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Abstract: In the period since the 1990 Congress on Coastal and Marine Tourism, analyses by those in government, academic, non-governmental organizations, and the private sector have exposed a diversity of problems and opportunities created by touristic activity in the pleasure peripheries of the coastal zone. Tourism is a sociocultural process more usefully viewed as enacting the interactions of brokers, local, and tourists than as involving the interplay of hosts and guests. The travel that others undertake has been so commonly denounced for two hundred years that anti-tourism sentiments have become customary. In particular, mass tourism has been condemned and mass tourists have been maligned in popular and analytical thought. Alternative tourism and variants such as ecotourism have been advanced as superior to mass or mainstream tourism. Unfortunately, these terminological alternatives may be more effective for their self-congratulatory or marketing appeal than for their scientific utility in analysis. Alternative approaches to tourism—like mass tourism approaches—require thorough examination before judgments about their appropriateness can be made. In implementing a neutral terminological vocabulary, tourism analysts must focus not only on the impacts of tourists, but on the influence of brokers in shaping tourism systems.
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The further I traveled through the town the better I liked it. Every step revealed a new contrast—disclosed something I was unaccustomed to.
—Mark Twain (1990: 1) describing his first experiences in 1866 in Honolulu

How embarrassing to be human.
—Kurt Vonnegut (1990: 290)

Introduction

An inspection of two kinds of intertwined global statistics underscores the intensity of contemporary interest in travel and tourism. A first category of statistics concerning magnitude of travel shows that more people are traveling for business and pleasure than ever before. Waters (1996: 6) reports provisional global estimates by the World Tourism Organization indicating that tourism generated 567 million international tourist arrivals in 1995, an increase of 6.7% over figures from the previous year. WTO experts have also estimated that in the year 2020 about 1.6 billion of the world’s 7.8 billion people will take a foreign trip (Crosette, 1998).

A second category of statistics relating to economic value shows that the income generated by travel and tourism still qualifies the multifaceted industry as the largest in the world. Citing a report prepared for the World Tourism Organization, Waters (1996: 6) notes that:

... in 1995 domestic and international tourism together stimulated over 200 million jobs worldwide. Output measured in U.S. dollars reached $3.4 trillion. The industry’s contribution to the world’s gross domestic product reached 11.4% in 1995. Capital investment made by travel and tourism companies in buildings and equipment was estimated at $705 billion for the year.

Globally, tourism generated total international receipts (excluding international fare receipts) estimated at $U.S. 372 million in 1995, an increase of 10.8% over figures from 1994 (Waters, 1996: 6).

It is uncontestable that the trends associated with these two kinds of statistics have a huge significance for the future of coastal and marine tourism. Throughout history, demographic patterns have substantiated that populations tend to be densely concentrated along coastlines. While proximity to oceans has certainly provided industrial and military advantages to cities established in the coastal zone, it has also provided amenities with great residential, recreational, and touristic appeal. The touristic result is that people have been drawn to the coasts in record numbers.

These facts support an increasing analytical interest in contemporary travel and tourism. Almost a quarter of a century ago, Turner and Ash (1975: 11-12) coined the term “Pleasure Periphery” to refer to a “newly dependent, social and geographic realm” created through the expansion of tourism:

This periphery has a number of dimensions, but is best conceived geographically as the tourist belt which surrounds the great industrialized zones of the world. Normally, it lies some two to four hours’ flying distance from the big urban centers; sometimes to the west and east, but generally toward the equator and the sun.
Turner and Ash illustrate the pleasure periphery by pointing to playgrounds in Mediterranean nations, Mexico, the Hawaiian Islands, Southeast Asia and elsewhere. With the rapid rise of jet transport, a consolidation of peripheries is occurring:

These Pleasure Peripheries are never static, possessing a dynamism of their own, which depends on the extension of the range of planes and the increase of leisure and affluence in general. ... While each individual periphery is expanding independently, they are now, for the first time, starting to merge into one giant, global Pleasure Periphery, where the rich of the world relax and intermingle. (Turner and Ash, 1975: 12)

Coastal and marine tourism links society with elements of the environment in the creation of destinations and the appreciation of the character of place. Statistics focusing exclusively on coastal and marine tourism are neither compiled on a regular basis nor are in wide circulation. Nonetheless, the basic notion of an ever-expanding and increasingly socio-economically potent coastal and marine tourism sector of society is both a matter of common knowledge and academic debate (cp., Miller and Auyong, 1991b; Miller, 1993b; Wong, 1993; Conlin and Baum, 1995; and Lockhart and Drakakis-Smith, 1997).

As Miller and Auyong (1991c: 78) have noted, coastal and marine tourism cannot a priori be deemed to be either good or bad. The growth of coastal zone tourism creates both problems and solutions for members of society and the natural environment. To illustrate, “mass tourism” is often identified as a tourism problem for its perceived negative ecological and social impacts, and also for the inauthenticity of its attractions and the superficiality of its rewards to tourists. In contrast, “ecotourism” (and its many variants sometimes subsumed under the term “alternative tourism”) has recently been promoted as a tourist solution for its potential to underwrite the preservation of endangered species and threatened habitats.

Perspectives on mass tourism, alternative tourism, and many of their variants are examined throughout this volume. Inspection of the multidisciplinary papers that follow confirms that people throughout the world place great—some would say immeasurable—value on ecosystems and cultural traditions in the coastal zone. This high regard has fostered concern about the degree to which the combined cultural, biological, and physical features of touristic destinations are put at risk by development. Because tourism depends upon travel, it necessarily creates new juxtapositions of people and places, and at times entirely new infrastructures. Whether or not the changes brought by coastal zone tourism are interpreted as sadly disruptive, reasonably acceptable, or as constructive depends on the case under consideration and also on one’s standards of evaluation and private philosophy.

In this introductory essay to the *Proceedings of the 1996 World Congress on Coastal and Marine Tourism*, we are broadly concerned with how tourism and tourists have been understood by tourists and by locals, how resources have been viewed and used, and how these elements have been analyzed in the private and public sectors. Because the natural amenities of the coastal zone are so appreciated for their ecological magnificence, and because manufactured amenities have such high economic value, studies of the role that anthropogenic factors play in changing tourism systems are inherently controversial. It is not surprising that findings—whether these reveal a negative, positive, or benign anthropogenic influence—routinely inspire interest and scrutiny by the general public and diverse special interest groups.

The Heisenberg uncertainty principle establishes that the act of measuring one of a number of related quantities in a system produces uncertainties in the measurement of the others. This principle becomes relevant in the study of tourism when researchers—whether these are natural or social scientists, or are in another way committed to the ideal of objectivity—ask themselves about the possibility that they are inadvertently changing features of the very systems they seek to examine objectively.

One touristic expression of the Heisenberg uncertainty principle takes place when scientific researchers are successful, sometimes inadvertently, in imposing their personal or institutional values on others. Ideally, scientific measurements that establish the characteristics of a tourism system and its processes are cleanly separated from opinions and recommendations about the “best” state of the system and appropriate courses of action.

Our thinking departs from the premise that objective analysis of tourism in the coastal zone and elsewhere is contingent on a neutral terminological vocabulary. We begin in the next section by proposing a tourism model, describing the components of the system, and identifying the analytical questions essential to tourism planning, development and management. We then discuss inherited cultural logics that foster negative attitudes towards tourism and tourists. In the third section, we show how the customary view of tourism as a discredited activity is evident in popular and academic treatments of mass tourism and mass tourists. In a final section, we remark that alternative tourism and its affiliated forms are rather wrongly prescribed as “solutions” to the “problems” of mass tourism without evidence as to their consequences or measurable advantages and disadvantages.
Tourism Systems

What I like about traveling is the wonder of the return.
— Stendahl (1962: 180)

The difference between the overlapping notions of what are known today as “travel” and “tourism” is much more an academic than a government or business matter. In many respects and for many people, the two terms are interchangeable. Both travel and tourism are characterized by trips that hold appeal for the three-dimensional (i.e., “instrumental,” “educational,” and “recreational”) contrasts they offer (Miller and Ditton, 1986: 11). Yet, travel and tourism are not exact substitutes. For example, it has become conventional—despite government and industry statistics that report “business tourism”—to regard tourism as an activity that is not work.

Tourism, then, can be seen as a special case of travel involving some form of pleasure, reflection, relaxation, recreation, or fun, among the other alternatives to work and religion. Historian Eric Leed (1995: 255-271), who has studied military, religious, commercial, scientific, and touristic expeditions, points out that touristic journeys stand out for being “unarmed,” “optional,” and “circular.”

With this as background and for the purposes of this paper, we define tourism as a sociocultural process grounded in the leisure agendas and activities of tourists who engage in the pursuit of contrast in a range of places and settings, ultimately returning home.

The BLT Model of Tourism

In the introduction to Proceedings of the 1990 Congress on Coastal and Marine Tourism and elsewhere (Miller, 1989a; Miller and Auyong, 1991a; Miller and Auyong, 1991c), we have presented a “BLT model” in which a tourism system is defined sociologically as consisting of three interacting components—brokers, locals, and tourists.

Brokers consist of persons who in one way or another pay professional attention to tourism. Major subcategories include 1) private sector brokers who are engaged in the business of tourism and who provide touristic services and sell touristic products, and 2) public sector brokers who as public servants are engaged in the governance and management of tourism. Locals consist of persons who reside in the general region of tourism routes and destinations, but who do not directly derive an income from tourism. Tourists consist of persons who travel for pleasure and who travel to touristic destinations for relatively short visits, and who ultimately return home.

The BLT model stresses the human relations in tourism that lead to conformity and conflict, and to changes in society. Importantly, the model also shows that the dynamics of broker-local-tourist relations 1) are constrained by the natural and historical settings, and 2) are anthropogenic causes of impacts that affect the natural and social environments (Miller and Auyong, 1991c: 76-78). BLT can be expanded to “BLTE” when issues regarding the environment, ecology, and ecosystems are central to the analysis at hand.

Over the last few years, we have found the BLT model to be a useful device for initiating discussions about tourism sociology. We can think of two reasons for this. First, the terminology in the model was designed to be as value neutral as possible. No motives of people in any one component of system are given designated as “good” or “bad.” Similarly, none of the several tourism-focused activities that drive the model—the travel of tourists, the commerce of private sector brokers, the governance of public sector brokers—is categorically taken to be “correct” or “incorrect” compared to the others. The model displays that the sociological dynamic of tourism involves tourists, locals, and brokers in government and industry. Over time, the relative proportions of brokers, locals, and tourists in a touristic region change. Moreover, individuals in these categories often change roles as, for example, when tourists stay on the scene to become private sector brokers or locals, or when locals become public sector brokers or take a trip and become tourists.

