

REVIEW

WORLDMAKING AND DOMESTIC TOURISTS: CRITICAL INSIGHTS FROM PHILOSOPHICAL HERMENEUTICS

DAMIEN JACOBSEN

School of Business and Tourism, Southern Cross University, Lismore, New South Wales, Australia

This review article raises insights into domestic tourism that deserve earnest attention from conceptualists and practitioners in Tourism Studies/Tourism Management (hereafter Tourism Studies). In it, Jacobsen critiques the movement in Tourism Studies, which is described by Hollinshead as worldmaking and which is indicative of the shift toward critical inquiry into the sociopolitical nature of tourism and travel. Jacobsen considers that the notion of (and practice of) worldmaking highlights the globalized nature of tourism that must be considered in relation to the complex place-specific processes of production. However, Jacobsen critically argues in this review article that the range of sociopolitical agencies illuminated via a worldmaking approach is an overinternationalized one and is therefore stifled by a presupposition that can obscure the conceptualization of, and therefore inquiry into, domestic tourism. In this light, Jacobsen maintains that this undersuspected presupposition relates to the construction of existential tourist being as “a place relation” that commences from “rupture.” He attempts to remedy this constrained Tourism Studies thinking by drawing on Gadamer’s philosophical hermeneutics—in support of Caton’s recent call (within this journal) for more informed reflections on Gadamerian interpretations of “tourism.” Following Gadamer’s insistence on the extent to which historical influence conditions the present, Jacobsen assigns “historicity” to touristhood in a move embracing the view that tourist being commonly implicates relations to place that actually precede the act of or experience in tourism. In examining the advocations that worldmaking is a helpful working conceptualization that can potentially and incrementally envision/reenvision tourism as a facilitator for genuine dialogue between disparate peoples, Jacobsen seeks to recast received considerations about “tourist being,” *ipso facto*. Yet, Jacobsen’s review article suggests that this potential for tourism to provide settings to contend with seemingly irreconcilable difference in the world is problematic, especially in regard to Heideggerian understandings about the inauthenticities of our time and the historically conditioned links between domestic tourists and place. Overall, this review article proposes that philosophical hermeneutics can indeed provide crucial insights that

extend what he sees as Hollinshead's ideas beyond current thresholds of thinking about worldmaking to open up new even further and fresher awarenesses of and about emancipated being, or rather of "being through tourism." (Abstract by Reviews Editor)

Key words: Domestic tourism; Worldmaking; Philosophical hermeneutics; Rupture; Historically conditioned being; Gadamer; Goodman; Hollinshead

Introduction: The Rise of Worldmaking Constructions in Tourism Studies

In recent times, the question of what constitutes relevant knowledge within the broad circles of Tourism Studies has undergone shifts from within and across a range of subdisciplines. The break toward more critical and politicized inquiry is, according to Hollinshead (2002, 2009a, 2009b), linked by an overall view among researchers from various backgrounds that tourism constitutes an influential realm of *worldmaking* in modern life. These developments highlight initiatives by emerging leaders in Tourism Studies to conduct situated and innovative inquiry into the sociopolitical and ontological nature of place performance through tourism. Yet, even with this concerted attempt to redefine the parameters of practical knowledge in Tourism Studies, viewing these developments through the lens of domestic tourism reveals that the boundaries of inquiry have only been pushed to a certain extent. Even though it accounts for the greatest volume of travel globally and recent global events are predicted to further invigorate domestic travel (Sheldon & Dwyer, 2010), the innovative works of critical thinkers have left domestic tourism issues aside. It would seem that even amidst such a groundswell of detraction from critical thinkers, some underlying views that shape Tourism Studies thinking appear to have remained quite stubborn.

Insight into why domestic tourism remains obscure amidst the advancements noted in worldmaking may reside in a presupposition about tourists too readily accepted in Tourism Studies literature. The purpose of this review article is to engage in a critical discussion about how the emergent notion of worldmaking conceptualizes tourists in a manner that mirrors this dominant presupposition persistent in Tourism Studies thinking. Using the existentialism championed in

worldmaking, this review article seeks to point out how existentialists mobilize a presupposition that tourist relations to place commence from histories largely unrelated to the enduring (long) stories of place. This historical distance between tourist being and place is termed here as *rupture* (after Guignon, 1986; followers of Heidegger should note that the use of the term "rupture" by Guignon [and his particular followers] is not the same as that of Heidegger and his own accolytes). The argument offered in this review article is that such a presupposition sets a problematic point of departure that serves to obscure the ontological agency of domestic tourists. Thus, despite existentialist attempts to increase the shadow of Heidegger (1927/1962) and the question of "being" in tourism—in which *being* is the high or unifying principle around which Heidegger's existentialism is built, equivalent to "power" for Nietzsche, "praxis" for Marx, and "the unconscious" for Freud (Critchley, 2001, p. 31)—this presupposition has the crucial effect of curtailing the potential of Heidegger's philosophical insights in such critiques. In an attempt to overcome these limitations, this critical review is composed consonant with the recent demand from Caton (2013) in this journal for richer/deeper application of the philosophical hermeneutics of Gadamer in Tourism Studies: In responding to Caton, it argues that informed distillation of and about Gadamer (1985) can particularly assist in reconfiguring the presupposition of "rupture" by enriching our recognitions about the historicity of "tourist being." This article takes the question of being further by showing how philosophical hermeneutics can overcome the presupposition that has constrained the conceptualization of domestic touristhood. The article sets out a way of conceptualizing (but not theorizing) domestic tourists in prelude to a forthcoming companion article (part of my ongoing research agenda

on domestic tourism in Central Australia) that aims to reveal and illustrate the transformative possibilities from such reconceptualized inquiry into tourism and travel (Jacobsen, 2016).

The approach in this review article is not intended to take focus away from how worldmaking highlights a long list of challenges facing Tourism Studies or its role in illuminating that tourism is a key realm of sociopolitical activity. Movements such as worldmaking maintain postmodernist projects of rethinking the parameters of knowledge set by modernity, especially in challenging subject-object duality, while emphasizing the exercise of power through language and our situatedness in the world (Feldman, 2005). Worldmaking draws attention to how Tourism Studies can benefit from the deconstructionism of Derrida, the critical theory of Habermas, the phenomenology of Heidegger, and the workings of power described by Foucault (e.g., Hollinshead, 1999). Indeed, in the process of discussing the conceptualization of tourists in worldmaking, this critical review highlights how aspects of long-term philosophical debate among Gadamer, Derrida, and Habermas can be overlaid into Tourism Studies debate. In addition, themes advocated in worldmaking (e.g., the sociopolitical nature of tourism, place performance, normalizing vision, tourist being) have a by-product of casting light in the direction of challenges associated with domestic tourism. Following this lead, this review article offers insights that may aid in transforming the potential for greater awareness about domestic tourism issues into agendas of inquiry.

This article also joins Caton (2013) in embracing an underlying optimism about the potential of using worldmaking interpretations of and about tourism to procure what may be termed as *genuine dialogue* about the future management and development of forms of tourism that genuinely satisfy manifest or sought tourist experiences. Although the world is marked by seeming incommensurability and difference, worldmaking interpretations are inclined to suggest that tourism can indeed play a crucial role in overcoming these challenges. Under Gadamer's (1985) philosophical hermeneutics, this practical task is approached by pointing out that our historical nature (our "historicity") conditions being—and here the hermeneuticist Gadamer (a student of the existentialist philosopher Heidegger) stands

as an interpreter of these vital matters of being, in which the historic origins of our being/one's being have been forgotten, as the values of the Enlightenment and of modernity simply do not connect "with the stuff of everyday life" (Critchley, 2001, p. 86). From this imbricated *existentialist* (for Heidegger) and *hermeneutic* (for Gadamer) perspective, the challenge of situating domestic tourism inquiry more firmly in Tourism Studies is to understand complexities arising from histories between tourist and place that precede tourism.

