

3. Tourism, Mobility Entitlements and the Condition of Freedom

As travel, changing locations, and leaving home become central experiences for more and more people in modernity, the difference between the ways we travel, the reasons for our movements, and the terms of our participation in this dynamic must be historically and politically accounted for.

(Kaplan 1996: 102)

Social and cultural-based citizenship claims or entitlements, though politically and ethically desirable, are often denied to those individuals and communities who are economically marginalized and politically disenfranchised. This chapter conceptualizes the diverse and contradictory interpretations of freedom that have helped to frame and reinforce the right to travel and be a tourist. It considers how ideas of freedom shaped early aspirations and forms of travel under colonialism, paving the way for the emergence of a taken-for-granted culture of mobility in Western industrialized societies prior to and after the Second World War. As the wealth and the capacity for international travel expanded during the emergence of a post-war liberal capitalist order, international tourism soon became a celebration of individual autonomy and freedom, as well as beacon of economic modernization for ‘developing’ countries desperate to move up the ladder of development in the aftermath of colonialism. This chapter explores the transformation of international tourism from its association with post-war ideals, notably modernization and the economic progress of developing nations, to its association with discourses of market individualism and the unfettered right to travel. The discussion draws attention to the alignment between tourism and market-based renderings of citizens as consumers, and questions the degree to which the rights and freedoms to travel can ever be distributed in an evenly and equitable manner within and across states.

Travel – The Perfect Freedom

In many ways, tourism represents a quintessential postmodern pursuit, an expression of humanity’s ‘natural’ desire for freedom, exploration and discovery. In the age of mass mobility, globalization and neoliberalism, international tourism evokes notions of freedom and democracy as well as a range of more self-oriented interests: individual choice, social status, hedonism and self-actualization. During the height of the Cold War, the slogan

adopted by the United States Travel and Tourism Administration was ‘travel, the perfect freedom’ (Richter 2000 [1989]: 6). However, the freedoms associated with one’s mobility and movement are politically ambiguous and unequally distributed. As Smith and Duffy (2003: 2) note, ‘the freedoms we associate with ‘progress’, including ‘free time’ and the freedom to travel, are part and parcel of a society that is ever more ordered and regulated’. Whether it represents a medium of escape from society or workplace, or an ideological expression of political freedom, tourism still evokes a myriad of interpretations and constructions of freedom. Often, however, there is a strong libertarian streak running through tourism discourses. This is demonstrated by Butcher (2003) whose reflection on tourism, freedom and ethics, deplores any attempt by non-government organizations and other arbiters of morality to promote a ‘New Moral Tourism’. He thus forcefully argues against the imposition of ethical standards on tourism and the moral regulation of our freedom to travel, stating:

Tourism need only be about enjoyment, and requires no other justification. As for moralising about tourist behaviour, how these people choose to enjoy themselves is a matter for them. (Butcher 2003:12)

Except for the presentation of a valid passport and/or visa to the agents of border security, it is unlikely that few tourists think about the origins and substance of the freedoms enabling them to travel across international borders with little hindrance. Although these freedoms are far from being universally entrenched, a taken-for-granted culture of tourism mobility has embedded itself in advanced capitalist societies, and increasingly amongst the better-off inhabitants of emerging economies. Such ideas reach their apex amongst the citizens of North America, for whom travel ‘is a primary activity of existence and not a sign of distinct progress’ (Urry 2013: 61). Ironically, however, according to the US State Department, in 2012 there were only 113.4 million US passports in circulation, approximately one-third of the total population (US Department of State 2013a). Nonetheless, such is the pervasive nature of discourses proclaiming our right to travel and visit wherever we choose that, with the exception of a few tightly controlled states and regions, international tourism is no longer perceived to be a privilege but one amongst many rights to which all citizens are entitled in a globalizing world of mobile consumers. The following statement from the UNWTO, warning governments not to tamper with the freedom to travel despite the global pandemic of swine flu in the summer of 2009, makes this stance very clear:

The Committee reaffirmed its view that the respect of human rights, of non-discrimination and of freedom of movement are fundamental values inherent to tourism and are pre-requisites for any successful tourism activity. (UNWTO 2009)

The extent to which the right to travel is regarded as sacrosanct by citizens of advanced capitalist states is often brought to the fore in the context of a ‘mobility crisis’. The sense of entitlement to foreign travel in the West was manifest in the response to the closure of European airspace in 2010 due to the Icelandic volcanic eruptions, as well as the disruption to cross-Channel Eurostar trains due to heavy snowfall in December 2009. The gravity of the public response was sardonically summarised by the *Observer* columnist, David Mitchell: ‘stranded holidaymakers are spoken to, and behave, like victims of an atrocity’ (2009: 32). The sense of entitlement to the freedom of mobility was further illustrated by complaints over the disruption to the usual ‘fast track’ treatment accorded to first and business class passengers at London’s Heathrow airport, which resulted from the national strike by public sector workers in the UK in June 2011 (which included UK Border Agency staff) (Evening Standard 2011). Further to the freedom of mobility upon which international travel depends, tourism gives expression to a sense of personal freedom or liberation (i.e. from tradition and cultural expectations) and the cultivation of one’s sense of self. According to Przeclawski (1988: 6):

Tourism constitutes one of the ways of realizing the desire for freedom, and the possibility to make a choice, so important for the subjectiveness of contemporary man [sic].

Although Przeclawski was writing prior to the end of the Cold War these discourses became even more pronounced during the era of neoliberal globalization and increased cross-border mobility. Urry (1995: 165) notes that in the West the ‘right to travel has become a marker of citizenship’. Such rights brings with them claims to consume a variety of cultures and environments, including those sites and attractions deemed to be of global significance, notably the UNESCO World Heritage Sites (Urry 2000: 174).

Privileged Freedoms: From Colonial to Post-Colonial Travel

The nation-state provided the conditions for capitalist industrialization and colonial

exploitation of the labour and resources of colonised societies, including strategic energy reserves. It was responsible for the emergence and indeed stratification of significantly larger flows of international travellers and tourists in the second half of the twentieth century. Colonialism and the ensuing integration of non-European societies into the mainstream of modernity provided a springboard for the development of tourism in a number of colonies and associated enclaves of privileged luxury, from Mexico and the Caribbean to North and East Africa and the South Pacific.

One cannot ignore the fact that the evolution of international tourism in many ‘Third World’ countries was strongly associated with expanding web of European colonial influence in the nineteenth century. Subsequently, as the post-war architecture of ‘neo-colonial’ enclave tourism began to take shape, a number of writers argued that tourism was tantamount to a form of imperialism or neo-colonialism (e.g. Britton, 1982; Kent 1977; Turner and Ash 1975). While it is no longer valid to speak of a rigid ‘north-south’ divide in the globalizing political economy of international tourism, certain contemporary forms of travel do evoke an element of colonial nostalgia that is reminiscent of Edward Said’s (1978) celebrated analysis of Orientalism. Even the names of certain up-market travel companies, such as *Coromandel* and *Voyages Jules Verne*, evoke the ‘simplicity’ and ‘luxury’ of colonial times; when travel was unencumbered by notions of rights, freedoms, ethics and responsibilities.

International tourism also manifests ‘civilizing’ discourses that emphasize the need for social advancement and economic progress. Such discourses involving ‘tourism as an instrument for development’ (De Kadt 1979), ‘tourism as peace’ (D’Amore 1988), ‘sustainable tourism’ (Mowforth and Munt 2009) and even ‘ethical’ or ‘responsible tourism’ (see Chapter Six), serve in different ways to render ‘peripheral’ (non-Western) societies approachable for travelers to experience ‘exotic’ foreign locales while simultaneously extending the offer of well meaning assistance. Increasingly, wealthy tourists are encouraged to indulge in the opulence of up-market eco-lodges for the purposes of achieving altruistic aims (*Observer* 2006). By doing so they are able to generate benefits for conservation efforts and impoverished local communities, averting any guilt associated with such indulgences. That is not to say there is anything inherently wrong with these initiatives. Rather, it points to an increasing trend within twenty-first century political landscapes, as well as within certain ‘ethical travel’ niches, whereby solutions to complex problems of poverty, inequality and a lack of development can be solved by exhorting wealthy tourists to consume even more

luxury, while doing little to alter the fundamental values and organizing logic of neoliberal capitalism. Chapter Six will explore in more detail the contradictions embedded within these tourism development scenarios.

