WHAT IS TOURISM? AN ANTHROPOCENTRIC DISCUSSION

Some decades ago, tourism scholars precluded that the production of knowledge would invariably lead to the maturation of discipline. Even in these years, tourism-research has grown rapidly but keeping some concerns respecting the possibilities to become in a consolidated discipline. One of the aspects that tourism research is unable to resolve is the dispersion of theories, and the lack of a shared epistemology to understand what tourism is. In this new manuscript I explain informally the anthropocentric ground of tourism. This does not represent any attack to any scholar in particular, but a call of attention to what today is being written.
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Introduction. Nowadays tourism research faces a serious crisis. This is the reason why an attempt is worth of my time and efforts. Here I will synthesize likely in an informal way, my experience as author, reviewer, and editor in tourism fields. Some decades ago, Professor J. Tribe held the thesis that the growth of tourism research was not backed by a firm background. The flexibility of International Academy for the Study of Tourism respecting to what is being produced worldwide, conjoined to other factors such as the fragmentation of theories and networks in the field resulted in the lack of a shared epistemology to understand the phenomenon [78, 79, 80]. If J. Jafari [27] in his seminal text, The Scientification of Tourism, proclaimed the rise of a knowledge based platform where any subjective valuations would set the pace to more objective scientific studies, Tribe observed that these spin-offs were based on serious discrepancies along with the meaning of tourism. As Thirkettle & Korstanje [77] put it, the struggle for emergent schools to monopolize and impose their own interpretations prompted a much deeper dispersion almost impossible to control. Instead of coordinating efforts to forge a more efficient and harmonized method, tourism-related scholars adopted transdisciplinary as a vehicle towards scientific maturation. From its onset, applied-research has been influenced by a business-centered paradigm in which case, tourism was naively defined as an industry in lieu of an ancient social institution. Rather than achieving the desired results, studies focused on the needs of finding new segments (demand) to satisfy the needs of suppliers. Most certainly, commercial tourism was sensitive to the demand leaving other of its aspects unchecked. Money was a crucial factor to optimize the leisure system that modern societies created after WWII [67]. Tourism management posed as a valid instrument of planning in order to organize territory in an efficient manner. Since future is unknown, and science is based on empirical facts, Van Doorn observed, the role of tourism-researchers was pointed out to forecast the trends and effects of tourism in environment [86]. The management of tourist destinations rested on the trust in the evolutionary progress of the industry. For this reason, applied-research should be tilted at measuring the dynamic of destinations from an all encompassing way [18, 22, 60]. During 90s decade, marketing and management monopolized the emerging paradigms emerging paradigms. New nascent trends such as dark-tourism, slum-tourism, creative-tourism, heritage-tourism and so forth, arrived to the top-tier journals to set agenda in scholarship to mark the boundaries of what should be or not investigated [77]. Though this dispersion generated new businesses for investors, states
and policy makers who always see in tourism a fertile source of energy, it forged a chaos in academy to organize all the produced material. The logic of businesses is often conducive to find new segments in a competitive market, which leads to dispersion, but these are not the goals science pursues [31].

As the previous backdrop, other scholars exert an extreme criticism against tourism literature by two main reasons. At a first glance, scholars have devoted considerable resources and times to producing scientific knowledge but it is far from being a scientific corpus consolidated as other disciplines. Beyond impact factors and citations, tourism-research still is naïve, biased and profit-oriented to understand the psychology of tourist mind. Secondly, the question whether positivists underpinned the proposition the interview was the only valid methods for reaching the truth, epistemologists in tourism fields have not contemplated in their respective fieldworks any other method than the opinion of tourists think [1, 2, 5, 62, 64, 65]. The problem with this perspective lies in the fact sometimes tourists are unfamiliar with their behavior or simply lie. Following this, ethnographers have adamantly observed the limitations of open or close-ended questionnaires or even formal interviews under some contexts. More interested in looking for new business opportunities or protecting the profits of investors, tourism-research is today far from explaining not only its origins but also what tourism is [36, 88]. Nonetheless, others seminal texts already discussed in the anthropology of tourism can give further hints [17]. In this short essay review, we discuss the contributions of founding parents who had worked to delineate the boundaries of discipline [10]. Later, in restant sections we propose our own conception of tourism not only as an escape-goat mechanism, but as an anthropological rite of passage.