To these ends, the present article is structured in four sections. It begins by identifying some core elements about worldmaking in terms of what it (they) offer(s) to Tourism Studies. Discussion then points out a dilemma of such conceptualizations of and about tourism/tourists and how this generates within worldmaking and within existentialism a problematic point of departure for the considering domestic tourism/tourists. The article then draws on insight from Gadamer's (1985) philosophical hermeneutics to propose a more befitting approach to thinking about domestic tourists. From here, the article configures the Gadamerian conceptualization of touristhood in light of the potential for travel to facilitate genuine dialogue between different populations, and between providers and participants in tourism place-making/travel-making experiences. In doing so, the article bolsters Caton's (2013) judgment that there are many sorts of as yet undocumented sociopolitical agencies of being unfolding here, there, and everywhere through tourism. Overall, discussion in this article draws attention to the possibility that the sociopolitical worldmaking agency of domestic travel may be much more preponderant and consequential within tourism than is typically conceived by traditional Tourism Studies thought-lines.

Worldmaking: Definitions and Orientations

In his ongoing service to advocating critical perspectives in Tourism Studies, Hollinshead (2002, 2004, 2009a, 2009b) has observed that the overall direction of such research has taken on a perspective of tourism describable as "worldmaking." According to Hollinshead (2009a, p. 640), the term denotes recent and growing emphasis by researchers in Tourism Studies on "interpretive and 'politically

reasoned' lines of inquiry." Hollinshead explained that a range of key authors reflect a worldmaking-style movement stirring within and related to Tourism Studies, including Hall, Rothman, Fjellman, Horne, Thomas, McKay, Kirshenblatt-Gimblett, Buck, Venn, Platenkamp, Edensor, Lanfant, and Sparke. The role of each is covered in Hollinshead (2009a, 2009b). In devising his description of this movement, Hollinshead (2009a) drew extensively on the work of Meethan (2001) on the tensions between globalization and globalized, and he proposed that worldmaking

is the creative and often "false" or "faux" imaginative processes and projective promotional activities that management agencies, other mediating bodies, and individuals strategically and ordinarily engage in to purposely (or otherwise unconsciously) privilege particular dominant/favoured representations of people/places/pasts within a given or assumed region, area, or "world," or and above the actual or potential representations of those subjects. (p. 643)

The concept of worldmaking draws attention to processes that characterize the industrialized nature of tourism that "selects visions of" or "produces versions of" place, space, and identity. The position of worldmaking is that for tourists, tourism is a crucial medium of viewing upon and "knowing" destination communities (Hollinshead, 2004). As such, Hollinshead argues that those involved in the production of tourism need to recognize that their representations, narratives, and activities are instrumental components of such activity. Such processes can be elaborate or subtle, driven consciously or unconsciously and exercised at all tiers of tourism production (Hollinshead, 2009a). These production processes often maintain, or sometimes are, the source of privileged place constructions (Hollinshead, 2009a). As such, tourism is inherently political; hence, there is not only a need to understand how these processes contribute to tourist place experience but also to interrogate the content of such discourse in relation to place. Furthermore, Caton (2013) has implicitly reminded us that the creative/false/faux acts of worldmaking are indeed ubiquitous acts of confirmation and/or invention and/or fabrication among all of us across the globe.

Hollinshead noted that a common feature for many tourism production processes is the moulding of place understandings. This activity typically unfolds via the "exercise of quiet and under-suspected normalizing vision . . . which objectify the meanings and the value of things at macro levels of awareness via a litany of often 'small' but 'aggregative' ways" (Hollinshead, 2009b, p. 143). Through the deployment of constructions of and about worldmaking, Hollinshead argued that researchers and agents in the production of tourism should engage in regular and ongoing reflexive questioning about whose interests they do in fact service by and through the narratives (or the *en groupe fantasmatics*) that they consciously or unconsciously champion. Following Meethan (2001), Hollinshead argued that under worldmaking perspectives, it is recognized that destinations/places/spaces/identities are not merely affected by tourism, and tourism is not a discrete external entity in and of itself. Rather, tourism is often a medium for host communities (or other players and publics) to reinforce specific held or hailed place projections. Thus, the "production" of tourism is a question more suitably explored in the context of symbolic or signifiatory performance (Hollinshead, Ateljevic, & Ali, 2009). Here, Hollinshead (2009a, 2009b) drew on Venn's notion of the *compossibility* of things as an apt descriptor for the coproductive reach and authority of tourism as vision-making (particularly an alternative vision maker) in which previously distinct local and global interests and identifications can coalesce strategically or be meshed together productively. As such, the call for insight into the normalizing and naturalizing act of worldmaking necessitates the sequestration of painstakingly obtained sensitivity toward such phenomenon as "emergent identifications," "local sensibilities," and "difficult-to-read hybrid trajectories." Such are the important but protean and often dark-light interpretations of belonging and aspiration that come hand-in-glove with the worldmaking mobilizations of tourism vis-à-vis its globalized and globalizing effects in and through tourism (Hollinshead, 2009b, p. 148). Under such developing worldmaking views, cultures are not seen to be static, tourism is not necessarily the primary instigator of representational or identificatory change itself, and an area of selective/

productive agency is not beyond the grasp of local populations (Hollinshead, 2009a). According to such emergent thinking about the concept of and the practice of worldmaking, critical place specific inquiry is needed to highlight such complexities of identity-projection and symbolic-belonging.

In his collection of articles, Hollinshead has proposed that worldmaking reflects a growing critical shift in Tourism Studies. As a key actor within this shift, Meethan (2001) articulated discontent about various dominant perspectives that have fashioned Tourism Studies, including the presumption that destination cultures are enclosed, that tourism acts as an external entity corroding those cultures, that tourism is a force in the unifying project of globalization, that tourism is merely subjective consumption, and that tourism provides tourists escape from modern life (see Hollinshead, 2009a, on Meethan). Meethan questioned the merit of suggesting that tourism is an arm of the unifying globalization project. To Meethan, cultures are always in a state of change, and it is within global society of trans-nationalism and hybrid identities that such change must be considered (Hollinshead, 2009a). Places are not homogenized as a result of global tourism activity but rather new identifications and patterns emerge that are based on place as situated in global contexts. In this light, Pernecky (2010) recently argued that tourism provides destinations with a means of being and that potentiality is central to the very declarative role that Hollinshead has sought to highlight. In this way, tourism holds promise for the future of destination communities in sociopolitical senses as much as it does in terms of orthodox and dominant economic valuations. Overall, unfolding thought-lines about worldmaking (after Goodman, per medium of Hollinshead) thereby serve to warn the field of Tourism Studies about how powerful but undersuspected the subtle workings of tourism can indeed be in "making," "remaking," or "demaking" destination places. These forms of privileged "place performance" and "space articulation" are evidently commonplace and incremental acts of destination-projection in which many interest groups and institutions engage (not just formal tourism and travel "corporations" and "organizations") in all societies. We all sometimes loudly and sometimes quietly exercise our aspirational acts of location-making as well as

confirm or create the right kind of narratives about our deserving selves.