Pratt's (2008) analysis of the writings of Victorian explorers draws parallels between the dehumanizing arrogance with which they consumed and ultimately appropriated the landscape unfolding before them, and certain contemporary Western travelogues in which the postcolonial 'Third World' landscape exists without history, and one might add, agency. Pratt's analysis thus asserts that the traveller, traditionally male, has relative autonomy and visual command over the landscape. Appropriately, Minh-ha (1994: 22) claims:

For cultures whose expansion and dominance were intimately dependent upon the colonial enterprise, travelling as part of a system of foreign investment by metropolitan powers has largely been a form of culture-collecting aimed at world hegemony.

In the very act of 'opening up' 'new' territories travel served to immobilize other peoples, who were depicted as 'timeless' while being simultaneously disconnected from the injustices of the colonial enterprise (Pratt 2008: 213).¹ Clifford (1992: 106-107) observes how 'bourgeois travellers' during the Victorian period enjoyed the status of 'proper travellers', unlike their servants and guides ('non-white persons') whose achievements often went unrecorded. In the popular Western imagination, the 'imperialistic' endeavours of those such as Christopher Columbus, James Cook and Marco Polo dominate historical accounts of pioneering and adventurous forms of travel, ignoring the contribution of travellers from both earlier 'pre-modern' times as well as the travel experiences of the wealthier or privileged subjects of colonized societies themselves. Moreover, well before these infamous travellers undertook their respective voyages, Herodotus had already documented the numerous festivals to which Egyptians would travel several times year (Cassen 1994: 31). Nor can the practise of modern leisure travel be traced exclusively to the rise of European modernity and the 'Grand Tour', which took place from the period of the Renaissance onwards (Turner and Ash 1975: 29-50). For instance, the travel expeditions of such non-European explorers as Zhou Dagan and the Islamic traveller-scholar, Ibn Battutah, have largely gone unacknowledged in the wider canon of Western literature and travel writings. Moroccan born Battutah spent thirty years (1325-54) of his life travelling throughout the Muslim world and

other non-Muslim countries, visiting such a variety places as Mecca, Persia, Mesopotamia, Asia Minor, Bokhara, India, China, Sumatra, southern Spain and North Africa (Dunn 2004). The writings of Arab, Chinese and Indian explorers and scholars serve to illustrate ways in which other societies and customs function from a non-Eurocentric world-view (Khair *et al.* 2005). Latin American writers and travellers, for instance, were keen on interpreting the fraught and difficult relationships between peripheral and European modernities (Pratt 2008).

For centuries, the ritual obligations of travel and hospitality have been associated with pilgrimages to the Holy Land and a multiplicity of other sites worldwide that are part of the sacred geography of religious travel. As Inayatullah (1995: 411) notes, ‘Muslims had to travel’ in order to make the annual pilgrimage to Mecca, a practice still held sacred amongst Muslim populations around the world. Referring to Ibn Battutah, Inayatallah goes on to state that ‘the accumulation of wisdom or *ilm*, was the essence of Islam’ and was intrinsically linked to ‘the spiritual journey of the Self’ (1995: 412). However, such travel was not restricted to Muslim holy sites. The principal motivation behind Battutah’s travels was to ‘discover differences’ (1995: 412), presaging certain aspects of the Grand Tour some four hundred or so years later. Another type of journey historically grounded in the Islamic world is the ‘Ziyara’, which is associated with visiting auspicious places and sites of religiosity (shrines and mosques), and travelling to places to meet religious scholars or to participate in religious events and festivals (Haq and Wong 2010).

A great deal of travel during colonial times nevertheless presupposed the enterprise of conquest and the worldwide expansion of trade and commerce from the fifteenth century onwards. This enabled individuals with the financial means and appropriate social status to take part in the privileges of travel, especially to experience the pleasures foreign cultures in ways that would profoundly shape the intellectual and cultural life of modern European societies for centuries to come. The colonial period would also mark the birth of travel as an engine of social, economic and cultural change. During the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, notions of cosmopolitanism came to be very much associated with and defined by the foreign travels of aristocratic men who would travel abroad in order to acquire the necessary knowledge and cultural capital expected of the ruling elite. Their ‘superior’ social status determined their desire and ability to attain the rich trappings of ‘cosmopolitanism’, which was also of course marked by an intrinsic sense of entitlement. The lives of male voyagers, scholars, missionaries and adventurers feature disproportionately in historical

accounts of travel. The racially imperious position of the superiority of the white European traveller was highly prevalent in the Western imagination and popular culture, firmly depicted in Daniel Defoe's (1972) novel, *Robinson Crusoe*, originally published in 1719. His story of a shipwrecked Crusoe subduing the hostile environment through a rational and enlightened mind, and a natural ability to civilize the noble savage, perhaps typifies the racial and patriarchal conception of Western voyages and adventures in conquering other territories and societies. Indeed, Clifford notes that travel metaphors were often constructed on the basis that women were not historically perceived to be earnest travellers: "'Good travel' (heroic, educational, scientific, adventurous, ennobling) is something men (should) do. Women are impeded from serious travel' (1992: 105). Leed perceives the history of travel as a 'spermatic journey', which has been classically constructed through 'myths of traveling gods, heroes, and patriarchs' (1991: 114). He also states:

The erotics of arrival are predicated on certain realities in the history of travel: the sessility of women; the mobility of men; the uncertainty and contingency of the relations formed between them in arrival...In the conditions of settlement and civility, travel is 'genderized' and becomes a 'gendering' activity, underlining a difference between men and women. Historically, men have traveled and women have not, or have traveled only under the aegis of men, an arrangement that has defined the sexual relations in arrivals as the absorption of the stranger- often young, often male – within a nativizing female ground (Leed 1991: 113).

However, women do travel and have travelled for centuries. One notable traveller was Celia Fiennes (2009), an upper-class English woman who undertook a series of excursions in England and Scotland from 1685 to 1703. She travelled by horseback and wrote about various sites, scenes, places and experiences. Fiennes presented firsthand accounts of social and domestic life in the late seventeenth century, drawing attention to the production and manufacturing activities of each locale that she visited, such as tin mining in Cornwall, pottery production in Staffordshire, and cheese making in Cheshire. Her travel narratives reflect a sense of national pride, with the implication that foreign sites (glorified by the Grand Tour) were often over-rated, where there was much to learn from domestic travel. Fiennes is the first recorded woman to visit every county in England, journeying at a time when travel was arduous and not without risk. The predatory activities of the notorious 'highwaymen' of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries (see Billett 1997) produced some sense trepidation for the independent traveler, especially for those who travelled without a protective entourage. Yet despite her accomplishment and gallantry, Fiennes, the granddaughter of

William Fiennes, 1st Viscount Saye and Sele, recorded the lives and lifestyles of the less affluent populations in the north of England and Scotland in ways which castigated these impoverished communities for their indolence. In her journey into Scotland, for instance, she writes:

... it seems there are very few towns except Edenborough Abberdeen and Kerk which can give better treatment to strangers, therefore for the most part persons that travel there go from one Noblemans house to another; those houses are all kind of Castles and they live great, tho' in so nasty a way, as all things are even in those houses, one has little stomach to eate or use any thing as I have been told by some that has travell'd there; and I am sure I met with a sample of it enough to discourage my progress farther in Scotland; I attribute it wholly to their sloth for I see they sitt and do little – I think there were one or two at last did take spinning in hand at a lazy way; thence I tooke my fish to carry it to a place for the English to dress it... (Fiennes 2009: 38).