The second reason for our preference for the model follows from the way in which it separates locals from brokers. Tourism is often marketed for its potential to be a happy drama of “good guests” and “good hosts.” It is also commonly castigated as a tragedy of “bad guests” and “good hosts.” Unfortunately, host-guest thinking masks fundamental differences in the orientations of individuals in tourism systems.

The two-element view of tourism sociology has its roots in the 1977 first edition of Smith’s Hosts and Guests: The Anthropology of Tourism (1989). Pearce (1989: 216) writes that “the basic dichotomy of host and guests’ popularized by the comprehensive anthropological volume is generally accepted.” While many continue to base analyses on this distinction, the limitations of the framework are gradually being corrected. In this regard, Chambers (1997: 6; emphasis added) writes:

Thinking of tourism as being predominantly a relationship between ‘real’ (i.e., residential) hosts and their guests has become problematic in several respects. Not the least of these is the extent to which most tourism has become a thoroughly mediated activity dependent on the intervention of others who serve as neither hosts nor guests in any conventional manner.
Whereas Chambers sees mediation to be a recent development of tourism, we would argue that mediation has been part of tourism virtually from the beginning (see, Miller and Auyong, 1991a and 1991c). The broker component of the BLT model formalizes the mediation that Chambers observes.7

In our view, then, a balanced understanding of tourism requires explicit recognition of the fundamental distinction made between people who are connected to tourism as a business; people who do not mediate tourism in either capacity, but who are residents, and people who are tourists. Accordingly, we recommend that at the outset of analysis, attention should be given to how each participant in a tourism system should be most appropriately coded as a kind of broker, local, or tourist.

Locals and brokers may both live in the same area, but their work underscores a key difference of interests. Locals—whether these are persons in families that have maintained the same residences for generations, or whether these are new residents—are not paid to understand tourism. On-site private sector brokers support themselves and their families (which may include locals) by endorsing some kinds of tourism. On-site public sector brokers (who also may have locals in their families) have the job of developing or inhibiting tourism growth on behalf of all (brokers and locals) within their bureaucratic constituency.

Having reviewed the BLT model, it is appropriate to briefly illustrate how the model accommodates others who participate in tourism and who were not discussed in our earlier papers. First, we introduce a terminology that specifies what we mean by “multiple cultures,” the “touristic public,” and the “touristic citizenry”:

1. **Multiple Cultures.** In some countries or regions visited by tourists, multiple cultures legally assert territorial, natural resource, and other rights. In these instances, public sector brokers can be taken to include persons and offices that exist in separate and competing governments. This situation obtains in, for example, destinations where a national government claims jurisdiction over territories in which indigenous or traditional cultures simultaneously engage in governance. In cases in which the governments of multiple cultures are involved, it follows that different sets of locals abiding by different cultural traditions will differently be aligned with public sector brokers in each government. Similarly, unique sets of private sector brokers will be associated with each culture. Multiple culture situations create the potential for the co-management of tourism.

2. **The Touristic Public.** This term is used to denote persons who may be locals or brokers in tourism systems, but who behave as tourists intermittently over the course of time. By extension, the non-touristic public would denote members of society (e.g., those who are elderly, incarcerated, impoverished, or otherwise immobile) who are unable to engage in tourism, or choose to never travel.

3. **The Touristic Citizenry.** This term denotes the voting constituency (and their dependents) that is found in a touristic destination or region. The touristic citizenry is determined by the jurisdictions of elements of government. Thus, one could speak of the touristic citizenry of a town, a county, a state, or a nation. Importantly, the touristic citizenry is composed not only of locals, but also of brokers. A main motivation of tourists is to see the people who constitute the touristic citizenry. As mentioned above, brokers are by definition remunerated (i.e., derive an income) from interactions with tourists.8 Locals (who by definition are unpaid for involvement in tourism, else they would be reclassified as brokers) can have touristic value (most obviously, for example, in cultural and ethnic tourism) in their own right. When this is the case, these locals play the role of "amenities," "unwritten attractions," or "attractors."9

While retaining the fundamental three-part conceptualization of tourism dynamics, the BLT model can be adapted to include subcategories of the following kinds.10

1. **TOURISTS**
   - Domestic tourists
   - International tourists

2. ** BROKERS**

   **Private Sector Brokers**
   - On-site (or First-order) brokers work and reside in the touristic region (examples are hotel and restaurant workers, guides, and vendors).

   **Off-site (or Second-order) brokers** do not work in the touristic region, but direct tourists, services, and products to the region (examples are travel agents and tour bookers who are not based in the touristic region of analytical interest).

   **Public Sector Brokers**
   - On-site (or First-order) brokers work and reside in the touristic region (examples are visitor and tourist bureau...
employees, resource managers and planners in local government).

- **Off-site (or Second-order) brokers** do not work in the touristic region, but direct tourists, services, and products to the region (examples are resource managers and planners who work for state or federal elements of government and who are not based in the touristic region of analytical interest).

**Other Broker Variants:**

- **Social Movement Brokers:** Formal entities referred to as "non-governmental organizations" (NGOs), "environmental organizations," "special-interest organizations," and the like increasingly play pivotal roles as brokers in the planning, development, and management of tourism.

- **Academic Brokers:** This term denotes those in academe who examine tourism as part of basic science, or scholarship.

- **Travel Media Brokers:** Reporters and journalists who are comment on tourism through the media (e.g., newspapers, magazines, television, the Internet) to inform the general public can be classified as travel media brokers.

- **Consulting Brokers:** Tourism analysts, marketers, travel writers, and a variety of other independent entrepreneurs are employed as consulting brokers for private and public sector brokers, and also for social movement brokers.

3. **LOCALS**

- **Established** (or Long-term) year-round locals

- **Recently arrived** (or Short-term) year-round locals

- **Seasonal locals** (for example, second-home owners)

In the application of the BLT framework to problems of coastal and marine tourism, a first question has to do with the total number of persons in the destination or touristic region of interest, and the proportions of this figure that are brokers, locals, and tourists. The answers help to establish the sociological structure of the tourism system.

An obvious second question has to do with the rates at which the sizes of these three populations are changing over time. Answers to this question help in the understanding of sociological process and the way in which tourism systems exhibit natural histories with phases of discovery, exponential growth, stabilization, and decline.\(^{11}\)

In order to address these questions, it is necessary to operationalize terms. While the (sub)categories of brokers, locals, and tourists listed above are of use in this task, it is inevitable that coding difficulties will arise, and that the status of some persons will seem to defy categorization. In this situation, the analyst must make practical decisions about how best to treat anomalies.

In passing, we want to emphasize again a particular terminological distinction. In this section we have defined "tourists" as persons who travel for pleasure and "tourism" as a sociocultural process in which touristic experiences and amenities are sought (by tourists) and provided (in a deliberate way by brokers, and in some instances incidentally by locals). To speak of tourism is to speak to the sum total of the intra-human relationships that exist between brokers, locals, and tourists, and also the relationships that link people in these categories with the surrounding ecology and environment.

The evaluation of tourism—whether one is in the role of broker, local, or tourist—produces a conclusion about the quality of the touristic system in its entirety. While tourists (collectively and individually) certainly contribute to the configuration of tourism in a particular locale, they do not alone determine its condition.

We make this point because it is so easy for people to project their attitudes towards tourism on tourists. It is one thing to say that the tourism has ruined or improved a place. It is quite another to say that tourists are responsible. The first charge points fairly to the negative or positive influence of a process defined by the interactions of brokers, locals, and tourists. The second singles out tourists for blame or accolade while ignoring the roles of industry and government brokers and locals in touristic change.

**Tourism Planning, Development, and Management**

The terms "tourism planning," "tourism development," and "tourism management" broadly encompass the decisions made by public sector brokers to affect the landscape and amenity profile of tourism destinations (existing and potential), and to affect the movement and satisfactions of tourists of selected kinds.\(^{12}\) While the jobs of tourism planners, developers, and managers in government are often cast as ones of satisfying tourists, it is the responsibility of these public servants to make policies in the best interests of their constituency, what we
have referred to above as the touristic citizenry. As noted above, the touristic citizenry is composed not only of voting locals and their families, but also of young brokers and their dependents.

Experience has shown that the proportion of locals to brokers in the touristic citizenry can vary considerably from place to place, and also that the socio-economic conditions, aspirations, and aesthetic preferences vary within each category and across time. For these reasons, it is not possible to promote a priori any single tourism management outcome above others. Tourism growth may be appropriate in one locale, but tourism inhibition a better solution in another. One touristic citizenry may exhibit a need for the seasonal tourism of, say, large numbers of adult tourists traveling alone or in small groups. Another citizenry may be so financially secure that it can afford to discourage tourism of all kinds.

While we contend that it is politically arrogant to argue that one particular outcome of tourism management should be universally endorsed, we do recommend that attention be given to tourism management goals. Goals that come to mind include “sustainable tourism development,” “appropriate tourism,” “optimal tourism,” “equitable tourism,” and “ecotourism.” Ideally, goals arise through a process of governance or planning that is responsive to the development philosophy of the touristic citizenry, the existing socio-economic and environmental conditions of the touristic place or region, the “problem” or “opportunity” at hand, an also to the (dis)advantages of alternative courses of action, and the value of monitoring, and evaluation.

Tourism goals reflect the priorities and ideals of supporting constituencies. Successful tourism planning, development and management requires a fair political process that allows for the consideration of different points of view, and forces debate about the social, economic, environmental, aesthetic and other trade-offs that are created by any tourism.

It is axiomatic that those who are responsible for making policy decisions pertaining to tourism planning, development and management stand to benefit from objective multidisciplinary tourism research. In our view, balanced tourism research must examine the status of human and natural systems. Accordingly, the fundamental question to be addressed first by tourism analysts can be seen to take the following canonical form:

**What is the significance (i.e., “value,” “importance,” “meaning,” “effect”) of existing and proposed tourism for a) locals and brokers who constitute the touristic citizenry, and b) elements of the surrounding natural environment?**

A second and complementary question broadens the scope of inquiry in the following way:

**What is the significance (i.e., “value,” “importance,” “meaning,” “effect”) of existing and proposed tourism for a) remaining components of society, and b) remaining elements of the natural environment?**

### Images of Tourism

**Kitsch and tourism; two words which go nicely together.**

— Gišlo Dørfles (1969: 153)

**It is intellectually chic nowadays to deride tourists.**

— Dean MacCannell (1989 [1976]: 9)

In a landmark text, sociologist Dean MacCannell (1989 [1976]: 3) follows and observes contemporary tourists as a strategy for understanding the “empirical and ideological expansion of modern society.” Citing the widely-circulated work of Daniel Boorstin (discussed below) and cultural anthropologist Claude Lévi-Strauss, MacCannell points out that the intellectual community has tended to view tourism as categorically unfortunate and holds tourists responsible for this.