Worldmaking and Existentialism: The Dilemma of Conceptualizing Tourists

As Caton (2013) reasoned in this journal, the recognition of (or deployment of) worldmaking constructions raises a number of issues related to the production of tourism that are seemingly ubiquitous (e.g., normalizing vision, agents of production, political agendas, medium of place experience). Indeed, unfolding conceptualizations about worldmaking draw attention to some complex consequences of tourism for destination communities, the central relevance of place in Tourism Studies, and the fact that tourism is a site of sociopolitical struggle and symbolic contestation. Such themes hold relevance in many subfields of inquiry into tourism and travel, whereas the refined use of worldmaking constructions and explanations might also invigorate research into certain specific areas (such as domestic tourism) that have been and still are neglected in Tourism Studies (Aramberri, 2004; Singh, 2009). Yet, a limitation observable in the emergent notion of worldmaking is that it is framed by continually thinking of tourism as a facet or phenomenon of international travel. Thus, worldmaking is regularly posed as a counterargument to those dominant "received views" that have shaped Tourism Studies during the 1970s/1980s/1990s (such as authenticity, typologies, binaries, impact studies, the colonizing West); however, in challenging those views, it has seemingly mirrored some of those other outlooks. Like the modes of knowledge generation that it seeks to scrutinize, the conceptualization of worldmaking also carries out what Tribe (2006) referred to as double-selectivity conditioning in the production of knowledge. Worldmaking conceptualities advance critical perspectives on seemingly ubiquitous dilemmas within and across tourism, but they tend to leave obscure how forms of domestic tourism, *ipso facto*, should be considered. Indeed, one could argue that domestic tourism is the bulwark form of tourism in almost all nations, economically and symbolically.

Some applications of worldmaking in Tourism Studies literature highlight the effects of thinking of tourism as global activity. Swain (2009), for

instance, discussed how tourists develop chameleon-like cosmopolitan characteristics allowing them to be adept at bridging cultural differences. According to Tucker (2009), the issue of strangeness and mediation between hosts and guests—which Tucker noted is an “inherently colonial relationship” (p. 444)—similarly raises the notion of the tourist self as something displaced and that is something that so frequently retains an acute intrapersonal insularity to cope with the experienced Othernesses of encountered (or expected) surroundings. The notion of tourism as encounter with the “other” places and “different” cultures traces back to the Grand Tour and beyond (Towner, 1985). Consulting the domestic tourism literature on this matter reveals discontent that this trajectory underscores a dominant presupposition within Tourism Studies that conceptualizes tourists in this very same mould (e.g., Aramberri, 2004). For clarity, this differs from Meethan’s (2001) position that global unification through tourism is a misleading perspective (again, see Hollinshead, 2009a, on Meethan). Indeed, I agree with Meethan on that point; however, whereas Meethan (and subsequently Hollinshead, 2009a) advocated the emergence of identities in these contexts, other pertinent and useful commentators advocated that the power of cultural or identificatory persistence must not be overlooked (Croucher, 2003; Opp, 2005). Transnationalism, global citizenship, and blurred boundaries are relevant in contemporary life; yet, commentators have concluded that the recent “modern” institution of nationhood not only persists but often is strengthened in these conditions (Croucher, 2003). Some researchers have even claimed that this is equally as applicable for European Union countries as it is for many others (Opp, 2005). Thus, understanding tourism as merely the practice of international travel obscures the extent of sociopolitical persistence via travel, but it also sets a problematic point of departure for understanding such complexities.

In worldmaking, the production processes and performance of tourism are the site of place experience for tourists. It is through tourism that tourists experience the narratives, past, objects, and landscapes associated with place. Thus, place and tourists are conceptualized as Other (this differs from “touring the authentic Other” that Hollinshead, 2009a, observed is rebuffed by Meethan). Preceding

tourism, history shared between the different them and us of populations—or between “us” tourists and the “them” of other/othered peoples—is presupposed to be relatively limited, as Hollinshead (2009a) illustrated: “Tourists have to be stimulated by awe-inspiring narratives about given places to help them choose which to visit” (p. 658). It could be argued then that for worldmaking, the production of tourism is primarily concerned with the provision of place experiences. Hence, it seems logical that such worldmaking understandings bolster recent Tourism Studies literature about the need to conceptualize tourists “existentially” (Hollinshead, 2009a, 2009b). Existentialism rethinks the concept of authenticity by instead focusing on the tourist subject as ontologically constituting him- or herself authentically in relation to the surroundings (Wang, 1999). Steiner and Reisinger (2006) furthered this very position by drawing on Heidegger’s (1927/1962) notion of being as “the self-projecting by the self of its possibilities” (Gadamer, 2006, p. 39). Hence, Steiner and Reisinger focused on the individualistic nature of one’s being in the world and how this generates unique experiential possibilities. With tourist agency thereby being “self-guided,” worldmaking outlooks inevitably remind us that a key moment in the production of tourism (the hybridity, the articulation, etc.) is in the experiential possibilities of the performance itself.

Steiner and Reisinger (2006) encountered a problem, however, when attempting to tackle the inauthentic tourist roles that are communal, shared, or open to anyone. To Steiner and Reisinger, inauthentic tourists “are not fully themselves” (p. 306). For Heidegger (1927/1962), this is not the case, because (for him) inauthentic existences in communal or public roles are not “any ‘lower’ degrees of Being” (p. 68). Heidegger maintained that such being is equally as legitimate as authenticity because everyday human existence regularly plays out in states of inauthenticity (for further discussion on this point, see Salem-Wiseman, 2003). Interestingly, Meethan (2001) identified this same problem (Hollinshead, 2009a) as encountered by Steiner and Reisinger. The existentialist view displays an unwillingness to apply the full relevance of Heidegger’s notion of being as “thrown” (discussed later). The developing suggestion in this

critical review is that existentialists seem unable to bridge the historical nature of tourist being. To be clear, the production of place through tourism ensures that tourist being is thrown in the Heideggerian sense. In worldmaking, such an admission is vital in ensuring that the performance of place remains a central issue. This is not in dispute here, because the prevailing frame of reference in Tourism Studies—embodied by existentialists and observable within emergent conceptions of and about worldmaking—contains a presupposed disavowal of the tourist being thrown in relation to a place that precedes tourism. It is arguable that this point of departure contributes to a tall stumbling block for existentialists, thereby leaving other possibilities of tourist being in relation to destinations as unclear. On this point, worldmaking also seems to reach a threshold of understanding.

Goodman's Worldmade World:

The Presupposition of Tourists as Rupture

The concept of world in worldmaking is derived from Goodman (1978), whom Hollinshead et al. (2009) credited as the source of the term that now conceivably headlines the critical movement observed in Tourism Studies. To Goodman, what exists are world versions, of which he noted that "all we learn about the world is contained in right versions of it" (p. 4). Goodman was interested in the processes of the very making or makings of such worlds. Central to his approach is that "Worldmaking as we know it always starts from worlds already on hand; the making is [thereby a] remaking" (Goodman, 1978, p. 6). Like Goodman's notion that art is made of symbols belonging to broader systems (Elgin, 2001), Hollinshead (2009a, 2009b) made this character explicit in worldmaking within and through tourism, especially in his concern with the cultural selection and the cultural production repertoires of tourism. As Hollinshead et al. (2009) stated, worldmaking "seeks to draw attention to the super-abundant mass of significations and . . . projections which all who work in tourism . . . unavoidably engage in" (p. 432). Tourism produces "world versions," and following Goodman, Hollinshead attempted to impart urgency in illuminating the makings of such lived realms because, as Goodman maintained, whether the world is a fitting one

is a matter of criteria befitting the held *doxa* or the hailed cultural warrants of each institutional or interest group world.

