 2015, p. 27)

The study-cases cited and mentioned in this book comprise two types of states. On one hand, as in Eastern Europe, state monopolizes worker unions at its discretion imposing the policies workforce should accept. On another hand, other types of states signal to bloodshed or violent coups that exerted considerable control over worker unions as the case of Chile or Argentina. Once military forces leave the power, a legacy of oppression still affects the horizons of unions even today.

Most certainly, in the democratic societies, the conflict between workers and businessmen is redeemed by the negotiations in which case the struggle of interests reaches on a dead-lock. In case of strike, the state should intervene to obtain a consensus building. Not only this sum-zero game reinforces democracy but determines the gravitation of unions in democratic life. In authoritarian legacies things go in the opposite direction. The point is that for many voices, strike even wildcat strike opens the doors for the necessary interaction to foster democracy. Those nations whose rights to strike was frowned, by the orchestration of different instrument, developed

democracies of low-quality that led to weaker worker unions (Caraway 2015; Lee 2015). As Caraway puts it,

"One of the ironies of Suharto regime's industrial relations ideology, HIP, was that it encouraged unions to pursue economic unionism but delegitimized the main weapon that workers had for pressuring employers in the workplace-the strike. Referring to the national ideology, Pacasila, and borrowing from organic static and revisionist ideas, HIP philosophy stressed harmony in the workplace". (Caraway 2015: 3)

After further review, this project outlines into three different paths. At a closer look, the main argument is that authoritarian legacies exert considerable influence in restricting the participation of work-force in politics. Not only this is an instrument for elite to keep the legitimacy, but also to protect centralized extractive institutions that amass wealth in few hands. Secondly, those countries which have faced authoritarian governments have less probabilities to develop stronger worker unions in comparison with democratic nations. Last but not least, the right of workers to protest and strike are two major elements of democracies which should be preserved by unions, and of course, the reason why, only success capitalism surfaced in democratic countries.

This begs a more than interesting question, where capitalism intersects with terrorism? During XIXth century, millions European workers migrated from the Old World to United States in quest of better conditions of life. Within these files, a bunch of anarchists struggled against Status Quo planning terrorist attacks against Chief Police officers, or politicians. Traced, jailed and deported some of them opted to organize the incipient unions introducing their ideologies in favor of workers. At a closer look, the nation-state endorsed to the new unions the right to strike conjoined to other benefits as less working hours and wage enhancement. All these improvements paved the ways for the advent of leisure practices that helped workers to enjoy holidays and other derived consumption practices. Basically, US disciplined terrorism by the incorporation of its ideological core. The organizations of labor, even the right to strike is terrorism by other means. Today, whenever tourists or travelers are stranded at an international airport by a sudden strike, they are instrumentalized in order for union demands to be accepted by State. Beyond the degree of cruelty or violence, the same happens with terrorism. In any case, what beyond the boundaries of capitalist society is dubbed as "terrorism", inside sounds as "the right of workers to strike". As Michel Foucault puts it, the power of discipline does not rest on the violence it generates, but in the fact that threats are mitigated of their negative assets in the same way, the vaccine represents an inoculated virus (Foucault, 1991). In this point, the danger, terrorism was disciplined to take a more mitigated form, strike.

It is tempting to say that social order is replicated by the articulation of binomial construes. The processes of reification by means citizens engage with their institutions are based on two trends. The first and most important is education. In the art of