Byron was reported to have said that 'to travel is to become a man of the world' (cited in Boorstin 1963: 91). Samuel Johnson apparently stated that 'a man who has not been to Italy, is always conscious of an inferiority, from his not having seen what is expected that a man should see' (Löfgren 2002: 157). By the late eighteenth and early nineteenth century the Grand Tour's aristocratic travelers were joined by the middle classes, who were to 'man' the outposts of Britain's colonial empire and spend their rising incomes on touristic adventures. Many of them became considerably knowledgeable and attached to the customs and societies of which they were sent to rule. Such figures as Richard Burton and most notably Warren Hastings, the first Governor-General of colonized Bengal, epitomized notions of nineteenth century 'elitist cosmopolitanism', whereby their unquestionable fascination with other cultures, religions and customs, and indeed fluency in many languages (Hastings spoke Persian and Urdu, for instance), did not appear to contradict their in-built assumptions of racial superiority (Appiah 2006: 1-8).

Women's limited ability to benefit from the kind of freedom of movement that men enjoyed can be understood by reference to the 'flâneur'. This concept signifies the capacity of the opportune and almost fearless male urbanite to stroll and observe the proliferation of public places of leisure and pleasure in the nineteenth century. Wilson (1995) exposes the masculine nature of this construct:

It is this flâneur, the flâneur as a man of pleasure, as a man who takes visual

possession of the city, who has emerged in postmodern feminised discourse as the embodiment of the 'male gaze'. He represents men's visual and voyeuristic mastery over women. According to this view, the flâneur's freedom to wander at will through the city is essentially a masculine freedom. Thus the very idea of the flâneur reveals it to be a masculine concept (cited in Wearing and Wearing, 1996: 233).

Nonetheless, renowned women travellers in the Victorian era periodically surfaced to contest male space and emphasize the rights of women to experience the trials and tribulations (and pleasures!) of travel, as epitomized by Mary Kingsley and Mary Hall's expeditions in various parts of Africa and Gertrude Bell's journey's in the Middle East (see Birkett 1991). Although the testimonies of various women travellers suggests that it may be possible to contest to some degree the gendered nature of the history of tourism and travel, race and class remain crucial determinants of people's ability and right to travel. In Hall's (1907) account of her travel experiences in Africa and Egypt, for instance, there are references to comfortable hotels, luxurious trains and obedient porters. Birkett's (1991: 125) evaluation of Victorian women travellers indicates that racial authority often surpasses gender as an all-defining attribute in the host and guest relationship:

As women travelers frequently pointed to the continuities and similarities with earlier European male travelers, the supremacy of distinctions of race above those of sex allowed them to take little account of their one obvious difference from these forebears- the fact that they were female.

As the cost of maritime travel fell with the advent of steam ships in the mid-nineteenth century, recreational travel received a significant boost alongside the expansion and intensification of colonial trade, incorporating, for example, the 'Mediterranean Atlantic' (*i.e.* Canary Islands and Madeira) into the orbit of European modernity (Wolf 1982: 293). Colonialism not only provided a vector through which new ideas of cosmopolitanism were forged and transmitted, it also provided the launching pad for the growth of an informal network of urban quarters and enclaves populated by transient and permanent communities of foreigners. By the early twentieth century, particularly during the inter-war period, bohemians, artists and members of the European intelligentsia were attracted to a growing number of foreign-dominated enclaves, thus giving rise to 'new types of citizenship' (Rojek 1998: 303). Alongside the foreign residents and seasonal visitors, certain privileged members of the local elite were integrated into the cosmopolitan spaces of leisure and emancipated living, which germinated in these colonial outposts. However, the terms and standards put in

place by the governing colonial powers often mediated and restricted their level of involvement.

One of the most well known cosmopolitan spaces was the Moroccan city of Tangiers, designated as an ‘international zone’ between 1912 and 1956 and jointly administered by the colonial powers of Britain, France and Spain. Amongst the noted artistic figures who visited Tangier at that time were the American author Paul Bowles and the ‘beat poets’, William Burroughs, Allen Ginsburg and Jack Kerouac, for whom the freedom to cross geographical, cultural and moral boundaries was intrinsic to their writings. The presence of these ‘hipsters’ in such far-flung colonies illustrates the archetypal adventurous traveller seeking to escape the shackles of stifling materialism and bourgeois conformity, that was characteristic of a later phase of international travel promoted by the new generation of travel guides from the late 1950s (Endy 2004: 136). As Rojek (1998) points out, these spaces offered levels of anonymity and license for the kinds of emancipated lifestyles often associated with activities that would have attracted moral censorship in the participants’ home environments. Colonial powers often permitted licentious behaviour, though the privileges were available to all but a few members of the local elite. This resulted in acerbic condemnation from members of the ‘Third World’ intelligentsia. Franz Fanon, for instance, was critical of ‘Third World’ countries for subordinating themselves to the leisured desires of the metropole, claiming:

The national bourgeoisie will be greatly helped on its way towards decadence by the Western bourgeoisies, who come to it as tourists avid for the exotic, for big game hunting and for casinos. The national bourgeoisie organises centres of rest and relaxation and pleasure resorts to meet the needs of the Western bourgeoisie. (Fanon 1968: 153)

Following de-colonization in the post-war period, tourism became enmeshed within the process of ‘Third World’ nation-building and the emergent ‘developmental system’ (Curtis 2003). This reflected the strategy of the major powers to export Western-inspired models of development to low-income states. Tourism was thus also a conduit through which newly independent states in the ‘Third World’ sought to forge new models of citizenship out of the ashes of the colonial state. However, from the 1970s and early 1980s there was a rapid realization that tourism was not a panacea for independence or autonomous development, reflecting continued levels of dependency and (neo) colonial relations. Nonetheless, it was not only academic critiques that were responsible for this realization but indeed willful

political leaders of progressive third world states that made these concerns abundantly clear. The leader of Grenada's People's Revolutionary Government (1979-1983), Maurice Bishop, believed that because tourism was predominantly foreign controlled and owned: '... it brought with it a number of distinct socio-cultural and environmental hazards such as the race question and undesirable social and economic patterns ...' (Bishop 1983:71).

The relationship between freedom and mobility rights was given practical scope via the uneven development of different forms of travel throughout the twentieth century. For 'drifter-tourists' of the 1960s (Cohen, E. 1972, 1973), for instance, the desire to be free from the constraints of bourgeois family life and career expectations, and the empty materialism of (Western) industrial capitalist society, acted as a strong impetus embark on the infamous 'hippy trail'. In contrast to hobos and tramps (Allsop 1967), this new 'class' of drifter-tourists normally comprised of college-educated individuals from comfortable middle-class backgrounds (Cohen, E. 1972: 176). Their rejection of conventional modes of travel and existence reflected the emergence of a counter-culture that had begun to take shape in the heart of a number of Western liberal-capitalist democracies.

Ironically, it was the political freedoms and rising prosperity within such societies that underpinned the growing sense of entitlement amongst these discontented youth travelers in as much as it also enabled the growth of international travel amongst a new generation of working and middle class tourists alike. Although many early travellers on the 'hippy trail' were adamant that they were on a spiritual journey (McGrath 2000: 10), it was precisely the changes brought about by post-war economic development and the rising prosperity of the middle classes in Western capitalist democracies that fuelled individualized aspirations to travel overseas. Significant improvements in transport technologies, principally aviation, were also facilitating factors. However, as Urry (2013) observes, none of this would have been possible without securing access to the plentiful supplies of cheap oil, which for the past decade literally powered the development and globalization of carbon-fuelled economies, notably in the US and Europe. The benefits of such carbon-fuelled economics disproportionately accrued to the citizens of the US and Europe, including of course the possibility for living mobile lives and participating in overseas travel.

Although the 'hippy trail' and other off-beat forms of 'drifter tourism' provided a convenient outlet for expressing a self-centred discontent with the prevailing norms of bourgeois

capitalist society, especially amongst sections of Western youth, such travel was premised upon deep inequalities and highly unequal flows of mobility prevalent at the time. While international travel has to some extent become more widespread, such contradictions continue to be echoed through a range of contemporary forms of tourism: from ‘neo-hippy’ hedonistic forms of tourism in Goa to up-market wellness tourism, and even certain forms of ‘ethical travel’ and volunteering. That is not to say that such tourists move in the same circles as the globally mobile elites discussed in Chapter Two. Nevertheless, their mobilities manifest many of the contradictory meanings and interpretations of freedom that circulate throughout various arenas of tourism consumption. As identified by Higgins-Desbiolles (2006a) and as will be discussed in further detail in Chapter Six, although certain contemporary forms of niche travel are underpinned by a global and/or cosmopolitan outlook they are also marked by a series of unresolved tensions. On the one hand, travel may be seen as a social force and marker of global citizenship, while on the other, it has become an increasingly marketized commodity framed by neoliberal values that is moreover, premised upon having the ‘right credentials’ for travel.