The nature of tourism put forward by Hollinshead is complex. For instance, if the selection and production of tourism involves nurturing normalizing visions of place, is it not then possible to pose a historicity between tourists and place that does precede tourism? In this respect, the critical point to consider here is the implicit conceptualization of tourists under the particular worldmaking account. With the short critique of existentialism above as a starting point, the argument can be taken further by considering another application of Heidegger in Tourism Studies. Take, for instance, how Pernecky (2010) sketched the being of tourism by attempting to centralize touristhood within a context of "worldhood." Pernecky argued that the spatiality of tourism corresponds with Heidegger's (1927/1962) being-in-the-world as a relation to things, things that are interconnected and thereby constitute the world. Pernecky's approach strikes closely to Heidegger's understanding of authentic being as experienced through loneliness, isolation, or solipsism (Dostal, 1992). In *Being and Time*, Heidegger believed that if we strip Dasein's (the Self's) concern for itself to the barest presence, its own death is what it always already faces. Dostal (1992, p. 405) observed this particular solidarity by remarking that "there is a limit as to what others can do for us in the face of death." The communality of being for Heidegger is noted above, yet Pernecky joined Steiner and Reisinger (2006) in emphasizing how Heidegger's solidarity of being is useful for conceptualizing tourists.

Pernecky (2010) was also in step with existentialists by encountering a stumbling block when considering the historicity of tourists. However, Pernecky sought to take existentialism further by pointing out how tourist being-in-the-world considered in a Heideggerian sense is being as linked to the everyday. In this manner, Pernecky joined with Urry (2002) and others in highlighting the increasing de-differentiation of tourism from everyday life. By focusing on Heidegger's (1927/1962) solidarity of being, however, Pernecky's argument remained about performing "being a tourist" in which tourism is the site of place experience. In doing so, there is a danger that Pernecky ended up departing from Heidegger's notion of everyday being,

especially in everydayness taken up by inauthentic selfhood (such as family or social roles). Hence, something central to Heidegger's thinking about being—the past—is at risk of becoming viewed in partiality (Dostal, 1987). Pernecky assigned historicity to things encountered in the world through tourism, but in relation to sociopolitical concerns, the starting point for tourists is presupposed as (to borrow a term from Gadamer) rupture. There is a parallel here to Rorty, for whom “history appears as a series of ruptures and revolutions. . . . We are always starting *de novo*, with no obligation to the past” (Guignon, 1986, p. 406). Interestingly, Dostal (1987) coupled Goodman's (1978) view of world with Rorty in this same regard. The suggestion here is that the dominant Tourism Studies perspective of tourists is based on similar underpinnings, and it is apparent that a presupposition of “rupture” has been imported into the conceptualization of and about tourists as captured in such worldmaking accounts.

The Historicity of (Domestic) Tourists: Insight From Philosophical Hermeneutics

Having now argued that a dominant Tourism Studies presupposition of tourists is to conceptualize their place relation as commencing from rupture, a brief clarification of Heidegger is required before introducing Gadamer to this discussion. Again, the past is central for Heidegger (1927/1962) in *Being and Time*. Heidegger's notion of being “thrown” relates to existing among that which is handed down socially, culturally, or in relation to things that all constitute being as historical. In *Being and Time*, Heidegger's view of history as epoch assigned history a discontinuity characterized by beginnings and endings (Lammi, 1991). This discontinuity downplayed the declarative character of historical consciousness, which to Gadamer was untenable (Lammi, 1991). Heidegger's notion of epoch is but one component of his overall conception of being as a future-oriented-concern (e.g., being toward death). Such a view is discernible in the existentialist version of touristhood seemingly adopted in Hollinshead's (2009a, 2009b) construction of worldmaking in tourism/Tourism Studies. Existentialists (e.g., Steiner & Reisinger, 2006; Wang, 1999) have conceptualized tourists as having unique pasts, but

in relation to specific destinations, where the starting point is rupture, leaving tourism as the site of place experience and ontological engagement and thus as a future-oriented concern (e.g., in terms of how it applies to the Self).

Those familiar with Gadamer will be aware that much in his 1985 seminal book *Truth and Method* is indebted to the work of Heidegger. Whereas in *Being and Time* Heidegger (1927/1962) pursued a fundamental ontology of being, Gadamer in *Truth and Method* outlined his philosophical hermeneutics (Dostal, 2002). As such, the questions chiefly pursued by Gadamer revolve around hermeneutic experience, which Gadamer brought to light by highlighting the view that Heidegger's Dasein “must find its expression in the understanding of historical tradition” (Gadamer, as cited in Dostal, 2002, p. 253). Here it is immediately evident that Gadamer had appropriated Heidegger on the one hand but proceeded in a different direction on the other. It is thus relevant to point out that Gadamer's upholding of historical consciousness situated the question of being as “an historical participation with others in the world—[and in which that] participation presupposes a solidarity with others” (Dostal, 2002, p. 263). Whereas Heidegger prioritized the future, Gadamer tended to prioritize the past. In later works, Gadamer tended to Heidegger's view of history as discontinuity by insisting that historical consciousness plays a crucial role in enlivening the present. As Lammi (1991) explained, “the past—the tradition—is not turned into an object but understood as afresh as an event of truth” (p. 505). Lammi continued by pointing out that for Gadamer, our task of renewal (of the past) is evident in how what is preserved in the present is history sustained, despite the persistence of forgetting.

Already we can see how Gadamer's insistence on historical consciousness may overcome the sense of rupture plaguing the conceptualization of tourists in Tourism Studies. Thinking of tourists as having historical consciousness removes the presupposition of rupture between tourists and place. The stumbling block for existentialists (Steiner & Reisinger, 2006) dissolves away. Suddenly the potentiality of domestic tourists comes further to light. The notion of Heidegger's communality that troubled Steiner and Reisinger

(2006) and Pernecky (2010) is to Gadamer implicit to being in the world. Gadamer insisted on historicity more stridently than Heidegger (Dostal, 2002). This is not to say that Gadamer overlooked change, rather that Gadamer's point is that history persists within the temporal progression that characterizes our being. Gadamer (1985) argued that "perspectives that result from the experience of historical change are always in danger of being exaggerated because they forget what persists unseen" (p. xxiv). Hence, Gadamer questioned the overinvesting emphasis on progression itself (e.g., refer to Habermas himself but see the traceable outlooks observable in Goodman). Within events and change, history is enlivened. For Gadamer, self-consciousness is conditioned by the past, which means that limitations or deficiencies of the present are historical (Weinsheimer, 1985). The temporality of being in the world is historical, which means that from Gadamer's point of view, *tourist being* can be deemed to be "inauthentic" because historicity is configured only in the present.