education peoples learn the rules, and most important steps to coexist with others. In retrospect, education plays a crucial role by formatting the minds of citizens to understand the concept of reality. The self should not be studied in isolation of social institutions, even the social fact encompasses individuals, culture, and the institutions where social life evolves. At some extent, institutions are created not only to solve problems surfacing in daily life, but also endorse to citizens a much deeper understanding of world. The micro-interaction among agents comprises the connection of self with others (Mead 1934; Ryle 2009). Structuralism as cultural and scientific project showed that culture is constructed by the imposition of contrasting values, which are expressed in combination with the opposite. To put this in other terms, black cannot be understood apart from white, in the same way, high has no sense for us without knowing what low is. As language the society should be divided into two halves, whose rules are pitted against the other side but working altogether (Levi-Strauss 2013; Dreyfus & Rabinow, 2014). However, structuralism gives a weak argument to explain how this world of contrasts is formed. Echoing Niklas Luhmann, society is the sum of different subsystems which are centered on communication. People are unable by communicating since only society communicates. By means of a reduction of complexity, which means that society only works by limiting the environmental complexity into two binomial codes in its core, Luhmann adds, people do not influence in communicative process but they are determined by environment (Luhmann, 2013). The legacy of Luhmann to the sociological discussion is very important simply because he introduces the concept of binomials. These observations can be endorsed to the outcome of Korstanje in his recent book *A Difficult World*, examining the roots of capitalism, where author discusses to what extent capitalism expanded across the world thanks to two key elements. At a first look, the industries of leisure as tourism and mobility were conducive to reduce the conflict instilled by terrorism in the first decade of Twenty century. The disciplinary mechanisms of control inoculate from threats the negative features but incorporating their core. In some respect, the process of education only tells part of the truth, covering part of the reasons why events happened. At the time we learn from media terrorists are hatred-filled criminals, we are not told the main of their ideologies remained in capitalist society. Extortion is the bridge between terrorism and the organization of labor. Not only terrorists or jihadists are native-born of the societies they attack, they look like us, even they may be our neighbors (Howie 2011). In this token, psychoanalysis has advanced in their studies of fear considering what is unsaid, is enrooted in the social imaginary causing an extreme sentiment of panic (Howie 2011). In fact, as Zizek puts it, the power of ideology is not given by what ideology says, but by what it hides (Zizek 1989). One of the best examples of this is the gap left by disasters when hit a community. The presence of mass-death causes ambivalent feeling within community. The uncontrollable nature of death undermines the social trust in institutions and officialdoms. In other terms, disasters produce a hole in society which should be fulfilled with ideology. Dark tourism, a new trends documented by various scholars recently offers a fertile ground to understand how politicians impose a discourse that leads society to interpret events within the hat of ideology (Stone & Sharpley, 2008; Reijnders, 2011; Sather-Wagstaff, 2011; Tzanelli 2015). Tourists visit

spaces of mass death or extreme mourning but without knowing what these tragedies really happened. Politicians to protect their interests poses a biased message which is commercialized by different tour operators (Guidotti Hernandez, 2011). As a result of this, since the real reasons of disasters are covered, the probabilities it repeats in a near future are higher. This was what Korstanje (2010) dubbed as the “end of resiliency”, or Baudrillard (2006) called “the spectacle of disaster”. The same applies to ground-zero or cities attacked by international terrorism where today were commoditized as important tourist attractions.

A second point of criticism in the text of Caraway, Cook and Crowley seems to be their idealized meaning of democracy. In times of Greek kings, democracy was a political resource invoked by any citizens whenever he considers a law was unjust. Democracy was functional to government dotted with small scales of population. At some extent, democracy was nothing to do with liberty, since the authority of King never was questioned. The rise of liberty introduced by bourgeois was tilted at destroying the social bondage forged in Medieval Times in order to produce new workers who can sell their services to capital-owners. From that moment on, capitalist societies erected on a biased image of democracy, which was more related to the freedom to consume, than a real political liberty. To what extent, US is more democratic than Argentina is a very hard to grasp. As the problem of terrorism which is seen as an issue prompted by the lack of democracy, many American intellectuals have developed a false diagnosis on how extreme violence can be triggered within democratic life (Piazza, 2008). In a seminal book, authored by Kathleen G Donohue (2003) notes that the passage from a society of producers to a society of consumers was no later than the mid of XXth century. Starting from the premise that the wealth of nations was a question of equilibrium, economists thought that the only manner to boost the economy of a country was at the cost of another country. In this viewpoint, a strong commercial relationship among nations should be organized in view of trade. Whenever, exports supersede imports, the economy rises. However, consumption was one of the main threats of well-being simply because it reduces the goods available for export. Here is one of the ideological pillars of modern capitalism. In the outset of XXth century, economists formulated a curious quandary to overcome the obstacle of poverty. Even if mercantilists conceived a “regulated consumption”, they neglected the thesis that consumption drives the tenets of economy. However, a new liberal trend instilled the belief that consumption drives economy, in what resulted that the only pathways for expanding prosperity was enhancing production. To accomplish this task, societies should import and develop strong capital investment accompanied by modern technological machines. Subordinated to this logic, economy compelled to the formation of extractive institutions that protected the profits of elite, while the workforce was pressed to compete for ever-decreasing low-skilled positions. The market gave interesting new opportunities for capital investment (by stimulating mass-consumption), but reducing the genuine growth of society. The obsession for eradicating poverty was the key factors for the acceleration of capitalist forces. After 1940, the freedom from want was related to one of human basic needs and expanded to

the world as an unquestionable principle. This was undoubtedly possible because intellectuals have discussed in earlier centuries the importance of consumption as an efficient instrument to reduce pauperism. The financial crisis in 1930 paves the pathways for nations to embrace this paradigm without resistance. Liberals formulated “the new deal of liberalism” to transform American society, even mingling the discourse of consumption with democracy. As Donohue puts it,

