distance from daily experiences. Tourism thus has much to do with the conditions and consequences of modernity and offers a clue to existential problems of modern society which might otherwise remain opaque (Urry 1990a:2). In addition, tourism has become a metonym for *personalized impersonality*, a kind of social relationship characterizing modernity. Tourism is, in short, an indicator of the ambivalence of modernity. The relationship between modernity and tourism is indeed a legitimate area for study, and this is what this book intends to do.

The author's exploratory journey began in 1993 when he enrolled to study for a PhD at the University of Sheffield. He was then interested in the sociology of tourism, and felt that there was a potential "gold mine" to excavate with respect to the relationship between tourism and modernity. Part of this book (Chapters 4–6) is adapted from his doctoral thesis, another part from published articles (Chapter 2 and 3), and the rest is newly written. Most of the material was gathered in the United Kingdom and was written in English.

The author received a lot of help when writing this book. He would like to thank Jafar Jafari for his constant encouragement, advice, and help. The latter's interest to include this research theme in the Tourism Social Science Series greatly stimulated the author's enthusiasm for the venture. The author is also indebted to Graham Dann for his helpful advice, comments, and suggestions on an earlier draft. He undertook the time-consuming task of carefully reading the manuscript word by word, criticizing the text line by line, correcting errors (the errors remaining are the author's own) and polishing the English. The author would like to take this opportunity to express his gratitude to Maurice Roche, who inspired the author when he was reading for his PhD. Thanks are also due to Chris Crowther for his friendship and constant help, and to Sharon MacDonald and Chris Rojek for their helpful comments. The author is indebted to his wife, Bin, for performing all the household chores, thus enabling him to concentrate on his work. The author greatly benefited from the support given by the Department of Sociological Studies, University of Sheffield, which provided the necessary Inter-library Loan Tokens to obtain a number of important documents. Finally, thanks are extended to E. & F.N. Spon and Elsevier Science, respectively, for permission to adapt two previously published articles by the author: Chapter 2 is adapted from "Logos-modernity, Eros-modernity, and Leisure" (*Leisure Studies*, vol. 15, 1996, pp. 121–35), and Chapter 3 from "Rethinking Authenticity in Tourism Experience" (*Annals of Tourism Research*, vol. 26, 1999, pp. 349–70).

Ning Wang
17 May, 1999

Chapter 1

Introduction

It is taken for granted that the movement of wild animals is a precondition of their survival—the way to search for food and prey. However, for a long period of intellectual history, travel and movement have not been seen as essential features of the human condition. On the contrary, the sedentary state is perceived to be a characteristic of civilization. As for hordes, they are usually defined as people who have not yet been civilized and remain barbarous. The same was true of the gypsies in the past. Indeed, in civilized society the movement of populations is often associated with human tragedy: war, pestilence, flood, and drought. Thus, in Western society, subjectivity is presumably sedentary and excludes mobility (Featherstone 1995). This situation is in accord with the Western tradition of logocentrism.

Of course the movement of human beings is regarded as important, since there is constant innovation in the technologies of transportation and communication. However, in the Western sociological tradition, travel, tourism and mobility have for long been treated only as *derisive* characteristics of human beings and society, and usually as economic indicators. Although the consequences of a specific kind of spatial mobility, i.e., immigration, are well analyzed, other kinds of spatial movement, particularly tourism, have been relatively ignored. Even today the sociology of tourism is a marginal branch of sociology, and its relevance is doubted by quite a number of mainstream sociologists.

However, all of a sudden the facts speak for themselves. If tourism has constantly been growing in the post-war period, then the results of this movement were spectacular in the late 1980s and in the 1990s. "Tourism", says Crick, "represents the largest movement of human populations outside wartime" (1989:310). The masses on the move have become a spectacular landscape of consumer culture in the "global

village" of late modernity. The significance of tourism is, however, far from merely economic. It is also sociological.

Tourism is increasingly globalized. With touristic consumerism expanding worldwide and tourists traveling further afield, various peoples, nations, and places are becoming involved in this touristic globalization and being exposed to its positive and negative consequences. No longer can a culture or a people remain insulated. Nor can a nation be severed from international society once it has joined the enterprise of tourism, for tourism is an "international fact" (Lanfant 1980). Nowadays almost every item of culture is 'touristifiable' and can be turned into a consumer good, conveying "image", "experience", "the authentic", or "the exotic", because it has a potential audience of tourists, especially international ones.

With the arrival of the democratization, consumerization, and globalization of tourism, the latter has become integrated into the social construction of both individual and national identity. On the one hand, tourists are away from home to experience the heightened consciousness of self by searching for reference images and signs of others. On the other hand, numerous places are involved in a new or modern kind of hospitality, which is different from the traditional one, characterized by an authentic interrelationship between host and guest. This modern hospitality implies a kind of anonymous, impersonal and commercial–yet "friendly"–social relationship between hosts and strangers (a kind of relationship which is congruent with the general trend of the impersonalization of modernity). Host peoples in various places become profit-driven actors who attract tourists by turning their places of residence into spaces of spectacle, attractions, and play-grounds, a so-called "touristification" process. (Lanfant 1995b:35; Picard 1995:46). In so doing, each destination vies with others in enhancing its image of tourability (including the image of the infra- and super-structures of tourism). Thus, like social structure itself, the symbolic structure of a place appears to be significant. These touristic phenomena, being social in nature, call for serious sociological study.

The birth of modernity was in a sense signalled by tourism, which in turn was a consequence of modernity. This is a kind of spiritual resource of modernity. For instance, if the Grand Tour involved the communication of the spirit of the Renaissance, then the person of travel implied the Enlightenment. As Boorstin observes, "The travels of seventeenth century around Europe, to America, and to the Orient helped awaken men to ways of life different from their own and led to the Enlightenment" (1964:79). No small wonder, then, that the time of the Industrial Revolution in England was also the time when modern tourism came into being, as exemplified by Thomas Cook's organized tours. To risk oversimplification, its history is an alternative, although marginal, history

of modernity. Rather than being merely sedentary, the modern subject is on the move (Urry 1995). As such, sociological indifference to mobility and tourism can no longer be justified.

This book attempts to reveal the importance of tourism in the formation of the modern subject and the understanding of contemporary society by studying the relationship between (late) modernity and tourism. One is not alone in choosing this as a central theme. Quite a number of pioneers have contributed, in various ways, to the sociological understanding of tourism by adopting a similar approach. This introduction will briefly review and analyze this literature and, as a result of this exercise, develop a set of ideas which can pave the way for further progress in the sociological study of tourism. The introduction covers three principal topics. First, some conceptual issues, such as the meaning of tourism, are discussed. Second, a brief review of the literature relating to the issue of modernity and tourism is undertaken. Third, the main ideas, themes, aim and the structure of the book are briefly explained.