Tourism: a long-simmering issue. Over last decades, tourism has been defied and approached from diverse angles. While some scholars prioritizes its dynamism (producing and distributing wealth) [46, 59, 76], others voices have exerted a radical critique respecting to its colonial legacy [20, 26, 49, 73, 81, 83, 84]. For this wave, tourism would be a mechanism of control enrooted in colonialism. The needs of being there that today characterize modern tourism can be equaled to the first ethnologists and social scientists who launched to the unknown. Aside from the scientific interests of these explorations, Europe expanded the colonial order to the periphery imposing not only a cultural matrix, but their products and trade [3, 9, 32, 33, 69]. A. Santana-Talavera has convincingly confirmed that the already-existent theories in tourism fields can be organized in 6 great families [71]: a) commercial hospitality, b) an instrument of democracy, c) a subtype of leisure, d) a form of cultural expression, e) a process of acculturation, and f) a discourse that strengthen the colonial dependency between centre and periphery. Though it is hard to imagine tourism without the pay-for logic, it is important not to lose the sight other theories have said something on this.

It is unfortunate that etymologists are not in agreement about the origin of activity [29]. While some experts associate the terms to old Saxon term torn, others envisaged France was the epicenter where tourism surfaced [45]. What is important to discuss is that no matter the used term, cultures have developed similar institutions for escapement than tourism.

Swiss-born economist J. Krippendorf found that tourism was something else than a mere industry, or a net of services as economists precluded. His original works were intended to discuss the psychological motivations of holiday-makers in the industrial society. At time of travelling to other sites moved by pleasure and relax, we are fulfilling one of our basic needs, resting. Since workers are trapped with a set of diverse frustrations and deprivation during an extended period of time, escapement and tourism play a crucial role by contributing to mental health. The maximization of individual pleasure is the main goal tourists pursue. Starting from the premise that economies and leisure are inextricably intertwined, Krippendorf adds, each society develops different forms of tourism. Human behaviors, which are socially determined by culture and values, are changed according to endogenous and exogenous forces. Combining anthropological insights with their own studies in economy, Krippendorf leaves
an all-encompassing model that helps followers to understand tourism as a social institution, enrootted in the culture from sedentary phase. The decline of happiness western societies experience today results from the degree of alienation workers suffer in their daily life. At once the productive system is more oppressive, further leisure is needed to counter-balance the material asymmetries. One of the conceptual pillars of tourism consists in emulating a lost-paradise as it has been designed by main religions. The eternal quest for this exemplary center corresponds with the attachment with mother’s womb. This top-down cosmology gives as a result a hierarchy of exploiting and exploited classes. In any societal order, the elite not only monopolizes the means of production, but also the allegories by which the work-force is subordinated, or in terms of MacCannell alienated. In this respect, Krippendorf acknowledges that one of the main problems of capitalism is its eagerness to expand to other markets consuming resources to yield capital-gain. This explains the struggle of locals and capital-owners in tourism as well as the negative effects in some destinations. No less true is that tourists are moved by a hedonist consciousness that leads to commoditize «the Others». In fact, tourism is not good or bad, it simply works as an instrument officials use in different manners. At time of considering tourism as a mechanism of alienation, we ignore its anthropological nature. Unless otherwise resolved, proponents of tourism as an agent of development leave behind its predatory conception of value [38–44].

