

Considering Cosmotourism:

*An initial engagement with the latent cosmopolitanism
of 21st century tourism.*

Submitted by:

Lanah K. Hake

April 2009

In fulfillment of:

**Master of International Relations Degree
Victoria University Wellington
INTP 589**

Considering Cosmotourism:

An initial engagement with the latent cosmopolitanism of 21st century tourism.

Abstract

The field of international relations (IR) has historically been situated in a Westphalian state centric system focused on a limited conception of what actors and activities are worthy of attention. Within this structure, IR has oft considered the idea of cosmopolitanism and its universality of human values as stemming from the Stoics and Kant further limiting the parameters of the discourse. Today, a variety of subjective debates on how to define cosmopolitanism is re-emerging particularly at the borderlands of IR and sociology, philosophy and anthropology. With the majority of the discourse focused on theoretical elite conceptualizations versus practical consideration of what this concept of cosmopolitanism means in the 21st century, there are significant gaps in the discourse when pushed beyond abstraction. This paper contends that the result has been a failure to engage with the largest industry in the world, global tourism, projected to employ 1 out of every 11 formal sector jobs in 2010. As the provider of one-third of world exports and a key tool of development throughout the Global South via neoliberal institutions, this paper proposes the *tourism industrial complex* is worthy of serious engagement within IR. It suggests that by bridging the concepts of Bhabha's vernacular and Appiah's rooted cosmopolitanism, the lens is widened and, when combined with a focus on relevance, it is possible to recognize latent cosmopolitanism previously ignored. To do this, core considerations of Appiah's three moral obligations of the cosmopolitan project are synthesized to help ascertain what may or may not be 'relevant' by interrogating its level of global responsibility, global governance and involvement of global actors. Through this cosmopolitan framework, the global tourism is interrogated to expose the vast amount of latent cosmopolitanism as represented by work of United Nations World Tourism Organization (UNWTO), development of recent emerging alternative tourisms, and the growing array of global actors. By interrogating tourism as part of the non-elite cosmopolitical phenomenon, this paper highlights the inability of current limited conceptions of cosmopolitanism to engage with key areas of modernity. In light of the need for a more robust engagement with the large, yet relatively ignored global industry of tourism, the paper concludes with the suggestion of a *cosmotourism* discourse. Through the reconsideration of cosmopolitanism and its application to tourism via a broader framework focused on relevance, the *cosmotourism* discourse is both substantiated and provided with an initial foundation from which this new conversation can begin.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | |
|---|-----------|
| Introduction | 1 |
| Literature Review | 4 |
| Delineating Cosmopolitanism | 4 |
| Debating the Definition | 6 |
| Focusing on Relevance | 9 |
| Approach: Re-considering Cosmopolitanism | 12 |
| Synthesizing Cosmo Criteria | 13 |
| Global Responsibility | 13 |
| Global Governance | 15 |
| Global Actors | 17 |
| Exploring Tourism with Cosmo Criteria | 21 |
| Seeing the <i>Tourism industrial complex</i> | 21 |
| Where is Global Responsibility within tourism? | 23 |
| Human Rights & Poverty | 24 |
| Alternative Tourisms | 27 |
| What is Global Governance in tourism? | 28 |
| Declarations | 29 |
| Poverty Reduction Strategies | 29 |
| Who are the Global Actors within tourism? | 31 |
| Pyramid of Actors | 31 |
| Consumer Consciousness | 33 |
| Building on Anthropological Tourism | 34 |
| Conclusion: A Cosmotourism discourse | 35 |
| Bibliography | 38 |

Introduction

The field of international relations (IR) directs attention to a vast array of activities across the globe. Often historically connected to issues of power, sovereignty, military, and international trade, IR has more recently evolved to include debates on human rights, development of the Global South and reconsiderations of the cosmopolitan project. For many, IR is, and should continue to be, bounded by strict parameters of interest that are often delineated from a predominantly European male perspective focused on elite interactions between states. For others, IR is evolving as a broad platform from which to ask and engage with issues previously outside of the traditional IR framework. This paper is of the latter mindset and premises its inquiry on the belief that parameters of a discourse do matter and particularly within regard to the universalities of cosmopolitanism in the 21st century. As this paper will suggest, the lens used within the currently constructed parameters of the cosmopolitan debate are severely limiting IR engagement in areas critical to global relations. Of particular interest is the oversight of global tourism, the largest industry in the world with profound ramifications for many that has thus far been relatively ignored within the cosmopolitan discourse. Therefore, this paper challenges the current parameters of IR and problematizes the historically stagnated cosmopolitan discourse in asserting that there is extensive latent cosmopolitanism within tourism today that continues to lack robust attention.

In light of this lack of attention, it is not surprising there is a paucity of literature that overtly links tourism with cosmopolitanism. Therefore, this paper sets forth a creative yet pragmatic approach to make room for this consideration that highlights contours of both the nature of the current cosmopolitan discourse as well as an understanding of tourism in the 21st century. To do so, this paper is laid out in three key sections beginning with an initial literature review highlighting the limitations of the current cosmopolitan discourse. By asking where it came from, what it is interpreted as being and most importantly what is its relevance beyond the discourse, the contours of the cosmopolitan discourse come to light. In doing so, the definitions beyond elite and metaphorical conceptions are surfaced to highlight the current gaps within the discourse and particularly the detachment of cosmopolitanism from the abstract. The second section provides a reconsideration of cosmopolitanism focused on relevance and, in doing so, makes room for a reconsideration of tourism. Using a formulaic approach premised on Kwame Anthony Appiah's three moral obligations of cosmopolitanism in conjunction with the synthesized themes from the discourse, an initial cosmopolitan framework includes a consideration of the role of global responsibility, global governance and global actors. Through this preliminary framework focused on relevance, it is possible to then ascertain what may or may not be relevant to the cosmopolitan project and fill the gap of application in the 21st century.