Conceptual Arguments

One of the problems that students of tourism face is that there is no commonly accepted definition of tourist or tourism. Different definitions are used to serve different underlying purposes (Burns and Holden 1995:5; Ryan 1991; S. Smith 1988) (for a review of the literature, see Gilbert 1990; Theobald 1994a).

The words tourist and tourism did not appear before the 1500s (Leiper 1983:277). In the 1700s "tour", in the sense of "tourism", began to be used. For example Daniel Defoe used it in his book *A Tour Through the Whole Island of Britain*, which appeared in the 1720s (Leiper 1983:278). According to the *Oxford English Dictionary*, the advent of the term tourist in English was in the late 18th century, and it was used as a synonym for "traveler". Thus the meaning of "tourist" during this early period of time was neutral. Yet, while this meaning is still in currency, by the middle of the 19th century it had acquired a negative connotation, one that was diametrically opposed to the term "traveler", which had a positive meaning. Thus in the latter part of the century, when traveling abroad English people liked to consider themselves as travelers rather than tourists (Buzard 1993:1; Fussell 1980).

In defining who is a tourist, a statistical expert's definition is usually different from that of an academic. For the purpose of data relating to international arrivals in 1937, a committee of statistical experts at the League of Nations defined a tourist "as one who travels for a period of 24 hours or more in a country other than that in which he usually resides" (Quoted in Gilbert 1990:8). In 1963 the United Nations Conference on

Travel and Tourism in Rome produced the more widely accepted definition of "visitor", which was adopted in 1968 by the International Union of Official Travel Organisations (IUOTO, the predecessor of the World Tourism Organisation, WTO). It was recommended by the UN conference that the term should be divided into two categories: "*tourists*" and "*excursionists*". A tourist was defined as a person who made an overnight stay and an excursionist as one who was on a day visit:

> For statistical purposes the term "visitor" describes any person visiting a country other than that in which he has his usual place of residence, for any reason other than following an occupation remunerated from within the country visited. This definition covers:
> – *tourists*, i.e. temporary visitors staying at least twenty-four hours in the country visited and the purpose of whose journey can be classified under one of the following headings: (a) leisure (recreation, holiday, health, study, religion, and sport), (b) business, family, mission, meeting.
> –*excursionists*, i.e. temporary visitors staying less than twenty-four hours in the country visited (including travelers on cruise ships) (IUOTO 1963:14 quoted in Leiper 1979:393).

These technical and statistical definitions are characterized by behavioral and situational features, including temporal (over 24r hours), spatial (away from place of residence), and situational (not for pursuing an occupation remunerated from the place visited) elements. Therefore, such definitions provide an objective standard for internationally consistent statistics.

Such technical and statistical definitions are often, however, dismissed by some academics of tourism as too broad to capture the essential features of a tourist. They tend to define a tourist in terms of a narrower range of motivations and purposes. For example, Nash defines a tourist "as a person at leisure who also travels", and tourism as the activity of such persons (1981: 462). Similarly V. Smith stipulates that "a tourist is a temporarily leisured person who voluntarily visits a place away from home for the purpose of experiencing a change" (1989:1). Thus both travel and leisure are two necessary components of tourism (Nash 1981; Pearce 1989:1), and accordingly those who travel for non-leisure purposes (for example business) are not tourists. Such variations on what constitutes a tourist certainly satisfy academic or disciplinary interests. However, for local tourism suppliers the difference between leisure and non-leisure travelers is of little relevence. This is particularly so since there is inevitably a leisure dimension to the work of business travelers.

Cohen (1974) offers a motivational definition of "tourist", that incorporates some elements of behavioral/statistical definitions. He defines the tourist in terms of six features. The tourist is a *temporal* traveler, not a permanent traveler such as a nomad; a *voluntary* traveler, not an exile, refugee, or prisoner of war who is *forced* to travel; a traveler on a *round trip*, not an emigrant on a one-way trip; on a relatively *long journey*, not an excursion; on a *non-recurrent trip* i.e., he or she is not a commuter or a holiday-house owner; and a traveler, the purpose of whose trip is *non-instrumental*, i.e., unlike businessmen or those whose trips serve a primarily instrumental (economic, political, or religious) purpose. In sum, Cohen's definition of the tourist is as follows:

> A "tourist" is a voluntary, temporary traveler, traveling in the expectation of pleasure from the novelty and change experienced on a relatively long and non-recurrent round-trip (1974:533).

Cohen insists that the boundaries between tourist and non-tourist roles are vague and fuzzy. This vagueness partly explains the complexity and difficulty of defining who is a tourist. Unlike Nash and Smith, Cohen does not completely exclude from the universe of the tourist, business travelers and the like who travel for instrumental purposes. They may be *partial tourists*, since business travelers and pilgrims can also participate in some activities for the sake of leisure, pleasure, and recreation during their instrumental travels.

In general terms, the official, industrial, or economic definition of a tourist tends to be a technical and statistical one (broad definition). In contrast, the anthropological, sociological, or psychological definition of a tourist tends to be a conceptual or motivational one (narrow definition). Thus, the former is usually broader since the latter excludes travelers for instrumental purposes from the boundaries of the tourist.

In regard to the question of "what is tourism?", pluralism also prevails. For some, "tourism" is synonymous with the activities and impacts of the tourist (Nash 1981:462). Others give a holistic definition of the term. Thus, Leiper considers tourism as

> the system involving the discretionary travel and temporary stay of persons away from their usual place of residence for one or more nights, excepting tours made for the primary purpose of earning remuneration from points enroute. The elements of the system are tourists, generating regions, transit routes, destination regions, and a tourist industry. These five elements are arranged in spatial and functional connections. Having the characteristics of an open system, the organization of five elements operates within broader environments: physical, cultural, social, economic, political, technological with which it interacts (1979: 403–404).

Jafari also offers a holistic definition, but his is based on an epistemological approach. He defines tourism as "the study of man away from his usual habitat, of the industry which responds to his needs, and of the impacts that both he and industry have on the host's socio-cultural, economic and physical environments" (1977:6).