In sharp contrast with Krippendorf, MacCannell conceives that tourism consolidated just after the mid of XXth century, or the end of WWII. Not only the expansion of industrialism, which means a set of benefits for workers as less working hours and salaries increase but the technological breakthrough that triggered mobilities were responsible from the inception of tourism. There was nothing like an ancient form of tourism, MacCannell notes. Taking his cue from the sociology of Marx, Durkheim, and Goffman, MacCannell argues that tourism and staged-authenticity work in conjoint in order for the society not to collapse. If totem is a sacred-object that confers a political authority to chiefdom in aboriginal cultures, tourism fulfills the gap between citizens and their institutions which was enlarged by the alienation lay people face. The current industrial system of production is finely-ingrained to expropriate workers from part of their wages. A whole portion of earned salaries is spent to leisure activities, even in consuming tourism. As Krippendroff, MacCannell believes, industrialism forged a «tourist consciousness» that revitalizes the glitches and deprivations produced by economy. Tourism would be a type of totem for industrial societies that industrial societies that like a chamanized, like a chamanized totem in primitive communities, revitalizes psychological frustrations and alienation proper of urban societies. Not surprisingly, MacCannell adds, Marx was in the correct side at denouncing the oppression suffered by the work-force. Nonetheless, leisure, far from being an ideological mechanism of control (as in whole Marxism), prevents the social disintegration [49, 50]. A last more radical insight situates tourism from «the fields of ethics». Whether tourism has proved something that is the lack of interests for the «Other» who is toured–gazed-. Originally opposed to Urry’s view, MacCannell does not use the term «gaze» because it is a Foucaultian term that denotes control. This is not the nature of tourism. Everything that can be seen suggests another reality which remains covered. Further, the goals of tourism not only are the leave from ordinary life as Urry precludes, but the formation of a meta-discourse towards a new consciousness. It was unfortunate that digital technologies and mass-consumption are undermining the attachment of people to their cultures and traditions. Over recent years, he was concerned by the lack of ethics in tourism consumption. Coalescing contributions of Giddens with Derrida, he points out that globalization entails to type of mobilities. Nomads who are defined as forged-migrants are pitted against tourists who are encouraged to consume landscapes and exotic cultures. Since tourists are conferred by a certain degree of freedom, this leads them to think they are part of a privilege class, affirming their own self-esteem by enjoying the precarious conditions where natives live. If this
is not controlled tourism may produce a progressive process of dehumanization [48–56]. Though there were commonalities between MacCannell and Krippendorf, some significant differences emerge at time of delineating the roots of tourism. While the former signals to tourism as a postmodern phenomenon, the latter one found ancient forms of tourism in major civilizations as Romans, Sumerians and Babylonians.

The British sociologist, J. Urry claims for a new understanding of tourism. In so doing, he uses the term, gaze to explain how ocular-centrism has monopolized the daily life of peoples. At time of traveling to other destinations, tourists are controlling natives by their gaze. The importance of watching allows modern tourists to take possession of «gazed-other». Like the other above reviewed scholars, Urry believes that the tourist-gaze is enmeshed into a cultural matrix which is systematically organized to reinforce the system of production and exchange of commodities. Since tourism relates to aesthetical revolution brought by postmodernism, it is impossible other civilizations developed similarly-minded forms of escapement. The rise of mobilities, which is validated by the current statistics of travellers worldwide, is contrasted to thousands of migrants who seek better opportunities. Both are physical movement, but the differences are visible. In fact, Urry is convinced mobility is often based on the dominance of esthetic over the rest of senses. At some extent, this explains the main reason as to why people recur to mass-transport as a mechanism of evasion as well as the increasing importance of travel photography in recent decades. In a globalized society characterized by the predominance of spectacle, multiculturalism encourages the displacement as a vehicle towards happiness, development and emotional commitment. From this angle, nation-states are reinventing their boundaries and identities constantly in the interchange of tourists, migrants and workers. This new forms of movements are part of social memory and broader acculturation processes which researchers should inspect [84, 85]. Beyond cosmopolitanism, Urry observes, an economy of signs has accelerated not only the exchange of commodities, but commoditized the culture according to consumption styles of westerners. In these terms, tourism corresponds with an aesthetical value underpinned in the needs of gazing the exoticness.

In this token, N. Salazar [70] centers a critical diagnosis from the lens of cosmopolitan spirit tourism often wakes up. Traditions and imaginaries are aligned to transitional spaces tourists discover while touring. They look for familiarity in an unfamiliar setting. Locals are interpelated by previous traits, stereotypes and marks elaborated from outside. The real engagement with the other is replaced by an act of consumption, where hosts are subordinated and invisibilized. This begs a more than interesting point, is tourism related to consumption?