We have moved to a point in this discussion in which some scaffolding of Hollinshead's worldmaking (i.e., his contextualization of Goodman's, 1978, notion of figured/refigured/configured local or institutional "worlds") may be recast to accommodate domestic tourists. Under Goodman's (1978) approach—nuanced by Hollinshead—the selective activity and the productive processes of tourism are worked on by interest groups and interpreting bodies, not unlike Overing's (1990) Amazonian Shaman who conditioned particular forms of "being" within the received myths and rituals for duteous followers. To be clear, then, the legitimacy of Hollinshead in choosing to exercise Goodman's approach is not in question here because its situated use draws attention to activities that establish normalizing visions of place (such as stories, myth, narratives, representations, place performances), all of which signal the primacy of language (or, rather, of symbolic/significatory agency within everyday/banal/mundane forms of tourism). Thus, the concept or construction of *worldmaking* evokes the latent critical theory of Habermas and also the deconstructionism of Derrida, both of which differing approaches seek to identify the authority

and power of the ordinary politicized nature of language. However, for Gadamer, the distinction is that language is as inherently historical as it is political. For Gadamer, then, language is the arena in which our thinking (and our prethinking) takes place. Evidently, for Hollinshead in tourism and related spheres of activity (as for Goodman in the arts and aesthetics), worldmaking is the everyday/everyplace process in which our thinking (and our prethinking) takes place.

For Gadamer, language is the means through which we are historically constituted. Language is not a tool but rather "in language the reality beyond every individual consciousness becomes visible" (Gadamer, 1985, p. 449). For Gadamer (1985), "the world is the common ground, trodden by none and recognized by all, uniting all who talk to one another" (p. 446). Gadamer's notion of a or the world comes to light through the recognition of the role that language plays, especially of the realization that "on it [language] depends the fact that man [*sic*] has a world [emphasis added] at all" and the coterminous realization that "language has *no independent life* [emphasis added] apart from the world that comes to language within it" (p. 443). Weinsheimer (1985) added further insight to Gadamer's perspective by observing that "there is no human world without it [language] . . . because the human world is linguistically constituted" (p. 245). To properly put this notion of a or the *language*d or *prelanguage*d world into context, Gadamer has distinguished that the human world unfolds within an environment that houses all beings and all nature.

Hence, for Gadamer, our being in the world is characterized by freedom: freedom within the world itself, freedom in "the plurality of language" (Weinsheimer, 1985, p. 245). We can only ever view the world from a particular standpoint, but as Gadamer emphasized, "a standpoint is precisely a point from which we *see* and not a point from which we are necessarily blinded" (Wachterhauser, 2002, p. 72). There is an overall unity among linguistic worlds and an openness for each to comprehend others, and thus to Gadamer, there are no "opposing" worlds (Weinsheimer, 1985). The determination of the world in language is not fixed but comprises a freedom that "precludes any linguistic determinism of thought" (Weinsheimer, 1985, p. 245). Language is the key event or mechanism that constitutes

being, the world, and history. By highlighting this freedom in language, Gadamer sought to make it explicit that "if the past lives at all, it lives in our own self-representations" (Weinsheimer, 1985, p. 132). Gadamer (2006) thereby argued that it is upon our linguistic being in the world that history is always already copresent. In this ontological light, the access of being "to the past is through what the present shares or can share with it" (Weinsheimer, 1985, p. 134). Through the performance of "being," history consonantly presents itself. Furthermore, if such understandings are now applied to conception of and about tourists, the presupposition that emanates from Gadamer's position becomes one in which *tourist being* is itself the very performance of historicity. Existential being is not merely an individualistic phenomenon (or noumenon) of each fresh moment, and place is not merely experienced through the then-and-there production of tourism. Whereas Pernecky (2010) argued for *a being of tourism*, perhaps a more apt parallel is that of *being through tourism*. Although the use of the concept of worldmaking draws attention to tourists visiting upon the range of articulated and produced elements drawn from (and into) the long/enduring stories of place, a contextualization of Gadamer suggests that being through tourism involves the co-construction of self and place. In this Gadamerian light, and for domestic tourists, this co-construction originated long before the productive and inscriptive processes of "tourism." Through Gadamer, then, we learn ontologically that in tourism, as in other contexts, the historical inheritances and the sociopolitical constructions of *being* do indeed reveal themselves. An important task for researchers in Tourism Studies is therefore to consider what happens to and within the longer stories between domestic tourists and place well after the traveler's journey is over.

The Refined Possibilities for Worldmaking:
The Potential for Genuine Dialogue
in/Through Tourism

For clarity, the approach in this critical review is not to combine Gadamer with Habermas, Derrida, or even Goodman. The differences and similarities of Gadamer from Habermas or Derrida are well documented (Di Cesare, 2004; Feldman, 2005).

However, it should be noted that within Gadamer's philosophical hermeneutics resides presuppositions of scientific thought in, for example, phenomenology (Dostal, 1987) and deconstruction (Di Cesare, 2004). The critical approach to Tourism Studies that is in embedded or advocated within Hollinshead's conceptualization of *worldmaking* targets the nature of power that courses in banal fashion through the selective and the productive agency of tourism (as Caton, 2013—among others—has codified for us). However, in gauging the force of such interpretive (or, rather, preinterpretive) agency in tourism settings or indeed in any applied contexts, we should not overlook the fact that both Habermas and Derrida were critical of Gadamer for simply not going far enough in his assessment of the reach of language (Di Cesare, 2004; Feldman, 2005). In response to such acute criticism, Gadamer maintained that the process of understanding is practical interpretation and therefore in itself can only be an inherently *critical* or *situated* one (Feldman, 2005; Kinsella, 2006). For Gadamer, our being in the world per medium of language indeed marks out what is historical and what is communal at each setting and point in time (i.e., with regard to what is interpreted *in each there at each then* sociopolitically); thus, each constituted being could be said to already inextricably be pre-critical, or presituated, itself.

As noted above, then, Gadamer is routinely concerned with the very persistence of history as it lurks within and conditions (or preconditions) language. Whereas Habermas and Derrida were critical of philosophical hermeneutics, others view Gadamer as one who provided useful conceptual tools to aid the practical task of tackling *incommensurability* in the world (Bernstein, 2010; Kinsella, 2006). Gadamer rejected Kuhn's position that different worldviews were "incommensurable" (Bernstein, 2008). His view of the world as one constituted by language accepts that the learning of a foreign language indeed involved the taking on of another worldview, but it was always a gain of insight and communication related to one's own interpreted stance (Gadamer, 1985). Hence, our historically conditioned being in the world is not an unconditional one (Gadamer, 1985). This freedom, as noted above, courses through language and through being, and thereby a world constituted through language holds clues to the histories carried into it that

enliven the particular present. In this fashion, and for the marginalized, Kinsella (2006) noted how a philosophical hermeneutical stance can indeed help identify the exercise of oppression and subordination within language. Moreover, in political science, Gadamer's philosophical hermeneutics has been useful in identifying subtle indicators of sociopolitical tension that have seemingly arisen through the life of language, whereas it has also helped "to deconstruct myths and prejudices that block mutual understanding and it can criticize misleading pictures of incommensurability that perpetuate hatred" (Bernstein, 2010, p. 392). The cardinal task is therefore—in each setting—to inquire seriously into the localized sociopolitical contexts that characterize the play of language in that viewed world, with the aim of moving toward the transformation of the seemingly *incommensurable*.