A similar holistic definition is put forward by Mathieson and Wall, who further distinguish "tourism" from "the study of tourism":

> Tourism is the temporary movement of people to destinations outside their normal places of work and residence, the activities undertaken during their stay in those destinations, and the facilities created to cater to their needs. The study of tourism is the study of people away from their usual habitat, of the establishments which respond to the requirements of travelers, and of the impacts that they have on the economic, physical and social well-being of their hosts (1982:1).

Still others tend to define tourism from a supply-side view. Thus, while recognizing that no adequate industrial definition exists, because most definitions are based on the characteristics of the tourist, S. Smith provides a supply-side definition of tourism:

> Tourism is the aggregate of all business that directly provide goods or services to facilitate business, pleasure, and leisure activities away from the home environment (1988:183).

He further divides these into two "tiers" of business. Tier 1 is composed of business and commodities which serve tourists exclusively, while tier 2 serves a mix of tourists and local residents.

Which definition of tourist and tourism will be adopted in this book? Rather than use a single definition throughout, following S. Smith's position of "intellectual tolerance and an appreciation for diversity in definitions" (1988:180), here a dual definition for different situations is employed. First, when a tourist or tourism is considered from the perspective of *demand*, an academic or motivational definition will be adopted (Cohen 1974; Nash 1981; V. Smith 1989). In this case, those traveling for *instrumental* purposes such as business, conferences, political affairs, and so on will *not* be treated as tourists. Accordingly, tourism will be regarded as the activity, experiences, characteristics, and impacts of these tourists. In other words, a tourist will be treated as a person who voluntarily travels away from home for *non*-instrumental purposes such as recreation and pleasure.

Second, when a tourist or tourism is discussed from the perspective of production, a technical, statistical, holistic, or supply-side definition of tourist and tourism will be adopted (IUOTO 1963; S. Smith 1988). That is to say, "tourist" refers to travelers who are on the move for instrumental purposes such as business and so on, as well as those who are exclusively on trips for leisure, recreation, and pleasure; and "tourism" refers not only to their activities and impacts, but also to the commodities and services supplied by businesses or the tourism industry. From this supply-side view, the distinction between instrumental and non-instrumental motives for travel is of little significance. To avoid confusion, the broad meaning of "tourism" from the perspective of tourism supply will be denoted by "tourism industry", "tourism business", "tourism economy", "tourism system", or "tourism production system" (Britton 1991).

Tourism has become a mature research topic for social scientists since the 1970s (Graburn and Jafari 1991) and sociologists have made many contributions to the study (see Allcock 1989; Cohen 1979a, 1984, 1988a; Dann and Cohen 1991; Sharpley 1994; Urry 1990a, 1991a). Recently, it has drawn wider academic attention from various disciplines, mainly because it has become one of the largest industries in the world, and "one of the quintessential features of mass consumer culture and modern life" (Britton 1991:451).

According to Cohen (1984), the first sociological account of tourism appeared in Germany in 1930 (L. von Wiese) and the first full-length work was written in German by H. J. Knebel (1960). Although similar social science writings in English were published in the 1930s (Norval 1936; Ogilvie 1933), tourism received little attention from sociologists until after World War Two. International mass tourism emerged soon after the war (partly due to the fact that the jet airplane was introduced in 1952), and there was an almost immediate academic response from students of sociology (Boorstin 1964; Dumazedier 1967; Foster 1964; Mitford 1959; Nunez 1963). However, significant progress was not made until years later (e.g., Allcock 1988, 1995; Apostoloplous, Leivadi and Yiannakis 1996; Böröcz 1996; Cohen 1972, 1974, 1979a, 1979b, 1984, 1988a, 1988b, 1995; Dann 1977, 1981, 1989, 1996a; de Kadt 1979; Greenblat and Gagnon 1983; Harrison 1992; Hitchcock, King and Parnwell 1992; Hollinshead 1992, 1996, 1997; Krippendorf 1987; Lanfant 1980, 1993; Lanfant, Allcock and Bruner 1995; MacCannell 1973, 1976, 1989, 1992; Roche 1992, 1994; Rojek 1993, 1997; Rojek and Urry 1997; Ryan 1997a; Saram 1983; Shields 1991; Turner and Ash 1975; Urry 1988, 1990a, 1990b, 1992, 1994a, 1994b, 1995; Watson and Kopachevsky 1994). Even so, and despite this trend, the sociology of tourism "is still very much in its infancy" (Dann and Cohen 1991:158).

For a subject to come to the point of maturity at least one of the following conditions must be satisfied. First, there should be "legitimate territories" within which a field or discipline is located. A discipline has its own "sovereignty" to which other disciplines cannot easily lay claim. Thus, for example, political science, economics, sociology, psychology, and geography all have their own domains. Although a cross-disciplinary perspective may become necessary in studying more and more social phenomena, each must nevertheless retain its own identity. Second, distinctive approaches, perspectives, or methods should be used to study the subject matter of "legitimate territories".

The difficulty for the sociology of tourism is that it has no monopolized "legitimate territory". In this regard, Cohen (1984) has identified four principal areas for the sociological study of tourism: the tourist, relations between tourists and locals, the structure and functioning of the tourism system, and the consequences of tourism. One cannot argue with such a

classification. However, these four domains are, of course, not the "legitimate territories" that are monopolized by the sociology of tourism. Other disciplines can also lay claim to these areas. For example "the tourist–his motivations, attitudes, reactions, and roles" (Cohen 1984:373) has also been studied in depth by psychologists (Iso-Ahola 1983; Pearce 1982, 1988; Ross 1994). The relationship between tourists and locals seems to be principally the domain of anthropologists (Nash 1981; V. Smith 1977, 1989). The structure of the tourism system has been examined by tourism studies in general (Cooper, Fletcher, Gilbert and Wanhill 1993) and social geography in particular (Britton 1991; Shaw and Williams 1994). The socioeconomic and cultural impacts of tourism have also been investigated by holistic tourism studies in general, and social geography in particular (Mathieson and Wall 1982; D. Pearce 1989). Tourism is essentially a multidisciplinary study. Hence, there are no clear-cut territories reserved *exclusively* for the sociology of tourism, although some areas clearly call for more sociological treatment than others.

Since it is difficult for the sociology of tourism to claim its own "sovereignty" over a monopolized "territory", it can only claim legitimacy through its own distinctive approaches, perspectives, and methods. In this respect, the sociology of tourism can be justified as a legitimate area of study, since it offers distinctive sociological approaches and perspectives to tourism which other disciplines cannot.