To this question, E. Cohen has formulated an original answer. Far from what MacCannell or Urry argued, he believes that tourism is not an escapement from an alienated life or a quest for novelty. Cohen defines tourism as a commercial hospitality which means temporal stage dissociation between rules and the maximization of pleasure. This not only generates a tension between centre and its periphery, but also tourists are moved by meeting with «Others». The encounter between hosts and guests is based on the possibility the commercial hospitality is sold by locals to visitors [11–13].

Other senior sociologist interested in these types of issues, G. Dann addressed to tourist motivations to explain why they need to travel. Oriented to give an answer for the misleading research, Dann establishes that in a context of anomie, ego should be enhanced to avoid serious pathologies. The social system produces a «phantasy world» in order for subject to protect its ego. At some extent, tourism is like a metaphor of social world. Dann’s diagnosis in this vein, converges with John Urry. Dann overtly goes on to acknowledge that tourism should be placed as a metaphor of changing world. Being a tourist reveals something else than Maccannel or Urry thought, it shows the socio-cultural conditions wherein society evolved up to date. It is unfortunate that this modern world is based on a clear tension between oppression (fear) and liberty (mobility). Not only the postmodern ethos should be explored by taking tourist as an object of study but as a metaphor
of the changes take room daily in industrial societies. To put this in bluntly, tourism denotes a change of environment, which only is feasible by displacement. In this quest for novelty, or authenticity, ethnography offers a good opportunity to find answers that clarify the meaning of tourism [14–16].

As the previous argument given, N. Graburn [23, 24] argues convincingly that tourism not only should be labeled as a rite of passage, but as a type of «sacred-journal», emulating the founding values of society. Because the play is vital in his argument to understand the meaning of tourism, the encounter between locals and tourists are open to uncertainty and unforeseen reactions. Basically, Graburn adds, things one makes in holidays are the same one are accustomed to do at home, the difference is the magic movement gives.

«The food and drink might be identical to that normally eaten indoors, but the magic comes from the movement and the non-ordinary setting. Furthermore, it is not merely a matter of money that separates the stay-at-home from the extensive travellers. Many very wealthy people never become tourists, and most youthful travelers are, by western standard, quite poor» [24, p. 24].

Taking his cue from previous insight in other allegories as those formulated by D. MacCannell (totem) and Cohen (lost-paradise), for Graburn, tourism is enrooted in the culture where elements of play and pilgrimage are inextricably intertwined [25]. In perspective, to symbolize such a meeting, Valene Smith speaks of the encounter of hosts and guests to denote how principle of hospitality is structured. Quite aside from its economic factor, tourist behavior corresponds with our needs of escapement which only is feasible by the introduction of hospitality. Three key factors determine tourism, «leisure, discretionary and positive locals». Albeit, discretionary income and individual motivations plays a crucial role by boosting or constraining the tourist demand, it allows the alternation of periods of work with relaxation. The social function of tourism seems to be the revitalization of the social scaffolding. However, since «as work gives way to leisured mobility, individuals find re-creation in a variety of new contexts. Different forms of tourism can be defined in terms of the kind of leisure mobility undertaken by the tourist» [75, p. 5].

At this stage, Smith is concerned on the effects of the activity over local community as well as the problems the tourist bubble generates. The meeting between guests and hosts may be very well a problematic issue if policy makers do not regulate the economic asymmetries created by the industry. The concept of acculturation is discussed as one of the most interesting points, placed by Smith in her original texts. However, unlike MacCannell or Krippendorf, she does not provide a thorough explanation of what tourism is.

Last but not least, in a recent book, D. Chambers and T. Rakic point out the experience of fieldwork suggest that at time we shed light on some issues others else remain unchecked. The legitimacy of academic disciplines rests on its explanatory capacity. These borders, far from being stable, are in continuous renegotiation. Though tourism-research has been consolidated as a promising academic option for graduate and post-graduate students, a radical turn undermines the dominant understanding of tourism as it has been formulated by the founding parents. Most certainly, beyond tourism, critical scholars unveiled a commoditized discourse where the «Other» is subordinated to ruling class of developed countries. As something else than a peace-making industry, tourism covers racialized allegories which lead to control the periphery. This paradigm sees in tourism an alienatory mechanism of surveillance. However, instead of the dismantling of epistemological borders of tourism, a reconfiguration of theory is preferable [10]. This seems to be exactly, through it was not recognized by English Speakers, what some scholars had done in Latin America.