Through his engagement with *worldmaking conceptualizations* (after Hollinshead, 2002, 2004, 2009a, 2009b), Pernecky (2010) and other *Critical Tourism Studies* commentators are inclined to express an optimism that tourism is a rich site that holds great potential for what can be termed as "fresh and genuine dialogue" about the as yet underrecognized fabrication and prefabrication of place and space. Hollinshead (2009a) pointed out that much is still to be explored in and across tourism settings, but he has highlighted the fact that developments in public culture/public heritage/public nature scenarios about Tourism Studies are indeed enriching knowledge about the authority and reach of political agency as regularly/routinely mobilized through the industrial and inscriptive spheres of "tourism."

For Gadamer, *genuine dialogue* is crucial in processes of reaching understanding about such normative or naturalizing activity, in which "genuine dialogue," *ipso facto*, composes the desire for "overcoming barriers, achieving agreement, commonality, and reconciliation" (Bernstein, 2008, p. 588). According to Bernstein (2010), the attainment of "genuine dialogue" requires "listening—really listening—and learning to hear what is different and other [in another population] than us" (p. 389). Part of this task of critical openness, as Bernstein (2010) continued, is having or developing "the imagination to enlarge our own horizon [of understanding] and the humility to realize

that our horizons are finite and limited" (p. 310). Bernstein (2008) highlighted the rarity of such dialogue and insisted that without willingness, most participants in most cross-cultural communicative encounters would simply fail to even approach engagement in any genuine sense. Taking account of such understandings about the natural insularities and the everyday ethnocentrism of contemporary peoples and institutions where tourism is itself concerned, the evolving *worldmaking* assessments of our time (Hollinshead, 2009a, 2009b) focus on the importance of procuring settings or trajectories for genuine dialogue. Hollinshead deemed this to be necessary because many current operational practices in the management and development of tourism simply deny destination communities and involved local populations the opportunity of portrayal via discourse and projection that actually befits their own representations of self, community, and inheritance.

Consonantly, viewing *tourist being* as "historical" in the Gadamerian sense enlarges the centrality and gravity of tourism as an ordinary and everyday site of genuine dialogue. In this regard, it must be noted that assessments of management and promotional activity in tourism via *worldmaking* inspections illuminate this Gadamerian task by arguing that "movement towards bona fide critical understanding comprises a potent political agenda to emancipate people, places and pasts, and thereby to promote social justice and equality through tourism across the world" (Ateljevic, Hollinshead, & Ali, 2009, p. 549). As noted above, the spotlight in *worldmaking* forms of analysis is invariably cast upon the production of tourism as a vehicle of emancipation. The value of such an argument is not in dispute here. The specific issue, in this review article, is to consider (or to reconsider) the existentialist presupposition of tourists as "rupture." In this light, place experience in tourism settings is deemed to be far too transitory under existentialist approaches to the field (Steiner & Reisinger, 2006), leaving the lasting consequences of and about "genuine dialogue" between tourists and destination communities rather unclear. If, however, the presupposition is of *historical relation* instead of *rupture*, a quite different picture emerges. The picture itself is reflective of Gadamer's (2006) view of hermeneutics as participation in an ongoing

conversation, of which it did not begin or will conclude. The intrinsic optimism embodied in the practical task of philosophical hermeneutics mirrors that of Hollinshead's cultivation of worldmaking awarenesses and outlooks. Viewed in this manner, the capacity to engender or develop "genuine dialogue" within or from tourism encounters assumes a form that comprises a continuation of the received history that exists (or has existed) between the tourist (or tourists) and the destination community (or the involved local populations).

It is interesting, however, that domestic tourists often provide a compelling twist to this line of argument. Highlighting this requires pointing out that implicit to genuine dialogue is the existence of "a genuine experience" in the setting examined. Here, Gadamer (1985) drew upon the notion of "learning through suffering" as derived from *Aeschylus* (p. 356). To have suffered provides one with "insight into the limitations of humanity. . . . Experience teaches us to acknowledge the real" (Gadamer, 1985, p. 357). This ability to recognize what is, according to Gadamer, opens us to embrace our own historical conditioning and also that of the other. Genuine experience is implicit to genuine dialogue because our existing prejudices and historicity are put at risk and thereby opened to views from the other (Gadamer, 1985). The optimum outcome of genuine dialogue is a fusion of differing worldviews (Gadamer, 1985). Yet, for travelers in their homeland—which often involves touring symbols of national identity, heritage, and cultural enactment or even places of pilgrimage—the potentiality for genuine dialogue is frequently (or predominantly) unclear. By touring such markers, domestic tourists often reinforce existing identifications with history, with place, and with broad community (McIntosh & Prentice, 1999; Palmer, 1999; Singh & Krakover, 2015). Of course, travel away from everyday comforts in itself harbors degrees of suffering, but if Gadamer's philosophical hermeneutics is accepted, then Franklin's (2004) argument that tourism is a indeed a form of *sociopolitical ordering* corroborates the Gadamerian view that the past will teach us much about domestic tourists in the present.

In support of the above proposition, there is growing evidence in the recent literature of Tourism Studies that for domestic travel, the incidence of (or

potential for) genuine dialogue may be constrained. For instance, Panjabi (2009) bolstered the view that domestic travelers in Kashmir regularly evade reminders of "their" violent colonial past, focusing instead on romanticized notions of landscape and place. Otherwise—according to Panjabi—the touring of Kashmir, where views of colonial disturbances actually do predominate, indeed makes it difficult for Kashmiris and Indians to deal with their troubled past. Panjabi therefore contended that current forms of domestic travel in Kashmir actually inflict a renewed kind of colonial violence on Kashmiris. Domestic tourists often perpetuate existing social conflicts by unsuspectingly/suspectingly embracing hegemonic ideologies that marginalize and subjugate others (Goulding & Domic, 2008; Spennemann, Clancy, & Thwaites, 2006). In Kashmir, Panjabi observed a form of normalizing vision at work; however, in contrast to the concept of worldmaking, that vision preceded the production of tourism by characterizing the preexisting historicity of domestic tourists (Indians) with place (Kashmir).

Here, Gadamer is surely justified in arguing that "advancing into the future in order to remedy deficiencies of the present will necessitate turning to the past" (Weinsheimer, 1985, p. 133). The incidence of historically conditioned being through tourism becomes further amplified when considering that national identity (Palmer, 1999) and heritage (McIntosh & Prentice, 1999) are often pivotal components of place experience. As such, states of Heideggerian inauthenticity sidestepped by existentialists may be far more prevalent and definitive of tourism than we currently acknowledge in Tourism Studies. Further, the discussion in this article also suggests that it may be prudent to consider that domestic tourists epitomize the practical challenge of seeming incommensurability. Thus—as Caton (2013) recognized—there is potential in what Gadamer can offer Tourism Studies in our attempts to grapple with these place-specific, population-complex, but poorly understood projective/preprojective and inscriptive/preinscriptive challenges.

Conclusion: Advancing and Contextualizing the Concept of Worldmaking

This review article has critically explored the conceptualization of tourists in worldmaking,

identifying in particular that received constructions of worldmaking are conditioned by a dominant presupposition in Tourism Studies that overlooks domestic tourists. This article argues that conceptualizing tourism as international travel contains an implicit presupposition of tourist place as that which commences from rupture. It has been argued in this review article that even though insight from Heidegger has increasingly posed the question of being (and of understandings about the ontological) in Tourism Studies, the extent of Heideggerian insight to Tourism Studies has been similarly hamstrung by this very presupposition of and about rupture. The article has been predicated on the view that existentialism epitomizes the Tourism Studies preoccupation with the conceptualization that tourists are inevitably individualistic and future-oriented persons. By posing insight from Gadamer's philosophical hermeneutics, this review has argued that accentuating the historicity of tourists not only paves the way for a richer comprehension of domestic tourists but it also raises new potentialities of and about sociopolitical agencies operating within and through tourism. Recently generated worldmaking conceptions indeed do highlight the need for critical place specific inquiry, but the Gadamerian position cultivated in this article goes further by arguing that the historicity of tourists must be much more strongly considered, which means that critical place specific inquiry must delve more seriously and decidedly into the sociopolitical cognitions that precede the production and the ontological of tourism.