By using these synthesized cosmopolitan criteria, it is then possible to assess what may or may not be worthy of attention in the cosmopolitan project. As a result, previously unconsidered areas such as tourism can be engaged with as relevant to the cosmopolitan discourse. Therefore, the final section introduces the concept of a *tourism industrial complex* to capture the pervasiveness of global tourism in the 21st century and applies these initial cosmopolitan criteria in an effort to expose the latent cosmopolitanism currently existing within tourism. This provides an opportunity to explore the latent cosmopolitanism within tourism in a substantive yet less subjective manner than might otherwise be allowed with utilization of one definition of cosmopolitanism. As a result, an open-minded view of the many variants of cosmopolitanism can be utilized which recognizes the dynamism of its evolution while still providing aspects of relevant application. By doing so, the questions of global responsibility, the role of global governance and the role of actors *within* tourism are investigated using this revised cosmopolitan framework. Such an interrogation highlights the high level of latent cosmopolitanism within tourism and the limited amount of recognition received despite the immense normativity of current efforts particularly by the UNWTO and its Global Code of Ethics as well as the newly emerging array of alternative tourisms.

By challenging the current and often unnecessarily complex and metaphorical definitions of cosmopolitanism, this paper also highlights the risk of missed opportunities when narrow conceptions are held in a dynamic environment. Instead, this paper reconsiders the cosmopolitan project as one that is not a project at all, but already exists today. In doing so, a new space for a *cosmotourism* discourse that includes a broader set of actors, is created with a focus on the relevance in 21st century. The hope is that the efforts of this paper to problematize the currently narrow conceptions of cosmopolitanism combined with the increased awareness of latent cosmopolitanism within tourism will increase the attention to this currently ignored area. The initial framework for cosmopolitanism premised on the question of relevance lays the groundwork for a serious consideration of tourism within IR.

As the biggest industry in the world and its inherent, but thus far unobserved, role in international relations, this paper contends it is time to take tourism seriously and doing so may require a reworking of current backdrops within IR. However, it is important to note that the focus of this paper is on the normative nature of cosmopolitanism as it applies to tourism but it is not a normative assessment of tourism itself. That said, the following highlights the reality that if tourism and its profound global ramifications continue to be ignored, our objectives of a more cosmopolitan world will be further out of reach. With an increasingly globalizing world where an understanding of cosmopolitanism is more important than ever and where international connections between cultures are taking place at ever-increasing pace there is urgency for

reconceptualizing cosmopolitanism beyond abstractions and recognizing the existing cosmopolitanisms abound. In doing so, opportunities for connection and evolution of the production and reproduction of a more cosmopolitan world will grow.

Lastly, this paper does not explore *all* the debates of cosmopolitanism, but instead considers the potential of a broader definition focused on relevance therein allowing IR to engage with an initial framework for how we might begin the connection with tourism within the cosmopolitan project. Therefore, it is important to clarify the limitations of this initial inquiry by acknowledging that both of these concepts are critically complex individually making the endeavor to suggest the linking of the two as preliminary and far from exhaustive. That being the case, this paper provides a structured case and an initial framework from which a new *cosmotourism* discourse can begin.

Literature Review

Tourism continues as the largest industry in the world affecting all nations and interlocuting actors along with billions in trade and labor, yet it receives very limited robust engagement in the international relations (IR) arena. However, as this paper will contend, there is a significant, if not overwhelming amount of latent cosmopolitanism within global tourism that has significant applications to IR at various levels. Despite this observation, there remains a paucity of literature that overtly contextualizes tourism within the cosmopolitanism discourse. Therefore, the following highlights the gaps in the existing cosmopolitan discourse by briefly delineating the historical roots of cosmopolitanism, the current debates and openings for a reconceptualization of the term beyond the abstract. Through these openings, the previously obscure world of tourism can be interrogated as the cosmopolitical phenomena it is via an updated cosmopolitan framework.

Delineating Cosmopolitanism

The roots of cosmopolitanism are quite consistently noted throughout the literature as being delineated from the Greeks and the Stoics originating from the Cynics movement. It is generally accepted that the Cynic Diogenes of Sinope in the 4th century BC, later to be known as the father of the Stoics, introduced the concept for his response when asked where he came from, he responded that he was 'a citizen of the world'. The Greek word '*kosmopolites*' stood for citizen of the world with 'cosmos' meaning world or universe and 'polis' meaning order. As a result, the Greeks have been credited for 'inventing' the term.¹ From this, as the idea of 'stoic cosmopolitanism' propelled the idea further to include the concept of belonging to two worlds at one time, one of your birth and one of the worlds' aspiration. A number of unlikely cosmopolitan figures emerged as a result including the Roman Empire uniting the whole of the Mediterranean under one political power.² Interestingly, the early Christians were considered to have been greatly influenced by these ideals, which resulted in an interpretation of it being a community people by limiting the citizenship in the city of God to those who love God.

However, much of this changed in 1648, with the emergence of the Treaty of Westphalia ushering in a new paradigm for world order, that being the nation state. During 'The Enlightenment', Erasmus of Rotterdam, who pleaded for national and religious tolerance, and Hugo Grotius are credited for the beginnings of natural law theory and the social contract theory progressing the idea of responsibility beyond oneself. Grotius is considered to have laid the foundation for

1 G. L. Ribeiro, "Cosmopolitanism," in *International Encyclopedia of the Social and Behavioral Sciences* (Amsterdam-Paris-New York-Oxford-Shannon-Singapore-Tokyo: 2001), p.2842