MacCannell argues that the temptation to see the negative in tourism is difficult to resist. It is easy to blame the downside of tourism on the tourists themselves and make them a point of attack. In this regard, MacCannell points out that tourists have come to occupy an emotional space previously reserved for other stigmatized social and ethnic groups.

The rhetoric of moral superiority that comfortably inhabits this talk about tourists was once found in unconsciously prejudicial statements about other “outsiders,” Indians, Chicanos, young people, blacks, women. As these peoples organize into groups and find both a collective identity and a place in the modern totality, it is increasingly difficult to manufacture morality out of opposition to them. The modern consciousness appears to be dividing along different lines against itself. Tourists dislike tourists. God is dead, but man’s need to appear holier than his fellows lives. **... The modern critique of tourists in not an analytical reflection on the problem of tourism—it is part of the problem.** (MacCannell, 1989: 9-10, emphasis added)
Part of this very problem has to do with the difficulty analysts have in separating themselves sociologically and morally from the people they study. MacCannell (1989: 10) comments that "academic (as well as popular) attacks on tourists are grounded in charges of superficial experience:

In other words, touristic shame is not based on being a tourist, but on not being tourist enough, on a failure to see everything the way it 'ought' to be seen. The touristic critique of tourism is based on a desire to go beyond the other 'mere' tourists to a more profound appreciation of society and culture, and it is by no means limited to intellectual statements. All tourists desire this deeper involvement with society and culture to some degree; it is a basic component of their motivation to travel.

As MacCannell notes (1989: 102), there is a "traditional intellectual concern" for the superficiality of popular thought in the world of academic scholarship. It is easy for the scientist to argue that the academic article or monograph is likely to be a more valuable touristic product than the quick report of a tourist. It is dangerous, however, to judge the participant observation experiences of the analyst (or any other expert on the scene) to be more "real," "important," or "significant" than the day-to-day experiences of tourists.

The Gospel of Anti-tourism

For many members of Western society—and especially for those who speak American English—the terms "tourism" and "tourist" have strictly negative connotations and accordingly are employed to condemn the travel that others undertake. The social consequences of being identified as a "tourist" are so unsettling that tourists frequently go to great lengths to justify the fact of their travel, their motives and morals, and their intellects and backgrounds.

The antipathy that the touristic public directs at others for being tourists (as well as the ambivalence that so often is generated for the same reason) is an intellectual and emotional response that James Buzard (1993: 3) would see as grounded in assumptions that "are themselves the product of nearly two hundred years' concerted cultural stereotyping." In a treatment of travel literature produced in between the Napoleonic and First World Wars, Buzard brilliantly advances the thesis that the tension between tourism and anti-tourism (evident in the distinction between the honorific label "traveler" and the derogatory "tourist") is a defining feature of pleasure travel. The urge driving the touristic public to so attack concedes for their tourism has long been a factor in the rival production of touristic solidarity (Buzard, 1993: 9).

As a result of this cultural conditioning, the touristic public today is unwavering in its determination to travel, while united in its endorsement of the gospel of anti-tourism. In short, people are confident they can distinguish righteous travelers from corrupt tourists. As Buzard (1993: 5) has noted:

Snobbish 'anti-tourism,' an element of modern tourism from the start, has offered an important, even exemplary way of regarding one's own cultural experiences as authentic and unique, setting them against a backdrop of always assumed tourist vulgarity, repetition, and ignorance.

In the remainder of this section, we briefly discuss two professors in the humanities whose ideas have transcended academic boundaries to resonate with those of the touristic public. Daniel Boorstin and Paul Fussell provide fuel to the fire in conveying the gospel that travel is dead, succeeded by superficial tourism and its angry relative anti-tourism.

1. Daniel Boorstin and the Decline of Travel. In a volume that has become a classic for those who study not only tourism, but social change in the U.S. and elsewhere, historian Daniel Boorstin (1962) includes a chapter titled "From Traveler to Tourist: The Lost Art of Travel." In this, Boorstin articulates the reasons why contemporary tourism is so shamefully unsatisfying for tourists and also unsatisfactory for its consequences for others. He begins by noting that both expectations about what travel offers and attitudes about the process of traveling have changed over history. Where travel in previous centuries was highly regarded as a means of education and personal growth, tourism today much more poorly serves the American tourist. In this regard, Boorstin (1962: 79) comes to a disturbing conclusion:

What is remarkable, on reflection, is not that our foreign travel has increased so much. But rather that all this travel has made so little difference in our thinking and feeling.

In accounting for this, Boorstin builds on a common complaint of the touristic public that touristic attractions are all too often inappropriately marketed as travel worthy when they are not. This critique also challenges the notion that a city, tradition, or country can be meaningfully "understood" in a half-day tour—whether guided or not.

Boorstin advances the thesis that travel is governed by the fascination of tourists (and the agents of tourism) with "pseudo-events." In the context of tourism, a pseudo-event may be seen to be an activity or touristic sight that is narrowly (some would say ruthlessly) contrived for the sake of profit and which has a "false" touristic value. Images
of hotel banquets and fiestas, "traditional" dances, and quasi-rational performances scheduled on a regular basis for the consumption of tourists come to mind, as do those of brokers engaged in the production and retailing of touristy curios that so often qualify as kitsch.17

In suggesting the conditions and causes that tie pseudo-events to travel, Boorstin provides a clear specification of the image and plight of the "Ugly Americans" so prominent in the literature of tourism:

Our travels have not, it seems, made us noticeably more cosmopolitan or more understanding of other peoples. The explanation is not that Americans are any more obnoxious than they used to be. Rather, the travel experience itself has been transformed. Many Americans now "travel," yet few are travelers in the old sense of the word. The multiplication, improvement, and cheapening of travel facilities have carried many more people to distant places. But the experience of going there, the experience of being there, and what is brought back from there are all very different. The experience has become diluted, contrived, prefabricated.

The modern American tourist now fills his experience with pseudo-events. He has come to expect both more strangeness and more familiarity than the world naturally offers. He has come to believe that he can have a lifetime of adventure in two weeks and all the thrills of risking his life without any real risk at all. He expects that the exotic and the familiar can be made to order: that a nearby vacation spot can give him Old World charm, and also that if he chooses the right accommodations he can have the comforts of home in the heart of Africa. Expecting all of this, he demands that it be supplied to him. Having paid for it, he likes to think he has got his money's worth. He has demanded that the whole world be made a stage for pseudo-events. And there has been no lack of honest and enterprising suppliers who try to give him what he wants, to help him inflate his expectations, and to gratify his insatiable appetite for the impossible.18 (Boorstin, 1962: 79-80)

Boorstin's full analysis of "the lost art of travel" elaborates on many issues in the above passage concerning the quality of modern tourism. Several of his themes and opinions are pertinent to studies of tourism throughout the world and are outlined below:

i.) The Emergence of the Mass as a Target: Boorstin (1962: 56) laments a "decline of the 'folk' and the rise of the commercially vulnerable 'mass'" in the United States. In Boorstin's view, the mass (as compared to the folk) is conspicuously less culturally productive, more passive and more susceptible to strategic suggestion:

The folk expressed itself [in spoken word, folklore, folk dance, and folk song]. Its products are still gathered by scholars, antiquarians, and patrons; it was a voice. But the mass, in our world of mass media and mass circulation, is the target and not the arrow. It is the ear and not the voice. The mass is what others aim to reach—by print, photograph, image, and sound. (Boorstin, 1962: 56)

ii.) The Displacement of Travel by Tourism: Touching on etymologies, Boorstin notes that "travel" is linked to the Old English "travail" (with meanings of "trouble," "work," and "torment"), as well as to a popular Latin repulsum referring to a "three-staked instrument of torture."

To journey—to 'travail,' or (later) to travel—then was to do something laborious or troublesome. The traveler was an active man at work. (Boorstin, 1962: 85)

Citing an American dictionary definition of a tourist as "a person who makes a pleasure trip" or also as "a person who makes a tour, especially for pleasure," Boorstin (1962: 85) contrasts the tourist with the historical traveler with an insinuation that work is more active and more worthy than leisure:

The traveler, then, was working at something; the tourist was a pleasure-seeker. The traveler was active; he went strenuously in search of things, of adventure, of experience. The tourist is passive; he expects interesting things to happen to him. He goes 'sight-seeing' ... He expects everything to be done to him and for him.

iii.) Tourism Consumerism: With the rise of the package tour, Boorstin sees evidence that the mass is being coerced to consume by industry. In discussing the impact of railroads and ocean liners on tourism in the latter part of the nineteenth century, Boorstin describes industries interested first in profit:

For the first time in history, long-distance transportation was industrially mass-produced. It could be sold to lots of people, and it could be sold cheap. For a satisfactory return on investment it had to be sold in large quantities. ... This enormous capital investment required that equipment be kept in constant use and that passengers be found by the thousands. Now great numbers of people would be induced to travel for pleasure ... The consuming public had
to be enlarged to include the vacationing middle class, or at least the upper middle class. Foreign travel became democratized. (Boorstin, 1962: 86)

Pointing to the fantastic successes of Thomas Cook and Son with international tours and guidebooks, and also to the similar trajectory of the American Express Company, Boorstin remarks on tourism as an industry with tremendous influence over the mass:

By the middle of the twentieth century, foreign travel had become big business. It was a prominent feature of the American standard of living, an important element in our cultural and financial relations with the rest of the world. ... Foreign travel now had, of course, become a commodity. Like any other mass-produced commodity, it could be bought in barmen packages and on the installment plan. ... Nowadays more and more travelers take the trip before they pay for it. ‘Go Now, Pay Later.’ Your travel agent will arrange it for you. (Boorstin, 1962: 90)

• “Travel adventure today thus inevitably acquires a factitious, make-believe, unreal quality. And only dull travel experiences seem genuine. Both for the few adventuring tourists who still exist and for the larger number of travelers-turned-tourists, voyaging becomes a pseudo-event. ... We go more and more where we expect to go. We get money-back guarantees that we will see what we expect to see. Anyway, we go more and more, not to see at all, but only to take pictures. Like the rest of our experience, travel becomes a tautology.” (1962: 117)

• “The traveler used to go around the world to encounter the natives. A function of travel agencies now is to prevent this encounter. They are always devising efficient new ways of insulating the tourist from the travel world.” (1962: 91-92)

• “Today more than ever before the traveler is isolated from the landscape he traverses.” (1962: 94)

• “The tourist who arrives at his destination, where tourist facilities have been ‘improved,’ remains almost as insulated as he was in route. Today the ideal tourist hotel abroad is as much as possible like the best accommodations back home.” (1962: 97)

In a synthesis, these ideas support a line of argument in which the general consuming public is targeted by technologies of mass delivery (e.g., newspapers, magazines, television, the Internet) which are used by industry marketers. This syndrome creates unacceptable conditions of inauthenticity and idolatry. Further, Boorstin is especially disturbed that tourists—in their subservience to the techno-economic establishment—are made politically impotent, and worse, are encouraged to settle for an undignified existence.