Mobility Entitlements, Travel and Citizenship

The wide-ranging transformations in the organization and structures of the international tourism industries - brought about by globalization, neoliberal capitalism and technological change - have rendered just about anywhere on the planet accessible. Accordingly, international travel has become an altogether more corporate, institutionalized and pervasive activity, encompassed within the worldwide reach of multinational corporations and profit-driven enterprises. Such is the pervasiveness of mobility that Holzapfel (2010: 14) argues that a ‘distance-intensive lifestyle’, based on the ‘constant availability and spatial accessibility of people and products’, has become taken-for-granted amongst the inhabitants of modern capitalist societies. Frequent flyer programs and hotel loyalty schemes epitomize privileged access to lifestyles of permanent and seamless mobility, available to a minority of globally mobile peoples and reflecting subtle forms of differentiated mobility. Many airline loyalty schemes now enable the fast-track passage of their members through customs and immigration. While these schemes are theoretically open to all travellers based on the ability to pay, such as the ‘Registered Traveler’ programme in the United States, additional security clearance is granted by the state which then enables participants to access high-speed lanes in

addition to those used by frequent flyers (Coles 2008a: 66). Increasingly then, asymmetrical flows of cross-border mobility do not just express differences in wealth and income, but rather go to the heart of contemporary questions regarding the meaning of citizenship in a networked, mobile and globalized society.

Despite the apparent democratization of travel heralded by the continued growth and worldwide expansion of international tourist arrivals, particularly in the emerging economies of the 'south', international travel continues to unfold in a differentiated and unequal manner. As indicated in the introductory chapter, global tourism encapsulates the contradictory forces of mobility and freedom on the one hand and immobility and disenfranchisement on the other. For Bauman (1998: 2), 'being local in a globalised world is a sign of social deprivation and degradation'. The tourist is often accorded a heightened social status, exemplified and reinforced through the various promotional discourses that continue to circulate throughout a variety of tourism contexts: from up-market niche operators to mass-market resort providers. While tourism may not be plagued by the kind of subservience and servility that was common in the 1960s and 1970s, although evidence of inferior working conditions in the tourism industries still abounds (see Beddoe 2004; ILO 2010: 14-18), the whims and desires of tourists must continuously be catered for. Some tourists can engage in role-reversal experiences and liberated encounters during their holidays, which are not always available in everyday life. Graburn (1989: 28) informatively notes:

Because the tourist journey lies in the nonordinary sphere of existence, the goal is symbolically sacred and morally on a higher plan than the regards of the ordinary workaday world.

Therefore, to be a tourist represents an ability to access a range of mobility privileges that are beyond the reach of many in host societies within impoverished parts of the world, as well as a large proportion of the unemployed and deprived members of population in developed capitalist economies. This point reinforces the claim that those who cannot afford to partake in tourism, or for whatever reason have their mobility freedoms curtailed, are prevented from actively enjoying the manifold benefits that tourism brings, in particular the citizenship 'rights' that accrue by virtue of being mobile.

Indeed, such is the potency of mobility as a symbol of privileged status and citizenship rights,

that in some cases, the travel entitlements of privileged members of society, particularly public servants and politicians, may become the subject of media scrutiny or indeed, the target of public opprobrium. Recently, the practice of accepting free holidays or accommodation from high-ranking politicians and wealthy citizens in other states by a number of senior European politicians has drawn widespread condemnation. Keen to be seen as responsive to citizens' concerns at a time of economic recession, governments responded to this apparent holiday 'gravy train' by addressing the manner in which politicians and government representatives took foreign trips. In early 2011, former President Nicolas Sarkozy (2007-2012) publically announced that ministers should ensure that all future overseas trips are fully authorized. This was a direct reaction to confessions by then French Prime Minister, who had accepted a New Year Nile holiday by the ousted Egyptian President, as well as the former Foreign Minister, who had travelled in a private plane financed by a Tunisian businessman. President Sarkozy also declared that holidays should be 'compatible with France's foreign policy', and that 'only by being above reproach will people holding high office strengthen their citizens' trust in the state institutions' (Telegraph 2011). The fact that these trips had taken place immediately prior to and during the 2011 'Arab Spring' uprisings makes this issue even more compelling, particularly at a time when the 'West' is supposedly keen to demonstrate the value of working towards principles of democracy, political transparency and openness. The response of the French premier thus illustrates the potent symbolic value of travel as a marker of privilege and citizenship. Even for the powerful, the 'right' to accept free travel and holidays as a form of diplomatic exchange, can quickly be curtailed when the political integrity of the state itself is at stake.

Besides constituting a mere marker of status and privilege, if tourism is to be perceived as a social necessity or benchmark of a 'civilized' life then the unfolding relationship between tourism and the differentiated axes of mobility has a number of implications for both existing and emergent understandings of citizenship. This is all the more significant in the light of the globalization of free markets and discourses of 'consumer citizenship', where rights are regarded by the apostles of neoliberalism and capitalist globalization as synonymous with the freedom to make personal consumer choices in the marketplace. Therefore, exclusion from the global marketplace of tourist consumption unequivocally implies a denial of twenty-first century citizenship rights.

MacCannell (1999: 159) indicates that the social pressure and need to travel in order to

escape daily boredom and routine implicates a common perception that those who are unable to travel or whose freedoms to travel are curtailed, are somehow *inferior* to those who travel on a more regular basis. Subsequently, in the context of neoliberalism and globalized capitalism, where mobilities are a pervasive element of market societies and help sustain the wheels of a globalized economy, immobility has increasingly become a sign of social exclusion and deprivation; as discussed at length in chapter one. Bauman (1998: 96) suggests that the ‘vagabond’, a term he uses to describe the impoverished majority whose mobility is either coerced or not experienced at all, is a ‘flawed consumer’ who contributes nothing to ‘the prosperity of an economy turned into a tourist industry’. He thus draws attention to the conceptual distinction between ‘tourists’ and ‘vagabonds’, where the former refers to those who are able to travel at will to wherever they choose, and the latter to those forced to travel for reasons of economic necessity and/or fear of political persecution. While the ‘tourist pays for their freedom to disregard native concerns and feelings’ (Bauman 1993: 241), the *sans-papiers* and those fleeing persecution and economic hardship are actually ‘trapped in the imperative of mobility’ (Lyon 2008a: 44). The contrast between the ease of mobility of international tourists and the immobility of poor residents and clandestine migrants adjacent to tourism resorts, whether for political or economic reasons, can often be quite stark (see Smith 2007).

The distinctive symbolic and economic value attached to diverse modes of mobility is palpably illustrated by the negative perceptions and media treatment of ‘gypsies’, ‘asylum-seekers’ and ‘economic migrants’ in the UK, and in other parts of Europe, whose mobilities are seen as inferior to that of tourists, amongst others. Media-fuelled xenophobia and public disdain against the ‘flood’ of immigrants and asylum seekers exacerbates such conflict. This is exemplified by the reactions of the UK tabloid press towards the (existing and perceived) movements of ‘gypsies’ (see Fagge 2004), outbreaks of violence towards the Roma in Italy (Popham 2007), and Romanian immigrants in Northern Ireland (Henry and Smythe 2009). Further typecasting has surfaced through acerbic constructions of migrants as ‘citizenship tourists’ or ‘welfare tourists’, travelling and moving to countries with advanced welfare systems in order to parasitically claim ‘free’ benefits of all descriptions (Breen *et al.* 2006; Fagge 2004; Shipman 2013). Although tourists and impoverished migrants often find themselves moving through or indeed sharing the same destinations, they naturally experience quite different worlds of mobility and hospitality. Whether in the case of migrants

attempting to cross the narrow straits between Turkey and the Greek Island of Samos (Smith 2007), or the rough-sleeping migrants on the beaches and public squares of the Canary Islands, the unequal distribution of mobility rights is severe (*La Provincia* 2009).