2 Pauline Kleingeld and Eric Brown, "Cosmopolitanism," in *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, ed. Edward N. Zalta (2008), p.4

international law as he envisioned a 'great society of states' bound by a 'law of nations' that holds 'between all states'. During the 18th century many philosophers such as Montesquieu, Voltaire, Diderot, Addison, Hume and Jefferson identified themselves as cosmopolitan in line with the *Encyclopedie* of the time that noted 'cosmopolitan' signified a '*man of no fixed abode, or a man who is nowhere a stranger.*' In 1753, Montbron in his *Le Cosmopolite* refers to himself as a cosmopolitan traveling all over and declares '*all countries are the same to me*' and '*I am changing my places of residence according to my whim*'. From this overt annunciation of cosmopolitanism, sprang critiques from Rousseau and Schlosser who noted '*it is better to be proud of one's nation than to have none.*'³ Clearly, the idea of cosmopolitanism emerged with a range of conceptualizations and, as it may be said to foreshadow, the inherent and prolific tensions today. Particularly challenging is the concern that 'cosmos' means a natural universal order and 'polis' is related to a society's order forcing the question of whose world this is.⁴ Despite this tension, the idea of universality emerged from these abstract roots housed within a state-centric elite oriented framework. Such interpretations have led to the argument that cosmopolitanism is a 'western notion' that some contend simply represents the need for social scientists to be able to conceive of a political and cultural entity beyond their own homeland that encompass all humans on a global scale.⁵

This is by no means an exhaustive historical sketch, but it highlights how this universal consideration of humanity is rooted in historically Eurocentric elite constructions innately tied to the time and limited place of their inception. The result has been the presentation and progression of a 'universal' ideal that in fact is a representation of values of limited euro male intellectuals. Further, to think that the conception of the world beyond oneself was actually 'invented' by the Greeks also implies the concept of cosmopolitanism did not necessarily fail to exist prior. The examples of pre-Kantian thinkers begs one to consider that if postcolonial Africa is off the cosmopolitan map for Kant or the Stoics, what could be learned from a biography of a rural Senegalese Muslim brotherhood and its transnational network?⁶ Additionally, Pnina Werbner provides the example of the Sanskritic cosmopolis that spanned an area from Afghanistan to Java and from Sri Lanka to Nepal – that was non-western but indeed cosmopolitan.⁷ The role of cities such as Paris, London and New York have long been associated with the idea of 'cosmopolitanism' and the idea of markets and people mixing culture and commodities and ideas but leaves open those areas outside the West? How does it look in China, Japan, and India and

3 Ibid. (De Iure Belli ac Paci, 1625, Prolegomena par. 17; Pufendorf, De Iure Naturae et Gentium, 1672).p.6

4 Ribeiro, "Cosmopolitanism."

5 Ibid.

6 Sheldon Pollock et al., "Cosmopolitanisms," Public Culture 12, no. 3 (2000).p.586

7 Pnina Werbner, "Vernacular Cosmopolitanism," Theory, Culture & Society 23, no. 2-3 (2006).p.7

the Islamic world?⁸ Were not the traders and merchants of Persia and Africa let alone the many aboriginal cultures that have had existential and universal considerations many years before the Greeks cosmopolitans? Moreover, who is to say that this awareness of oneself as part of a global community is not a general state of human being? A cosmopolitanism invented from, and rooted in, an abstract conception of a universal cosmos premised on elite individuals yet presented as a representation of the wider humanity results in missed opportunities of many real world existences of latent cosmopolitanism including tourism.

Debating the Definition

The more recent literature on cosmopolitanism is profuse and multi-disciplinary in its attempt to disentangle what cosmopolitanism means, who its actors are and what, if any, relevance it has for the 21st century. The following provides an initial overview of such debates, allowing for inquiry into the potential engagement with more quotidian activities involving non-elites such. A core debate within cosmopolitanism discourse lies in how to define this nebulous concept, and more aptly whether to attempt to define it at all. Most dictionaries, such as the Merriam Webster, notes that a 'cosmopolitan', as most dictionaries cite with 'cosmopolitanism' as the noun yet undefined, is, in an adjective dated 1798 pertaining to:

- 1) *having worldwide rather than limited or provincial scope or bearing;*
- 2) *having wide international sophistication: worldly;*
- 3) *composed of persons, constituents, or elements from all or many parts of the world;*
- 4) *found in most parts of the world and under varied ecological conditions.*

In an effort to help clarify, two additional adjectives are listed as 'worldly' and 'a cosmopolitan herb' in reference to the latter definition.⁹ From this, one can deduce the ambiguity and subjectivity of the term let alone its' underlying conceptual and practical applications leaves much to be desired.

A great deal of this debate is happening outside of IR at the borderlands of many disciplines including anthropology, sociology and philosophy. Questions of what it means are challenged by asking what its relevance might be beyond the abstract theoretical Eurocentric universalism of being a 'citizen of the world'. This is followed by the most challenging question of whether it is indeed possible, and if so, how? Despite these broader questions, the discourse has focused primarily on narrow conceptions and neglected a consideration of a wider definition and its

8 Steven Vertovec, "Conceiving and Researching Transnationalism," *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 22, no. 2 (1999).p.16

9 Merriam-Webster, "Main Entry: Cosmopolitanism," in Merriam-Webster Online Dictionary (2009).

relevance beyond the abstract. As the idea of cosmopolitanism re-emerges in the 21st century, it is attracting more interest in the fast globalizing interconnected world of technology, labor and communications and testing the utility of abstracted theories. Additionally, with the growing reality of transnationalism despite constructed borders, the challenges of this once theoretical concept are being tested. Ironically, the debates regarding this idealistic concept arguably premised objectives of a 'perpetual peace' thrives within a discourse that is not only divided but also full of tensions. Such fundamental tensions include the question of cosmopolitanism's objective, the role of states and institutions as well as what actors and identities should be included in the equation.