“This new liberal system was not without its detractors. Critics became increasingly concerned that freedom from want was being equated with a right of plenty. And they worried that material plenty was being treated as a precondition of democracy” (p. 277)

Ideologically, Americans have felt “superior” to other nations because they are enthralled as the main democratic and prosperous society; although more egalitarian at the surface, American citizens are subject to more work and consumption but less leisure. This happens because, in a pro consumer society, workers are bombarded with emulation and advertising creating the needs to buy. This not only jeopardized their real liberty to choose, but affects seriously to democracy. Detractors of capitalism, who pushed their focus on the arbitrariness of producers, were involuntarily responsible or conducive to the formation of a global society of consumers. Those denunciations on an economy that protect the interests of producers as well as the needs to adopt consumption to break the material asymmetries among classes, were two guiding concepts to embrace a globalized version of capitalism, prone to mass-consumption. This fascinating book is based on a lucid and penetrating reading of history which ranges from 1870 to 1940. Offering a sensitive interpretation of capitalism’s evolution, Donohue reminds one of the paradoxes of our current civilizations, at time investment in a global economy offers new channels for profits, poverty increases in an accelerated and unsustainable way.

Undoubtedly, the argument presented by Caraway, Cook and Crowley rest on shaky foundation because it trivializes the real evolution of capitalism and democracy. In fact, terrorism and capitalism not only were inextricably intertwined, but also advanced in lockstep to form a state of symbiosis of mutual feed-back. Once again, this is the reason to think twice in the fact that perhaps when we visit Ground-zero, we have heard a partial truth. While the organization of labor, unionism, and the right of strike are pondered as good things every democrat should respect, terrorists are foes of liberty, or maniacs who hates US because it represents cultural values associated to harmony and democracy, all they hate seems to be what they cannot obtain. We need to reconsider this belief in the view of historical facts and the evidence discussed in these corollary notes.

Emeritus professor from SUNY at Buffalo, Geoffrey Skoll observed that “the war on terror” has changed forever Americans awaking up from the slumber they were. Terrorism cemented the critical spirit in order to forge a “culture of fear”, that centers on the false belief the world is a dangerous or hostile place to live. Americans see the

world as an incomplete leviathan where democracy failed to give responses to economic needs of lay citizens. As a result of this, US is targeted as the reasons of all evils the world should face.

The idea that capitalist system reproduces by the growth of inequality and poverty is not new since it has been discussed widely by Marxism and post-Marxism in the four corners of the world. However, the intersection of terrorism and capitalism seems to be a heated discussion which today retains considerable concern from scholarship. We are told that working is the best project in what we can spend our time whereas terrorism is an act of hatred-filled hearts or maniacs. But to what extent it is true?

In his recent book, *Globalization of American Fear Culture*, Geoff Skoll continues a much deeper discussion instilled by former work, *Social theory of Fear*. At a closer look, the act of governing through fear is used by US to create a culture of mistrust. From the onset, US was based on the belief that the world as a dangerous place to live. Over recent decades in XXth century, fear was used to enhance the legitimacy of elite, sometimes oriented for the workforce to accept policies otherwise would be rejected. At the time, capital and American Empire expanded to colonize new worlds, a much deeper sentiment of fear accompanied the politics. Therefore, it is safe to say we live in a world characterized by a “global fear” which is functional to a particular way of making politics. One of the aspects facilitated the expansion of capitalism was the idea that citizens live in the best of the possible worlds. Beyond the boundaries of consuming society, of course, any change represents a threat for popular parlance, a barrier to overcome.

