



Enlightening Tourism.

A Pathmaking Journal



Universidad
de Huelva

Editorial Team

Editor in Chief

Alfonso Vargas-Sánchez, University of Huelva, Spain

Associate Editor

T.C. Huan, National Chiayi University, Taiwan

Books Review Editor

Steve Watson, York St. John University, United Kingdom

Secretariat

Cinta Borrero-Domínguez, University of Huelva, Spain

Mirko Perano, University of Salerno, Italy

Style reviewer and text editor

Beatriz Rodríguez-Arrizabalaga, University of Huelva, Spain

Editorial Board

José Manuel Alcaraz, Barna Business School, República Dominicana

Mario Castellanos-Verdugo, University of Seville, España

José Antonio Fraiz-Brea, University of Vigo, España

José Manuel Hernández-Mogollón, University of Extremadura, España

Shaul Krakover, Ben Gurion University, Israel

Jean Pierre Levy-Mangin, University of Quebec, Canadá

Tomás López-Guzmán, University of Córdoba, España

Alfonso Morvillo, National Research Council (CNR), Italia

Yasuo Ohe, Chiba University, Japón

María de los Ángeles Plaza-Mejía, University of Huelva, España

Nuria Porrás-Bueno, University of Huelva, España

João Albino Silva, Algarve University, Portugal

Advisory Board (Spanish Members)

César Camisón-Zornoza, Jaume I University, Spain

Enrique Claver-Cortés, University of Alicante, Spain

María Teresa Fernández-Alles, University of Cádiz, Spain

José Luis Galán-González, University of Seville, Spain

Félix Grande-Torrales, University of Jaén, España

Inmaculada Martín-Rojo, University of Málaga, Spain

Antonio Manuel Martínez-López, University of Huelva, España

Francisco José Martínez-López, University of Huelva, Rector, España

María Jesús Moreno-Domínguez, University of Huelva,

España

Pablo A. Muñoz-Gallego, University of Salamanca, España

Francisco Riquel-Ligero, University of Huelva, España

Josep Francesc Valls-Giménez, ESADE, España

Advisory Board (Other European Members)

Paulo Aguas, Algarve University, Portugal

Gustavo Barresi, University of Messina, Italy

Carlos Costa, Aveiro University, Portugal

Salvatore Esposito de Falco, University of Rome "La Sapienza", Italy

Sheila Flanagan, Dublin Institute of Technology, Ireland

Tania Gorcheva, Tsenov Academy of Economics, Bulgaria

Tadeja Jere-Lazanski, University of Primorska, Slovenia

Metin Kozak, Mugla University, Turkey

Álvaro Matias, Lusitana University, Portugal

Claudio Nigro, University of Foggia, Italy

Angelo Presenza, University "G. D'Annunzio" of Chieti-Pescara, Italy

Renee Reid, Glasgow Caledonian University, United Kingdom

Advisory Board (Members from the rest of the world)

John Allee, American University of Sharjah, United Arab Emirates

Nestor Pedro Braidot, National University of La Plata, Argentina

Roberto Elias Canese, Columbia University, Rector, Paraguay

Luca Casali, Queensland University of Technology, Australia

Nimit Chowdhary, Indian Institute of Tourism and Travel Management, India

Steven Chung-chi Wu, National Pingtung University of Science and Technology, Taiwán

Dianne Dredge, Southern Cross University, Australia

Daniel Fesenmaier, Temple University, United States

Babu George, University of Southern Mississippi, United States

Dogan Gursoy, Washington State University, United States

Kanes Rajah, Tshwane University of Technology, South Africa

Albert Yeh Shangpao, I-SHOU University, Taiwán

Pauline Sheldon, University of Hawaii, United States

Germán A. Sierra-Anaya, University of Cartagena de Indias, Rector, Colombia

Xiaohua Yang, University of San Francisco, United States



MACCANNELL RE-VISITED: A CRITICAL APPROACH TO STRUCTURALISM

Maximiliano E. Korstanje

University of Palermo (Argentina)

maxikorstanje@fibertel.com.ar

ABSTRACT

From his publication, the Tourist, Dean Maccannell has shed light on an entire generation. His legacy opened a new focus of attention in the cultural studies of geography, territory, authenticity and mobility. However, his negative view about tourism as an alienable activity paved the ways for the trivialization of tourism as a scientific discipline. This essay review not only is aimed at reviewing deeply from various works, ranging from the Tourist to Empty meeting grounds, but also we focus on the methodological inconsistencies of structuralism to be applied on tourist-related studies. Our thesis is that Maccannell misunderstood the real nature of tourism and its difference from the tourist destination. His outcomes are illustrative to examine the life of tourist destinations but are invalidated at time of studying tourism from a macro-sociological perspective. Maccannell is a hero of tourism applied research because of his merit; our efforts are placed to debunk his contributions.

KEYWORDS

Sociology; Anthropology; Tourism; Mobility; Maccannell; Structuralism.

ECONLIT KEYS

Z100; Z130.

1. INTRODUCTION

From 20 years onwards, the specialized literature is discussing about the requirements for tourism to be consolidated as a scientific discipline. Although some studies focused on the maturity of research, Ph D thesis, Conferences and Books (Knebel, 1974; Jafari and Aeser, 1988; Jafari and Pizam, 1996; Jafari, 1990; 2005a; 2005b), others more conservative warned about the troublesome growth of tourism

advance in last years (Tribe, 2011; Dann, 2005; Muñoz-Escalona, 2011; Korstanje and Busby, 2010; Barretto, 2010; Schluter, 2008; Monterrubio-Cordero, 2011). There would be a so-called “indiscipline” that does not allow the creation of a unified epistemology of tourism. A profound methodological review reveals that the existent studies in this incipient field, lack of a clear object. But worse comes to worst, some classical disciplines as anthropology, sociology and psychology still trivialize tourism as a scientific option. From its inception tourism and Anthropology kept a conflictive relationship. Anthropology charged against tourism for considering this activity is exclusively based on banal acts and profits; the tourism-related research was seen as a pseudo-scientific effort to validate marketing campaigns or protecting commercial products. Dean Maccannell was one of the exponents in situating tourism as a mechanism of alienation and impersonality. In view of this, tourism creates parallel spaces of consumption similarly to virtual realities. This critical view led to many scholars to see in tourism a fictitious form of knowledge incompatible with other serious disciplines. Here an interesting question arises, is Maccannell right?. An alternative answer reveals that Maccannell did the right, but opted for the incorrect ways to continue his development. The original suspicions about the link between modernity and commoditization of landscapes (seen in the early studies) were not followed. Rather, he preferred to adapt the structuralist theory, even though Levi Strauss warned on the impossibilities to apply structuralism to urban studies. To put this in bluntly, Disneyland, as a product of marketing design, seems not to be representative of the forces by means tourism is determined.