Boorstin is not entirely clear on whether the cause of the problem lies more fundamentally with the demand presumed inherent in tourists, or whether it lies in the initiative of industry to manufacture (as opposed to meet) these expectations. At times he seems to suggest that as tourists and the public acquiesce, they perpetuate the system that benefits a profit-driven tourism industry and through this action become culpable as well.

Boorstin’s portrayal of tourism and tourists may seem overly harsh, but the kinds of outcomes he bemoans have been employed over the last three decades by countless analysts, tourists, and others to denounce the tourist industry and the tourist identity.

Then, too, there is a certain irony in the touristic morass. People who intend to travel but who do not want to be tourists find themselves in a bind. Tourists can thus suffer not only from knowing they are, in fact, tourists, but also from knowing they are vulnerable to the control of a powerful tourist industry. In such a situation, it has become routine for people to resist and to develop the
illusion that they are not tourists at all—only travelers of some positive variety.

Of course, this personal reaction fails to provide a solution to the charge of being a tourist and the problems of inferred materialism and victimization by the tourism establishment. Further, the semantic solution (of reserving the term “tourist” for others, while failing to apply it to oneself) perpetuates a peculiar—yet conventional—understanding of tourism and tourists.

2. Paul Fussell and the Rise of (An-)Tourism. Paul Fussell, an English professor and social and literary critic, develops an argument that supports that of Boorstin. Fussell (1980: 38-39) laments many of the socio-technological changes that have occurred since the Renaissance and concludes that tourism is the least noble of several forms of travel:

Before tourism there was travel, and before travel there was exploration. ... The genuine traveler is, or used to be, in the middle between the two extremes. If the explorer moves toward the risks of the formless and the unknown, the tourist moves toward the security of pure cliché. It is between these two poles that the traveler mediates, retaining all he can of the excitement of the unpredictable attaching to exploration, and fusing that with the pleasure of 'knowing where one is' belonging to tourism.

Fussell (1980: 42) is insistent that tourists can be distinguished from travelers, and suggests that telltale signs concern a preoccupation with social status and materialism:

What distinguishes the tourist is the motives, few of which are ever openly revealed: to raise social status at home and to allay social anxiety; to realize fantasies of erotic freedom; and most important, to derive secret pleasure from posing momentarily as a member of a social class superior to one’s own, to play the role of a ‘shopper’ and spender whose life becomes significant and exciting only when one is exercising power by choosing what to buy.

Fussell (1980: 41) assumes “that travel is now impossible and that tourism is all we have left.” With this orientation, he interprets tourism as a status war that has created its own sociological product—the “anti-tourist”:

As I have said, it is hard to be a snob and a tourist at the same time. A way to combine both roles is to become an anti-tourist. Despite the suffering he undergoes, the anti-tourist is not to be confused with the traveler: his motive is not inquiry but self-protection and vanity. ... Abroad, the techniques practiced by anti-tourists anxious to assert their difference from all those tourists ... involve attempts to merge into the surroundings, like speaking the language, even badly. Some dissimulations are merely mechanical, like a man’s shifting his wedding ring from the left to the right hand. A useful trick is ostentatiously not carrying a camera.20 (Fussell, 1980: 47)

Finally, Fussell remarks on the management of “tourist angst,” a condition arising when one faces one’s own tourist identity:

Tourist angst ... is distinctly a class signal. Only the upper elements of the middle classes suffer from it, and it is endemic in places like Florence and Mikonos and Crete. It is rare in pseudo-places like Disneyland, where people have come just because other people have come. This is to say that the working class finds nothing shameful about tourism. It is the middle class that has read and heard just enough to sense that being a tourist is somehow offensive and scorned by an imagined upper class which it hopes to emulate and, if possible, be mistaken for.21 (Fussell, 1980: 49)

It is Fussell’s (1987: 653) conclusion that the challenge before the contemporary tourist is to do one’s best to perform both as a sensitive tourist and as a traveler, to strive to enjoy “the stereotyped as well as the outre [Other].”

The Customary View

The customary view of tourism that we summarize here is a generalized model of shared assumptions and understandings. It is derived, in part, from the images of tourism and tourists that Boorstin and Fussell have so provocatively diagnosed and which have been discussed above.

The customary view is the everyday or non-professional perspective of the tourist public—persons who intermittently behave as tourists, but who do not make their living by promoting, controlling, or otherwise analyzing tourism. In its essence, the customary view is a quick explanation answering the question “What is tourism all about?”

As will be seen in the next section, the customary view is also evident in analyses of tourism offered by academics and experts. The customary view has a cultural currency in that it facilitates discourse and evaluation, and can lead to action. Most importantly, the customary view is more accepted than challenged.25
The customary view of tourism is based on three premises. With a first premise, tourism is considered to be a two-component social system consisting of those who reside in the vicinity of the touristic destination on the one hand, and of visiting tourists on the other. Under a second premise, the tourist is taken to be a rational, independent actor who initiates the touristic trip and accordingly must bear lead responsibility for its consequences on locals and the environment. The third premise holds that the relationship forged between the tourist and the local is predominantly socio-economic in character (i.e., based on a supply and demand model); tourists and locals are portrayed as “guests and hosts” or as “consumers and producers.”

Taken together, these three premises generate a customary understanding of tourism in which consequences of tourism are seen to follow directly from the actions of tourists. The impacts of tourists on the world are expected at best to be benign, while at worst to be seriously negative. The touristic public and tourism analysts depend on the customary view to diagnose and plan tourism.

From our perspective, the customary view is not so wrong as it is limiting. To the extent that the view is adopted without testing or is projected without competition with other views, the customary view inhibits the development of different analytical understandings of tourism.

In a very preliminary way, we remark on how the customary view might be challenged. Addressing the first assumption, we reiterate a point made earlier that the BLT model of a tourism system accounts better for the different stakes that people have in fostering or opposing tourism than does a two-component model. Speaking to the second assumption, we acknowledge that tourists do indeed make decisions, but we elaborate that it is also the case that marketers and other brokers can be seen to create demand, effectively telling tourists what they should want. The third assumption describes the relationship between tourists and locals (using the BLT model, we would say between tourists and locals and brokers) in social and economic terms. This ignores the political dimensions of tourism.

Mass Tourism

_Because of sheer numbers, people tend to think first of modern, mass tourism (with all its negative consequences) as a model for all tourism._

—_Dennison Nash (1996: 23)_

In this section, we examine how aspects of the customary view profiled above are revealed in the ways in which tourism is popularly and professionally discussed. In this, we concentrate on the general inclination of people to consider mass tourism and the mass tourist with disdain.

Mass Tourism—The Most “Dissed” Tourism

In everyday conversation, “mass tourism” has become the preferred term of disrespect, the favorite target of tourism critics who subscribe to the customary view. The popular image of mass tourism is patently negative; it so brings to mind touristic errors of materialism, ignorance, style, and insensitivity that it is virtually inconceivable that anyone would accept being labeled a mass tourist.

While mass tourism is denounced with conviction by the touristic public and by touristic pundits, it is not easily defined. Mass tourism is a multidimensional concept that evokes different images and dissatisfaction for different people. These images and associations make mass tourism a symbol of many wrongs. To illustrate, we describe five basic interpretations of mass tourism as a problem:

1. Mass Tourism as a Population Problem. With this view, mass tourism brings to mind images of great crowds and invasions of tourists. Mass in this context refers to an undifferentiated (and unthinking) quantity or weight of tourism. Mass tourism becomes a “tourismmass” analogous to the ecological notion of biomass. In this context, mass tourism is perceived to be “wrong” for the congestion it creates and for the way the combined behavior of members of the mass interferes with the remainder of the ecosystem.

   This conceptualization does not, however, provide standards of scale that would help the observer to know the acceptable levels of mass tourism. Nor does this view make any inference about the sociological or economic structure of the tourismmass or about its relations to the remainder of society.

2. Mass Tourism as a Technological Problem. For many, mass tourism denotes the efficient and relatively inexpensive movement of large numbers of travelers. The history of this mass tourism is punctuated by the development of technological and business innovations that have affected modes of mass transportation. Thus, the early rise of mass tourism in the nineteenth century can be linked to the development of the first railroads in Europe in the 1830s, and the rise of the Continental and trans-Atlantic steamship trade in the early- and mid-1800s.

   Speaking to the social aspects of technology, changing business practices have equally nurtured mass tourism. In 1841, Thomas Cook—at the time a publisher and an unpaid general overseer of a temperance association—arranged for a “Special Train” to conduct 570 passengers...
on a ten-mile excursion from Leicester to Loughborough for a temperance meeting. In 1845, Cook repeated the experiment for profit and negotiated with four railroad companies to take 350 excursionists from Leicester to the sea at Liverpool (Swinglehurst, 1974: 14-15; 28-30).

In a famous demonstration of entrepreneurship, Cook expanded (with the help of his family) his business to the proportions of an empire. By making travel affordable and arranging for every detail, Cook simply revolutionized the business of tourism. Cook is credited with democratizing travel by addressing not only aristocratic tourists, but also tourists (and notably women) from the middle- and working-classes (e.g., Swinglehurst, 1974, Tumer and Ash, 1975, and Withey, 1997). In the course of an extraordinary career, Cook also invented the role of travel agent as an “Excursion and Tourist Manager,” prepared what is perhaps the first package tour guidebook (A Handbook of the Trip to Liverpool), and founded the first travel magazine—The Excursionist. (Swinglehurst, 1974: 28-29; 35; 156).

3. Mass Tourism as an Infrastructural Problem. This view of mass tourism—like the technological view just discussed—is an explanation that challenges the meaning of what has been called “progress.” Whereas the technological view focuses on modes and brokers of transportation, the infrastructural view concerns hotels, enclaves, resorts, and other accommodations; restaurants; and human-created tourism attractions. Mass tourism interpreted this way is considered “wrong” for its role in contributing to urban expansion and to the disfigurement of the natural landscape.

4. Mass Tourism as a Service Problem. Seen as a service problem, mass tourism involves organized groups of tourists under the control of brokers (e.g., tour guides, resort managers, travel agents). This mass tourism is perceived as “wrong” for the manipulation of tourists and locals, and for the transformation of the tourist environment by service institutions in the pursuit of profit.