The approach in this critical commentary has sought to avoid dismantling the concept of "worldmaking," *ipso facto*; rather, the intention in this review has been to illustrate that worldmaking has a threshold that is set or structured within boundaries of dominant or received knowledge frameworks in Tourism Studies. The notion of the normalizing artifice and sociopolitical practice of worldmaking indeed offers valuable explanatory power for Tourism Studies, and Hollinshead has made it abundantly clear that silences and misconceptions about destination pasts or sociocultural struggles are repeatedly produced and reproduced through everyday and everyplace inscriptive and declarative tourism industry activities. For Hollinshead, this character of modern tourism is importantly

banal, and it is importantly ubiquitous. Such unfolding and resultant awareness of and about the commonplace ordinariness of worldmaking craft and conditioning indeed draws attention to the seriousness of consequences from the sociopolitical understandings of place that are procured and projected through the declarative productivity of tourism. Hence, emergent understandings of and about worldmaking agency and authority of the selective and productive power of tourism help researchers cast light on the sorts of projections and performances of localized sociopolitical complexity that comprise the mundane and the collaborative articulations of tourism. Furthermore—specifically for my own research agenda on tourism activity in Central Australia—the deployment of conceptualizations about worldmaking power and reach can help direct much needed attention to the importance of critical inquiry into how domestic travel is conceivably governed and experienced. Yet, in being apparently fixated on the globalized nature of travel, many worldmaking frameworks overlook a potentially crucial aspect of localized sociopolitical historical persistence while they axiomatically favor the sorts of emergent identity that arise within or under global cosmopolitanism. In response, this critical review has therefore argued that entities such as national communities do persist within globalized society. By conceptually refining the concept of worldmaking and investing in that very kind of historicity in/within tourists, the most common form of travel within nations, across continents, and around the world may no longer be overshadowed by the received or vogue knowledge predilections of Tourism Studies.

The proposition that a philosophical hermeneutic perspective helps to illustrate how domestic tourists may epitomize the practical challenge of incommensurability stirs in Tourism Studies a debate waged by eminent philosophers of language, history, and being. Both Derrida and Habermas believed that in merely pointing out practical challenges, Gadamer had failed to realize the full responsibility of philosophical thought. This article has sought to demonstrate that to others, Gadamer's (1985) philosophical hermeneutics in *Truth and Method* is not only sufficient for this very task but is also intrinsically critical and therefore useful in studying political or social phenomena at play. There are numerous limitations in Gadamer's

perspectives, which will be taken up more pointedly in the forthcoming article (Jacobsen, 2016; contextualized within the domestic tourism of Central Australia) that is partnered with this present review article. The danger for Gadamer has been the elision of him with relativism, and even with antimodernism (Feldman, 2005). In response to relativism, Gadamer and Grondin (2006) stated that if “there was no doubt in absolute truth,” then there would be no concern for relativism (p. 88). The matter of truth for Gadamer will also be taken up further in the forthcoming companion article to this review article.

In closing, no theory of and about domestic tourists, per se, has been offered in this article; rather, insight from Gadamer’s philosophical hermeneutics has been recruited to assist in the practical task for Tourism Studies researchers in more richly conceptualizing things. The outcomes of this article raise the question as to why domestic travel has been overlooked within Tourism Studies to such an extent that it has gone largely unnoticed by the broad movement of critical thinkers. Despite the questions that emergent worldmaking conceptualizations pose about the prevailing Tourism Studies claims to knowledge, insight about the consanguinities between domestic tourists and the hailed narratives of local place and space have remained undeveloped. Seemingly preoccupied with economic rationalism, immersed in the intricacies of technology (Heidegger, 1927/1962), Tourism Studies have been what Gadamer described as distracted by the distractions of modernism (Franklin, 2004; Hollinshead, 2009a, 2009b; Tribe, 2006). Put simply—and in Gadamer’s (1985) own words—“Things that change force themselves on our attention far more than those that remain the same. That is a general law of our intellectual life” (p. xxiv). Gadamer noted that historical self-transparency becomes lost, so the pursuit of knowledge ends up taken in by vogue concepts at the time more so than “the furthering of an event that goes far back” (p. xxiv). The movement of critical perspectives noted within Hollinshead’s unfolding conceptualizations about worldmaking agency and authority is arguably a move by him—and by other applied critical theorists in Tourism Studies such as Echtner and Jamal (1997); Franklin (2004); Coles, Hall, and Duval (2006); and Tribe (2006)—to reclaim a tier of historical self-transparency that continued to be overshadowed (during

the 1970s/1980s/1990s/early 2000s) by the sorts of vogue managerialist and prescriptivist concepts that have seemingly dominated thought and praxis in and across Tourism Studies. Thus, the arguments put forward in this critical review can therefore be considered as an attempt to further such conceptualizations about the normalizing production power of tourism but to more appropriately contextualize them in the specific and undermonitored, but very large, critical realm of domestic tourism.

Acknowledgments

This article is based on work funded by the Desert Knowledge Co-operative Research Centre, Australia. Dr. Jacobsen is an Aboriginal man descended from the Bulgun Warra clan of the Western Yalanji People in Far North Queensland, Australia.

Reviews Editor Endnote

This review article from Damien Jacobsen raises several important points about the productive, projective, and performative reach of tourism. Readers of *Tourism Analysis* who wish to offer short critical commentaries on what Jacobsen covers are invited to send short (1,000 word maximum) critical reflections on what he says or does not say. Such critical reflections are particularly invited on the following areas of understanding and contestation:

- on “philosophical interpretations” of and about tourism (after, e.g., Dostal/Gadamer/Goodman/Heidegger),
- on generalized “emerging critical interpretations” of and about tourism (after, e.g., Franklin/Meethan/Pernecky/Steiner/Reisinger), and
- on specific areas of the worldmaking agency and authority of tourism (on, e.g., the reach of history through tourism/the force of language within tourism/the performative influence of tourism/the imaginative parameters of tourism/tourism as a site of experience/tourism as an instrument of dialogue).

Interested commentators should send their short critical commentaries on one of the above specific topics or issues to Keith Hollinshead (Reviews Editor, *Tourism Analysis*) at khdeva@btopenworld.com

Commentaries longer than 1,000 words will not normally be considered.