In perspective, Skoll traces the historical roots of the culture of fear in America. In retrospect, the capitalist system and theories of economy showed widely that accumulation only is feasible if we introduce exploitation as a key factor to produce and distribute wealth in few hands. The monopolization of surplus value, as Marx puts it, resulted not only from human creativity but by the means of elite to commoditize labor into exchangeable goods. The number of rank-and-file workers involved in a process of production affects directly the profits of capital owners. From that moment on, the capital reproduction seems to be always in detriment of workforce. In this mayhem, whenever the conflict rises, fear undermines the possibilities of claimers and protesters to impose their views. Two major instruments were used by privileged classes to keep the control, ideology and repression. While the latter appealed to surveillance to exert violence against the pathological agents, the latter one was enrooted in a process of fear-mongering that limited the negotiation of worker unions. After 9/11, total forms of control were established in private life subordinating individual rights to the collective well-being, which means a more secure society. Leisure industries were witness of obstructive methods of surveillance over lay citizens. It was unfortunate that this trend makes from US a fascist state. This is a very interesting introductory section where author combines his erudition pitting historical cases where governments used fear in their favor against US and its Anglo-allies in the war on terror.

As the previous argument given, Skoll discusses to what extent elite in America devoted its resources to forge a culture of fear which passed from communism towards terrorism. The organization of labor conjoined to profit maximization is two key factors behind the manipulation of fear. Though actors changed, the dynamic are the same. Doubtless, this is one of the merits place Geoffrey Skoll now as a must-read author in terrorism-related issues. It is important not to lose the sight on the model of four wars where Skoll confirms a path-breaking thesis. From its inception, US was always an imperialist power which struggled in four major events, *Philippine War, Korean War, Cold War and Vietnam War*. Though the two total world wars involved US as well, no less true is that in these events US played the role of an empire inspiring a model that situates United States as the “administrator” of capitalism. The management of exploitation centers in a genocidal campaign by disciplining communists.

The period 1968-1973 not only encouraged a liberalization of human relationship, it induced substantial changes in economies worldwide. During this age the spin doctors of capitalism precaritized the power of workers paving the pathways for the rise of neoliberalism during 90s decade. As this backdrop, the expansion of US as the unique imperial power was possible after the collapse of Soviet Union, but without the legacy of UK in financial leadership, it would have never taken place. One mantle passed from one power to other as US enthralled as the center of manufacture and trade. The globalization of fear is assessed in chapter six, seven and eight. The direct intervention or full-scare led wars are ideologically legitimized by the needs of bringing the ideals of American democracy, liberty, freedom and mobility. However, at the bottom, this globalized culture of fear hidden dark interests associated to exploitation. Paradoxically, these types of interventions suggest that terrorism needs the use of force, but in so doing, impotence and deprivation surface. To set an example, Skoll adds, whilst US supported by financial investors, IMF or ONG arrives to Middle East to take the local politics on its hands, a state of chaos and political instability dominates the environment. The allegory of war on terror leads governments not to tackle off real dangers produced by capitalism as pollution or global warming. Last but not least, eight and nine chapters formulate ground-breaking suggestions to stop with the discourse of fear. Unless otherwise resolved, the question whether US and its domains pays attention to terrorism as the main threat of West covering other most terrible risks, one dangles that the probabilities our civilization collapses are higher than thought. Anyway, citizens are prone to develop sustainable practices of consumption that encourages a real democracy from the bottom to the top.

After further review, I feel professor Skoll presents a well-argued book which is a result of years of academic maturation and research. Starting from the premise post-Marxian studies have a lot to say in terrorism issues, most of them discriminated by academy, Skoll exerts a radical and illustrative criticism on the “culture of Fear” in US but posing much trust in democracy. In future approaches, Skoll should resolve what Korstanje dubbed as “Hobbesian dilemma of politics”, which means that Marxism was wrong respecting to the role of power in societal fabric (reproaching the argument more to Max Weber). To put this in bluntly, with Thomas Hobbes we learned that fear

underlies in the worlds of politics even during democracy. Although economic production plays a vital role in the formation of society, it is not determinant. There is nothing like a progress towards an end of class struggle, which advances through history. This suggests that society is not affected by fear but it results from the imposition of mechanisms oriented to discipline fear. In other terms, society is created by the fear. The problem with wayward Puritans lies in the fact they have developed a cosmology of conflict where sublimation is only affordable by the imposition of sacrifice. The sense of predestination closed their future in order for Anglo-worker to demonstrate he deserves salvation. In this stage, social Darwinism did the rest. Capitalism worked not only by the culture of fear or consumption imposed to citizens, but by the fact that they enter in competence with others with an exaggerated idea about their real probabilities of success. Because of Americans feel special, superior or even supermen, narcissism undergirds the social trust. The survival of the strongest is the final goal, but behind this, only one is the winner. We can see scenes of this nature in main reality shows as Big brother or even in films as Hunger Games, where the glory of few entails the ruin of the rest. This is a normal ideological resource to normalize the precaritization of workforce. Inevitably, the war of all against all emulated by Darwinism allows the reproduction of material asymmetries by means capitalism expands (Korstanje 2015). To cut the long story short, this is a democracy which is insensitive to human needs, this is a democracy leaves many open question to human suffering, this is a democracy where the gap between have and have-nots has been enlarged...