Kant's observation regarding universal happiness highlights the difficulty in finding agreement as to the overarching objective in that humans conceive of happiness in many varied forms and this is one of the challenges to peace.¹⁰ For example, some ask whether cosmopolitanism is a goal of global democratization and this idealistic hope that cosmopolitanism groups will lead the effort to establish values, institutions and lifestyles, which are less directly, embedded within nation-state societies such as the United Nations (UN). At the same time, others look down upon this use of institutions as a normative tool considering it the 'revolt of the elites' the inability of the upper and middle class to sustain a sense of responsibility towards a growing numbers of the excluded or marginalized around the world.¹¹ Such opposition is highlighted today by non-elite groups such as the World Social Forum (WSF) questioning the normative neoliberal agenda of such institutions. Additionally, the increasingly popular suggestion and propositions of a 'new world order' by the West and representatives such as the G-20 emphasizes the question of who is indeed ordering this world to what extent their idea of universal happiness is shared.

An additional tension of obligation exists between one's self and one's nation and particularly how that might be balanced with any further obligation beyond those spheres to the broader global community. A key example is highlighted by the contradiction of historical Kantian conception of hospitality between states that challenges the conditions of a universal hospitality in theory and the issue of human rights in reality. In Kant's hospitality the right of a stranger is to not be treated as an enemy when he arrives in the land of another as one state is obligated to respect the sovereignty of the other and receive each other hospitably. However, one may refuse to receive him when this can be done without causing his destruction; but, so long as he peacefully occupies his place, one may not treat him with hostility.¹² Andrew Linklater, in particular, has written a great deal on this tension often as it relates to human rights and responsibility to protect

10 Todd Hedrick, "Race, Difference, and Anthropology in Kant's Cosmopolitanism," *History of Philosophy* 46 no. 2 (2008).p.247

11 Theory Culture & Society Centre (TCS), Nottingham Trent University, http://www.ntu.ac.uk/research/school_research/hum/29480gp.html, viewed Jan. 20 2009.

12 Terry Nardin Chris Brown, and Nicholas Rengger, ed., *International Relations in Political Thought: Texts from the Ancient Greeks to the First World War* (Cambridge, 2002).p.436-449

(R2P) that repositions the once sole state subject as existing within a broader network of actors including the 'non-elite'. His suggestion of a 'no-harm principle' as a basic cosmopolitan obligation is one example within the literature that moves beyond the abstracted elite focus and proposes a way forward for implementing the ideals and principles discussed within the cosmopolitan debate today.¹³

As a result of such tensions, there are varieties of derivative takes on cosmopolitanism that have developed over the years resulting in a plethora of descriptions. These range from vernacular or cosmopolitanism as coined by Bhabha, local or rooted cosmopolitanism by Appiah, as well as a range of colonial, political and spiritual forms of cosmopolitanism. Further, a consideration of the plural 'cosmopolitanisms' and particularly *cosmofeminism* provides significant openings for widening the way in which cosmopolitanism is adapted towards a particular issue.¹⁴ As a result of so many derivations, the idea of 'macrocosmopolitanism' has also been suggested attempting to encapsulate the broad array of derivations within the concept.¹⁵ Although such derivations attempt to differentiate what is or is not cosmopolitan, they raise further questions. For example, Werbner suggests there is, or should be, an oxymoronic nature of cosmopolitanism that '*joins contradictory notions of local specificity and universal enlightenment*'.¹⁶ It is this counterintuitive oxymoronic nature that in fact premises the need for a reconsideration of cosmopolitanism.

Werbner provides a number of examples including Homi K. Bhabha who arguably coined the term vernacular cosmopolitanism and has fostered the idea of marginal cosmopolitanisms where the reality that many, different, cosmopolitan practices co-exist in late modernity. Drawing on Appiah's vision, she suggests that Bhabha proposes a '*cosmopolitan community envisaged in marginality*', a border zone which he terms vernacular cosmopolitanism. In contrast, is Martha Nussbaum's use of the self at the center of concentric circles and with universal values above the rest of the nation and family that Werbner notes such an idea of borderless cosmopolitan community leaves out the reality of refugees and other marginalized groups. In this regard, Bhabha highlights the interplay between social and political manifestations of governance and various actors all within a complex web of inter-relations. In greatest contrast to such conceptions is Ulf Hannerz originally an advocate for an 'us' versus 'them' delineation of who is or is not cosmopolitanism. However, Hannerz has revised his viewpoint to acknowledge that non-elites may be cosmopolitan noting that 'bottom-up' cosmopolitans are unlikely to be recognized as such

13 Andrew Linklater, "Cosmopolitan Political Communities in International Relations," *International Relations* 16, no. 1 (2002).

14 Pollock et al., "Cosmopolitanisms."

15 Sam Knowles, "Macrocosmopolitanism? Gilroy, Appiah, and Bhabha: The Unsettling Generality of Cosmopolitan Ideas," *Postcolonial text* 3, no. 4 (2007).

16 Werbner, "Vernacular Cosmopolitanism." p.7-11

in their own environment.¹⁷ An overt critic of the elitist cosmopolitanism is Bayet who succinctly concludes '*it is a mistake to limit cosmopolitan exchange solely to the prerogative of the elites*'. He recognizes that his term 'everyday cosmopolitanism' may not go as far as the often abstract and philosophical notions of the Stoics 'world citizenship', but engages in the modest and down to earth though highly relevant ways in which ordinary men and women from different communal cosmos manage to engage, associate, and live together at the level of the everyday'.¹⁸

Combining both Bhabha and Bayet's consideration is Kwame K. Appiah who provides comprehensive idea of 'rooted cosmopolitanism'. This concept stems from the idea that cosmopolitans begin from membership in morally and emotionally significant communities (i.e. identity) while still espousing notions of tolerance and openness to the world and further that it is able to transcend ethnic difference and the moral responsibility for and incorporation of the 'other'. Of particular contribution is his book, *Cosmopolitanism: Ethics in a World of Strangers* and his contention of an inherent three moral obligations within cosmopolitanism including that of one to strangers, the role of states and institutions and simultaneously to our roots.¹⁹ The combination of Bhabha, Bayet and particularly Appiah offer very insightful conceptualization of cosmopolitanism that more accurately reflect the complex relations and quotidian opportunities previously ignored and underestimated as a cosmopolitical force.