References

- Aramberri, J. (2004). Domestic tourism in Asia: Some ruffle and flourish for a neglected relation. *Tourism Recreation Research*, 29(2), 1–11.
- Ateljevic, I., Hollinshead, K., & Ali, N. (2009). Tourism and worldmaking—Where do we go from here? [Special Issue Endnote]. *Tourism Geographies*, 11(4), 546–552.
- Bernstein, R. J. (2008). The conversation that never happened (Gadamer/Derrida). *The Review of Metaphysics*, 61(3), 577–603.
- Bernstein, R. J. (2010). The spectre haunting multiculturalism. *Philosophy & Social Criticism*, 36(3–4), 381–394.
- Caton, K. (2013). The risky business of understanding: Philosophical hermeneutics and the knowing subject in worldmaking. *Tourism Analysis*, 18(3), 341–351.
- Coles, T., Hall, C. M., & Duval, D. (2006). Tourism and postdisciplinary enquiry. *Current Issues in Tourism*, 9(4–5), 293–319.
- Critchley, S. (2001). *Continental philosophy: A very short introduction*. Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.
- Croucher, S. L. (2003). Perpetual imagining: Nationhood in a global era. *International Studies Review*, 5(1), 1–24.
- Di Cesare, D. (2004). Stars and constellations: The difference between Gadamer and Derrida. *Research in Phenomenology*, 34, 73–102.
- Dostal, R. J. (1987). The world never lost: The hermeneutics of trust. *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research*, 47(3), 413–434.
- Dostal, R. J. (1992). Friendship and politics: Heidegger's failing. *Political Theory*, 20(3), 399–423.
- Dostal, R. J. (2002). Gadamer's relation to Heidegger and phenomenology. In R. J. Dostal (Ed.), *The Cambridge companion to Gadamer* (pp. 247–266). New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Echtner, C. M., & Jamal, T. B. (1997). The disciplinary dilemma of tourism studies. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 24(4), 868–884.
- Elgin, C. Z. (2001). The legacy of Nelson Goodman. *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research*, 62(3), 679–690.
- Feldman, S. M. (2005). The problem of critique: Triangulating Habermas, Derrida, and Gadamer within metamodernism. *Contemporary Political Theory*, 4, 296–320.
- Franklin, A. (2004). Tourism as ordering: Towards a new ontology of tourism. *Tourist Studies*, 4(3), 277–301.
- Gadamer, H.-G. (1985). *Truth and method*. New York, NY: Crossroad Publishing.
- Gadamer, H.-G. (2006). Classical and philosophical hermeneutics. *Theory Culture Society*, 23(29), 29–56.
- Gadamer, H.-G., & Grondin, J. (2006). Looking back with Gadamer over his writings and their effective history: A dialogue with Jean Grondin (1996). *Theory Culture Society*, 23, 85–100.
- Goodman, N. (1978). *Ways of worldmaking*. Brighton, England: Harvester Press.
- Goulding, C., & Domic, D. (2008). Heritage, identity and ideological manipulation: The case of Croatia. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 36(1), 85–102.
- Guignon, C. B. (1986). On saving Heidegger from Rorty. *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research*, 46(3), 401–417.
- Heidegger, M. (1962). *Being and time*. Malden, MA: Blackwell. (Original work published 1927)
- Hollinshead, K. (1999). Surveillance of the worlds of tourism: Foucault and the eye-of-power. *Tourism Management*, 20, 7–23.
- Hollinshead, K. (2002). *Tourism and the making of the world: Tourism and the dynamics of our contemporary tribal lives* [Honors Excellence Lecture]. Florida International University, Miami.
- Hollinshead, K. (2004). Tourism and the new sense: Worldmaking and the enunciative value of tourism. In C. M. Hall & H. Tucker (Eds.), *Tourism and postcolonialism: Contested discourse, identities and representations* (pp. 25–42). London, England: Routledge.
- Hollinshead, K. (2009a). Tourism and the social production of culture and place: Critical conceptualizations on the projection of location. *Tourism Analysis*, 13(5–6), 639–660.
- Hollinshead, K. (2009b). The “worldmaking” prodigy of tourism: The reach and power of tourism in the dynamics of change and transformation. *Tourism Analysis*, 14(1), 139–152.
- Hollinshead, K., Ateljevic, I., & Ali, N. (2009). Introduction, worldmaking agency—worldmaking authority: The sovereign constitutive role of tourism. *Tourism Geographies*, 11(4), 427–443.
- Jacobsen, D. (2016). *Being through domestic tourism: Some insights from Central Australia*. Manuscript submitted for publication.
- Kinsella, E. A. (2006). Hermeneutics and critical hermeneutics: Exploring possibilities within the art of interpretation. *Forum: Qualitative Social Research*, 7(3), 19.
- Lammi, W. (1991). Hans-Georg Gadamer's “correction” of Heidegger. *Journal of the History of Ideas*, 52(3), 487–507.
- McIntosh, A. J., & Prentice, R. C. (1999). Affirming authenticity: Consuming cultural heritage. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 26(3), 589–612.
- Meethan, K. (2001). *Tourism in global society: Place, culture, and consumption*. Basingstoke, England: Palgrave.
- Opp, K.-D. (2005). Decline of the nation state? How the European Union creates national and sub-national identifications. *Social Forces*, 84(2), 653–680.
- Overing, J. (1990). The shaman as a maker of worlds: Nelson Goodman in the Amazon. *Man*, 25(4), 602–619.
- Palmer, C. (1999). Tourism and the symbols of identity. *Tourism Management*, 20, 313–321.
- Panjabi, S. (2009). From the center to the margin: Tourism and conflict in Kashmir. In T. Winter, P. Teo, & T. C. Chang (Eds.), *Asia on tour: Exploring the rise of Asian tourism* (pp. 223–238). Oxford, England: Routledge.

- Pernecky, T. (2010). The being of tourism. *The Journal of Tourism and Peace Research*, 1(1), 1–15.
- Salem-Wiseman, J. (2003). Heidegger's Dasein and the liberal conception of the self. *Political Theory*, 31(4), 533–557.
- Sheldon, P., & Dwyer, L. (2010). The global financial crisis and tourism: Perspectives of the academy. *Journal of Travel Research*, 49(1), 3–4.
- Singh, S. (2009). Domestic tourism: Searching for an Asianic perspective. In S. Singh (Ed.), *Domestic tourism in Asia: Diversity and divergence* (pp. 1–25). Sterling, VA: Earthscan Publications.
- Singh, S., & Krakover, S. (2015). Homeland entitlement: Perspectives of Israeli domestic tourists. *Journal of Travel Research*, 54(2), 222–233.
- Spennemann, D. H. R., Clancy, L., & Thwaites, R. (2006). An exploration of the public face of indigenous cultural tourism in Australia. *Journal of Vacation Marketing*, 13(3), 239–259.
- Steiner, C. J., & Reisinger, Y. (2006). Understanding existential authenticity. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 33(2), 299–318.
- Swain, M. B. (2009). The cosmopolitan hope of tourism: Critical action and worldmaking vistas. *Tourism Geographies*, 11(4), 505–525.
- Towner, J. (1985). The Grand Tour: A key phase in the history of tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 12(3), 297–333.
- Tribe, J. (2006). The truth about tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 33(2), 360–381.
- Tucker, H. (2009). Recognizing emotion and its postcolonial potentialities: Discomfort and shame in a tourism encounter in Turkey. *Tourism Geographies*, 11(4), 444–461.
- Urry, J. (2002). *The tourist gaze* (2nd ed.). London, England: Sage.
- Wachterhauser, B. (2002). Getting it right: Relativism, realism and truth. In R. J. Dostal (Ed.), *The Cambridge companion to Gadamer* (pp. 52–78). New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Wang, N. (1999). Rethinking authenticity in tourism experience. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 26(2), 349–370.
- Weinsheimer, J. C. (1985). *Gadamer's hermeneutics: A reading of truth and method*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Copyright of Tourism Analysis is the property of Cognizant Communication Corporation and its content may not be copied or emailed to multiple sites or posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's express written permission. However, users may print, download, or email articles for individual use.