The objectives of this essay-review are twofold: on one hand it is necessary to explore the conceptual problems of Maccannell’s theory and structuralism to be extrapolated to tourism fields. On another, this study focuses on how Maccannell contributes to create a pejorative view of tourism feeding the argument of detractors of scientification of tourism. At some extent, it is important not to loose the sight that Maccannell has fallen in to significant errors, which has not been noted up to date (this is the merit of this research). The pejorative connotations on tourism are unfortunately centred in biased studies and interpretations of structuralism, as it has been put by Levi Strauss.

In the first section, we discuss not only the historical legacy of French structuralism and its obsession for visual-fields but also the first steps of Maccannell studying how the otherness constructed is. Next, of his famous book "*The Tourist a New Theory of the Leisure Class*", the main outcomes are detached to understand the primary concerns for the advent of modernity. The ideas debated in the tourist not only will generate interesting impacts in the sociology of tourism but also will pave the pathways for the advent of a second powerful research, Empty Meeting Grounds. Although at this stage, Maccannell is characterized to exhibit a complex jargon, based exclusively on deep sociological theories, we must recognize this represents his most prolific legacy to expand our current understanding of the connection between mobility and modernity. If the primitive mind (and religious life) has been disappeared forever in view of the advance of capitalism, also the market has gained hegemony on almost all social relationships, even the leisure. Tourism, here, corresponds with a commercial reified activity where real encounters never happen. The money has been mediated the social bonds. Ultimately, this assumption will lead to think that the only way of making more human tourism is the introduction of ethics. What is important to remind here are two aspects: one is that Maccannell's theory seems to be attractive, original and illustrative but rests on myths (speculations) which must be re-considered. Second, his negative viewpoint of tourism is based on a conceptual misunderstanding between tourism and tourist destination.

2. THE CONTEXTUAL LEGACY

From the metaphor of the Cavern in Plato, many philosophers have questioned the role of modern vision and curiosity in the way of thinking in the West. The dichotomy between light and darkness worked as a mythical archetype to understand "sight-seeing". Hans Blumberg (1993) explains how the supremacy of vision in the West derives from the classical Greek world and its particular way of interpreting facts. Those things captured by the eyes gained more credibility than those sensations perceived by the ears. Throughout late-modernity, the "oculacentrism" played a vital role not only in the advance of Science and experimentation but also in all spheres of social life. Not only vision paved the ways

for the advent of oculacentrism but also in giving citizens a way of entertainment (Levin, 1993). The hegemony of vision cuts the world in two, authenticity and falsehood.

The sensible world, as we will see in Levi Strauss and D. Maccannell, should be divided in two opposite parts in ongoing dialogue. The world is viewed by means of oppositions; if the light needs from darkness, also darkness are in connection to light. This exhibits a dialectical relation between two objects. We, human beings, recur to this dialectic to understand the facts. I do understand what is black because I am familiar with the term white. In sum, the meaning of events seems to be determined by the understanding of opposite senses. This point of discussion is exactly the legacy left by French structuralism to American sociology. The vision after all has survived to the passing of time thanks to the philosophical discourse of episteme in the modern world. Therefore, there was shared-consensus in French philosophers that “social representations” must be studied as the primary object of sciences. With the dialectics of hermeneutics, as a form of individual representations, philosophy tried to conceal the essence of original from its pertinent copies. Our thinking is widely based on an ocularcentric genealogy that fabricated not only ideas but also perceptual experiences. The psychological experiences can be digested by mind only if they can be previously imagined. In this context, Maccannell writes his primary studies respecting to the connection between leisure and economy.

3.1) THE CULTURE OF OTHERNESS

For Maccannell, ethnicity stems from the cross-cultural interaction which is adjusted to social change. This alteration is subject to external factors. His development is based on the idea that Empires consider ethnicity as political instrument of hegemony and indoctrination. The identity, self-image, seems to be construed to mark a boundary among human beings. This type of fabricated ethnicity replicated the logic of colonial powers during the passing of years. Maccannell explains that the passage from colonialism to modernism comes across with a new of forms of ethnicities, more diversified. Mass-tourism and mobilities, paved the

ways of constructing otherness, by means of ethnical groups, lore and heritage, to be visually consumed. The aborigines, becomes in a commodity in part because of the attractiveness they generates in West. Lay people in urban cities travels to exotic places to visit folkloric customs, their languages and other aspects of their life, which seems to be petrified in the time (Maccannell, 1988, p. 208). The encounter between tourists and natives may be compared to the colonial conquest during XIXthe century. This poses an interesting question, is tourism an instrument to absorb the negative effects of modernity?

If the social fragmentation, produced by late-modernity, jeopardizes the social bonds, tourism allows the ethnicity reconstruction in order for revitalizing the material asymmetries occurred in the sphere of work. Unlike Barthes, who consider tourism as an alienable activity (industry), Maccannell and his first stage, acknowledges that tourism, as a form of leisure, plays a crucial role entertaining the modern workers; therefore it is very important for the mental health of citizens. Tourism has a specific function. The struggle of classes creates many psychological problems and deprivations in minds. Tourism would resolve these shortcomings. Nonetheless, in the politics struggle of classes, there is a combination of some disciplinary powers that are mixture of silence, violence and ethnicity. This means that any power is a negotiation between two or more groups. If we refer to “black or White power” involuntarily, we are speaking of two factions, victors and vanquished. Ethnic minorities accept the hegemony of their masters and does not exert any type of resistance. By means of text, and writing, the European powers have systematically exterminated any non-white resistance through the world they conquered (p. 214). This tendency engendered stronger and weaker cultures. While the former advanced to other civilization, transforming their style of life, the latter passively were condemned to disappear.