Interestingly, even if one can intuitively tell a sociological approach from that of another discipline, such as psychology or economics, it is still difficult to define clearly what a distinctive sociological approach is. In reality, sociology is quite controversial in terms of its own approaches and perspectives. With regard to tourism, there is no single approach but rather numerous sociological ones (Dann and Cohen 1991). These approaches include the Weberian, or tourism as meaningful action and motivation (Dann 1977, 1981); the Durkheimian, or tourism as ritual and myth (Graburn 1989; MacCannell 1973, 1976; Selwyn 1996a); the Marxian, or tourism as false consciousness and ideology (Thurot and Thurot 1983); the structural-functional, or tourism as social therapy (Krippendorf 1987); the structural-conflictual, or tourism as the conflict of interests between the Core and Periphery (Turner and Ash 1975); the symbolic interactionist, or tourism as communication of identity and as symbolic display of status (Brown 1992; Dann 1989); the phenomenological, or tourism as experiences (Cohen 1979b; Ryan 1997a); the feminist, or tourism as gender inequality (Kinnaird and Hall 1994); and the post-structuralist, or tourism as sign, discourse, and representation (Culler 1981; Dann 1996a; Lash and Urry 1994). While all these approaches are sociological, there must still be a distinctive common identity for all of them. This identity, it is argued here, lies in a more *holistic* treatment of

the subject matter in comparison with other disciplinary approaches. Economics, politics, geography, and psychology are all characterized by abstracting their own subject matters, such as the economy, polity, spaces, and psychological phenomena, from the rest of social reality, as if they were independent. By contrast, a sociological approach treats any phenomenon (such as values, activities, and social processes) in terms of human interaction, or in relation to other social phenomena, the wider context of social trends, social structures, or social demography. The micro-sociological approach, as a legitimate approach, does not fail to consider these wider contexts, although its focus is on micro-situations.

Within the community of sociologists, how to treat tourism as a legitimate area of study is also controversial. As noted previously, for a number of mainstream sociologists, tourism is a trivial pursuit and thus not worthy of serious academic effort. As a result, this subject is still regarded as a marginal branch of applied sociology. Even for those who acknowledge tourism as a legitimate academic area, there are problems of how to locate tourism on the map of sociological exploration. In charting tourism, sociologists usually examine it in three ways (Dann and Cohen 1991). First, tourism is treated as a *sub*set of leisure by the sociology of *leisure* (Dumazedier 1967; Krippendorf 1987; Rojek 1993). Second, it is regarded as a specific kind of migration, such as seasonal leisure migration (Böröcz 1996; Vukonić 1996). Third, it is legitimized as the subject matter of the sociology of tourism in its own right, an approach which stresses the *travel* dimension of tourism (Cohen 1972, 1979a, 1984, 1988a; Graburn 1983a, 1989; MacCannell 1976; Urry 1991a, 1995). Whichever approach is adopted, a number of concepts are employed to characterize tourism sociologically, such as escape (Cohen and Taylor 1992; Dumazedier 1967; Rojek 1993), social therapy (Krippendorf 1987), authenticity-seeking (MacCannell 1973, 1976), quasi-pilgrimage or ritual (MacCannell 1973; Graburn 1983a, 1989), play (Cohen 1985; Mergen 1986), the core and the periphery (Britton 1982, 1991; Turner and Ash 1975), strangerhood (Greenblat and Gagnon 1983; Böröcz 1996), consumerism (Watson and Kopachevsky 1994), leisure migration (Böröcz 1996), and discourse (Dann 1996a).

One fundamental approach that sociologists apply to tourism, whether consciously or not, is what can be called the "*contextualism of modernity*". It can be argued that the study of the relationships between modernity and tourism is a central, if not the whole, task of the sociology of tourism. Indeed it was laid down by the pioneers of the sociology of tourism: Boorstin (1964), Dumazedier (1967), MacCannell (1973, 1976), Cohen (1972), and Dann (1977, 1981). Boorstin's (1964) cynical critique of mass tourism as a depthless "pseudo-event" in America may thus be understood as the first attempt to explore the relationship between tourism and modern society. Dumazedier (1967) treated the phenomenon of the

"mass on the move" in terms of urbanized and industrial society. He revealed tourism as an escape from the alienation arising from an urban way of life. Thus, his exploration was another attempt to study tourism in terms of the wider context of modernity. However, MacCannell (1973, 1976) was the first writer *clearly* to relate tourism to the sociology of modernity. In response to Boorstin's hostile attitude towards mass tourism, MacCannell treated tourism as a ritual celebration of the differentiation and wholeness of modernity, and also as a quasi-pilgrimage–quest for the authenticity and meaning which were lacking in the home society but which existed in other places and other cultures. Rather than dismissing tourism, he regarded it as an integral element of modern life. He saw the tourist as one of the best models for the modern individual. Tourism for him was thus a cultural phenomenon that mirrored the structure and contradiction of modernity. Cohen (1972), although in a different way, viewed tourism as an essentially modern experience and, in so doing, confirmed the possibility of studying this subject in the context of modernity. This contextual approach was soon adopted by many of their successors. For example Dann's (1977, 1981) studies of tourist motivation linked the latter to the context of industrial modernity. He argued that tourists travel because they want both to escape the "anomie" (normlessness, meaninglessness, and isolation) of modern life, and to compensate for the dissatisfying aspects of everyday life, such as relative status-deprivation, with the "ego-enhancement" of tourism. Based in part on Foucault's approach, Urry (1990a) has introduced another influential paradigm for the sociology of tourism–the "tourist gaze", around which various power relations involving consumption and production are analyzed. Tourism has also been explicitly linked to more all-encompassing paradigms–both modernity and postmodernity (1990a, 1995). Rojek (1993) has investigated how tourism is socially organized as "ways of escape" under the condition of modernity. Böröcz (1996) has similarly explored how modernity is related to "travel capitalism", and how the uneven development of tourism is determined by differences in the degree of industrialization and modernization among some Western and Eastern European countries.