Focusing on Relevance

Within the widened discourse that moves beyond a historically elite definition, the question remains of what, in practice, cosmopolitanism means in the 21st century. As is evident from much of the discourse, the focus remains at the abstract or ideological level. However, a few authors such as Bayet have questioned why there is an obsession with elitist definitions when we simply need to carve out room for a discourse on the pragmatic relevance to global relations as well as everyday life.²⁰ Such an inquiry provides for further attention to the conceptualization of cosmopolitanism as *both* a theoretical and practical entity that focuses on its relevance in the everyday modern world. Highlighting the need for a reconsideration of relevance is the article *Cosmopolitanisms* written by some of the key leaders of the discourse which openly asserts:

17 Chris Brown, ed., *International Relations in Political Thought: Texts from the Ancient Greeks to the First World War*.

18 Asef Bayet, "Everyday Cosmopolitanism," *International Institute for the Study of Islam in the Modern World (ISIM)*, no. 22 (2008).p.5

19 Kwame Anthony Appiah, *Cosmopolitanism: Ethics in a World of Strangers*, ed. Henry Louis Gates Jr., 1st ed., *Issues of Our Time* (W.W. Norton, 2006).

20 Bayet, "Everyday Cosmopolitanism."

*'we are not exactly certain what it (cosmopolitanism) is, and figuring out why this is so and what cosmopolitanism may be raises difficult conceptual issues. As a practice too, cosmopolitanism is yet to come, something awaiting realization.'*²¹

This latter aspect provides the most robust support for the contention that the effort to ascertain what is or is not cosmopolitan is far from delineated. Instead, it is more beneficial to focus on the essence of the ideal by asking how it is that people can live in this world together and how people connect to something beyond themselves regardless of the many derivations. They recognize the challenge of this by in that *'the indeterminacy of how to achieve political practice feeds back into the problem of academic analysis'* and that *'its (cosmopolitanisms) various embodiments await discovery and explication'*.²² Despite the plethora of writings on cosmopolitanism for centuries, there remains a continual disconnect between the way this concept is presented in the discourse and its attempted application. Linklater's consideration of the responsibility to protect reflects the reality of translating conceptualizations into practice.

Although a wider definition of cosmopolitanism allows for greater recognition of actors, the ability to respect state sovereignty and a responsibility to protect fellow world citizens simultaneously remains a significant challenge. Part of this challenge includes the lack of awareness as to what this ideal means beyond the abstract and particularly, beyond application to 'elites'. Further, how is it that an ideal conceptualized for a majority can indeed be applied to a minority or marginalized group? Additionally, how can activities held outside the public sphere be considered? This is highlighted in the discourse via the brief, but notable, considerations of the engendered terms of the cosmopolitan debate that, as with many areas within IR, reflect a gender bias and further limit the opportunities for seeing cosmopolitanism beyond the abstracted elite male. Particularly when speaking of relevance under the idea of universalism, it is important to recognize that the language of the central debates of cosmopolitanism has been suggested as masculine nature including: universal, theoretical, abstract and conceptual in that they have a concern for mastery and absolutes in human life. Of particular interest, is their suggestion of *cosmofeminism* which highlights the questions of who is the 'subject of world citizenship' and the second question of how can one consider the intimate under its sign without restricting intimacy to the domestic sphere?²³ As such, the idea of the cosmopolitan adventure²⁴ is appropriate in capturing the relatively uncharted waters of how in fact this idea, robust in abstraction of elite responsibility to the broader globality, is practically produced and reproduced in day-to-day modernity.

21 Pollock et al., "Cosmopolitanisms."p.577

22 Ibid.p.589

23 Ibid.

24 The term 'cosmopolitan adventure' is taken from: Erve Chambers, "Can the Anthropology of Tourism Make Us Better Travelers?," NAPA Bulletin 23, no. 1 (2005).p.584-589

In summary, and as Sheldon Pollock and his Chicago colleagues note, the definition of cosmopolitanism is not obsolete but instead misunderstood practically in that *'cosmopolitanism is not some known entity existing in the world, with a clear genealogy from the Stoics to Immanuel Kant, that simply awaits a more detailed description at the hands of scholarship'*.²⁵ Instead, there is much scope for conceiving cosmopolitanism theoretically, practically and in terms of the people and contexts that the term can illuminate.²⁶ Therefore, the following section provides a synthesized reconsideration of a pragmatic cosmopolitan framework to fill the existing gaps of the inappropriately positioned 'universal' that has failed to recognize a plethora of worldly activities in which latent cosmopolitanism exists.

²⁵ Pollock et al., "Cosmopolitanisms." p.577

²⁶ Steven Vertovec and Robin Cohen, "Conceiving Cosmopolitanism," in *Conceiving Cosmopolitanism: Theory, Context, and Practice* (Oxford University Press, 2002).

Approach: Re-considering Cosmopolitanism

The discourse on cosmopolitanism and its many considerations for a responsibility beyond oneself has thus far failed to critically engage with a number of quotidian modern day activities despite their latent cosmopolitanism. Therefore, the following sets forth a less prescriptive yet relevant focus that moves beyond the historically narrowed discourse and the current focus on theoretical definitions, to focus on a framework to facilitate this engagement via the determination of what may or may not be relevant to the cosmopolitan discourse. The framework consists of criteria that, when disentangled from the often rhetorical debates, allows for a grounded engagement and subsequent framework to explore latent cosmopolitanism within tourism. Using a hybrid consideration of various expanded definitions and primarily Appiah's three moral obligations of cosmopolitanism, it is possible to look beyond a narrow conception of elites into quotidian areas of activity making room for a closer look at tourism. Therefore, the following sections:

1. *Synthesize core criteria of cosmopolitanism discourse focused on relevance*
2. *Apply the criteria as an initial framework to expose latent cosmopolitanism within tourism*
3. *Conclude with a consideration of a cosmotourism discourse*