At some extent, the history is witness of how staged-ethnicity has selected some aspects of conquered culture to be showed, enjoyed and consumed by their First world citizens. Tourism is, in this token, the continuance of warfare by other means. Once, groups are adjusted, integrated in the same net, the monetary system facilitates a development so that human interactions are circumscribed to a text. Two

combinations also are possible, following this reasoning, a) structural superiority /inferiority and b) Rhetoric association / resistance. The struggle to resist or accept the stronger identity seems to be associated to new four combinations, a1) weaker groups are indexed by stronger ones, a2) weaker group defines its identity in opposition to stronger one, b1) a stronger group indexes voluntarily a weaker one, b2) the stronger group defines its ethnicity in sharp contrast to weaker one.

Truthfully, Maccannell is not wrong when says that cultural admiration encompasses reactions in points a1, b1 while b2, a2 gives as a result a fabricated ethnicity. In view of this, tourism appeals to transform the weaker cultures in creating products for consumptions. For example, it is not strange to see how tourism commoditizes the culture of aborigines according to Western patterns. The world is advancing to the forging of a globalized nets of cooperation based on the hegemony of financial powers, and money (capital). One of the aspects more interesting to study tourism is its ability to make for other life, a point of curiosity. Tourism works consuming what in the bottom is inalienable, the other (p. 222). Unless otherwise resolved, a world where tourism capitalizes the social relationships reduces inevitably the social conflict. To what extent is that true?

Maccannell continues his valuable analysis warning the conversion of a group in a tourist attraction never provides a relief to its oppressed condition. The adaptancy of master-related values worsens the situation of hosts, our American sociologist assertively adds. This happens because its lack of accessibility to modern forms of productions is not enough to determine and guide the tourist expenditure. Following this, mass-tourism evolves in two contrasting tendencies. At some direction, we have the homogenization of cultures in a periphery whose patrimonies should be protected while a counter-process of individualization (fragmentation) is held in the core of industrial societies (p. 226). Following this, tourism appears to be an activity that evolved according to a previous sentiment of inferiority imposed. The success of tourism depends on the needs of some peripheral groups that think in its economic benefits as the only alternative solutions to their problems. Its feasibility is determined by the fact that hosts should internalize their supposed inferiority respecting to other hegemonic authorities. To put this in bluntly, tourism is an

instrument of colonization of minds where all details of life are radically altered, as the work, the familiar scaffolding, customs, and expectances. In doing so, cultures are gradually labelled in forms of staged-authenticity. Is protection a subtle way of paternalism? Seeing aborigines as actors who deserve protection, Maccannell involuntarily assumes that the superiority of West (strong culture) is defined by the access to technology.

3.2) THE TOURIST

Undoubtedly, capital, tourism and imperialism seem to be inextricably intertwined. *The Tourist, a new theory of leisure class* corresponds with an innovative research that explores not only the advance of modernity and visual hegemony in daily life, but also tourism as a form of connecting local economies into a globalized-net the blurs the boundaries of time and spaces. Maccannell is strongly convinced that the concept of tourist may be applied to real travellers or to an abstract sociological construal. The complexity of modern societies should be situated in opposition to primitive cultures. The religious symbolism, proper of savage mind, has somehow evolved to elaborated forms of politics and relations that today are expressed in tourist experience. As this given, tourism symbolizes the evolution of religious life (as it has been put by Durkheim). The religion in the modern world has not disappeared, but persisted in new forms. Totemism seen as the stepping stone of sacred-life in primitive societies, in this vein, is equalled to tourism. Both confer relative safety, similarly to ideology, to lay-people. In other terms, this means that tourism in the modern society give a message, a discourse any social scientist should decipher.

To understand tourist behaviour, Maccannell methodologically presents an innovative technique, the self-ethnography (a neologism coined by E. Goffman that allows the reconstruction of all covert expressions of people at daily life). Since social actors bolster a staged-front to communicate, self-ethnography would be a fertile ground to discover those attitudes. For Goffman, the nature of man is evil and pervasive. The classical methodologies reveal only a part of human emotions. The deep reactions exhibited at rear-state are not explored by scientific research. Since tourism is a hedonist activity based on illusory and conspicuous behaviours, self-

ethnography plays a fertile source in deciphering the codes of tourism. The application of self ethnography undoubtedly represents not only a new method of study but also installs a negative view of tourism as a commercial activity based on the exchange of consumable goods. Even Goffman was widely criticized following ethical concerns because self-ethnography breaks the ethical codes of privacy of interviewees. Persons cannot be studied without explicit authorization. Furthermore, the ethnomethodology of Goffman has some conceptual problems to be adapted in Maccannell's theory. The negative view of human bonds in Goffman is continued by Maccannell to understand the encounter between guest and hosts. In sociology, functionalism and structuralism exerts considerable criticism on the phenomenology of Goffman. Familiar with this, Maccannell needs to launch to discuss directly to structuralist exponents such as Claude Levi Strauss.

For the first structuralists, culture may be defined as an ongoing interaction of words which are framed in two opposed half-sides. At some extent, the politics of primitive cultures is interlinked to the observation of clans, and natural life. The hierarchal order seems to be the result of the environmental adaptation, Levi Strauss adds. Levi-Strauss advises that structuralism, as a methodology, may not be extrapolated to urban cultures because of their complexity. Levi-Strauss considered the primitive cultures may be ordered in form of periodic table to explain not only the universal mind, but also how a culture is constructed. Unlike Maccannell, who divided the world in two, Levi Strauss is strongly convinced there is no substantial difference between urban and primitive cultures. The question is why Maccannell forcing Levi-Strauss development?, if structuralism was an incorrect theory, why does Maccannell insist in citing Levi-Strauss's findings?