Paradoxically, in the light of the above, 'Third World' communities are often simultaneously romanticized and pitied by tourists seeking out 'authentic' and 'exotic' experiences, as so brilliantly captured in the film *Cannibal Tours*, which depicts a group of up-market tourists on a voyage to see 'primitive' Papua New Guinean communities along the Sepik River (O'Rourke 1988). Such encounters constitute a form of tourism commonly known as 'ethnic tourism' (see Harron and Weiler 1992), a popular activity for those who wish to become familiar with the lifestyles of others and appreciate other ethnicities because of their perceived pristine nature, spirituality and cultural depth. The irony, however, relates to the way in which people from 'less developed' countries are converted into devalued subjects once they are seen as a threat and / or seek to enter 'developed' societies or indeed, their wealthier neighbours, as demonstrated by the persecution of migrant workers from Bangladesh and Burma in Thailand (Rahman 2009).

A further illustration of the chasm that exists between the world of the tourist and non-tourist concerns the politicized and ideological constructions of Mexicans seeking entry to the United States. Here, the popular conception is one of hordes of poor migrants or 'wetbacks', as they are derogatively known, seeking access to the employment opportunities and riches of the US at the expense of hard working (usually blue-collar) US citizens, whose livelihoods are threatened by such movements. The populist image of the Mexican migrant or stowaway supersedes any notion of the Mexican tourist or consumer, despite the fact that cross-border shopping by Mexicans in the US is an economically significant phenomenon. Perceptions of Mexicans as tourists, however, are in effect invisible and rendered problematic throughout countless media and cinematic portrayals as illegal migrant workers, if not criminals. However, Murià and Chávez (2011) recognize that, although Mexican labour is often subject to state surveillance, Mexican consumption rather than production (i.e. employment) is actually encouraged and facilitated. Market research companies and major retail outlets in San Diego often track affluent Tijuana residents, encouraging them to shop across the border through the production of sales information, coupons and discount offers. However, the authors suggest that US law consequently regulates the mobility of the residents in Tijuana by formulating a 'binary distinction between consumers and workers', which exposes the

economic disparities between the ‘rich and poor in the city’ (Murià and Chávez 2011: 370).

The justification for the special treatment of international tourists is thus commonly based on the somewhat dubious economic assumption that, while tourism always provides much needed wealth and employment to a host country, immigration almost always acts as a drain on economic resources and indeed a threat to ‘native’ cultural values. Despite such popular (mis)conceptions, there is evidence to suggest that migration can be of significant benefit to both the recipient countries as well as the sender countries. Mathers and Landau (2007) show how migrant labour has been a crucial ingredient in South Africa’s economic success in both the formal and informal sectors, not to mention the shoppers and traders who make up a substantial proportion of cross-border tourist traffic. Migration can also have cumulative benefits to home societies, as evidenced by the substantial flow of global migrant remittances worldwide. In 2011, World Bank figures calculated the value of global remittances to around US\$501 billion, an increase of 12.1 per cent from 2010. This amount represents nearly a half of the export income generated by inbound tourism, which also includes passenger transportation, which in 2011 was US\$1.2 trillion (UNWTO 2012: 2). Somewhat paradoxically, given their oft-hailed status as emerging powerhouse economies, of those countries reliant upon remittances for significant export revenues, India was the largest beneficiary at US\$62 billion, followed by China (US\$62 billion) and then Mexico (US\$24 billion) (Ratha and Silwal 2012).

The boundaries between ‘tourist’ and ‘migrant’ are also in constant flux. While temporary migrants may at times engage in touristic activities, people may also use their status as tourists to gain entry into a country and remain there beyond the time allowed by the authorities. The opportunistic utilization of the ‘tourist visa’ relates to people’s need to seek employment and decent wages relative to their home countries. It has been estimated that from 2003 to 2005 more than 70,000 of the 800,000 pilgrims, who were issued with a Hajj or Umrah visa by Saudi Arabia’s Hajj Ministry (9 per cent of all pilgrims), failed to return home after their visa was complete. The issue of illegal immigration apparently prompted the country authorities to introduce new rules to discourage married men under the age of 40 obtaining an Umrah visa. This specifically applies to men originating from nine countries: Bangladesh, Chad, Egypt, Ethiopia, India, Nigeria, Pakistan, the Sudan and Yemen (Gearon 2006). Missing tourists have also become a concern for those states that try to ensure that their hospitality does not get taken for granted, and whose policies concerning immigration and the economic welfare of the nation

are fully protected. In 2010, for instance, Chinese and Korean authorities were concerned that over thirty Chinese cruise ship tourists had gone missing on the South Korean island of Jeju during a routine day tour (Yingying 2010). Controversially, tourism can be perceived as a platform to create opportunities for impoverished or persecuted individuals to access other countries, mobilizing illegal migrants to seek the economic means to survive and support their families and communities. In reality, however, the utilization of tourism as a ticket for survival is often thwarted by the power of the state to clearly define which individuals constitute 'tourists' and 'non-tourists' as well as 'citizens' and 'non-citizens'. Therefore, the 'non-tourists' or rather the 'deportation class' (Salter 2008a: xi) are seemingly the vagabonds of society, such as refugees, migrants, illegal immigrants, asylum seekers and dissidents. Bauman further claims: 'As a rule, vagabonds can't and don't stay in a place as long as they want, they stay in a place only as long as they are wanted' (2003: 209). This can be contrasted to his interpretation of the 'tourist's world' where 'the strange is tame, domesticated and no longer frightens' (Bauman 1996: 29). There are parallels here with MacCannell's (1992) notion of the 'empty meeting ground' in which 'tourists' and 'vagabonds' pass each other within the same space, interacting perhaps but rarely upsetting the underlying power structures which facilitate and structure this unequal encounter.

The stark contrast between the 'mobility rich' and 'mobility poor' was illustrated in the aftermath of Hurricane Katrina which devastated the US city of New Orleans in August 2005, resulting in leaving nearly two thousand dead and hundreds of thousands more homeless (Creswell 2006). In addition to the injustices experienced by residents of the hardest hit Lower Ninth Ward, one of New Orleans's poorest areas, tourists were quickly and carefully escorted to safety by the US military, and immediate arrangements were made to ensure their return to their home destinations. However, hundreds of thousands of mainly working class African-American residents were without access to private transportation (an estimated quarter of the population) and thus unable to evacuate. In an ironic twist of historically conditioned fate, New Orleans's most famous tourist assets, including the French Quarter and the Garden District and its most patrician neighbourhoods such as Audubon Park, survived due to being built on higher ground than the poorer surrounding districts (Davis 2005). The experience of local resident Abdulrahman Zeitoun, who was arrested by the National Guard and incarcerated in a maximum-security prison for nearly one month, further illustrates the racism which fuel the attitudes and actions of the authorities when faced with the mobility of 'non-natives' or those

deemed ‘suspicious’. Zeitoun’s apparent wrongdoing was that he rescued numerous people trapped in their homes using an old canoe. Although as Eggers (2010) recounts, it is Zeitoun’s Syrian origins that were in fact the cause for ‘concern’ for the authorities, hence why he was accused of ‘terrorist’ activity.

In the aftermath of the storm, the term ‘refugee’ was wrongly used by broadcasters to refer to residents fleeing the stricken city and seeking refuge at the city airport and the Superdome, implying that they were somehow acting in a ‘un-American’ way. Accordingly, conservative pundits all but attributed the inability of many of the poor and black residents to leave the city with haste as a testament to their stubbornness rather than the ineptitude of the authorities (Scheper-Hughes 2005). This stubbornness also linked to iniquitous claims, noted by Somers (2009), that such residents were generally socially apathetic and highly dependent on the government. In Spike Lee’s gripping depiction of the aftermath of Katrina in the acclaimed documentary, *When the Levees Broke* (2006), one resident suggests that it was as if ‘the storm had blown our citizenship away’. However, as the residents had already endured many years of economic and social marginalization from mainstream American society and the wider political community, their status as citizens was already contestable (Somers 2008).