In the midst of reconsidering what may or may not be worth attention within the cosmopolitan project is the most interesting question that asks, what if we are already and have always been cosmopolitan but lacked a focus on semantics to define it? Why must it be stratified and dissected? As some suggest, purification is the threat to this idea that we are already cosmopolitan and the division of the absolute universalisms of Western cosmopolitanism are necessary. The resulting consequence is the failure of the political sphere to recognize this which has led to many negative consequences and lends itself to urgency of this issue.²⁷ Therefore, with a focus on relevance regardless of semantics, a framework of cosmopolitan criteria is synthesized to facilitate the ability to interrogate activities that may have been cosmopolitan all along but overlooked resulting in missed opportunities to better understand, and possibly achieve or recognize, cosmopolitanism. The intent is that the initial framework can be used as a starting point to interrogate tourism as a cosmopolitical activity and expose its latent cosmopolitanism by asking:

1. *Where is global responsibility within tourism?*
2. *What is the role of global governance within tourism?*
3. *Who are the global actors within tourism?*

²⁷ Pollock et al., "Cosmopolitanisms." p.588

A core aspect of this approach lies in its focus on the *existing* nature of cosmopolitanism as it presents itself within tourism today. In addition, this inquiry is not intended as a normative exercise for tourism, but instead as an exploration of the normative conceptualization of cosmopolitanism as it exists within global tourism today. By interrogating tourism with criteria that move beyond elite abstractions, it will be possible to expose the latent cosmopolitanism and progress beyond the current discourse that has failed to give attention to the production and reproduction of cosmopolitanism occurring as a result of tourism in the 21st century. In doing so, the latent cosmopolitanism within tourism can be unearthed and brought into an inaugural and much needed *cosmotourism* discourse.

Synthesizing Cosmo Criteria

In an effort towards ascertaining what actors and activities may be part of the cosmopolitan project, key themes in the cosmopolitan discourse provide an initial framework from which to begin. With a widening of the cosmopolitan discourse, it becomes critically important for a utilitarian framework that can aid in the exposition of previously unconsidered areas of attention. Appiah, in particular, provides a useful synthesis of core cosmopolitan obligations in his book *Cosmopolitanism: Ethics in a World of Strangers*. Most important for this synthesis are his three key obligations within cosmopolitan mindset including: moral obligation, nation state and other institutions role as well as recognition that inevitably our identities will lend us to greater sympathy for our family, friends or - our own lives.²⁸ Using a hybrid consideration of Appiah's criteria blended with Bhabha's vernacular themes are translated to include the considerations of global responsibility, governance and actors as criteria to aid in an initial attempt to both recognize the complexity of cosmopolitanism while at the same time allowing for practical application to tourism in the following section.

Global Responsibility

One general area of agreement within the many debates on cosmopolitanism is the sense of responsibility beyond oneself. The vast majority of literature uses the premise of the Greeks building on this ideal of shared universal values or some sense of responsibility beyond self or nation that connects to the wider 'cosmos'. For example, as Kant observed, this idea pertains to acting from a pluralistic standpoint of humanity as collective actors as opposed to that of an egoistic individual.²⁹ Along these lines, Kant developed four different modalities of cosmopolitanism that would become the main aspects of contemporary discussion of normative

²⁸ Appiah, *Cosmopolitanism: Ethics in a World of Strangers*.p.164-166

²⁹ Brown, "Cosmopolitanism."

IR theory, liberal political economy and theories of globalization. These included, as part of a holistic whole, a world federation as the legal and political institutional basis for cosmopolitanism as a form of right; the historical basis cosmopolitanism in world trade, the idea of a global public sphere and the importance of cosmopolitan culture in instilling a sense of belonging to humanity.³⁰ Bhabha speaks of dual loyalties and the fact we are defined by where we come from noting 'we carry where we came from in the stories we tell and the food we cook.' He notes that the most important thing is being able to combine these things in a new home without losing their uniqueness saying that assimilation is futile and asserts the best outcome is when a host culture adopts the culture of its new residents."³¹

Most useful however is Kwame Appiah's consideration of global responsibility and his question of 'What in fact do we really owe to strangers?'. He suggests that it is a responsibility to *both* human rights and our homeland basic needs that must be recognized in furthering any practical application of this concept. His suggestion of a 'rooted' or 'partial' cosmopolitanism believes it naïve to ignore the reality that we will, no doubt, give favor to our own life which is not to say to ignore the needs of others. Further, he challenges the reality that in light of the fact we will not treat strangers the same as our nearest and dearest family and friends, asks what our moral obligation is.³² Using this conception, the idea of global responsibility becomes intimate and involves not only the elites and state actors, but also the much broader arena of actors including those at the 'everyday' level and even within the intimate sphere. In doing so, it pulls in the quotidian everyday activities as being part of this moral obligation. By suggesting that every human has obligations to every other human, Appiah overtly places the essence of obligation on all actors regardless of their 'status'. By doing so, those with the utmost power as well as those with diffused, but existent, power in the equation of global relations are held responsible to, and, simultaneously as, the responsibility of others. Additionally, Appiah's summarization of what this obligation might look like in reality focuses on the essence of cosmopolitan nature as being a response that begins with 'wanting to understand why a child is dying' emphasizing the critical role of intelligence, curiosity and engagement.³³ By merely translating the idea of global responsibility to a practical objective of gaining increased understanding, Appiah moves the discussion well beyond the abstract.

Inherent in this responsibility, however, are a number of challenges included the issue of normativity of the whole on behalf of the few. This raises the question of whether it is indeed

30 Adam K. Webb, "Taking Back the Cosmopolis," *Modern Age* 50.2, no. Spring 2008 (2008).

31 World Economic Forum, "Defining "Home": Divided Loyalty or Dual Loyalty,"

http://www2.weforum.org/site/knowledgenavigator.nsf/Content/Defining%20_Home___%20Divided%20Loyalty%20or%20Dual%20Loyalty_20037cef.html?open , viewed Feb. 15, 2009.