5. Mass Tourism as a Social Problem. Mass tourism also conveys something about the tourists themselves. With the social view, mass tourism has social, economic, and political meanings, evoking images of a traveling middle-class. Those who have this perspective perceive themselves as somehow more qualified to travel (and more entitled to judge the travel of others) than the persons they consider to be mass tourists. This elitist view builds on the idea that those who travel inexpensively in “tourist class” are settling for a lesser experience not only in transit, but in all aspects of the touristic trip.

The mass tourist in this view shares qualities with those attributed to the “mass man”—a figure of speech with origins in the 1940s, a time in which dramatic changes in the growth and mobility of human populations were associated with technological progress. The Random House Dictionary of the English Language (1987: 1183) defines mass man as:

a hypothetical common man, especially one held to be typical of a mass society, to be characterized by the absence of unique values or distinct personality traits, to lack a sense of personal or social responsibility, and to be readily manipulated by the techniques developed by mass media.

Mass tourism in this view is devalued because the mass tourist is regarded as undistinguished and “average,” as having no personal history or voice.

Separately and collectively, these five images are validated in day-to-day experience. They are operative when people express with a cultural reflex their distaste for the mass tourism of, for example, Waikiki, Las Vegas, Disneyland, and any crowded beach town or resort worldwide.

The images foster conclusions that mass tourism is intrinsically “wrong.” In each instance, however, mass tourism can be seen to be a surrogate for a more generalized object of controversy. Thus, mass tourism qua population problem raises objections to growth. Mass tourism qua technological problem encourages negative reactions to science and technology. Mass tourism qua infrastructural problem encourages opposition to urbanization and development. Mass tourism qua service problem legitimates negative reactions to the profit motive in the service sector. Finally, mass tourism qua social problem promotes a poor understanding of the struggles and potentials of the middle-class.

That words used informally to discuss matters of tourism have multiple, even contradictory, connotations is not a serious problem. Indeed, the humor, satire, and sociopolitical sparring that makes life interesting is all supported by flexible language. In the realm of science, however, terminological ambiguity is to be avoided. Adherence to the ideal of objectivity requires that technical terms be free of value judgments. Science seeks therefore to describe or predict how the natural and social worlds are organized; it does not, in theory, concern itself with recommendations unless the value orientation of the analyst is made explicit.

The Analysis of Mass Tourism—A Problem of Quantities, Qualities, and Subjectivities

In the analytical literature of tourism, the term “mass tourism” and variants that include “mass tourist” have been used inconsistently. The selections in this volume, for example, illustrate that analysts, like the touristic public,
associate mass tourism with population, technological, infrastructural, service, and social problems. This has fostered the study of the nature and consequences of mass tourism with a grand array of biological, ecological, historical, engineering, cultural, social, economic, political, (post)modern, and other disciplinary paradigms.

Analytical accomplishments aside, mass tourism and the mass tourist are all too frequently assumed to be elements of popular speech with the result that they are employed more with diction than examined with scientific or humanistic precision. It is not uncommon in the tourism literature for researchers to use the term “mass tourism” without defining the term at all. In such cases, it might be expected that the reader would infer that mass tourism means many tourists, and moreover presume that this term is engaged in by persons of the socioeconomic middle-class. Given the omnipresence of the customary view, we would suspect that the reader would additionally be inclined to infer that the mass tourism in question is unfortunate for the impacts caused by the quantity of tourists, and for the consequences (including those affecting the tourists themselves) of their behavior.

As mass tourism has been used by tourism analysts, the term has come to have three different meanings, each of which is an extension (though in different ways) of the images discussed above. Two of the associated approaches to mass tourism are compatible with the ideal of objectivity and its traditional criteria (reliability and validity). The quantitative meaning stresses changes in the demographic, economic, and business “numbers” of tourism. The complementary qualitative meaning emphasizes the socio-cultural transformations of tourism. The third approach to mass tourism—one that promotes a subjective meaning of the term—is, by comparison, incompatible with scientific inquiry. This approach unfortunately inhibits objective analysis by embedding a judgement of mass tourism as a feature of its definition.

1. **Mass Tourism—The Quantitative Meaning.** With the quantitative approach to the importance of the phenomenon, mass tourism is analytically approached as a statistical—but not a social or moral—problem. This is the meaning fostered by those who incorporate standardized kinds of census and travel data in demographic, economic, and business analyses. Research questions concerning the intensities and distributions of mass tourism have to do with measurement of the overall magnitude of travel, travel routes, profiles of tourists (based, for example, on country of origin, age, occupation, size of party, etc.), visitation patterns (as characterized, for example, by length of stay, purpose of visit, etc.), and so forth.

Two distinct subcultures of analysts regularly use a quantitative conceptualization of mass tourism. First, analysts trained in microeconomics examine mass tourism to reveal, for example, how the quantity demanded by would-be mass tourists of a touristic product (say, an airplane ticket combined with hotel accommodations in a package tour) declines with increase in price of the product. The economic framework depends on the idea that the decisions that people make, and which constitute demand, are determined by preferences and available income. Microeconomics might also study how the entire demand curve shifts with changes in, for example, the number of consuming mass tourists.

Importantly, the microeconomic analyst (at least in uncomplicated studies) does not focus on the question of how it is that mass tourists come to have preferences. Because this question is not pertinent for the purposes of many analyses, it is assumed that people simply have preferences prior to being exposed to any particular economic product.

A second subculture of analysts that employ a quantitative conceptualization of the mass tourist consists of professionals with backgrounds in advertising and marketing. The job of these analysts is to effectively communicate the advantages of existing products to consumers, and also to design products that mass tourists do or will want. Not surprisingly, mass tourism advertisers and marketers exhibit an opposite assumption about the origins of preferences than do microeconomists. For this group, the preferences of mass tourists are—to a degree—regarded as creations of advertising and marketing departments. Thus, the presentation of a touristic product actually generates preferences.32

2. **Mass Tourism—the Qualitative Meaning.** Mass tourism has qualitative significance for analysts who are concerned with changes in cultural and social structures and processes that have been attributed to changes in the sheer numbers of people traveling. Used to denote tourism with a particular quality or identifying character, mass tourism contrasts with other kinds of tourism on dimensions that reflect more than just the volume of travel. In remarking on a host of sociological typologies, Nunez (1989: 272), for example, suggests that “mass tourism” might usefully be contrasted with “elite tourism.”33

When mass tourism is employed in a qualitative manner, it is defined to make a point warranted by theory in a field such as sociology or cultural anthropology. Despite the way in which mass tourism may be used elsewhere, it is essential to social scientific practice that the term is introduced in analyses with neutrality. This is to say that while the consequences of mass tourism may empirically be seen to be severe and negative, mass tourism per se is neither “good” nor “bad” any more than an exploding population of predators (say, wolves or sea lions) is so perceived.41
Several examples of the use of mass tourism as a descriptive—that is, neutral—sociological and historical concept follow:

i.) Grayburn (1989: 30) remarks on the origins of mass tourism in a way that would facilitate the study of class struggles:

The final cultural revolution that set the stage for the mass tourism of today was prompted by the First World War. Not only did this catastrophe pauperize the elite riviersonas, but it did away with many of the ruling families and other European aristocrats whose fortunes had fueled the lifestyle.

ii.) Pi-Sunyer (1989: 191) equates mass tourism with "modern tourism" and sees this Post-World War II phenomenon to represent "more than a mere quantitative jump in the incidence of travelers." Citing instances in Europe, Pi-Sunyer (1989: 191) links mass tourism with expansions of the tourist market in which less-developed regions and countries have been transformed into "the summer playgrounds of the working classes and the lower middle classes of the more affluent nations."

Tourism on the present scale is clearly a reflection of the socioeconomic transformations experienced by the more developed Western societies since 1950; in short, it is a manifestation of mass consumption. ... [T]he discontinuities created by mass tourism were in the main the consequence of a sudden change from a historic, steady interaction with a limited number of outsiders to the massive influx of short-term tourists. (Pi-Sunyer, 1989: 191)

iii.) Lead (1995: 266) views mass tourism as a social form wedded to its very transportation technology:

The industrialization of travel created a new integration of human and machine through common motion. This integration produced a new kind of a collective, a 'mass,' distinguished by an absence of the inequalities that usually characterize social structures.

Speaking of the sociology of touristic trips, Lead (1995: 269) elaborates:

Our touristic journeys thus differ in telling ways from what constituted the experience of expatriationaries before the age of steam. Ours are journeys mediated by machinery, which defines our membership in a mass, our temporary communities, our extended body awareness attained through mechanized motion.

3. Mass Tourism—The Subjective Meaning. The subjective approach to mass tourism differs from the quantitative and qualitative approaches in that the term is defined in a way to carry—and implicitly endorse—either a positive or a negative evaluation of the activity. It is important to keep in mind the difference between defining a variable in preparation for research in, say, a negative way, and concluding as a consequence of analysis that the variable causes unfortunate outcomes. Mass tourism may indeed be empirically shown to have certain negative impacts on ecologies and people visited, and on tourists themselves, but this conclusion does not warrant definitions of mass tourism in future studies that imply it is inherently "bad" or "undesirable."

Examples of analyses that treat mass tourism subjectively and negatively, but do not bother to define the term are pervasive in the tourism literature. These are disturbing because they invite the reader to agree from the outset that mass tourism is to be discouraged and that mass tourists are somehow morally, intellectually, physically, or otherwise inferior to the reader, the analyst, and others with more refined travel habits and preferences. The authors of such studies would be inclined to concede that they are prejudiced against mass tourism as a collective phenomenon and mass tourists as individuals.

We have no quarrel with those who personally oppose mass tourism and choose to attack it in an ideological, philosophical, aesthetic, or other grounds. Free speech and activism are to be encouraged in the tourism policy arena. After all, there are also those who see in tourism—mass or any other kind—mechanisms that would liberate the tourist.36 Nor do we ask those who tailor their analyses to different partitions of tourism to look instead to mass tourism.37 But, we do, however, point out that it is also all too common for analysts to inadvertently incorporate biased definitions of mass tourism in their scientific work.

Here we offer illustrations of how mass tourism has been defined in a sociological context by Erik Cohen and in a cultural anthropological context by Valerie Smith. While it is surely the case that their definitions were developed to foster neutral analyses, the tone of the writing arguably reveals an antipathy of the researchers toward mass tourism.