As stated, Maccannell acknowledges that urban life is a continuance, enrooted in the evolution process, of primitive culture. Modernity, as a secular culture, does not need religion to avoid the social fragmentation, but uses tourism in a similar way. The cultural entertainment and leisure revitalize not only the economics but also the human being relations. The entire time of daily life is formed by labour and leisure. While the former is needed from the human force framed and guided to production and law, the latter represents conversely the psychological distance of self according

to the rules. The rationale that characterizes the post-modernity affects day by day the human emotions. These types of deprivations should be restored by leisure and tourism. Visiting a tourist destination is the best alternative to adapt tourists to their society. As tourists, lay-people play an outstanding role to make special things, being special is the prerequisite for leisure. The alienation and oppression in humdrum routine life of work, adds Maccannell, accelerated by industrialism endorsed the social relationships. The tourist experience constitutes a ritual performed to cultural identities. The tourist consumption is a way to overcome the modern disconformities, and in doing so, an effort to create a unified, shared but false event. It is interesting not to lose the sight that the rhetoric of tourism, curiosity and staged authenticity are inextricably linked. In this token, tourism plays a pivotal role in engendering a modern conscience that frames the ways of production, and the ways of contact among human beings.

As the previous argument given, Maccannell explores how cultural experiences are designed in view of the inclusion of some values but excluding others. Neither natural nor enrooted in history; this dynamic seems to be subject to the logic of market and the needs of capital reproduction. Basically, the imaginary productions of culture that strengthen the logic of tourism determine the destiny of our civilization. A cultural experience, in opposition to a scientific experience is based on error and subjectivism. An assumption like this is of paramount importance to understand why the Maccannell's stance is conducive to detractors of scientificization of tourism. Maccannell theory is widely correct but only it is valid for tourist destinations, not for tourism at all.

What he observed in the field-works, should be applied to destinations. Tourism, as social institutions, seems to be something else than a simple industry. At an overview, tourist destination refers to the geographical site dependent of tourism industry; this means the tourists, the infrastructure and ways to connect the diverse elements of tourist-system. Rather, tourism is defined as a process much broader that revitalizes the asymmetries given by other social forces. As dreams, tourism works as a social institution from immemorial times. Here we find the first problem in Maccannell's legacy, tourist destinations are products designed by policy makers

and subjects to the effects of late-modernity while tourism is a legendary institution presents in many cultures and civilizations. Secondly, if this industry, for better or worse, is born from the conquest and industrialism, indexing local economies to be subdued to the empire of sign, we must accept that the aesthetic is juxtaposed to represent a scenario that is not real, staged authenticity. The ethno-methodology of sightseers reveals how the marks and makers draw the world to be visually consumed by first world citizens while peripheral economies are obliged to solicit financials loans to adequate their lands and landscapes to industrial tourist gaze. This interesting point suggests that capitalism expanded throughout the world engendering needs of “touristification” in peripheral countries at the time the doors towards a financial dependency was opened. The theorist, proponents and detractors, of the theory of development has not reached consensus in considering how in spite of all monetary assistance given to periphery their situation worsened in the last decades. Paradoxically, the quest for what is or not authentic resulted historically from the unabated technological advance of modern mind. Whenever, like at a museum -an object that has a specific history- is exhibited for being seen by others, two objects surface *an original and a copy*.

Other scholars, as G. Van den Abbeele charged against Maccannell’s view because he precludes that tourism may be defined by the behaviour of tourists exclusively. At some extent, Maccannell confused tourism with tourist destinations, a well point that ushered Maccannell to up date his position in next editions. The pervasive nature of tourism, our American sociologist adds, is not necessarily associated to commerce and alienation, although its nature has been commoditized by the media and market. I am not saying that tourism would be an alienable condition of human beings, but the problem lies when Maccannell forced the concept of the term, touristic. He recognizes that this word has any meaning in Oxford Dictionary, but was enforced according to the role of modernity in consuming traditions, landscapes and folks. Maccannell thought the touristic elusively in terms of trade and commerce, and of course this was an error because trivialized more than 40 years of ethnological studies about tourism and travels. This means that savage minds, as Levi Strauss realized, developed their own forms of leisure, tourism and displacements following entertainment purposes similarly or even more

elaborated than moderns. Navajos, Romans, Greeks, and other civilizations not only kept particular means of transport but also of escapements. Tourism, did not birth in Europe or England. This ancient institution was present and persisted to the passing of centuries, thanks of the articulation of hospitality, as a covenant of trade in peace periods and common-defence in wartimes. Maccannell ignores the specialized literature respecting to the history of hospitality. Why some non-western forms of tourism has been silenced?

Third, Levi Strauss struggled by the idea in a universal mind, this is in sharp contrast in what Maccannell proposes. Starting from the premises that aborigines identify themselves with a certain Totem, Maccannell argues that modern citizens have certainly made of consumerism a symbolic pattern of cultural identification. However, these types of consumptions are far away of being authentic. Of course, an idea of this magnitude has been proposed by many others scholars before than Maccannell but he had the ability to combine different previous works into a coherent frame. One can realize that a feeling of immense gratitude is owed to Maccannell due to his critical contributions in the research of social fragmentation as well as alienation issues. As Durkheim, Maccannell should be criticized in encouraging a romantic view of primitive mind. The efforts to create a bridge between structuralism and symbolism are based on speculations that show serious inconsistencies. Some of them will be discussed in next. What Maccannell and Durkheim have not seen is that every culture develops its own form of tourism. But if Levi Strauss stated structuralism may not study tourism, why Maccannell insists?, what are the conceptual limitations on Levi-Strauss that Maccannell ignores?