Tourism Research in Latin America. Over many years, tourism research in Latin America struggled to establish as a serious academic alternative. Based on an inter-disciplinary approach, the produced state of the art was intended to forge an epistemology of tourism which not only explains the roots of this phenomenon, but giving alternative solutions to the problem of sustainability. At some extent, as Australian-led research the question of ecology posed as a primary concern of tour-
ism scholarship. Understanding the academic relations between North and South alludes to the metaphor of skeleton and flesh. While skeleton represents the theory produced in the Northern developed countries, South provides with the flesh which signals to the empirical basis that validates the theory.

In this vein, the global south recently became in a fertile source to give information respecting to theories which are drawn in other hemisphere. For some reason, the problem of ecology was present not only in Latin American studies but also in other global south destinations as Australia, New Zealand and South Africa. Because of limitations in time and space, this essay review is only tilted at discussing critically the conceptual background of tourism applied research in Latin America. Offering a new point of view to the current epistemological problems of tourism-research, Latin Americans and their own kaleidoscope paved the ways for the upsurge of a new more critical turn where the discourse of status-quo is defied but at the same time legitimized.

As Korstanje puts it, one of the limitations of tourism research does not correspond with the time of maturation, the discipline obtained, but with the fact that a clear shared epistemology should be developed [34, 35]. Aside from this aspect, Latin Americans devoted considerable efforts in forge an all-encompassing view of tourism [61].

Whilst profit-oriented school envisages tourism as an activity strongly associated to productivity [58], historians (revisionists) attempted to reconstruct the socio-economic factors that explain the rise of tourism amidst XXth century [21, 28, 68, 72, 74, 89]. Nonetheless, over the last two decades a new stance more critical of tourism effects not only placed its roots under the lens of scrutiny, but exerted a radical diagnosis to a much deeper connection with capitalism [63]. In any direction, Latin Americans accept the Euro-centric paradigm that tourism surfaced amidst XXth century; a problem already discussed in the founding parents of the discipline. Without exception as M. Osorio Garcia [65], M. Barreto [4] or S. Gastal [19] among others who are definitely influenced by J. Krippendorf, a whole portion of theory produced in Latin American universities are related to the belief tourism is a modern issue. The marginal interests for history in tourism fields explain the lack of perspective to obtain a self-explanatory theory. As K. Walton pointed out,

«It is particularly important that tourism studies should begin to pay serious attention to the relevance of historical research and writing to its concern. Despite the growing interest in issues of heritage, authenticity, and historical representation in the provision of tourist experiences and the analysis of consumer expectations and response to them, which entails assessment of the ways in which tourism uses history, and occasionally, the ways in which history might use tourism, the attention paid to the serious examination of the past in much tourism literature retains a tendency towards the derivative and perfunctory, especially in the introductory texts that so often set the tone of student experience» [88, preface, 3].

In a radical critique to E. Pastoriza [68] and the school she represents, M. Korstanje [32, 33] publishes a book review at Pasos, Journal of tourism and Cultural Heritage with focus on the limitations historians inherited to address tourism. At a first glance, historians who approached tourism were not Latinists, or were unfamiliar with the daily life of Ancient times. In this vein, they were somehow connected to Middle Age and envisaged that earlier civilizations were pre-tourist organizations. Following this paradigm, obviously, not only they were unable to find leisure practices or forms of tourism in Middle age where feuds were atomized through Europe, some of them pitted against their neighbors or involved in civil wars. At a second point, no less true is that this period represented a stagnant point that obscured many centuries into the shadows of violence. However, ancient empires as Rome, Babylon and Assyria have certainly developed certain escape-goat mechanism in order for their political structure do not plunge into chaos [47]. Romans used a term *feriae* to confer its citizens the right to rest for 3 months after one year of hard work in the capital. One might imagine Rome as a cosmopolitan exemplary centre stubbed with aliens and citizens coming from the four corners of civilized periphery. What is more than important to discuss, is that our modern rights to holidays are
not new [66, 30]. Even *holidays* in German and Portuguese read as «das ferias», and «die ferien». Strengthening social ties with relative or friends, citizens used feriae in the same way we do today. Although one of the problems of historians to frame correctly tourism is associated to their lack of information gathered from other non-European cultures, ethnology and anthropology may very well fulfill the gap. Quite aside from this, tourism is «a rite of passage» which takes different forms depending on culture and time.