The sociology of leisure and the anthropology of tourism have employed escapism and compensation in their studies of tourists and their experiences. Thus, tourism as a form of leisure is regarded as a (temporary) escape from the alienation, monotony, etc. of everyday life (Cohen and Taylor 1992; Krippendorf 1987). As far as compensation is concerned, tourism is seen as a "repayment" for the limits of everyday life, a ritual inversion or reversion of "ordinary life" or a ritual intensification of non-ordinary experience (Gottlieb 1982; Graburn 1983a; Lett 1983). These approaches, particularly when they are combined, are still useful and valid and have been successfully incorporated into sociological studies of motivation and experiences. However, their deeper significance has been revealed only after they have been linked to the broader approach of the "contextualism of modernity". This orientation was, as mentioned above, introduced to the sociology of tourism by its pioneers more than twenty years ago. It is within this context that the concepts of escape and compensation have obtained deeper sociological significance. Thus, tourism, which had hitherto been considered by many as a superficial and trivial topic, began to gain "a deeper structural significance" (Cohen 1979a:22). Indeed, the continuous and stubborn growth of tourism during the post-war period has promoted sociologists to ask deeper questions in regard to this phenomenon. Why do people travel? Is it enough to treat tourism simply as a quest for pleasure, or as the natural outcome of an increase in discretionary time and income? Besides an improvement in living standards, is there anything else that is responsible for the emergence and growth of tourism? Does not tourism indicate that there may be something wrong with the existential condition of modernity? Is not tourism an opiate inasmuch as modernity uses it to seduce people to its own exciting but problematic order? All of these important issues deserve further debate and discussion.

This book elaborates on the relationship between tourism and modernity. It studies tourism within the context of modernity which has developed in the tradition of sociology. Tourism is thus no longer simply regarded as a universal and homogeneous phenomenon. Rather, as many pioneers have pointed out, it is essentially a contemporary phenomenon and thus needs to be analyzed in terms of the larger context of modernity. The justification for the present work is that, although this approach has been developed in the classic sociological writings on tourism, the academic "fruits" of this particular tree (the contextualism of modernity) are still relatively deficient. Much more can and should be achieved. Therefore, the aim of this book in choosing such an approach is to elaborate upon the theme and demonstrate its importance to the sociological theory of tourism.

Clearly, sociology cannot tell the whole story. That is the task of more than one discipline (Dann and Cohen 1991:167; Graburn and Jafari 1991; Przeclawski 1993). Therefore, this book does not pretend to reveal all aspcts and issues of tourism. It insists on a *sociological* approach since this is indispensable in telling part of the story, but some other disciplinary studies, for example in the fields of geography and anthropology, are increasingly overlapping with sociological studies of tourism (Shaw and Williams 1994; V. Smith 1989). Further, this book argues that there is no *single* sociology of tourism, but a number of sociologies of tourism (Dann and Cohen 1991:167). The contextual explanation in terms of modernity is just one–albeit an important one–of sociologies of tourism.

Tourism and the Ambivalence of Modernity

One commonsense view is that tourism is universal and has existed throughout history, for human beings have a certain innate need for recreational travel. However, several sociologists argue that tourism is essentially a modern phenomenon (Böröcz 1996; Cohen 1972:165, 1995:12; Dumazedier 1967; MacCannell 1976; Saram 1983:99; Urry 1990a), and Böröcz maintains that "the notion of tourism as a transhistorical constant of human life is not very useful" (1996:49). Therefore, for many sociologists, tourism can be better understood within the context of modernity.

One could say that tourist demands and motivations are mostly biological and psychological (for example north-west European (holiday-makers) travel to enjoy favorable weather in southern Europe), so how can they have anything to do with modernity? However, biological impulses or psychological factors are intertwined with social environments, as well as structural and cultural conditions, indicating that tourist motivations and demands are not purely biological or psychological, but also sociological. Modernity has established its norms and mechanisms to regulate, by either constraining or releasing impulses and needs (Elias 1978, 1982; Elias and Dunning 1986). To a certain extent, biological instincts or spontaneous drives are negatively sanctioned by society and culture, that is, they are required to be constrained and subdued (as in the realm of work and production). On the other hand, they are positively sanctioned by society and culture and hence allowed to be released and gratified, but within a liminal zone, such as a paid holiday at a resort (Elias and Dunning 1986; Shields 1991; Urry 1990a; Wang 1996). Therefore, as Krippendorf puts it, "man was not born a tourist. . . . What drives millions of people from their home today is not so much an innate need to travel. . . . The travel needs of the modern age have been largely created by society and shaped by everyday life" (1987:xiv). To understand the formation of tourist motivations, consciousness and consumption, it is necessary to appreciate why and how people under the condition of modernity, are transformed into tourists.

The formation of tourist motivation is not merely an issue of bio- or psychogenesis at the level of the individual, but also a question of sociogenesis at the levels of society and culture. To put it another way, the formation of this motivation involves the development of certain modern values "about health, freedom, nature, and self improvement" (Graburn 1983a:15), which are closely related to modernity and are also "social facts" in a Durkheimian sense (Lanfant 1993) or a "total social phenomenon" (Lanfant 1995a:2, 1995b:26). These values act as the cultural sanctions of people's biological and psychological impulses and desires, and shape an individual's consciousness of and attitude towards tourism.

Thus, in certain cases, people may have a holiday less on account of their innate needs and more due to the pressure of the norms created by society, that is, the pressures of a possible "stigma of absence" linked to the disabled body and career failure. As Graburn states:

> Within the framework of tourism, normal adults travel and those who do not are disadvantaged. By contrast, able-bodied adults who do not work when living at home are also in a taboo category among contemporary Western people (1989:23).

Therefore, with respect to tourist motivation, in contrast to a psychological perspective that focuses on experiential and psychological factors sociology concentrates on cultural values and the social mechanisms that help shape these values. Rather than exploring psychological motivations, sociology studies both cultural conditions (such as values and social consciousness) and structural conditions (such as enabling conditions) that are responsible for the sociogenesis of tourism. There is, therefore, justification for a sociological study of tourist motivation on the basis of the wider relations between culture and modernity.

Nevertheless, some say that premodern persons occasionally traveled for pleasure (e.g., pleasure travel in ancient Rome). As Nash claims, "I believe that there is . . . some form of tourism at all levels of human culture. To satisfy some of our critics we may have to call it 'prototourism,' but it is tourism nevertheless" (1981:463). How can tourism exclusively be linked to modernity? Indeed, certain premodern people traveled, and some of this travel might have had certain intrinsic characteristics similar to those of modern tourism (such as pleasure). However, there are several differences between premodern travel and modern tourism. First, premodern and modern people have different orientations, attitudes, and conceptions of recreational travel. In premodern society, tourism was not a socially and culturally accepted lifestyle, phenomenon or leisure activity. By contrast, under modernity, especially late modernity, tourism has become widely accepted as part of life, and for many it has become a deeply rooted habit. Furthermore, this orientation towards tourism has been increasingly globalized under late modernity. This has transformed tourism into a virtual "necessity": whereas in the past tourism was a luxury, available only to élite groups, in modernity and late modernity, tourism is for mass consumption. In association with the view that freedom of movement is a basic civil (or political) right, in line with freedom of association and communication, tourism is nowadays seen as a form of welfare, a "social right", "an important indicator of social well-being" (Haukeland 1990:179). With the arrival of the "democratization of travel" (Urry 1990a, 1992) in the West in the post-war period, "to travel or not to travel" has consequently become a social question. Lack of the opportunity to travel is treated as a sign of social

deprivation. In this sense there is a touristic right in modernity (Urry 1995), and this right is a "total social fact" (Lanfant 1993:77) which is connected with broader aspects of participatory citizenship in modern societies.