Last but not least, in primitive cultures, the myths sustain not only the social order but also the economies. Levi Strauss envisaged that structuralism may compare mythical structures to create an all-encompassed theory of social behaviour. In doing so, comparison of structures (myths) would be a fertile ground. Measuring a resemblance between two cultures, ethnologists, following Levi-Strauss concern, would understand not only their proximity but a causal nexus in their formation. Structuralism opened the door to search the underlying patterns of thought in every

forms of human organization. Behaviour would be explained if myths are interpreted in comparison (juxtaposition) to other myths in binary formations.

As the previous backdrop given, Levi Strauss triggered a hot debate not only in anthropology but also in epistemology of social sciences until Mary Douglas, a confessed durkheimian supporter, revealed some inconsistencies in his theory. She situated structuralism as an inadequate theory simply because she insisted that myths should not be studied in comparison with other myths; rather they should be studied in observance of human practices. To put this in bluntly, resemblance should not be equalled to scientific causality. Two or more structures (cultures) may be alike, as the case of Saxon and Lampion in Scandinavia. This does not mean these cultures keep a similar root, but they developed similarly patterns to the adaptation to a same environ. Neighbouring tribes also developed alike tactics for grating their survival. Therefore, their institutions keep considerable resemblance. It is fruitless to compare structures in abstract. On another, hypothetically two or more neighbouring tribes can keep similarities in tradition, rites, religions, cults but this does not denote any ethnical bond (Douglas, 1996). Ethnicity can be defined as a construe which is linguistically determined. That way, Douglas's view not only wounds the Levi-Strauss position but also bombards the double-grid model, industrial vs. primitive. Douglas adds that considering the world civilized vs. primitive terms is an old prejudice the anthropology should leave behind. It is an error to think our industrial societies, as Marx, Durkheim and consequently Maccannell precluded, are remainders more evolved than savage mind. This euro-centric discourse persisted the passing of years, and still present in academic voice (Korstanje, 2009). By the way, the needs for protecting non-western cultures involuntarily encouraged the Euro-centrism in XIXth century. In doing so, the different aspects of these cultures were homogenized according to colonial interests. If other tribes developed their own way of practicing tourism, these practices were subordinated to Anglo-Tourism. Maccannell here opens the debate considering only one type of tourism, ignoring other previous pre-tourist or leisure practices. To put this in other terms, Hopi, Navajo and other tribes encouraged their own ways of moving for pleasure in homology to tourist practices today. In considering these practices as a part of totemnism or religious life, Maccannell objectified the non-European heritage. It is

safe to say that we are unable to judge now Maccannell for a theory elaborated more than 25 years ago. The tourist was a book written in 1976. An update of new Maccannell research is vital. Therefore, in next we will examine in depth another second work entitled *Empty Meeting Grounds*.

3.3) EMPTY MEETING GROUNDS

Unlike the tourist, on Empty meeting Grounds, the foci of analysis takes another direction. Surely this encompasses a set of revised material Maccannell already published. This book is written thinking in tourism as a “new primary ground” of fabrication of new goods, and forms of cultural consumption. Tourism, beyond its economic nature, is based on an ideology that priories themes linked to preservation, history and nature. The movement -this means the mobility of travellers from one point to another of the globe- dehumanizes, as in Disneyland, the social life of hosts. Not only migrants are dominated to serve tourists, in a broad sense of the word, but tourists voluntarily or not replicate that hegemony.

The empty meeting grounds corresponds with the attempts to reduce the local communities to “nothing” more than a product, a good to be exchanged in a wider system. Maccannell goes on to say *“critical theory, even those branches of it, which want to stand outside of, even beyond history, is fully historical. It was deployed at exactly the same moment in history as the double movement of tourists to the periphery and formerly marginal peoples to the centers. In this double movement and deployment, the human community has been rethorically reduced to nothing more than a territorial entity with a unified economy, as in the European Community, and perhaps a single race”* (Maccannell, p. 2).

From Maccannell legacy, this exhibits the most elaborated thought and deepness, honestly in some pages almost difficult to understand. However, the resistances to this movement have costs, and the formation of new subjects seems to be underexplored by Critical Theory. Combining Giddens and Derrida’s contributions the American sociologist sheds light on a world that has been altered by mobility and picturque routes portrayed in tourist guidebooks. Basically, the globalized world is

characterized by the combination of two new forms of displacements: nomads and tourists. The former refers to people who seek constantly to expand their psychological boundaries in quest of new sensation and liberty. They go not as invaders but as travellers who ignore the sovereignty of nation states and their frontiers. Rather, tourists prefer to settle in a privatized space and move strictly under controlled and secure circuits. Tourists are reluctant to be in contact with other tourists. They preferably are inclined to connect with natives. The importance of authenticity plays a pivotal role in tourist mind. The tourist consumption is based on the needs of authenticity. The social bond, in view of this, was transformed in a commodity to be visually exploited by travel agencies.

Mobile people demands authenticity although periodically what they consume is only a copy-cat. Tourism engenders a discourse, whose message seems to be clear, no matter where one goes, the western comfort and safety will be there. Maccannell put brutally that *“the drive here is not for Freedom but for world-wide commitment and control moving always toward the ideal of two economic classes (local vs multinational), one currency, one passport, one market, one government; global fascism”* (p. 5). Unlike the Tourist, in *Empty Meeting Grounds*, our author recognizes the evolution of cultures and rational, as they have been described, are a hoax. Rather, he creates a new dichotomy between localism and cannibalism. Cannibals are determined by emotional arousing associated to primitive desires; they are the lack, the zero, the emptiness. The needs for more proper of capitalists constitute a form of cannibalism; we may speak of a politics of cannibalism functional to financial powers. This new alternative to the politics of states in West leads toward the dictatorship. What are at stake, are the definition of human relations, and how they are framed by the logic of cannibals, capitalism.