Let’s clarify that by his access to Latin or through the reading of Iberian studies in Ancient history, some Spanish Speakers pivot the applied-research which takes mythology as a fertile ground towards the archetype of lost-paradise, an allegory humans seek adamantly by the performance of rites of passage [8, 17, 31]. This new school claims that the academy did not pay sufficient heed to myths in ancient and modern cultures. In these texts the mandate of rest and traveling not only is sacred but ordered by Gods. Albeit, originally humans and gods coexisted in peace, a sudden radical rupture pushed humans not only towards the limits of their vulnerability but were exiled from this exemplary centre forever. In touring, peoples are performing a rite of passage to emulate the lost paradise in the same way children look for their mother womb. The connection between care-takers and the psychological system of exploration was widely studied by *attachment theory* [6, 7]. In this direction, psychology and anthropology converge.

**Tourism, a rite of passage.** Regarding to the nature of tourism, we have exhibited almost the main theories within social sciences. Because some constraints in time and space, we were forced to exclude some seminal texts from this discussion. In this section, we held the thesis tourism is a rite of passage whose original function consists in engendering a territorial and identity’s dislocation. This rupture serves in order for the people to pretend themselves in other roles. Similarly to the function of dreams (as a play in terms of Cohen), tourism revitalizes all material deprivations balancing the personal frustrations. The break with routine or rules of daily life is almost a universal practice in all cultures, as professor B. Malinowski [57] said. In his studies of exchange in Melanesia, Malinowski contends that biological instincts in humans such as metabolism, reproduction, safety, movement, bodily comfort, growth and health can be traced and observed in many aboriginal communities. Each one contains a cultural response which is crystallized as a social institution. For example, reproduction is for kinship what bodily-comfort is for shelter-games. In perspective, he recognized that the needs of recreation and playful rest are vital for the culture. Building their own forms of escapement, cultures do the correct thing by gaining further adaptation to environment. Those communities which fail for developing the necessary instrument for recreation are doomed to be wiped out [57]. However, our polish anthropologist does not deepen his analysis in regards to the recreational behavior in aboriginal tribes. Nowadays, anthropology has produced a substantial background in order for lay-readers to understand what a rite of passage means. As a part of the world of rituals, it signals to a celebration that happens whenever a member of community leaves a former group to be introduced in another new one, and of course, in a different status. In his book, *Les rites de Passage*, Van Gennep argues that each community has its own rites of passages where peoples, roles and gifts are exchanged. One of the aspects that defines these rituals is the needs of *physical displacement*, which sometimes places the candidate in temporal isolation to be reintroduced at a later day in the new group. This isolations are based on two types of separations, the distinction between males and females, and profane and the sacred [87]. In view of this, rites of passage comprise three facet which are, separation, liminality and incorporation. The efficiency of rituals corresponds with its ability to detach a person from the in-group rules. In the induced transition, threshold candidates avoid any direct contact with their former groups at least until the rite is completed. Not only candidates should demonstrate their worthies and virtues, but skills to be esteemed as a free man. One might speculate that whenever tourists avoid direct contact with other conational tourists or are prone to diversity to learn from
far-away cultures, we are in the presence of a rite of passage. In accordance to Van Gennep, Victor Turner established a pungent model to understand the connection between passage and liminality. His interest was centered on an African tribe, Ndembu (Zambia), a case which facilitated his Doctoral thesis completion. Similarly to Van Gennep, Turner writes that the rite of passage should be divided in three stages, pre-liminal phase (separation), liminal phase (transition) and post-liminal phase (reincorporation). The role of liminality is crucial to determine the new status of candidates, Turner adds. This happens simply because the transitional stage or in-between states are valid mechanism adopted by community to bear ambiguity. Embedded in a limbo, candidates are tested to achieve a much deeper sentiment of communitas [82]. Not surprisingly, rites of passage are not limited to aborigines or tribal organizations; rather there are clear examples in West as baptism, tourism, graduate trips, Christmas or New Year celebration among many others. In earlier works, Korstanje & Busby noted that, «We can conclude that renovation of norms that entails the return is enrooted in the figures of baptism, guilt, sacrifice and expiation. This moral process can be compared with social duties or rules visitors abide by every day. These forces not only determine individual behaviour but also pave the pathways towards a new reinsertion. This eternal return to day-to-day life (once the vacation is over) demonstrates an ambivalent nature. On the one hand, we change in some way but certainly it is unquestionable we are subject of a process of forgiveness. On another hand, there is continuity because we were introduced in the same real before our departure» [37, p. 107].