Second, another major difference between modern tourism and its predecessor relates to the necessary social conditions. In today's society, there is massive social organization (Urry 1990a) or a "tourism production system" (Britton 1991). As Turner and Ash point out, nowadays, the unifying factor "is not their [tourists'] motives or attitudes ... but the existence of a coherent industry which strives to recognize, stimulate and serve the travel needs of all of them" (1975:14). The commodification of tourism, as part of overall capitalist commodification, is a form of social organization and the production of experiences is based on the logic of capitalistic commodity production (Britton 1991; Watson and Kopachevsky 1994). Thus, if premodern travel was related to risk, hardship, and travail, then today's tourism is a consumer good, a commodity characterized by safety, ease, and comfort and involving complicated social relationships that are integrated within tourism.

Third, while premodern travel was an occasional event, modern tourism is a mass phenomenon, an *institution*,–institutionalized leisure travel concentrated into a number of consecutive days, usually in the form of holidays with pay. Thus, although modern tourism can be described as a quasi-pilgrimage that "humans use to embellish and add meaning to their lives" (Graburn 1989:22), it is above all an institutionalized leisure and consumer activity characterized by pleasure-seeking, the "tourist gaze" (Urry 1990a), seasonal leisure migration (Böröcz 1996; Crick 1989:327; Vukonic 1996:31–3), the ritual inversion of everyday roles and responsibilities (Crick 1989:332; Graburn 1989; Gottlieb 1982; Leiper 1983), evasion (Saram 1983:93), escape (Rojek 1993), and social therapy (Krippendorf 1987). Although tourism in modern society is a marginal activity, a deviation from everyday roles, it is nonetheless institutionalized and is often culturally and socially constructed as an annual ritual, functioning as the "lubricating oil of pleasure" that keeps daily life going. As Krippendorf points out, "People travel so that they may be confirmed in the belief that home is not so bad after all, indeed that it is perhaps the best of all. They travel in order to return" (1987:xvi). Touristic deviation from everyday life therefore serves to renew the meaning of home and to reinforce order in daily routines.

The history of tourism in Western modernity, either in terms of tourism as a form of leisure travel, or as a specific commodity production system, coincides roughly with the history of modernity. Thus, the relationship between tourism and modernity is worth examining in depth. The question of how tourism is causally related to modernity is interpreted in various ways within the literature. According to one body of opinion, tourism originateds from modern people's reaction against and resistance to the dark side of modernity. Accordingly, tourism is treated as an *escape* from the alienation of modernity (Cohen and Taylor 1992; Rojek 1993). In other words, tourism is a mirror of disenchantment with modernity; the sociogenesis of tourism is described in metaphorical terms as the "push of modernity". By contrast, another body of opinion has attempted to demonstrate that tourism is in fact a "false" necessity, and that the demand for tourism is the result of manipulation, seduction, and control by the tourism production system (a sector of capitalist commodity production) (Britton 1991; Watson and Kopachevsky 1994). Hence, those holding this view explain the social origin of tourism mainly in terms of the "pull of modernity".

Both positions contain elements of truth. Yet they are partial if they exclude or oppose each other. In fact, the "push" factors and "pull" factors are two sides of the same coin (Dann 1981). They indicate the same *structural ambivalence* of modernity from different aspects, and it is this which underpins the sociogenesis of modern tourism. One can say that modern tourism is a cultural celebration of modernity (such as the improvement of living standards, and increased discretionary time and disposable income), appearing as tourism-related consumer culture. One can also say that it is a cultural critique and negation of modernity (such as alienation, homelessness, stress, monotony, and urban environmental deterioration), exhibited as an escape and a desire to "get away from it all" (home and daily responsibilities). Tourism can be both. It is an expression of both "love" and "hate" in response to the existential condition of modernity. To be away from home implies returning home again. Being "home and away" is a persistent touristic dialectic, reflecting the deep structural ambivalence of modernity.

In general terms, "modernity" refers to the period since the Renaissance and is thus associated with the *replacement of traditional society* (premodernity). More specifically, "modernity" refers to a new social order that has arisen during the last two or three centuries, a social order that first appeared in the West and then spread to the rest of the world. It comprises an institutional order (capitalism, industrialism, surveillance, and the monopoly of violence by the nation-state) (Giddens 1990), an intellectual order (science and technology, de-enchantment) (Weber 1978), a temporal order (schedulization, synchronization, routinization, or accelerating tempo and rhythm) (Simmel 1990), and a socio-spatial order (urbanization, globalization, abstractization of space, etc.) (Lefebvre 1991). All these dimensions are in reality intertwined with one another. At the heart of the institutional, intellectual, temporal and spatial orders of modernity is "rationalization" (Weber 1978), a process whereby traditional customs give way to contemporary ways of doing things. Many authors argue that postmodernity replaced modernity dur-

ing the last quarter of the twentieth century (Harvey 1990). However, this idea is still controversial. This book does not deny the structural changes suggested by the term "postmodernity". However, since these so-called postmodern changes have not transcended rationalization, this book, following Giddens (1990), disagrees with the view that postmodernity has already replaced modernity. On the contrary, postmodernity is viewed as a new form of the same order (rationalization). Classical modernity and so-called postmodernity are two different forms of the modern order. They are two analytical devices used to characterize different phenomena within the same contemporary society. Therefore, it may be better to treat so-called postmodernity as late modernity, in reference to the forms of social organization characterizing advanced society during the last quarter of the twentieth century. Therefore, when the term "modernity" is used, it may refer to early or late modernity, or both, but, more often than not it refers to late modernity.