Now, contradictorily with his previous works, Maccannell says *“the primitive/modern opposition developed by sociology and anthropology for the study of the effects of nineteenth century industrialization on European society, and for the study of the peoples discovered during the period of European conquest and colonization, is not appropriate to the study of new cultural subjects. Tourism today occupies the gap between primitive and modern, placing modernized and primitive*

people in direct face to face interaction using intercultural English and other pidgins" (p. 17). Ex ipso primitive and modernists are two new labels; he employs to refer to the same thing, the continuance of modernity. This bloody advance will destroy all ex-primitive cultures and savagery to the extent to homogenize the social interaction in an only one sided style. The end of primitive world seems to be inevitable, irreversible and imminent. Therefore, the protection of primitive cultures would be vital to balks the alienation of life, real life. To decipher Maccannell's argument, one might think that *"the image of savage that emerges from these ex-primitive performances completes the postmodern fantasy of authentic alterity which is ideologically necessary in the promotion and development of global monoculture"* (p. 19).

Following this argument, the discovery of former centuries, as Columbus, set the pace to the total conquest. Polemically, in this book, the professor of the University of California contends the desires to feel real experiences are related to our self-identity, as civilization, a sentiment of guilty experienced by the extermination of savagery. The implicit idea seems to be the modernization entails the destruction of aboriginality. Since West has denied its responsibility in this process, the cultural protection may be defined as a sentiment of culprit produced by social unconsciousness. Unlike the other earlier research, most polemic than this, Empty meeting grounds is a fine platform to discuss the role of modernity in the subordination of local geographies. Particularly, we stress that this Maccannell seems to be closely to the creation of a new type of ethic, an ethic of tourism overcoming the vicious of market and trade. Although this book exhibits a serious effort in Maccannell to understand late-modernity articulating a lot of theories and studies magisterially, his view of tourism not only is still reactionary but he confuses mobility with displacement. Is tourism a form of leisure, as explained in *The Tourist*, or an expression of mobility?

Without previous explanation, Maccannell situates in the same categories the mass, modern and white tourism. His points of view really take for valid the idea that tourism acquires a negative nature for humankind, but he is not referring to tourism but mobility. Unlike mobile cultures Maccannell boasts, tourism worked as a social

archaic institution enabled by the hospitality. The confusion likely is that we have to call this into a new neologism. But this is a deep-seated matter which merits to be continued in other occasion.

3.4) THE ETHICS OF TOURISM IN REVIEW

Alter further review, it is difficult to assume tourism may be ethic, at least in Maccannell terms. Throughout the recently published paper "On the ethical stake in tourism Research", he questions on the maturity of tourism as a scientific research, institutionalized as other classical disciplines. In this book, tourism is presented as "an effort and organization based on human desire to connect with a experience something or someone other as represented by or embodied in an attraction" (Maccannell, 2011, p. 184) but here a question arises, what does mean other?, what is the difference between other and otherness?. Apparently, the meaning is the same for both words. The metamorphosis of Maccannell is impressive and positive according to his early criticism on *The Tourist*; now, tourism is seen as a social force that alters the way people communicate each other. For that, tourism should not be based on rationale, it should be defined as a moral science. What remains unclear is Why does ethic sound so important for Maccannell at this stage of his academic life?

Ethic is necessary because tourism still is an artificial dynamic that transforms the nature of communities in view of the interests of market. These changes are radical due to the bridge created between what people feel and do. Somehow, hosts dissociate their behaviour in a front and back-stage. The adoption of tourism as a primary source of economy accelerates the process of fragmentation between norms and practices. *"Social and cultural norms are the basis for a tourist's experience of difference and otherness. They also shape what is locally thought to be civilized or socialized (i.e. proper) behaviour. They demand deference to other feelings, appropriate choices of objects of satisfaction, and moderation in expression of needs and desires. Civilized human beings famously sublimate their repressions via cultural expression- music, dance, cuisine, adornment, etc. There is no place on earth, no cultural region, no geographical feature that figures as a tourist attraction, which is no defined in moral terms"* (p. 185).

The lack of ethics is exhibited whenever the other is silenced, invisibilized, disappeared. Taking its cue from Boorstin, Maccannell recapitulates saying that tourists are motivated to the consumption of pseudo-experiences. One more time, tourists are presented as unethical agents more interested in fulfilling their individual dreams than in a genuine knowledge of others. Even, the ecological concerns, enrooted in tourist expectances, are based on ego-centric desires. It is not clearly explained if tourists may be more ethical than today, but Maccannell clarifies, tourists are not the problem but the product they consume. Developers of tourist attractions exploit not only the needs and human miseries of hosts, but prevent engagement between the self and its community. The suffering of others is commoditized to be transformed in a product, ready for consumption worldwide, anytime... erecting a bubble which only may be fulfilled by the capital, in this point, Maccannell is right. The tourist city, as known until the last decade, has been destroyed, constructed and destroyed, simply because capitalism expands by means of destructive creation. Enrooted in a simulacrum, tourists are not trained to experience or learn more about the visited cultures. Truthfully, the tourist bubble (city) is a *“formula”* for controlling and constraining the variety of possibilities that surface in the encounter of hosts and guests. In this apocalyptic context, the ethics would somehow have to expand the potential of human beings to create a more cosmopolitan culture.

As the previous backdrop given, the epistemological nature of space has changed. *“I have been arguing, in effect, that tourists now occupy approximately the same subject position as the classical social theorists, and it is up to tourism researchers to reconfigure our understanding of rural versus urban geographies. At the present moment, rural and urban no longer make theoretical sense in classical terms”* (p. 192). Based on the assumption, tourist experience is not authentic, also it is not ethic. This new space where the borders, starting and end of the city is not clear is codified according to a simulated image, ideological and unquestionable. The pervasive logic of tourism reframes dreams and experiences coherently according to what has been yet explained, but the understanding of how these models works, should be subject to further scrutiny. His contributions lead certainly

academy to assume tourism by its own nature may not be considered a serious science.

Furthermore, a recent book review presented by Professor Steve Watson suggests that "The Ethics of Sightseeing" may be something a profound research respecting to the visual hegemony of tourist observation. Nonetheless, this text is fraught of hidden "complexity". Sightseeing involves not only the person connection but also the self-awareness along with the question, does my presence help or hurt to strangers? If the alienated conditions of modernity advance, also tourism views may be equalled to other scholars as Urry or Giddens (Watson, 2012). This is true, but Ethics of sightseeing still persist in a biased conceptualization of tourism, more linked to the destination. Maccannell sheds his charge against tourist system when really he is talking about the tourist destination.