The tendency to privilege certain forms of mobility over others has to some extent been reflected in the tendency amongst ‘developing’ countries, desperate for hard currency, to prioritize international tourism over domestic tourism, notwithstanding the fact that the latter far outnumbers the former (Gladstone 2005: 14). In certain popular mass tourism destinations, for example, the Canary Islands, distinctions between international and domestic travel are often physically reinforced through the enclosure of coastal areas for the purposes of the developing up-scale resorts for foreign tourists, in the process of denying access to the shoreline to (‘non-paying’) domestic inhabitants and eviscerating any memory of its previous non-commodified usage (Sabaté Bel 2001). Elsewhere, Sheller (2009: 199) describes how neoliberal policies are reshaping Caribbean urbanism ‘as part of larger transnational processes of urban restructuring’. In recent years, Caribbean states have gone about liberalizing once publically owned infrastructures (including the beachfront) and paving the way for a new generation of fortified, private tourism enclaves, in addition to the ‘traditional’ ‘all-inclusive’ resort that occupied a predominant place in Caribbean tourism since the 1980s. More significantly, Sheller (2009: 194) points to how new, multi-scalar geographies of development and mobility linked to neoliberal policies work to free up flows of real estate investment and

tourists, while simultaneously limiting ‘the mobility rights afforded to local citizens and to migrant noncitizens’.

Clearly not all tourists embody the kind of one-dimensional structural power implied in neo-Marxist accounts of tourism (e.g. Britton 1991), nor are all hosts ‘powerless’ (Cheong and Miller 2000). The axes of power along which the diverse interactions between visitors and residents take place are more complex and multi-faceted than Bauman’s tourist / vagabond dichotomy reveals. It does not, for instance, capture the range of placements between the tourist and vagabond, the latter referring more to those with even more tenuous rights of mobility such as the illegal immigrant, asylum seeker, refugee, dissident or exile, each of which are loaded with myriad political connotations according to their socio-political contexts and encounters. Given the plethora of diverse mobilities traversing the globe, to reduce the different modalities of movement to a single category or binary opposition between two mutually exclusive categories is thus clearly inadequate. Consequently, there are various unique categories and permutations existing beyond the metaphorical use of the term ‘vagabond’, and the ‘tourist’ for that matter. It would be rather myopic to suggest that all the different categories can be reduced to a single category. However, different degrees of cross-border international mobility are not based on straightforward financial determinants and/or relative consumer power, but are further mediated by determinants of ethnicity, race, religion and gender, which serve to restrict the freedom of movement of those who inhabit the ‘margins’ of the global economy.

Tourism, Mobility Rights and Market Freedoms

The freedom of movement and right to travel that enables international travel and tourism conceals a number of tensions and paradoxes that are not always explicit. The most significant of all is the tension between the right to the freedom of movement as set out in the UNDHR and the right to travel interpreted as the *right to* tourism. This is the interpretation clearly expressed in Article 8 of the WTO’s (1999) *Code of Ethics*. Accordingly, the right to tourism implies not only the politically-guaranteed rights of the freedom of movement and the right to travel, but here it is interpreted to mean the right to enter and consume other places and cultural sites ‘without being subject to excessive formalities or discrimination’. These unresolved tensions between the socially progressive and individualistic aspects of tourism can be traced to the birth of modern industrial tourism itself. Specifically, to the

contrast between the ‘commercial philanthropy’ of Thomas Cook and the more instrumentalist ‘imperial entrepreneurship’ of his son, J.M. Cook. Furthermore, although the right to a holiday has been institutionalized and given practical scope through paid holidays and socialised leisure programmes throughout most advanced capitalist societies, the right to travel is one that is far from being universally acknowledged worldwide, not least due to variations in statutory leisure time (see Hall 2005: 87).

Although tourism continues to embody the residue of earlier ‘welfarist’ ideals to classical liberal notions of peace and cultural exchange, it has increasingly become shaped by discourses of market individualism and the unfettered right to travel (Higgins-Desbiolles 2006a). In a lucid summary of the contradictory values that are inherent in contemporary tourist practices, MacCannell (1999: 193) remarks that,

the term “touristic” names the line dividing the exchange of human notice, on the one side, and commercial exchange on the other. “Touristic is the place where these two kinds of exchange meet.

Related to this, the economies of those states that were ‘protected’ from liberal capitalism have increasingly ‘opened up’ through accelerated globalization and economic integration. Whereas social tourism is organized around various modes of state, civil society and trade union-based support, embodying an egalitarian approach to travel, the notion of tourism as a human right presupposes both the democratization of travel and the universal ability to travel, thus implying a shift towards a more individualist rights-based conception of tourism. This approach to tourism is clearly epitomized in the observations made by the travel columnist, Simon Jenkins (2009), who, following the travel chaos brought about by the unusually heavy snowfalls in the UK during December 2009, argued that ‘of all the human activities that bring out the selfish in mankind, nothing compares with travel’.

Such is the strength of ‘our’ entitlement to travel within advanced capitalist, highly marketized societies, that to question the right to travel is tantamount to questioning our fundamental rights as human beings. Furthermore, Western governments may very well acknowledge that to enable their citizenry to participate fully in the rights of tourism, not only involves the legal scaffolding upholding the right to a paid holiday and rights to mobility, but also the material capacity to engage in travel. Hence, the provisions of numerous social

tourism programmes for the less affluent became a defining feature of many social democratic governments, as both a means of incorporating less privileged citizens into the consumption of travel as well as to sustain the accumulation of capital itself. Nevertheless, however much the struggle for paid holidays may have embodied the rightful aspirations of working peoples in advanced capitalist societies for time off work, increasingly, the presumption that a holiday is both a necessity and a right encompasses a rather more hard-nosed set of individualistic values and market-oriented notions of citizenship, in which:

One is *entitled* to travel since it is an essential part of one's life. Cultures become so mobile that contemporary citizens (not just Americans!) are thought to possess the right to pass over and into other places and other cultures. (Urry 2002: 157)

In many ways, the association of tourism with the relatively unencumbered right to consume peoples, places and their cultures, embodies a 'negative' conception of freedom in which freedom, or rather 'liberty', is defined as 'the area within which a man [sic] can act unobstructed by others' (Berlin 1969: 169). The tourist is thus exhorted to choose between a variety of products, places and environments for their holidays, while the institutional apparatuses of the international tourism industries seek to ensure that their choices and the related expansion of tourism are as free from regulatory constraint as possible. This libertarian position ignores the manner in which such freedoms are governed by the prevailing distribution of material resources and the geo-strategic intentions of states that constrain and enable the ability to travel. Further, as Higgins-Desbiolles (2007: 318-319) notes, this position also glosses over the continuing disparities between the advancement of the rights to travel and to tourism on the one hand and the 'rights to development' on the other. These latter rights are established and clarified in the 1986 UN Declaration on the Right to Development (United Nations 1986). The right to tourism and all that it implies in terms of being able to enjoy the comforts and pleasures that one can consume while on holiday often overrides the rights to development, as demanded by less mobile subjects. These demands, for instance, may concern claims by fishermen to maintain unhindered access to beaches and appeals by informal enterprises to ply their trade on beaches coveted by or turned over to large-scale hotel and tourism developments (see Hochuli and Plüss 2005: 11-13; Hodal 2013): Therefore, it follows that:

If liberty means freedom to choose what and when to consume, the market can deliver

that for most citizens of developed countries, in profusion. Here, the main conundrum, even in these most favourable agendas, of free markets with democracy – which is not always so evident as the protagonists of neo-liberalism assert. (Deakin 2001: 202)

The degree to which tourism is seen as an inalienable right and one that is beyond critical scrutiny is depicted here in the response from the Chair of the Kathmandu Research Centre to the beating of a Swiss tourist by Nepalese Maoists, who refused to pay the ‘tourist fee’ often demanded by the rebels. Comparing tourists to ‘Gods...whom we never beat or insult’, Dr Pradhanang went on to argue that ‘beating a tourist is the same as killing oneself and suicide to the national economy and tourism development!’ (Steinmetz 2007). Dr Pradhanang further suggested that foreign tourists beaten in Nepal, which one has to bear in mind is not a common occurrence at all, should be granted free medical care - a right not enjoyed by the majority of the Nepalese. More recently, in the heart of the European Union, the Greek government offered to compensate tourists stranded in Greece during national protests over the recent economic austerity measures imposed on Greek citizens by the EU (Smith 2010). These illustrations demonstrate the various ways in which different states prioritize the needs and mobility rights of tourists, further distancing tourists from any notion of ‘risk-taking’ and shifting the burden of responsibility for ‘protecting’ tourists onto the peoples of the destinations. Such tensions between the rights to travel and be a tourist versus various the development and other rights of less privileged citizens of host communities (e.g. the rights/freedom to migrate for the purposes of escaping political persecution or economic hardship), are ones that will be explored in further detail in Chapter Six, particularly in the light of attempts by civil society and advocacy NGOs to boycott travel to particular places in the name of higher moral values.