The term "ambivalence" was introduced by Eugen Bleuler earlier in the 20th century, since then it has been both employed and explored mainly by psychologists. The "concept of ambivalence in psychology refers to the experienced tendency of individuals to be pulled in psychologically opposed directions, as love and hate for the same person, acceptance and rejection, affirmation and denial" (Merton 1976:6). However, according to Merton, ambivalence is not only a psychological concept, it is also a sociological one. Whereas the psychology of ambivalence focuses on personality, its sociological equivalent highlights "how and to what extent ambivalence comes to be built into the very structure of social relations" (1976:5). The latter "refers to the social structure, not to the personality" (1976:6). Thus, "sociological ambivalence is one major source of psychological ambivalence" (1976:7). The analysis of the sociological ambivalence can be traced back to Freud (1963), who demonstrated how civilization is essentially ambivalent, and that all cultural life includes an imprint of the ambivalence of civilization. Following Freud, Elias (1978, 1982) empirically demonstrated how the "ambivalence of interests" in social relations led to the formation of the absolutist state and associated forms of culture, such as manners. Likewise, as a cultural phenomenon, tourism also has roots in the structural ambivalence of modernity. This is a central theme of this book.

Modern tourism involves the interaction between consumers and tourism-oriented capital. On the one hand, the presence of the tourist as a consumer implies that there is sufficient, public or private investment in the facilities and infrastructure which are necessary for consumption, such as attractions, transport, and accommodation. On the other hand, capital requires a mature tourist market, namely a sufficient number of people with the desire to consume tourism as a commodity. Justice cannot be done to either of them if only one is acknowledged at the expense of the other, although only one of them can be the analytical focus of a given piece of research due to the social division of academic labor.

The emergence of the tourist has to do with the *enabling* conditions of modernity, metaphorically the so-called "love" side of the ambivalence of modernity (or the "pull" of modernity). As Marx and Engels claim in *The Communist Manifesto*, one of the most striking characteristics of capitalism is unprecedented productivity. Greater productivity not only necessitates but also facilitates a faster flow of commodities, people, and capital, which prepares the social conditions for the constant advancement of transportation and communication, and each technological revolution in transport and communication stimulates the further enhancement of productivity. Transport, communication, and travel are therefore integral elements of the system of capitalist commodity production and circulation. Thus, for the sake of commodity production and exchange, it is necessary for a society to devote a certain amount of capital to the facilities and infrastructure that are indispensable to transportation and communication, the basis upon which tourism can develop. That is why the first industrialized countries were the first tourist destinations. Thus, Britain, for example, was not only an early industrialized country, but also one of the first developed tourist destinations in the world, enjoying high visitation rates; as Böröcz notes:

> The penetration of leisure migration presupposes the availability of the services and infrastructure used for commercialized travel. That requires a certain level of surplus in the society at the destination, so that labor and infrastructural resources can be devoted to the service of foreigners and the transformation of social structures into ones capable of and willing to accommodate a primary commercial flow of strangers (1996:28).

The development of a tourism industry, therefore, is closely related to infrastructural development and the ability to accommodate a large volume of leisure and commercial travelers. However, adequate infrastructure is a necessary but not sufficient condition for the sociogenesis of tourism. The emergence of tourism also entails a social condition, namely, entrepreneurs who are willing to devote their capital to the commercialzation of tourism. In this respect the advent of Thomas Cook's tours signaled the beginning of the commercialization of tourism, a form of social organization based on technological advances (Urry 1995), which are integral to capitalist commodity production and exchange in general. For those Third World countries that have sufficient tourist resources but not the capital to devote to infrastructure and facilities, the inflow of foreign capital is unavoidable. This capital integrates these countries into the global system of the capitalist production of tourism. Nowadays, almost all countries are within the reach of tourist-sending societies and are accordingly involved in the inflow of capital from commercial intervention by the latter.

From the demand side, the emergence of tourism also has to do with certain levels of productivity (Nash 1989:39, 40, 41). Higher productivity creates spatial mobility (improved means of transport and travel) on the one hand, and psychological mobility (the desire to travel) on the other (Nash 1989). Indeed, with an increase in productivity, together with an enhanced and just distribution system, the number of people who have a surplus over "bare subsistence" grows (Pimlott 1976). They are able to transfer "a certain amount of surplus value to wages spent on such types of nonessential consumption as leisure travel" (Böröcz 1996:28). Moreover, higher productivity also indicates an increase in leisure time. "Less and less time is spent by most individuals in the world of productive labor of any kind. Consequently, more and more time is spent in private life" (Berger, Berger and Kellner 1973:171). As long as people are willing, or cultures encourage, they are able to spend part of their disposable leisure time on holidays.

"To travel or not to travel?" is a question involving the identity of modern citizenship. "We" travel for pleasure and fun because "we" are moderns. "They" don't travel because "they" are socially and economically constrained from doing so, and hence are still outside the modern lifestyle. Therefore, tourism, especially mass tourism, is an indicator of the affluence brought about by modernity and its associated lifestyles. The rate of national participation in tourism becomes one of the indicators of a demarcation between the traditional and the modern. This symbolic aspect is exploited by the cultural branch of tourism, i.e., in tourism advertisements. Touristic consumer culture also takes symbolic meanings of tourism as a concern. In this sense, people's leisure travels are a cultural celebration of the "love" side of the ambivalence of modernity.

However, tourism is also a popular expression of disenchantment with the "hatred" side of the ambivalence of modernity. Urry (1990a:2) argues that tourism can be treated as similar to deviance, for it is also a deviation from "normal society". Therefore, the study of tourism helps clarify what is wrong with this "normal society", which might otherwise remain opaque. Thus, tourism can be regarded as a kind of responsive activity that implies a critique of the dark side of modernity. Alienation or inauthenticity, the degradation in the environment, stress, monotony, and homogenization are all expressions of the "hatred" side of the ambivalence of modernity. People's loathing of the "evils" of modernity can be either verbal or non-verbal. Tourism is a non-verbal critique of these evils, for people's disenchantment with the dark side of modernity is deeply—albeit sometimes unconsciously—rooted in their motivations for tourism.

Tourists' disenchantment with the dark side of modernity is unconsciously expressed in their need to perform a kind of role and pursue a type of lifestyle that is contrary to their normal and daily lives (Gottlieb 1982; Lett 1983; Rojek 1997:58). People do not simply take a holiday. Their choice of holiday, unconsciously, or consciously, reflects their desire to change the order of 'everydayness', where the dark, as well as the positive side of modernity is embedded. They change this order by escaping (Rojek 1993), by engaging in "extraordinary" experiences (Urry 1990a), by searching for authenticity (MacCannell 1976), by experiencing novelty (Cohen 1972), by "anomie-avoidance" or "ego-enhancement" (Dann 1977), or by a quest for simplicity and the exotic (Turner and Ash 1975). All these motives help to boost seasonal leisure migration (Böröcz 1996).