One of the characteristics of modernity appears to be the progressive emptiness of the sense of space, and the decline of social relations. According to this, the organised industrial capitalism has been replaced by disorganised capitalism which has no concept of hierarchies but rather of abstract networks for the exchange of services between the centre and the periphery. According to the globalized world, J. Urry (2001) convincingly replied that Maccannell developed an image of tourists singled out in only one type of mobility. Side by side tourists fabricates non-places of modernity as rail stations, airports and coach stations. It is true globalization is configuring the tourist-gaze, but its effects are not homogenous. While some bodies are mobilized other remains immobilized. By means of urban anonymity, encounter between hosts and guest would suppose non-interaction. What Maccannell ignored, is that globalization, as a process, opened the door for multiple gazes subject to the ways of displacements. Besides, mobilities are not synonymous of tourism. It is almost impossible to imagine a space emptied of sense.

To cut the long story short, Maccannell did not delve into the criticism against structuralism. At some view, he misjudged the levi-straussian concept of universal mind. Secondly, confusing the pars pro toto, he examines only a couple of tourist destinations extrapolating his findings as valid to judge all types of tourism. Even, he

thinks that tourism is only possible in industrial societies, and exclusive product of West. This view would be enriched if additional ethnographies would be incorporated to indicate how tourism is practiced in non-western cultures as well. No matter the culture and time, tourism has historically practiced by many civilizations in many contexts, although certainly under other names. Recently, Maccannell accepts his error (in the last preface of the Tourist edition in 2003) acknowledging that. Why tourism-related specialists did not see this before? Last but not least, the lack of familiarity of tourism researchers respecting to Structuralism resulted in unconditional acceptance of Maccannell's theory. This essay review looked to recognize his contributions and legacy in the study of heritage and authenticity but taking into consideration two significant aspects: *the technical problems bestowed from structuralism, and secondly, his outcomes respecting how authentic tourism is.*

4. CONCLUSION

As discussed, the problems and limitations for tourism to become a scientific discipline can be traced to the view anthropology developed in past of this activity. Its connection with authenticity and culture paved the ways for the advent of numerous studies that focused on tourism in a pejorative manner. The origin of this misunderstanding, of course, stems from Maccannell's viewpoint.

A lot of studies contradicts Maccannell's findings, (Dann, 2005, Helpburn, 2002, Azeredo-Grunewald, 2002, Wickens, 2002, Lane and Waitt, 2007; Korstanje and Babu, 2012), but less attention was given to the theory of authenticity as it was forged. Not only, Maccannell developed a negative view of tourism taking the most polemic sides of structuralist theories, but also cut the world in two, presenting urban life in contrast with savage mind. This biased image of history brought serious misunderstanding to the way of considering the encounter between hosts and guests. Empirical-rich research contradicts his findings simply because his construction of sacredness and tourist-role are not explicit.

Pearce & Moscardo (1985) suggested reviewing the contributions of structuralism because it trivializes the importance of social interaction in tourist destinations. The illusory nature of a destination is based on how the involving actors interact with each other, not by mega-structural factors. The front or back stages to figure the social life is not only insufficient but also confusing, impossible to be empirically validated. According to this, Korstanje & Babu (2012) widely showed that the concept of sacredness in Maccannell is wrong. The process of sacralisation does not generate attractiveness. The segment and demands are secular constructs that have nothing to do with sacred-life. The exemplary centres, where gods dwell, often are restricted to mass-tourism.

Furthermore, the Spanish anthropologist Nogues-Pedregal is correct when he says that MacCannell, and his methodological inconsistencies, have been responsible for the fact that many of the social sciences trivialise the scientific study of tourism, as they pre-define the activity as hedonistic and superficial consumerism of spaces, assuming, without any basis, "that there is nothing authentic about modern tourism" (Nogues-Pedregal, 2009). Since 30 years of investigation on, Maccannell waked up reluctance and admiration in detractors and proponents. This essay review does not attack Maccannell the man, but his theory constructed by the most polemic side of classical sociology texts. As an unquestionable founding parent of the discipline, Maccannell's legacy illustrated to an entire generation dedicated to study heritage and authenticity issues, but at the same time, it prevented tourism would be a scientific discipline.

References

Azeredo-Grunewald, R. Artes Turísticas e Autenticidade Cultural. *Veredas, revista Científica de Turismo*. Año 1, Número 1, 2002^a, pp. 7-21.

Azeredo-Grunewald, R. Tourism and Cultural Revival. *Annals of Tourism Research*, Vol. 29, 4, 2002b, pp. 1004-1021.

Barthes, R. *Mitologías*. México, Ediciones Siglo XXI, 1997.

Barretto, M. *Turismo, Reflexividad y Procesos de Hibridación Cultural en América del Sur Austral*. Tenerife, Colección Pasos, nº 4, Universidad de la Laguna (Tourism, Reflexivity and Hybridization in Latin America), 2010.

Blumenberg, H. Light as a metaphor of truth. In *Modernity and the Hegemony of vision*. D.M. Levin. California, University of California Press, 1993, pp. 31-62.

Boorstin, D.J. *The Image: a Guide to Pseudo Events in America*. New York, Harper & Row, 1961.

Castaño, J.M. *Social Psychology of Travels and Tourism*. Madrid, Thomson Ed, 2005.

Cohen, E. Rethinking the sociology of Tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research*, Vol, 9, 1979, pp. 403-428.

Dann, G. The theoretical State of the State-of-the-Art in the sociology and anthropology of tourism. *Tourism Analysis*. Vol. 10, 2005, pp. 3-15.

Douglas, M. Animales anómalos y metáforas animales en Estilos de Pensar, Barcelona: Gedisa. - "Clasificado como Comestible" en Estilos de Pensar, Barcelona: Gedisa. - "La broma cósmica" en Estilos de Pensar, Barcelona: Gedisa, 1996.