We do not, however, mean to single out two researchers for criticism and imply that they alone might employ some definitions with embedded judgements. In fact, both scientists are widely and rightly respected for their pioneering contributions. The work of Cohen is so well-known that it is almost routine for his typology to be centrally considered in reviews of the field and in anthologies (see, for example, Urry, 1990; Lowry et al., 1992). Nash (1996: 164) reports that Smith's 1989 edited volume, *Hosts and Guests*, "may be the best known book in
the field." Our purpose here, then, is to encourage the refinement of definitions so that these could not be interpreted as value-laden.

i.) In a sociological paper, Cohen (1990: 199) contends that tourism combines "a degree of novelty with a degree of familiarity," and finds sociological expression of this in a continuum of four tourist roles: 1) the "organized mass tourist," 2) the "individual mass tourist," 3) the "explorer," and 4) the "drifter." Cohen defines the two roles reflecting mass tourism as follows:

The Organized Mass Tourist: The organized mass tourist is the least adventurous and remains largely confined to his 'environmental bubble' throughout his trip. The guided tour, conducted in an air-conditioned bus, traveling at high speed through a steameng countryside, represents the prototype of the organized mass tourist. This tourist type buys a package tour as if it were just another commodity in the modern mass market. The itinerary of his trip is fixed in advance, and all his stops are well-prepared and guided; he makes almost no decisions for himself and stays almost exclusively in the microenvironment of his home country. Familiarity is at a maximum, novelty at a minimum.

The Individual Mass Tourist: This type of tourist role is similar to the previous one, except that the tour is not entirely preplanned, the tourist has a certain amount of control over his time and itinerary and is not bound to a group. However, all of his major arrangements are still made through a tourist agency. His excursions do not bring him much further afield than do those of the organized mass tourist. He, too, does his experiencing from within the 'environmental bubble' of his home country and ventures out only occasionally—and even then only into well-charted territory. Familiarity is still dominant, but somewhat less so than in the preceding type; the experience of novelty is somewhat greater, though is often of the routine kind. (1990: 199)

Cohen (1990: 199) considers these two mass tourism roles to be "institutionalized" in that:

... they are dealt with in a routine way by the tourist establishment—the complex of travel agencies, travel companies, hotel chains, etc. which cater to the tourist trade.

Expanding on the nature of institutionalized tourism, Cohen is critical of the sociological outcome:

Contemporary institutionalized tourism is a mass industry. The tour is sold as a package, standardized and mass-produced. ... The main purpose of mass tourism is the visiting of attractions, whether genuine or contrived. ... The sad irony of modern institutionalized tourism is that, instead of destroying myths between countries, it perpetuates them. The tourist comes home with the illusion that he has 'been' there and can speak with some authority about the country he has visited. (1990: 200, 202)

ii.) In a typology of tourism determined by the "kinds of leisure activity undertaken by the tourist," Smith (1989: 4-6) includes "ethnic tourism," "historical tourism," "environmental tourism," and "recreational tourism." In addition, Smith presents a tourist typology based on "their numbers, their goals, and their adaptations to local norms." In this, mass tourism is seen to have three variants that remind one of Cohen's two mass tourism roles. First, "Incipient Mass tourism" is introduced as:

... a steady flow of people, and although the numbers are increasing, they usually travel as individuals or in small groups. The tourist industry is only one sector of the total economy, and hotels usually have a mix of guests including domestic travelers and businessmen as well as tour groups. This phase of tourist activity is exemplified by many 'popular' destinations such as Guatemala, or the summer visitors to the Arctic, the latter secure in their guided tour, heated buses, and modern hotels. These tourists seek Western amenities, and totally ignoring the fact that at great expense the hotel room in the Arctic has a private bath, many of these visitors would complain about the 'ring around the bathtub.' (Smith, 1989: 13)

Second, a more generic "Mass tourism" is:

... a continuous influx of visitors who inundate Hawaii most of the year, and other areas at least seasonally, including the European resorts, and Northern Hemisphere 'winter vacation' lands such as coastal Mexico and the Caribbean. Mass
tourism is built upon middle-class income and values, and the impact of sheer numbers is high. Because of the diversity of individual tastes and budgets, in Europe, for example, the tourists are everywhere—hitchhiking at the roadside, riding trains with their Eurailpasses, or huddling around a guide who is attempting to be heard above the voices of other guides in some crowded museum. With a 'you get what you pay for' attitude, they fill up hotels of every category, pensions, and hostels but, as a common denominator, they expect a trained, multi-lingual hotel and tourist staff to be alert and solicitous to their wants as well as to their needs. The 'tourist bubble' of Western amenities is very much in evidence. (Smith, 1989: 13)

Third, "Charter tourism" is introduced in the following way:

Charter tourists arrive en masse, as in Waikiki, and for every 747 plane load, there is a fleet of at least ten big buses waiting to transfer them from the airport to the designated hotel, in the lobby of which is a special Tour Desk to provide itineraries and other group services. Should an individual ask even a simple, 'What time does the tour bus go?,' the immediate answer is, 'What group are you with?' The 'you' in the reply is spoken as to a 'living thing' and not as to a personality. Charter tourists wear name tags, are assigned to numbered buses, counted aboard, and continually reminded: 'Be sure to get on the right bus.' Given the requisite organization that makes Charter tourism a high-volume business, to avoid complaints tour operators and hotels have standardized the services to Western (or Japanese) tastes, and there are 'ice machines and soft drinks on every floor.' For Charter tourists, even destination may be of very little importance, especially if they won the trip as part of an incentive sales program, or it coincides with tax-free convention travel. (Smith, 1989: 13-14)

These two definitions, like those of Cohen, reinforce the idea that mass tourism is wrong for its consequences, if not embarrassing for its tackiness. Despite the fact these descriptions are offered in a typology, the profiles are not delivered in a neutral tone. It is clear that, for Smith, the behavior of Incipient, Mass, and Charter tourists leaves much to be desired. Smith defines Incipient mass tourism as consisting of naéve, if not ethnocentric tourists. Mass tourism is driven by tourists who, in Smith's eyes, are subservient to guides, and who exhibit a materialistic attitude toward life, demanding their wants be satisfied. Finally, Charter tourism fares no better in Smith's assessment.

Discussion

In this paper, we have examined some of the ways in which tourism and tourists are defined and evaluated in everyday discourse and also in the literature of tourism research. We have isolated assumptions that facilitate knee-jerk opinions that tourism is inherently ugly and that tourists are uniformly insensitive and incorrigible. We have argued that positions taken about mass tourism and mass tourists often betray a failure to make a distinction between properties of a system and properties of individuals within systems.

Earlier, we pointed out that that self-attributes towards tourism are marked by ambivalence. Because the character of tourist systems and the behavior of fellow tourists is so frequently disappointing, negative stereotypes have surfaced in both popular and academic considerations of tourism and critiques of the styles of individual tourists. As we have shown, mass tourism and mass tourists have been cast as scapegoats by those who find it easy or convenient to malign others who travel.

Yet, touristic ambivalence also signals a deep-seated positive inclination to travel. Most of the countless masses who have been tallied in tourism statistics would be of the opinion that they have greatly benefited from travel, and would no doubt encourage their family members, friends, and others to travel as well.

In the early 1960s, brokers and tourists began to cooperate in the redesign of tourism and the tourist identity. Miller (1993a: 187) reports that the term "eco-tourism" can be traced to a call by Hetzer (1965) for a reassessment of the educational and cultural possibilities to be found in tourism. In the period since, ecotourism and a host of relatives (e.g., "nature tourism," "adventure tourism," "soft tourism," "responsible tourism," "green tourism," "sustainable tourism," "environmentally sound tourism," "ethnic tourism") subsumed under the rubric of "alternative tourism" have been widely discussed (e.g., Keyes and van den Berghe; 1984; Edwards, 1988; Kusler, 1991; Whelan, 1991; Smith and Eadington, 1992).

Over the last years, forms of alternative tourism have been so effectively promoted as superior to "mass" (or "mainstream") tourism that the argument has been incorporated into the customary view of tourism. In reviewing this literature, Pearce (1992: 22-26) reports that the key variables used in distinguishing alternative tourism from "conventional or mass tourism" concern: 1) facilities (type, scale, quality, service, prices), 2) location (localized/extensive, isolated/ incorporated), 3) developers/ownership (origin and type, attitudes and motives), 4) development process (requirements, time, planning, process, form), and 5) markets and marketing (origin of tourists, other
tourist characteristics, promotion and packaging), and 6) impacts.

The rising interest of analysts and policy makers in forms of alternative tourism is introduced by Pearce (1989: 101):

Opponents of high-volume, large scale, enclavic forms of tourism development have suggested that there must be other, better ways of developing tourism in Third World countries. Mass tourism ... has been criticized for the degree of external control and for failing to deliver on promised economic benefits while causing severe social disruption.

Eadington and Smith (1992: 3) echo this justification:

Disillusionment with 'mass' tourism and the many problems it has triggered has led many observers and researchers to criticize vociferously the past methods and directions of tourism development and to offer instead the hope of 'alternative tourism,' broadly defined as forms of tourism that are consistent with natural, social, and community values and which allow both hosts and guests to enjoy positive and worthwhile interaction and shared experience.

It is instructive to realize that alternative tourism is explicitly marketed as a positively valued substitute for negatively valued mass tourism. This is unfortunate because it imposes a judgement about preferred tourism conditions instead of offering a neutral vocabulary for analysis. Eadington and Smith (1992: 3) nearly anticipate this complaint:

As many of the articles in this volume point out, it is easier to grasp and speak against the negative results of mass tourism than it is to formulate a realistic and cohesive view of what 'alternative tourism,' however defined, can reasonably offer.