This excerpt sheds light on the real nature and evolution of tourism, as something else than a recreational travel or a commercial hospitality. What is more than important to discuss is to what extent, the inversion of rules is a key-factor that leads liminal candidate (tourists) to a new status. To put this in bluntly, those sedentary societies (following the example of Westerners) where the labor (sacrifice) is the rule that dictate civilized co-existence, the maximization of pleasure becomes the necessary rite of passage. Otherwise, archeology and history witnessed how aborigines (in times where Spanish colonizers have not arrived to Americas) who were unfamiliar with the logic of work, since they worked only for subsistence, rites of passages were marked by suffering, tests, and games of forces. European empires as Spain and Portugal, once introduced in the continent, expanded their hegemony by the exploitation of aborigines. They introduced the needs of work in societies whose economies were not based on surplus. Most certainly, the rites of passage of these cultures experienced a radical shift which prompted their cultural death. The western model of work-leisure (as MacCannell puts it) was imposed to aboriginal tribes in a way that subordinated their culture into the westerner-gaze (Urry). From that moment the model of recreational travel, based on the European legal jurisprudence, as with principle of law, hospitality and recreation as they were coined in Europe, were forcefully adopted by the fourth world. In so doing, it contributed to the expansion of Christianity in Americas. Then, what is the mission of tourism-researchers? Epistemologists, experts and pundits should understand that the current modern tourism (which may be dubbed Anglo-tourism) not only seems to be defined as a rite of passage, but also other forms of recreational travels should be explored. As Levi-Strauss envisaged with structuralism, which means the creation of a periodic tables of cultures, researchers should find a periodic table of tourism(s). This was originally what MacCannell, Urry or Krippendorf dreamed but failed to perform. The division between totems vs. tourism is not enough to explain the nature of the phenomenon. Therefore, in this essay-review we provided readers with an alternative all-encompassing model to expand the current understanding of tourism.

Conclusion. Though the sociology of tourism has advanced various steps in the consolidation of tourism as an object of study, or even the interests of social scientists for tourism multiplicatized in last years, a great dispersion of knowledge respecting to what has been produced remains one of the concerns that may lead the discipline into a deep crisis of meaning [10]. In this context, despite the great volume of theses, works, books and
proceedings, still is open an answer to what tourism is. In this token, we triggered a much deeper conceptual discussion intended to contribute in framing tourism into the world of rites, alternating not only my own experience as editor and researcher, but the contributions of anthropology and ethnography in other non-white communities. Discussing the assertions and limitations of founding parents of discipline, though many others have not included, an alternative explanation on the roots of tourism has been given to the scrutiny of readers. Last but not least, in next approaches the relation of tourism with dreams should be continued. Both shares similar functions for society, by revitalizing the day-to-day deprivations or by ensuring the smooth functioning of societal order. In this context, Spanish speakers and Latin Americans in particular have much to say. Most likely by the influence of a great scholar of the caliber of Jost Krippendorf, or by his natural fluency to understand other Romanic languages as Italian or French who observed a rich legacy of Ancient cultures as Romans or Iberians, Latin American researchers is reproducing a complementary platform to understand tourism as it really is, a rite of passage.
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ЧТО ЕСТЬ ТУРИЗМ?
АНТРОПОЦЕНТРИЧНАЯ ДИСКУССИЯ