32 Appiah, *Cosmopolitanism: Ethics in a World of Strangers*.p. 156

33 *Ibid*.p. 168

possible for the many actors involved to find a mutual balance of equitability or happiness when conceptions may vary greatly. This is highlighted as Kant notes '*Since people differ in their thinking about happiness and how each would have it constituted, their wills with respect to it cannot be brought under any common principle and so under any external law harmonizing with everyone's freedom.*'³⁴ Within this diversity of perceptions is also a second challenge which is the idea of moral favoritism as an example of the inherent tension between the sense obligation individuals feel towards their co-nationals or homeland, and arguably similar identity group as compared the responsibilities or obligations they may have for the broader humankind. Further, Linklater's work and particularly the '*no-harm principle*' that such a solution rests on the principle that encounters with others and with nature are to be encouraged so long as they do not cause harm and that they are respectful and ethical.³⁵ However, understanding what harm may be to one and to another can be difficult if not impossible. For example, when one speaks of 'our world' or 'our times', it is important to recognize that often the 'our' is a non-inclusive 'our' that consists of able-bodied white heterosexual men. As such, no true universalism can be constructed without recognizing that there is a diversity of universals on which analyses are based. In this sense, it is important to recognize the potentiality of a post-universalism perspective as it relates to cosmopolitanism. Similarly, the consideration that there is not one history or one future of cosmopolitanism but instead plural 'cosmopolitanisms' leaves open true reconsideration of this idea.³⁶ Recognizing the importance of global responsibility within the cosmopolitan discourse as well as its challenges allows for a more thoughtful consideration of latent cosmopolitanism within tourism and the moral obligations it evokes theoretically and practically.

Global Governance

In addition to the focus on global responsibility is the issue of how the interpretation of order or governance should be associated with cosmopolitanism. Often interpreted as 'global governance' or a one world government stemming from the aspect of 'polis' interpreted as order within the term cosmopolitanism, the range of interpretations of this vary greatly. The literal interpretation of 'global citizenship' is in direct contrast to the historical focus on the nation state. However, as Cheah suggests, it is the 'in between' conceptions of governance where the vast majority of consideration lies including the role of international law, the United Nations, international criminal court (ICC), and various international treaties ranging from environmental to human rights. He provides an insightful inquiry into the normativity of institutions and highlights the need for serious scrutiny of the many re-emergences of cosmopolitanism under the guise of globalization. Highlighting the need for attention to the neoliberal agenda via such frameworks, his observations

34 Hedrick, "Race, Difference, and Anthropology in Kant's Cosmopolitanism." p.247

35 Debbie Lisle, "Joyless Cosmopolitans: The Moral Economy of Ethical Tourism," in ISA's 49th Annual Convention: Bridging Multiple Divides (Hilton San Francisco, San Francisco, CA, USA, Mar 26, 2008 2008).

36 Pollock et al., "Cosmopolitanisms."

make an even greater case for looking more closely at whether and how any latent cosmopolitanism within tourism is being manifested and observed.³⁷ Such critiques are imperative to a robust review of any activity or institution framed as being cosmopolitan in nature as many realists might suggest a great deal of such activity may indeed be for self interested motives. This is of particular interest as tourism has become a key tool of the neoliberal supranational Bretton Woods Institutions as will be discussed in the following section.

Appiah's recognition of the role of the nation state and its institutions is a pragmatic middle ground as the tensions between state sovereignty and other global actors grows. His observation is that the nation-state is the primary mechanism for ensuring basic needs are met. That said, he values a variety of political arrangements as long as each individual state meets the basic needs of every individual. His criticisms of a world government are focused on the uncontrollable power that could be used to do harm, its ability to be unresponsive to local needs and its reduction in the variety of institutional experimentation that allows for new learning opportunities. He summarizes this assertion of the nation state as a player amongst many and one that has a simultaneous responsibility to the life and justice of its own as well as a role in ensuring all states respect the rights and meet the needs of their citizens.³⁸ Therefore, similar to R2P, if one cannot meet those needs, through our nations if they are supportive and in spite of them if they are not, there is a shared collective obligation to change them. The recognition of the existing role of states regardless of an idealized world government as some suggest, is imperative to any effort towards recognizing and understanding where latent cosmopolitanism may exist. However, most important is the recognition that the state, in contradiction to most historical conceptions of cosmopolitanism since the Treaty of Westphalia, is not without responsibility to its own citizens. In a recent interview with *The Hindu*, Bhabha was asked about the persistence of the category called nation and responded that although there is a narrative aspect to the creation and construction of a nation it does not deny the material and historical reality of it as a form of political and social life. Noting that territorial societies are most commonly seen as national politics he notes 'histories of nations and narratives of nations have always been woven together and have created this compelling social form' highlighting the evolution of this seemingly stationary actor.³⁹ Such an awareness emphasizes the importance of not overlooking the significant role of states, but to most importantly consider its interactions with non-state actors and the broader context as a whole.

37 Pheng Cheah, "Cosmopolitanism," *Theory, Culture & Society* 23, no. 2-3 (2006).

38 Appiah, *Cosmopolitanism: Ethics in a World of Strangers*.p.164-164

39 Sachidananda Mohanty, "Towards a Global Cultural Citizenship: Interview with Homi K. Bhabha," *The Hindu*, www.thehindu.com/thehindu/lr/2005/07/03/stories/2005070300020100.htm , viewed February 19, 2009.