We agree with Eadington and Smith (1992) that there cannot be one "alternative tourism" that merits universal application. There are as many forms of alternative tourism as there are visions. Further, we align with Butler (1992) who has succinctly described the mass tourism vs. alternative tourism debate as an unproductive misunderstanding of the positive and negative potentials of development:

[...simplistic (big/small, rapid/slow development) type of comparison (between mass and alternative forms of tourism) is not acceptable. (1992: 37)]

Alternative tourism is often used as a synonym for appropriate tourism. In this context, however, it is necessary to ask the question: appropriate for whom? Furthermore, one should also ask for how long, under what conditions, and by whose decision is it deemed appropriate? (1992: 39)

Development has the capacity to enhance enjoyment, economic return, and the environment if the type, scale, and timing are correct. It also has the power to degrade, corrupt, or bankrupt and despoil if any or all of the elements are wrong. Claiming that one form of tourism is all thing for all areas is not only pious and naive, it is unfair, unrealistic, and unwise. (1992: 46)

In conclusion, we remind readers that tourism and tourists should be treated with a constructive suspicion, but not with predisposed cynicism. Touristic systems in the coastal pleasure pimplery qualify as important objects of inquiry. Tourism analysis are especially challenged to 1) develop a vocabulary of broker-local-tourist interactions that does not prejudice conclusions, 2) examine the role of tourism brokers in interactions between tourists and locals as well the role of brokers in managing interactions that link locals and tourists with the environment, and 3) delve as well into the study of the accomplishments and impacts of tourism approaches that are proposed as alternatives to mass tourism.
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ENDNOTES

1 To illustrate, a discussion paper (U.S. Federal Agencies, 1998: F-19) published in the United Nations “International Year of the Ocean” finds little information on U.S. marine and coastal tourism:

There is no systematic collection of data and information on the magnitude, nature, and economic and social impacts of tourism and recreation in the nation’s coastal zone. This is, in part, responsible for a general under-appreciation of this set of activities and for the failure to devote adequate planning and management attention to the relevant issues that are raised for coastal tourism and recreation.
Most kinds of tourism have both proponents and detractors. "Enclave" or resort tourism, for example, can be seen to be both a problem and a solution. For some, this tourism—as it is associated with the acquisition of valuable lands, infrastructural development, and rules of exclusion—is an intensification of mass tourism. For others, enclave tourism is a solution of sorts. Because it is designed as an expensive and localized experience, enclave tourism involves relatively few tourists interested in the best of service and on-site exposure to artistic and cultural productions, and aesthetic vistas.

Tourism that takes place in the coastal zone can be considered as falling along a "coastal dependency continuum." At one end of the continuum is the tourism that requires beaches, boats, living marine resources and the other amenities usually expected in a seaside destination. At the opposite pole is the tourism based in museums, casinos, theme parks, and shopping malls that could just as reasonably take place in non-coastal settings.

In this essay, we are primarily interested in coastal-dependent tourism. We do, however, recognize that it can prove difficult to separate coastal-dependent tourism from non-coastal-dependent tourism. To illustrate, consider the touristic report of Umberto Eco (1986: 48-49) concerning American "amusement cities" and attractions:

- Spongeorana, Sea World, Scripps Aquarium, Wild Animal Park, Jungle Gardens, Alligator Farm, Manneland: the coasts of California and Florida are rich in marine cities and artificial jungles where you can see free-ranging animals, trained dolphins, bicycling parrots, otters that drink martinis with an olive and take showers, elephants and camels that carry small visitors on their backs among the palm trees. The theme of hyperrealistic reproduction involves not only Art and History, but also Nature.

The attitudes that prevail today about tourism and tourists can be better understood with an appreciation of terminology. We digress briefly to show how "tour," "tourist," and "tourism" entered the English vocabulary.

- Tour has Middle English and French forms, and traces to tōrnus (Latin for lathe), and also to tórnus, (Greek for a tool describing a circle, a turner's wheel). By one dictionary meaning, "tour" as a noun refers to:
  a going or traveling round from place to place, a round; an excursion or journey including the visiting of a number of places in a circuit or sequence ...; [especially] a circumtuous journey embracing the principal place of the country or region mentioned. (The Oxford English Dictionary, 1989:18] 305)

Used in this sense, OED establishes that "tour" first appeared in print in 1652, and that a spelling variant appeared shortly before that in 1643. The "Grand Tour"—a term most usually employed to refer to a journey taken by a young Englishman (typically accompanied by a tutor and servants) in the eighteenth century through France, Germany, Switzerland, and Italy—was known for its function of educating future diplomats, public servants, soldiers, and gentlemen a century before it first appeared in print in 1670 (Hibbert, 1969: 10).

- Tourist derives from tour and is defined in the dictionary as:
  One who makes a tour or tours; [especially] one who does this for recreation; one who travels for pleasure or culture, visiting a number of places for their objects of interest, scenery, or the like. (OED, 1989:18] 306)

According to OED, "tourist" first appeared in print in 1780 and by about 1800 was considered as a synonym for "traveler." OED (1989: 18] 306 also confirms that "tourist class" appeared in print (in the New Yorker) as early as 1936: "In Tourist Class, too, you can find typical American standards."

- Tourism did not appear in print until 1811; its dictionary definition is:
  The theory and practice of touring; traveling for pleasure. [Originally usually depreciatory.] Also, the business of attracting tourists and providing for their accommodation and entertainment; the business of operating tours. (OED, 1989:18] 306; emphasis added)

The World Tourism Organization makes a statistical distinction between "international tourists" and "excursionists;" the former spend 24 hours (or, in some compilations, one night) in the country visited, and the latter a shorter period. International tourists and excursionists are both classified as "visitors," who are in turn defined as "travelers" who visit countries "for any reason other than following an occupation remunerated within the country visited." Excluded from these categories are border workers, nomads, transit workers, refugees, members of the armed forces, representatives of consulates, diplomats, and temporary and permanent immigrants. WTO categorizes "domestic tourists" and "excursionists" in a similar manner (WTO cited in Miller and Au Yong 1991c: 96-97). For additional detail regarding WTO guidelines, see Gee et al. (1984: 4-11). For basic sources of tourism statistics, see Goeldner (1981).
6. Leed (1995) concentrates on "modern" (or "industrial age") tourism.

7. Van den Bergh and Kees (1984) have conceptualized tourism as fostering three roles: the "tourist," the "tourist"—a performer who modifies his behavior for gain according to his perception of what is attractive to the tourist" (1984: 346)—and the "traveler." With the BLT model, private sector brokers include, among others, the "traveler" identified by van den Bergh and Kees (See Endnote 7; 1984: 346) as well as their "traveler" who:

...fakes his art, his dress, his music, his dancing, his religion, and so on, to satisfy the ethnic tourist's thirst for authenticity at the very same time that the tourist invasion assaults his culture and subjects it to the homogenizing process known as 'modernization.'

8. We are grateful to our students for raising some of these possibilities. The term 'unwitting attraction' was suggested by Chensie Gaffney; "attractor" was suggested by Andrew Bennett. Relatedly, brokers can also sometimes be regarded as attractors and amenities. With the perspective that political activists can be brokers (for example, in formally rejecting some kinds of tourism). Edmund Eno moto suggests the term 'sovereign' for reformists in Hawaii who have demonstrated the potential to attract the interest of tourists.

9. This elaboration of the BLT model is illustrative rather than exhaustive. Tourists, for example, could be subclassified by World Tourism Organization categories (see Endnote 5); private-sector brokers could be partitioned into full-time, part-time, and seasonal categories; and so forth.

10. Rates of the population growth of brokers, locals, and tourists can be studied in the same way—and with the same Lotka-Volterra models—as are changes in the numbers of predators and prey that concern population biologists and ecologists.

11. In a parallel way, tourism planning, development, and management are all engaged in by private and social movement brokers, although the constituencies or clients may differ from those of the public sector broker. For ease of reading, we discuss public sector brokers as the primary agents of action in this section.

12. To illustrate, Miller (1989b: 115; also displayed in Grenier et al., 1993: 10-11) breaks down the tourism planning process into phases of "front-end planning" (consisting of scoping and research activities), "project planning," and "project management."

13. As a quick visit to a bookstore will attest, the genre of travel writing is popular with the touristic public. We are aware of only two titles, however, which signal that the lead figure is a "tourist." The first of these is Stendhal's (1962 [1838]) first-person account Memoirs of a Tourist. The second is Tyler's (1985) piece of fiction, The Accidental Tourist. Interestingly, Stendhal as a tourist is a seeker of truth whereas Tyler's lead character is a guidebook writer who hates to travel.

14. In comparison with the stigmatized identity of "tourist," consider that of the "student." The student identity is widely regarded in very positive terms, no doubt for the associations it evokes with scholastic intentions, an economic lifestyle, and the genuine curiosity of youth. Not surprisingly, many tourists describe themselves as students when they travel. The same strategy is used by professors, scientists, and others who can claim their travel is some kind of an assignment. Leed (1991: 287) makes a similar point in a discussion of the way in which travel writers and others are self-conscious about their own implicit tourism:

There is a touching desperation in the attempts of professional tourists, well-funded anthropologists, and recording travelers, to distinguish themselves from the traveling masses and run-of-the-mill adventurers. The most characteristic mark of the tourist is the wish to avoid tourists and the places they congregate. But this is merely evidence of the fact that travel is no longer a means of achieving distinction. It is a way of achieving and realizing a norm, the common identity we all share—the identity of the stranger.

Finally, consider the advertising language employed by a Canadian firm offering small group adventure packages to reach the "Discerning Traveler": "Canadian Adventures for the UNTourist."

16. More specifically, Boorstin defines a pseudo-event as a happening that:

- "... is not spontaneous, but comes about because someone has planned, planted, or incited it";
- "... is planted primarily (not always exclusively) for the immediate purpose of being reported or reproduced. Therefore, its occurrence is arranged for the convenience of the reporting or reproducing media. Its success is measured by how widely it is reported. ... The question, 'Is it real?' is less important to that, 'Is it newsworthy?'";
- "[has a] relation to the underlying reality of the situation [that] is ambiguous. Its interest arises largely from this very ambiguity. Concerning a pseudo-event the question, 'What does it mean?' has a new dimension. While the news interest in a train wreck is in what happened and in the real consequences, the interest in [a pseudo-event] is whether it
really happened and in what might have been the motives"; and

- "... usually ... is intended to be a self-
  fulfilling prophecy." (Boorstin, 1962: 11-12)

In later chapters, Boorstin (1962: 243) equates another of his terms—"images"—as "the pseudo-events of the ethical world":

What the pseudo-event is in the world of fact, the image is in the world of value. The image is a pseudo-ideal. As we shall see, it is synthetic, believable, passive, vivid, simplified, and ambiguous. (Boorstin, 1962: 185)

Although Boorstin does not explicitly say so in his chapter on travel, he would doubtless agree that images are surely as responsible as pseudo-events for the way in which American tourists behave and are perceived in their travel.

Giesz (1969) argues that the "bad taste" attributed to tourists is also a shortcoming of many others in modern society. Thus, the tourist is but one special case among many of "kitsch-man" (Kitzmensch):

As far as the kitsch-man is concerned, the fascination of tourism lies in this process of the familiarization of the exotic, which is analogous to the privacy of kitsch delight in art ...; or alternatively in the exoticization of the familiar.

The two processes are indistinguishable. He poses for photographs as a bullfighter, and the Acropolis is a suitable backdrop. (Giesz: 1969: 170-171)

The idea of an "Ugly American" as a touristic creature with ethnocentric and materialistic attitudes is easy for a contemporary audience to assimilate. This passage from Boorstin shows, however, that these tourists disappoint even themselves. Perhaps "Unfulfilled Tourist" is an equally fitting label.