Статья посвящена теоретическим и вытекающим из них прикладным проблемам наук о туризме. Автор подчеркивает разобщенность методологических подходов к пониманию туризма, отсутствие общей эпистемологии, несогласованность вопросов происхождения феномена туризма, конфликт между коммерческим и социальным целями исследований туризма. Господство “бизнес-центричной” парадигмы привело к тому, что туризм воспринимается и изучается сузительно как индустрия, а не как древнейший социальный институт. Коммерческий туризм преимущественно чувствителен к спросу, оставляя остальные составляющие этого феномена незамеченными. Такой подход привел к ориентированию исследований на стандарты потребления турпродуктов, полностью игнорируя антропоцентрические корни туризма как явления.

Автором проведен обзор и подробный анализ работ европейских и латиноамериканских ученых с целью выявления основных подходов к пониманию туризма и, исходя из этого, найти корни существующих методологических проблем наук о туризме. Если взять за основу тот факт, что основные существующие теории в туризме могут быть разделены на шесть групп (согласно A. Santana-Talavera) – коммерческая гостеприимность, инструмент демократии, подкультура отдыха, форма культурного выражения, процесс аккумуляции, фактор усиления колониальной зависимости между центром и периферией, – то заметно, что социальная и антропоцентрическая сущность туризма остается в тени исследований о туризме. Поэтому в статье подчеркивается важность таких исследований.

Актуальный вопрос, которому автор уделяет особое внимание в своем исследовании, – это корни туризма как явления, истоки и предпосылки его возникновения. На этот вопрос нет однозначного ответа: многие авторы, понимающие туризм как бизнес-индустрию, считают, что туризм развивается с сер. ХХ в., т. е. после окончания Второй мировой войны, ученые же, трактующие туризм как социальное явление, говорят о первых проявлениях туристской деятельности в древних цивилизациях. Автор не согласен с точкой зрения первых, он также приводит аргументы против теории “стагнации” туристской деятельности в Средние века и склоняется к тому, что туризм – это древнейший социальный институт, направленный на удовлетворение базовых человеческих потребностей в отдыхе.

Автор в ходе своего исследования выявил следующие понимания туризма: 1) бизнес-индустрия; 2) способ повышения производительности труда; 3) священный тотем для индустриального общества; 4) “потерянный рай”, на поиски которого отправляется человек, совершая туристическую поездку; 5) метафора со временного мира; 6) древний социальный институт. Также автор приводит тезис о том, что туризм – это ритуал, и его первоначальная функция заключается в пространственно-территориальной и личностной дислокации. Это позволяет людям почувствовать себя в других социальных ролях и в другом статусе. Туризм – это также функция мечты, попытка порвать с рутиной или правилами повседневной жизни. То есть, такой кратковременный побег из повседневной реальности, и не в социальных цивилизациях, позволяет обществу сохранить свою устойчивость и функциональность путем психического равновесия своих индивидов. При этом автор подчеркивает, что европейская модель туризма с максимизацией удовольствия и фокусировкой на финансовой выгоде не может быть принята как единственно верная, а туризм не должен быть рассмотрен только как ритуал путешествия с целью потратить на досуг заработанные деньги, также необходимо рассматривать и другие модели и понимания туризма. Ведь в племенах, не знакомых с концепцией “работа ради отдыха”, тоже можно наблюдать специфические формы туризма. Этот пример подчеркивает значимость антропоцентричной модели развития туризма.

Одной из важных методологических проблем в системе наук о туризме является территориально-культурная и культурно-языковая разобщенность мирового научного сообщества. За прошедшие десятилетия латиноамериканскими учеными накоплен значительный массив знаний, который практически не известен европейским исследователям. При этом латиноамериканская научная перспектива значительное влияние европейской, и большинство представителей первой приняли “евроцентричное” понимание туризма. Автор подчеркивает, что в такой ситуации важно учитывать и другие модели и понимания туризма, которые могут быть предложены и в других культурах, в том числе и в племенах, не знакомым с такими понятиями, как “работа ради отдыха”. В этом смысле, также подчеркивается значимость антропоцентрической модели туризма.
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