References

- Baudrillard, J. (2003). *The spirit of terrorism and other essays*. London, Verso.
- Caraway, Teri, Cook Maria L. Crowley Stephen. (2015). *Working through Past: labor and Authoritarian legacies in comparative perspective*. New Brunswick, Cornell University Press.
- Caraway, Teri. 2015. "Strength amid Weakness". *Working through Past: labor and Authoritarian legacies in comparative perspective*. (pp. 25-43). New Brunswick, Cornell University Press.
- Dreyfus, H. L., & Rabinow, P. (2014). *Michel Foucault: Beyond structuralism and hermeneutics*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Donohue, K (2003) *Freedom from Want*. Baltimore, John Hopkins University.
- Foucault, M (1991). *The Foucault effect: Studies in governmentality*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Guidotti-Hernández, N. M. (2011). *Unspeakable violence: Remapping US and Mexican national imaginaries* (p. 374). Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Howie, L. (2011). They Were created by Man... and They have a plan: subjective and objective violence in Battlestar Galactica and the War on Terror. *International Journal of Zizek Studies [P]*, 5(2), 1-23.
- Keohane, N. O., & Zeckhauser, R. J. (2003). *The ecology of terror defense* (pp. 103-131). New York, Springer US.
- Korstanje, M. (2010). Commentaries on our new ways of perceiving disasters. *International Journal of Disaster Resilience in the Built Environment*, 1(2), 241-248.
- Korstanje M. (2015). *A Difficult World, examining the roots of Capitalism*. New York, Nova Science Publishers.
- Korstanje M, Skoll Geoffrey, Terrorism, Freddy.(2014). "Tourism and Worker Unions: The disciplinary boundaries of fear". *International Journal of Religious Tourism and Pilgrimage*, 2.1: 1-12
- Mead, G. H. (1934). *Mind, self and society* (Vol. 111). University of Chicago Press: Chicago.
- Lee, Y. (2015). "Labor's political representation: divergent paths in Korea and Taiwan. In *Working Through Past*. Edited by Caraway T. Cook M & Crowley S. (pp. 44-63). New Brunswick, Cornell University Press.

- Lévi-Strauss, C. (2013). *Myth and meaning*. New York, Routledge.
- Luhmann, N., (2013). *A sociological theory of law*. New York: Routledge.
- Piazza, J. A. (2008). Do democracy and free markets protect us from terrorism?. *International Politics*, 45(1), 72-91.
- Reijnders, S. (2011). Stalking the count: Dracula, fandom and tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 38(1), 231-248.
- Ryle, G. (2009). *The concept of mind*. New York: Routledge.
- Sather-Wagstaff, J. (2011). *Heritage that hurts: Tourists in the memoryscapes of September 11* (Vol. 4). Walnut Creek, Left Coast Press.
- Skoll, G (2016). *Globalization of American Fear Culture: the empire in the Twenty-First Century*. New York: Palgrave MacMillan
- Skoll, G. R. (2014). "Stealing Consciousness: Using Cybernetics for Controlling Populations". *International Journal of Cyber Warfare and Terrorism (IJCWT)*,4.1: 27-35.
- Skoll, G. R., & Korstanje, Maximiliano. (2013). "Constructing an American fear culture from red scares to terrorism". *International Journal of Human Rights and Constitutional Studies*, 1. 4: 341-364.
- Stone, P., & Sharpley, R. (2008). Consuming dark tourism: A thanatological perspective. *Annals of tourism Research*, 35(2), 574-595.
- Tzanelli, R. (2015). *Mobility, Modernity and the Slum: The Real and Virtual Journeys of 'Slumdog Millionaire'*. Abingdon, Routledge.
- Žižek, S. (1989). *The sublime object of ideology*. London, Verso.