In passing, it should be noted that the "Ugly American" in Lederer and Burdick's (1958) famous book of the same name was a physically ugly engineer who exhibited particularly positive traits and sensibilities in cross-cultural interactions in Southeast Asia. Other Americans described in the book leave much to be desired as ambassadors; this is illustrated by the evaluation of a fictitious character from Burma:

For some reason, however, the Americans I meet in my country are not the same as the ones I know in the United States. A mysterious change seems to come over Americans when they go to a foreign land. They isolate themselves socially. They live pretentiously. They're loud and ostentatious. Perhaps they're frightened and defensive; or maybe they're not properly trained and make mistakes out of ignorance. (Lederer and Burdick, 1958: 123)

Boorstin (1962: 243-245) contrasts idolatry (the attachment of value or importance to images) with materialism (the overvaluing of objects for their own sake). Acknowledging that Americans are commonly perceived to be materialistic, Boorstin rejects this perception, arguing that American society is all too often fooled by the very illusion it creates:

We suffer unwringly from our own idolatry. The more images we present to people, the more irrelevant and perversely and unattractive they find us. The image, because it invites compassion, is irrelevant. Few people are not sensible enough to see that the image does not relate to them. Our images suggest arrogance: in them we set ourselves up as a mold for the world. (Boorstin, 1962: 244)

Fussell has also written with humor about touristic status competitions waged to display "class" and command respect. In Class (1983: 109), he points out that tourism appeals to the middle class because the "feeling" of belonging to a higher class can be bought:

For what the middle class most envies in the classes above is their trips abroad, more than their houses, cars, or other items of local conspicuous consumption.

For an excellent sociological review of Class, see Kirk (1984). It would be interesting to compare Fussell's perspective on strategic impression management with the insights of Stephen Potter in, say, Three-upmanship (1962).

Humor aside, Fussell directs most of his attention at a middle class that he associates with the worst of science and technology, and the downside of purchasing power. Buzard (1993: 5) notes that while Fussell accurately describes the tendency of the educated middle class to deny that they are ever tourists, he "idealizes an upper-class capacity" to admit to being a tourist and to enjoy touristic amenities without angst. (At the same time, Buzard sees Urry [1990: 45-47] as idealizing a post-modern working class for the identical ability to battle angst.) For a criticism of Fussell and Boorstin based on their inattention to the cultural mechanisms responsible for shabby behavior, see Culler (1989).

The "truth" of the customary view is generally presumed on grounds of experiential knowledge and face-validity.

In those instances where a power relationship is perceived with the customary view to exist between the tourist and the local—as, for example, in tourism involving First World tourists and Third and Fourth World locals—this power is interpreted as colonial and imperialistic with a high potential for negative distributional outcomes. With this perspective, power in the hands of tourists has negative repercussions for locals. Generally, the customary view does not accommodate analyses of power that would
establish the tourist as the target (rather than the executor) of power.

The first railroad line in Europe linked Manchester with Liverpool and was built in 1830 (Dulles, 1964: 59).

The first steamship crossed the English Channel in 1816, the first regularly scheduled trans-Atlantic service was initiated by the Black Ball line in 1818 (Withey, 1997: 63). For a social history of Atlantic liner service for the 1818-1968 period, see Bannin (1971). See, also Dulles (1964: 43-67), Swinglehurst (1974: 96-107), and Withey (1997: 171-174; 188-190). Later, mass tourism was greatly facilitated by the development of the car and national road systems, and passenger aircraft. In 1958, the era of jet tourism was ushered in as the Boeing 707 displaced the propeller-driven DC-7 (Sutton, 1980: 247).

The democratizing influence of tourism has persisted across decades. For example, Gee, et al. (1984: 28) note that “package tours” opened Europe to American travelers in the period just before World War I in the way Cook’s tours earlier opened Europe to the English traveler. Gee et al. (1984: 26-27) also remark on how mass tourism in the United States has increased the opportunities for non-elite members of society to travel.

The sixties brought what has sometimes been called the ‘democratization’ of foreign travel. The middle class traveled abroad in great numbers.

For additional comment on tourism as democratizing force, see Urry (1990: 16, 24, 42) and Leed (1995: 255-271).

Today’s luxurious enclave resorts are descendents of the Grand Hotels of an earlier age. For an account of the rise of the Ritz hotels in the last quarter of the nineteenth century, see Ritz (1938).

Thomas Cook sold third class tickets for his first excursion trip from Leicester to Loughborough in 1841. Although Cook subsequently made a point of meeting the needs of upper-class customers, it also became a business routine to advertise “cheap” excursions and tours (see Swinglehurst, 1974: 29, 148).

It could be argued that a related term, “mass society,” also has negative connotations. The Random House Dictionary of the English Language (1987: 1183) defines mass society sociologically as:

A society whose members are characterized by having segmented, impersonal relations, a high degree of physical and social mobility, a spectator relation to events, and a pronounced tendency to conform to external popular norms.

These problem characteristics of mass tourism can, of course, be combined to support ideological and moral assaults on interlocking systems of capitalistic structures and Judeo-Christian worldviews.

As used here, the tourism analysts would include professors and government and industry managers and analysts. It would, importantly, not include “marketers” whose purpose is to re-package or re-create soiled tourism as quality travel.

Of course, there is no consensus in academia about the source of preferences or values. For some, preferences are formed early in the process of socialization and are relatively permanent, even latent. For others, preferences are not only sustained or rejected by experience, but are supplemented and displaced by new preferences as these are marketed by others.

Nunez (1989: 272) also mentions other contrast sets. These consist of:

... internal, domestic tourism vs. international tourism; 'packaged and programmed' tourism vs. individual tourism; resort tourism vs. 'off-the-beaten-track' tourism; religious vs. secular tourism; [and] recreational vs. educational or 'cultural' tourism.

For a discussion of six tourism typologies—some based on socio-economic characteristics of tourists, others on lifestyle differences—see Lowych et al. (1992). For an overview of classifications of tourism development and also typologies of tourists, see Pearce (1992). For a discussion of tourism development typologies in the context of coastal tourism, see Pearce (1989: 58-65).

Social scientists have long contended with the communication problems created when academic concepts used to study social problems—“deviance,” “delinquency,” “dysfunctionalism,” and “marginality” come quickly to mind—have popular meanings with negative connotations. Of course, biological and ecological scientists who investigate “predation,” “compeition,” etc. would have faced similar difficulties if their objects of study could talk.

In addition, Pi Sunyer (1989: 191) points out that:

[modem] tourism especially in southern Europe, differs also from earlier forms of travel in that it is overwhelmingly a phenomenon of the coasts.

For example, MacCannell (1989: xii) writes in his “Introduction” to the 1989 edition of The Tourist that he would “abhor any tendency to belitle the motives or competencies of the people we study.” He is truly interested in understanding the behavior of tourists in a time of modernity, not judging them:

Does tourism and/or postmodernity, conceived in the most possible way as a (perhaps final) celebration of distance, difference, or differentiation, ultimately liberate consciousness or enslave it? Is modernity, as constituted in the system of attractions and the mind of the tourist, a 'utopia of difference,' to use Van den
Abbeelée's energetic phrase? Or does it trap consciousness in a seductive pseudo-empowerment, a prison house of signs? _The Tourist_ does not give an answer. (MacCannell 1989: xvi)

Withey (1977: x) for example, chooses not to equate tourism with "mass, mechanized travel":

[Instead] I prefer to consider it rather more broadly, as leisure travel—a distinctly modern phenomenon but one that predates railroads and travel agents by several decades. In this sense, I would argue, tourism originates with the 'grand tour,' which had its origins in the sixteenth century but reached its heyday in the late eighteenth.

Cohen's categories of tourism have been used in many studies. Tumer and Ash, for example, see Third World nations as especially vulnerable to "institutionalized mass tourism" involving Cohen's "individual" and "organized" mass tourists. These tourists, along with "drifter" tourists, have proliferated since World War II and constitute for Turner and Ash (as they do for Cohen) a significant social problem:

Tourism is no trivial phenomenon. It is a visible result of the fourth of the great waves of technology which have changed the social geography of the world since 1800. ... Finally [after the development of railways, steamships, and cars] we have the aeroplane which, when linked with rising affluence, has led to a whole new tribe—the Mass Tourists. The barbarians of our Age of Leisure. The Golden Horde. (Turner and Ash, 1975: 11)

In addition to the "Incipient mass," "Mass," and "Charter" tourists types discussed here, Smith (1989: 11-15) refers to "Explorer," "Elite," "Off-beat," and "Unusual" tourists. Smith presents these seven types in a triangle diagram to show a frequency distribution that begins with a small number of Explorers and steadily increases to include Elite, Off-beat, and, ultimately a large number of Charter tourists. Smith's typology brings to mind Kaplan's (1960: 214) observation that:

... there have been four major types of travelers throughout history: the explorer or adventurer, the businessman, the soldier, and the missionary or religious pilgrim.

In consideration of the American traveler abroad, Kaplan (1960: 216) observes that there are "two rough types" of "new travelers:"

First there are those we may call 'comparative strangers.' These persons travel physically, but in reality they never, or seldom, leave their own familiar ideas and judgments. They find security wherever they may be in what is called ethnocentrism, the application of one's own standards to other situations: their own are always superior to those of others. They view, but do not understand. As Walter Lippman wrote, these are persons 'who do not see first and then define, they define first and then see.'

A second group may be called 'empathetic natives.' These persons seek, as best they can, to put themselves in the place of those whom they visit. They become native as much as their backgrounds, study, and empathy permit. What they take from their own environments are not particulars but universals. They sincerely wish to perceive and to understand. Like the explorer or trader, the soldier or the priest, these travelers depend on preparation and knowledge.

It is interesting to note that while Smith discusses other tourist types by modifying "tourist" with a type (e.g., "elite tourists," "charter tourists," "off-beat tourists," etc.), she does not extend this convention to the incipient and mass types. Thus, the reader hears about "incipient mass tourism" and "mass tourism," but not the "incipient mass tourist" or the "mass tourist:"

The rise of ecotourism follows from the agenda of environmentalists with travel ambitions and tourism entrepreneurs to repair the tarnished image of tourism. Miller (1985: 188-190) suggests that ecotourism represents a "restoration" and also an "enhancement" of tarnished images of tourism. With restoration, (ugly) tourism is transformed into benign ecotourism, in this case, ecotourism does no harm. With enhancement, tourism is transformed into extra-protectionist ecotourism; in this instance, ecotourism improves features of the social and ecological environment.

The customary view holds tourism—especially mass tourism—in a negative light. Alternative tourism is seen with the customary view to be a redeeming tourism.