The emphasis on expanding the realm of individual freedoms is also of course one of the preconditions for the workings of the ‘free market’ and a defining trope of neoliberal marketized societies. Indeed, according to the liberal political tradition, the right to buy and own property and the right to buy and sell the labour are accorded equal status to that of other individual rights. Yet ‘our’ right to travel whenever and wherever we please is often deemed superior than the right of workers in the travel and transport industries to protest about working conditions and go on strike. This suggests that citizens of advanced capitalist states are increasingly exhorted to see themselves as consumers, particularly during times of buoyant employment, as opposed to citizens whose principal orientation is towards the

defence of civil and political rights and freedoms in the public realm (see Urry 2000: 184-5). Hence, citizens of neoliberal societies are less tolerant of restrictions on their freedoms to consume and travel, whether as a consequence of the imposition of higher taxes (such as the controversial UK Air Passenger Duty)² or industrial action, than they are the restrictions imposed on the movement of migrants and asylum-seekers, particularly in the UK (see Lowles 2012).

In 2010, the response of British Airways management and media commentators to a strike by BA cabin crew offered an instructive insight into society's high regard for the right to travel. Disproportionate attention concerned the strike's inconvenience to millions of people's travel plans, as well as its long-term impact on the airline's brand image, rather than on the rights of workers to express discontent at management practices and working conditions (BBC 2010a). Although the right to withdraw one's labour and the related right to freedom of association are fundamental human rights enshrined in UK and international law, this point barely received an airing in the midst of the shrill of attacks on 'recalcitrant' unions and 'cosseted' airline workers (Ewing 2010). Furthermore, in a particularly spiteful attack on the mobility rights and travel privileges of BA cabin crew, the BA chief executive withdrew the travel perks of striking cabin crew as a means of exerting pressure on the union to withdraw its action. Thus, not only did BA management seek to deny cabin crew their lawful right to strike by seeking a court injunction, it also sought to remove their rights to 'privileged' travel freedoms as airline employees in response to the lawful withdrawal of labour as a means of protest.

This conflict exposes a number of the tensions between contrasting notions of freedom and rights as they apply to consumers on the one hand and workers on the other. Globalization and deeper and wider EU integration has facilitated (with notable exceptions) increased movements of labour, while exposing scheduled carriers (many of which were once heavily protected state airlines, such as BA) to the full force of market competition, thus bringing pressure to bear on airline wages (Whitelegg 2003). However, at the same time, BA cabin crew were accused of being a privileged group of airline workers insofar as they were earning double that of cabin crew working for rivals Virgin Atlantic and other low-wage carriers, at the time of writing. The implication, therefore, is that the actions of striking BA cabin crew would inflate the costs of travel for BA customers while remaining silent on the irony that

profit margins must remain untouched or, better still, increased (Milmo 2010: 4). In this regard, one must concur with Wright (2009: 105) that citizenship in neoliberal, marketized societies has become little more than a 'licence' to sell one's labour and, of course, to consume. Conversely, Whitelegg (2003: 245) argues that the increasingly cosmopolitan character of cabin crew and pilots, who often live in countries other than the airlines' operational base, has brought about new forms of transnational solidarity, thus explaining the continued militancy and resilience of certain airline unions.

Individual freedom and the right to travel have thus in many ways come to be seen as coterminous with freedom of the market. Moreover, the latter is also regarded as a necessary precondition of the former. Any attempt to challenge or indeed abolish market freedoms is tantamount to a violation of human freedom (c.f. Callinicos 2003: 115). In this regard, global tourism can thus be seen as the apotheosis of a (neo)liberal 'cosmopolitan' global order based on a seamless harmony between the free movement of people (with the exception of labour or 'economic migrants'), goods and capital. 'Freedom of travel' has quite literally become synonymous with the 'freedom of trade' (O' Byrne, 2001: 409). The constant expansion of the realms of consumption via the relentless development of new tourist products, niche tourist segments and destinations of distinction, epitomises the hallmark of capitalist development and indeed globalization that was foretold by Marx and Engels (1985 [1888]: 83), both writing over a century and a half ago!:

The need of a constantly expanding market for its products chases the bourgeoisie over the whole surface of the globe. It must nestle everywhere, settle everywhere, establish connections everywhere. The bourgeoisie has through its exploitation of the world market given a cosmopolitan character to production and consumption in every country.

Over the past two decades the continued growth of international tourist arrivals, which recovered remarkably quickly from the 2007-8 financial crash (see UNWTO 2011), and the concomitant expansion of globalized tourism businesses, has been increasingly shaped and organized by the institutionalization of a neoliberal 'market fundamentalism' and associated discourses of (consumer) freedoms and 'open' borders for tourists. Such discourses underwrite a sense of entitlement to travel when, wherever and however one wishes,

reinforced by the various proclamations put out by the UN World Tourism Organisation and the World Travel and Tourism Council. In fact, both institutions enthusiastically promote three pillars of neoliberal tourism: (1) the opening of new markets; (2) the de-regulation of corporate enterprise; and (3) the inalienable right to travel. According to the WTO (1999):

the world tourism industry as a whole has much to gain by operating in an environment that favours the market economy, private enterprise and free trade [...] responsible and sustainable tourism is by no means incompatible with the growing liberalization of the conditions governing trade in services.

The elision of market freedoms and the rights of the individual are in many ways cornerstones of the US Constitution, particularly since 1886 when a Supreme Court ruling extended to corporations the same constitutional rights that had been put in place to uphold individual freedoms (Kingsnorth 2003: 285). The first amendment guarantee of free speech has been interpreted to enable unlimited spending on political campaign advertising by corporate donors (Freedland 2012). This echoes the increasingly blurred distinction between the right to travel and the right to tourism, referred to earlier. As the preamble of the WTO's (1999) *Global Code of Ethics* illustrates, 'the right of all persons to use their free time for leisure pursuits and travel' is accorded equal importance with promotion of 'the market economy, private enterprise and free trade'. Across the varied landscapes of global travel promoted by the marketized tourism industries, the social and economic distinctions between tourists, consumers and citizens are therefore increasingly difficult to discern, especially as the right to travel and to tourism is subsumed within the totality of capitalist social relations and the right to profit.