Durkheim, E. *The Elementary Forms of Religious Life*. Madrid, Akal, 1992.

Escalona-Muñoz, F. La Visión convencional del Turismo según sus primeros codificadores (los grundisse de Hunziker y Krapf, 1972". *Turydes. Revista de Investigación en Turismo y Desarrollo*, Vol 3, 8, 2011, pp. 1-20.

Goffman, E. *The Presentation of self in Everyday life*. Buenos Aires, Amorrortu Editores, 2004.

Hardt, M. & Negri, A. *Empire*. Buenos Aires, Paidos, 2003.

Hardt, M. & Negri, A. *Multitude. War and Democracy in the Age of Empire*. Debate, Barcelona, 2004.

Helpburn, S. Tourist forms in life Nepal. *Annals of Tourism Research*. Vol. 29, 3, 2002, pp. 611-630.

Jafari, J. Research and Scholarship: the basis of Tourism Education. *Journal of Tourism Studies*. Vol. 1, 1, 1990, pp. 1-10.

Jafari, J. The Scientifization of Tourism. In Valene Smith and Maryann Brent (eds). *Host and Guest revisited: tourism issues of the 21th century*. New York, Cognizant Communications, pp. 28-41, 2005.

Jafari, J. The Scientification of Tourism. In Valene L. Smith: *Host and guest revisited: Tourism issues of the 21st century*. New York, Cognizant, 2005, pp. 28-41.

Jafari, J. and Aaeser, D. Tourism as a subject of Doctoral Dissertations. *Annals of tourism Research*, 15, 1, 1988, pp. 407-429.

Jafari, J. and Pizam, A. Tourism Management. En M Warner (ed.) *International Encyclopedia of Business and Management*. London, Routledge, 1996.

Knebel, H.J. *Sociology of Tourism*. Barcelona, Ed. Hispano-Europea, 1974.

Korstanje, M. and Babu, G. Falklands/Malvinas. A re-examination of the relationship between sacralisation and tourism development. *Current Issues in Tourism*. Vol. 15, 3: 153-166.

Korstanje, M. MacCannell em Perspectiva: análise crítica sobre a obra *El Turista*. *RBTUR, Revista Brasileira de Pesquisa em Turismo*. Vol. 3, 3, 2009, pp. 80-111.

Korstanje, M. and Busby, G. Understanding the Bible as the roots of physical displacement: the origin of Tourism. *E-Review of Tourism Research*, Vol. 8, 3, 2010, pp. 95-111.

Lane, R. and Waitt, G. Inalienable places. *Annals of Tourism Research*. Vol. 34, 1, 2007, pp. 105-121.

Lash, S. and Urry, J. *Economies of Signs & Space*. Buenos Aires, Amorrortu, 1998.

Leach, E. *Political System of highland Burma*. London, Bell, 1954.

Levin, D.M. Decline and Fall: ocularcentrism in Heidegger's reading of the history of metaphysics. In *Modernity and the Hegemony of vision*. D. M. Levin. California, University of California Press, pp. 186-217, 1993.

Lévi-Strauss, C. *The Primitive Thinking*. Buenos Aires, Fondo de Cultura Económica, 2003.

MacCannell, D. Turismo e Identidad cultural. En Todorov, Tzvetan. *El Cruzamiento entre culturas*. Madrid, Ediciones Jucar", 1988.

MacCannell, D. *The tourist, a new theory of leisure class*. Moia, Spain, Ed. Melusina, 2003.

MacCannell, D. *Empty Meeting Grounds*. Barcelona, Melusina Ed., 2007.

Maccannell, D. *The Ethics of Sightseeing*. California, University of California Press, 2011a.

Maccannell, D. "On the Ethical stake of Tourism". *Tourism Geographies*. Vol. 14, 1, 2011b, pp. 183-194.

Monterrubio Cordero, J.C. *Turismo y Cambio Socio Cultural. Una perspectiva conceptual*. México, Plaza y Valdéz, 2011

Nogues Pedregal, A.M. Genealogy of troublesome relationship between anthropology and tourism. *Pasos*. Vol. 7, 1, 2009, pp. 43-56.

Pearce, P.L. and Moscardo, G. The concept of authenticity in tourism experiences. *Australian and New Zealand journal of Sociology*, Vol. 22, 1985, pp. 121-132.

Peirano, M.G. A Análise Antropológica de Rituais. Serie de Antropología 270. Universidad de Brasilia, Brasil, 2000.

Piglia, M. Ciudades de Lona: El automóvil Club Argentino y la Construcción de los campings como lugares turísticos en la entreguerra (1926-1939). En *Viajes y Geografías*. Zusman, P; Lois, C. and Castro, H. (Comp.), Buenos Aires, Prometeo, 2007, pp. 131-148.

Schluter, R. *Tourism: an integrated vision*. Buenos Aires, CIET, 2008.

Sharpley, R. and Sundaram, P. Tourism: a sacred journey? The case of Ashram, Tourism India. *International Journal of Tourism Research*, Vol. 7, 2005, pp. 161-171.

Tribe, J. Tribes, Territories and Networks in the tourism Academy. *Annals of Tourism Research*. Vol. 37, 1, 2011, pp. 7-33.

Urry, J. Globalising the tourist gaze. *Cityscapes Conference*. Graz. Austria. September, 2001.

Urry, J. *The Tourist Gaze*. London, Sage Publications, 2002.

Van den Ebbeeel, G. Sightseers: the tourist as theorist. *Diacritics*, 1980, pp. 2-14.

Watson, S. Review, The Ethics of Sightseeing. *Enlightening Tourism. A Pathmaking Journal*. Vol. 2, 1, 2012, pp. 66-69.

Wickens, E. The sacred and profane - a tourist typology. *Annals of Tourism Research*. Vol. 29, 3, 2002, pp. 834-851.

Article info:

Received 17/10/2012. Accepted 04/11/2012. Refereed anonymously.