All migration indicates disenchantment with something in the home society, including "hard" evils such as poverty, suffering, and political persecution, and "soft" evils such as the monotony, routinization, stress, and alienation that are closely intertwined with the goods of modernity, such as higher living standards. If modernity has, in a material sense, broadly eliminated "hard evils", then it is destined to relate to its "soft evils". The latter, mostly spiritual, constitute the "hatred" side of the ambivalence of modernity. People from Third World countries engage in permanent, or at least long-term, migration to developed countries in order to escape the "hard evils" of the home society. By contrast, people from advanced countries migrate to the "pleasure periphery" of less developed countries (Turner and Ash 1975) in order *temporarily* to escape the "soft evils" of the home society. They get away in order to return with renewed meanings of home. Boorstin summarizes the contrast between these two categories of migrant as follows:

> Men who move because they are starved or frightened or oppressed expect to be safer, better fed, and more free in the new place. Men who live in a secure, rich, and decent society travel to escape boredom, to elude the familiar, and to discover the exotic (1964:78).

Tourism involves a temporary change of the *status quo*. However, it ends up as protection and reproduction of the *status quo*. It is, therefore, conservative in effect. MacCannell regards tourism and revolution as "the two poles of modern consciousness—a willingness to accept, even venerate, things as they are on the one hand, a desire to transform things on the other" (1976:3). Yet one could argue that tourism is also a willingness to change, to alter the present order, to destroy current prohibitions and norms at least temporarily; it thus shares with revolution a common feature—it changes the present order. However, the difference between the two is still obvious; revolution wants to alter things permanently (whether or not it will be successful is another matter), whereas tourism changes the present order only temporarily, fantastically, and illusively. Tourism modifies reality by means of escape into qualitatively different spaces. Thus, it is a way of *avoiding* the present order. Therefore, if

revolution is a radical form of change, then tourism is essentially a conservative form of change, serving to consolidate the everyday order at home. Thus, unlike revolution, or what Marx calls a "weapon's critique" of capitalism, tourism is only a kind of "euphemistic critique" of modernity that moderates the disappointing aspects of modernity. In paraphrasing MacCannell, Van den Abbeele writes:

> Thinking he is engaging only in his own pleasure, the tourist is unconsciously contributing to a "strong society". Tourism is thus an institutional practice which assures the tourist's allegiance to the state through an activity which discreetly effaces whatever grievances, discontent or "alienation" that the tourist might have felt in regards to society. The tourist enslaves himself at the very moment he believes himself to have attained the greatest liberty. Tourism, to paraphrase Marx, is the opiate of the (modern) masses (1980:5).

Thus, tourism, like religion, functions as the opiate of the masses and helps reproduce the *status quo*. Politically speaking, it acts in complicity with the state in the reproduction of the social order. Tourism is neither simply a freedom, nor simply a result of manipulation by the tourism industry. It is, rather, a responsive action to the ambivalence of the existential conditions of modernity, but it ends up helping to reproduce these existential conditions.

Furthermore, although tourism acts, at least partly, as a cultural "rebellion" against that capitalist commoditization which has destroyed authentic human relationships, it itself comes into being with the help of capitalist commoditization. Thus, tourism appears as a response to the ambivalence of modernity, but finishes up as ambivalence itself, namely both "love" of and "hatred" of the modern commoditization of travel experiences. Indeed, mass tourism is made possible by the tourism industry, i.e., the commoditization of tourism. However, this leads to homogeneous, standardized, and inauthentic tourist experiences (MacCannell 1973, 1976), which increasingly causes dissatisfaction among tourists.

This ambivalence is experienced not only by tourists but also by tourist destinations. Unlike goods that are used by consumers in their homes after being purchased, most of the components of tourism products are intangible, and are consumed at the point of destination, simultaneously with the period of travel. This greatly increases the amount of personal contact between hosts and guests. As many of the destinations that are integrated into the network of Western tourist consumerism are economically weak and many locals are forced to perform marginal jobs, such as service jobs, certain tensions arise from these contacts. The economy of tourism does provide locals with jobs and other economic benefits, metaphorically the so-called "love" side of the coin, but there are also "hatred" components. The relationship between local and tourist is asymmetrical. On the one side is the tourist who is engaging in leisure, play, and recreation. On the other side is the local employee who works and serves (Nash 1989:45). Tourism thus involves two categories of people:

> those who serve and those who are served. As such, it is not hard to see how feelings of superiority and inferiority develop in tourism relationships, and why it is the locals who more often than not must adapt to tourists' wishes, demands, and values, and not the other way around (Watson and Kopachevsky 1994:653).

A shopkeeper in the US Virgin Islands has voiced a similar complaint: "The only trouble is that the tourist is here for fun, for a party. We're here all the time and nobody can be in a happy-happy party mood all the time" (O'Neil 1972:7, quoted in Britton 1979:324). In Third World destinations such "hatred" components of the ambivalence of tourism may sometimes be more intense than, or even fuse with, sentiments of nationalism, which may be leveled against white tourists. Tourists are also sometimes taken by terrorists as hostages in order to place pressure upon a government for a political goal. Thus, tourism may be either a "sunny" enterprise or clouded with malaise or potential danger. From a deeper structural perspective, the ambivalence of the tourism economy is one manifestation of the asymmetrical world-system in which the core (the major transnational companies in affluent countries from whence tourists originate) dominates the periphery (the less developed tourist-receiving areas) (Turner and Ash 1975). Under such international conditions, the economy of tourism in the Third World may enter into a "dependency syndrome" (Dann and Cohen 1991:162). In short, the ambivalence of the tourism economy is the embodiment of the structural ambivalence of globalizing modernity.

Finally, it needs to be pointed out that, as modern tourism originated in the West, when modernity is referred to here, it is mainly Western modernity which is the focus. However, since there are some fundamental structural similarities (i.e., market economy, industrialization, bureaucracy) as well as differences between Western and Eastern modernity (especially Japanese modernity), the concept of modernity should be understood as incorporating the contemporary experiences and roles of some Eastern societies, such as Japan and Singapore. In addition, while modernity as a whole is closely connected with the development of tourism, it is *late* modernity that is particularly so associated, and it is this link that is the current focus. Late modernity includes the condition of globalization. For present purposes, "post-modernity" is treated as a dimension of late modernity.