Tourists, Citizens and Consumers

The alignment of personal liberty and market freedoms received a significant boost after the collapse of the Communist Eastern bloc regimes in 1989. The struggle for democracy in Eastern Europe and the subsequent fall of the Berlin Wall in 1989, symbolised the triumph of 'civil society' over totalitarianism (Urry 2000: 162). Former communist states, particularly Russia, witnessed brutal economic restructuring by the International Monetary Fund while at the same time the apostles of neoliberalism claimed that societies have reached the 'end of

history', that is, the universalization of free market capitalism and the worldwide embrace of Western liberal democracy (Fukuyama 1989). While struggles for rights of citizenship were simultaneously fused into demands for rights to consume, the integration of these societies into the expanding dynamics of neoliberal capitalism also signalled the opening up of new frontiers for travel as well as capital. In the course of these events, 'citizens openly declared their right to be tourists' (Munar 2007: 347) as a plethora of new places, cultures and 'products' then entered the global tourist 'market' for consumption. Ironically then, the freedoms which were ushered in on the ruins of Soviet communism and which heralded the birth of new democratic citizenship rights in these countries, resulted in a crisis of the very idea of citizenship itself as it became increasingly subsumed by the market. Equally, in the capitalist heartlands, the transformations associated with neoliberalism and capitalist globalization, in particular the hollowing out of the social-democratic state, have meant that state-based definitions have begun to give way to a new, market-led definition of the citizen:

Citizenship is becoming conflated with consumerism- truly the revenge of the market against the state in the form of an aggressive non-liberalism armed with the new ideological construction of freedom in the form of buying power. (Silverman 1992: 151)

A free market conception of citizenship also underpins the construction and expansion of the European Union. However, this sometimes brings it into conflict with other areas designed to strengthen European citizenship, including the goal of enabling the freedom of movement of all European citizens and other social imperatives, such as the desire to expand social tourism (see Diekmann and McCabe 2011: 421-422). Historically, the EU has sought to reconcile the protection of social citizenship rights (*e.g.* the Social Chapter) while removing barriers to the mobility of capital, as signalled by the terms of the 1993 Maastricht Treaty or Treaty on European Union and more recently, the 2009 Lisbon Treaty. As Shore (2000: 84) demonstrates, the EU increasingly appeals to its citizens as consumers to the extent that consumption, for example, through tourism and experiencing Europe's cultural heritage, is conceived as a defining principle and an act of European citizenship.

[INSERT PLATE 3.1 NEAR HERE: A section of the Berlin Wall's infamous East Side Gallery'. Threatened by demolition, the 'gallery' became a symbol of the fall of the wall and a memorial to human freedom, and is now a major tourist draw. Photo: Cody Morris Paris]

The discourse of tourism as freedom to travel and consume, and freedom from regulation, embodies a neoliberal ideal in which the ‘citizen’ has thus become increasingly synchronised with the ‘consumer’:

The life of a consumer, the consuming life, is not about acquiring and possessing. It is not even about getting rid of what was been [sic] acquired the day before yesterday and proudly paraded a day later. It is instead, first and foremost, about *being on the move*. (Bauman 2007: 98)

Twenty-first century travel experiences are not only commodities distributed through the mechanisms of market exchange, they are also vehicles of individual self-expression, freedom and autonomy. In this regard, postmodern ‘critical turn’ theorists such as Ateljevic (2000: 381) envisage the ‘cultural practice of tourism as an arena wherein individuals create their identities based on power and knowledge’. There is no doubt that the compelling sense of liberation from traditional social norms and traditional ‘real’ communities, signified by such ‘communities of consumption’, induced the transition from the ‘allocation economy’ of Fordist capitalism to the customized consumption of a flexible Post-Fordist capitalism (Streeck 2012: 36).

The ability to abandon oneself to a constant vortex of conspicuous consumption, ostensibly ‘surfing’ from one identity to another, only serves to grant privileged access to such social identities to those with the economic means to do so. Through varying niche forms of travel, affluent tourists are able to ‘cleanse themselves’ of their frustrations and seek solace from their ‘alienation’ in the *ashrams* and up-market yoga retreats of places like India. Accordingly, they are able to enjoy the benefits of unhindered international travel in ways which are unimaginable to most of the residents of poor countries and increasingly, many of those in the recession-stricken countries of the ‘north’. From the travels of Goethe and Byron in Italy to the semi-ethnographic adventures of T. E. Lawrence in Arabia, the act of seeking peace or spiritual renewal amongst the world’s poor is nothing new. However, what was once the endeavour of a few maverick aristocrats or later, a spontaneous expression of the hippy movement,³ is now a multi-billion dollar industry (Global Spa Summit 2010). Here too, Bauman (2007: 100) offers a characteristically poignant insight:

The consumerist culture is marked by a constant pressure to be *someone else*. Consumer markets focus on the prompt devaluation of their past offers, to clear a site in public demand for new ones to fill. They breed dissatisfaction with the products used by consumers to satisfy their needs - and they also cultivate constant disaffection with the acquired identity and set the needs by which such an identity is defined. Changing identity, discarding the past and seeking new beginnings, struggling to be born again - these are promoted by that culture as a *duty* disguised as a privilege.

Such views echo a kind of ‘market populism’ in which consumption becomes a substitute for, or more precisely, a vehicle of progressive politics and individual empowerment. This apparent ‘postmodern’ radicalism does not challenge the hegemony of the market but rather it is enacted through the marketplace and myriad individual acts of consumption, thus equating ‘the will of the people with the deeds of the market’ (Frank 2001: 287). There are parallels here with the spirit of ‘ethical’ tourism consumption and the belief that the market, left to its own devices, can achieve progressive outcomes in the shape of poverty alleviation and sustainability that will be explored in greater detail in Chapter Six. While the rise of so-called ‘ethical’ and ‘responsible’ tourisms would appear to offer evidence of value systems that run counter to the neoliberal emphasis on market freedoms and the primacy of individual rights, they often prevail within a regime of rights that places significant emphasis on voluntarism and the empowered individual.

Conclusion

Notwithstanding the economic gains attributed to tourism, the citizens of the ‘global south’ for the most part did not benefit from the massive expansion in global travel during the first decades of post-war economic development. This is particularly the case where the ability to become tourists themselves is concerned. Despite the proclaimed rise of the emerging economies, the majority of the world’s inhabitants are still no closer to joining the ranks of the ‘tourist citizenship class’. Moreover, a combination of deep recession and public austerity, and growing inequalities in conjunction with a series of environmentally-related impacts linked primarily to global climate change, threatens to further curb or somehow derail the exponential growth and worldwide expansion of international travel to which many in the West have become accustomed over the past sixty years or so. Thus, while the global

landscape of travel has become more populated as consumers in emerging economies continue to join the ranks of the 1 billion international arrivals, international tourism continues to expand in an uneven and differentiated manner, including some and excluding others.

This chapter concludes its examination of the relationship between tourism and ideas of freedom, by emphasizing how the discourses of freedom and rights underpinning the neoliberal logics of globalizing tourism, serve to elide the distinction between the right to the freedom of movement and travel on the one hand and the right to travel and to be a tourist on the other. Accordingly, this chapter explored the transformation of international tourism, from its association with privileged freedoms and mobility privileges, and examined how these evolved and were produced in both the colonial and post-colonial era and into the present epoch. However, it was not until early post-war period that the question of right to travel and to take a holiday became increasingly intertwined with the kinds of rights underpinning the freedom of movement, economic development and modernization.

One of the central observations of this chapter therefore, is that international tourism has increasingly come to be regarded as universal right rather than a privilege, as well as a marketized commodity shaped by discourses of market individualism and the unfettered right to travel. Accordingly, it has drawn attention to the alignment between tourism and increasingly market-based renderings of citizens as consumers, being highly sceptical of any egalitarian vision of an equal and equitable distribution of the rights and freedoms of travel and tourism within and across states. The ascendance of neoliberal globalization has thus reinforced the seamless connection between discourses framing the right to travel and the freedom of movement and those associated with the expansion of an increasingly marketized tourism and the right to be a tourist. The next chapter will continue to reflect on the nature of such rights as are encompassed within international tourism, with particular emphasis on the role of states in enabling and constraining the movement of tourists, and the implications for citizenship.

¹ Dube's (1999: 38) account of the travel worlds of white missionaries in central India drew attention to the civilising and hegemonic agendas of Anglo-European societies; where there was a significant movement to 'civilize the heathen'.

² The Airline Passenger Duty is an excise duty and environmental levy on aircraft emissions that is charged to outbound travellers from the UK. It was originally brought in by the UK government in 1994 but was been amended in 2008 to incorporate four bands based on the distance between London and the eventual destination. It has been strongly criticised by the aviation industry and travellers alike (Fearis 2007). It was also challenged by Caribbean island destinations who pointed out that the tax discriminated against them by charging passengers less for travelling to the US west coast, than it did to the geographically much close Caribbean region (Travel Mail Reporter 2013).

³ Ironically, MacCannell (1999: 171) referred to hippies as the 'shock troops of mass tourism'.