The idea of global governance is not a straightforward endeavor as some may imagine but instead is, at best, a balancing act so that those in power do not marginalize or effectually homogenize the order and those it orders. A challenge that remains within cosmopolitanism is the question of whether cosmopolitanism can be conceived with a regulatory power embedded in institutions. Secondly, a question about the normativity of these institutions and whether they can be in relation of mutual feedback with a political consciousness that voices the universal interest of humanity and tries to maximize human freedom. Cheah suggests that if such challenges cannot be addressed, then cosmopolitanism remains an 'intellectual ethos of a select clerisy, a form of consciousness without a mass base.'⁴⁰ These questions are highlighted today by the United Nations (UN) and Bretton Woods institutions and their many aid efforts often revered as a panacea for the world's ills. However, at the same time, peripheral groups such as the ground up World Social Forum (WSF) continue to focus their efforts in opposition to the neoliberal agenda of many institutions particularly the World Economic Forum (WEF) as it relates to 'supporting' the Global South and its utilization of tourism and other capitalistic driven ventures to do so.⁴¹ Additionally, Kant's discussion of the 'right' suggests a number of agreements that should govern relations among individuals who have united themselves under the rule of law and indeed a social contract in explicitly moral terms. In essence, he states that human beings, who are unable to avoid mutually influencing one another, are obliged to respect arrangements of right, such that their freedom harmonized with the freedom of others.⁴² This is a critical recognition of the cosmopolitan project that indeed, our enjoyment should not be at the expense of others, which, as discussed in the final portion of the paper, has profound wealth of considerations for tourism in the 21st century. The consideration of normativity within any global governance effort cannot be overlooked and provides an essential criterion of consideration.

Global Actors

When synthesizing the current debates of cosmopolitanism the questions of global responsibility and the role of governance are easily apparent. However, a third critical aspect includes the question of the actors and the roles within the cosmopolitan project. Are states and elite representatives the only actors or can a local fisherman and textile artist contribute to a more cosmopolitan world? Must one be a UN employee or enjoy western influenced foods to seem worldly? As with any debate there is a spectrum of perspective that, in this case, ranges from an elite or narrow conception of key actors that might only include nation states and diplomats contrasted with an 'everyday cosmopolitanism' that recognizes the role of everyday encounters of the non-elite as critical to broader relations. To some, the idea that the common currency of world is changing to one not solely a nation state oriented one is obvious while to others it is a threat to

40 Cheah, "Cosmopolitanism." p.491

41 Boaventura De Sousa Santos, "The World Social Forum and the Global Left," *Politics & Society* 36, no. 2 (2008).

42 Hedrick, "Race, Difference, and Anthropology in Kant's Cosmopolitanism." p. 247

the order.⁴³ Regardless, the cast of actors is growing including private, public, non-profit and a variety of transnational corporations and informal networks often facilitated by access to technology and communications allowing many to engage who previously would not have had the option.

In line with the historical connotation of 'elitism' that stemmed from the association of the 'cosmopolitan' as that of a European urbanite who ate caviar and sipped fine wine, is Ulf Hannerz who supports one of the stricter interpretations of cosmopolitan actors. He is among those that feels it is possible to exactly delineate who or what is or is not cosmopolitan and concludes the 'true' cosmopolitans exhibit a culturally open disposition and interest in a continuous engagement with one or other cosmopolitan project. As he noted, 'For one thing, there are cosmopolitans, and there are locals'.⁴⁴ On the contrary, Bhabha proposes a vernacular cosmopolitanism focused on incorporating the non-elite actors into the project. However, incorporation of a group is not necessarily sufficient in the cosmopolitan criteria as Bayet suggests, it goes beyond this. His intriguing article highlights the difference between activity and intent by noting that the objective possibility to experience mixing, mingling, and sharing (i.e. via business travel) is not same as the subjective desire to do so. Additionally, he asserts the term 'everyday cosmopolitanism' to acknowledge the relevant ways ordinary people from different 'communal cosmos' managed to engage, associate, and live together at the everyday level. He suggests it is the process of 'transcending self' at the various levels of individual, family, tribe, religion, ethnicity, community, and nation - to associate with agonistic others in everyday life. In essence, it highlights how ordinary members of different groups can share and interact. The idea that only elites can be affected or enlightened for that matter is outdated as Bayet highlights in his examples of 'everyday cosmopolitanism' as exhibited in 20th century Cairo, Baghdad, or Aleppo where he suggests that ordinary members of different religious communities - Muslims, Jews, Christians, Shiites, or Sunnis had a great deal of connection and shared lives via trade or work and the community.⁴⁵ It is important to recognize that these actors are operating within a much broader global infrastructure including states and institutions. However, as Sindjoun notes, the state was never the sole actor, but only the way Westphalia was interpreted and that by enlarging the quality of actors you do not reject the state because the complex of interactions via globalization, are done through interdependence of state and non-state actors.⁴⁶ This interdependence between elite and non-elite actors is critical to understanding and recognizing cosmopolitanism and the vast relations involved.

43 Pollock et al., "Cosmopolitanisms."p.582

44 Ulf Hannerz, *Transnational Connections - Culture, People, Places*, ed. Davide Morley (Routledge, 1996), Beth E. Notar, "Producing Cosmopolitanism at the Borderlands: Lonely Planeteers And "Local" Cosmopolitans in Southwest China," (2008),p.101-111

45 Bayet, "Everyday Cosmopolitanism."

46 Luc Sindjoun, "Transformation of International Relations--between Change and Continuity: Introduction," 22, no. 3 (2001),p.226

In challenging the traditional assumption that cosmopolitan actors can be identified based on their role or activity such as travel is immensely useful in considering who is or is not part of the cosmopolitan project. For example, is it fair to assume that those who spread the word of seemingly cosmopolitan 'shared values' are indeed operating in the best interest of their global strangers? Particularly, as the West highlights the importance of free democratic and open capitalistic societies as part of the neoliberal agenda, will respect for a difference of opinion be honored? In addition to these considerations beyond assumptions that words innately equal cosmopolitan ideals is the question of whether mobility is a mandated prerequisite of cosmopolitanism. This is highlighted by the idea of corporeal mobility of the cosmopolitan actor challenged by the idea of 'local cosmopolitanism'. Through this idea, the entire necessity of corporal mobility (i.e. travel) is negated when one considers the ability of a shared world and interactions, to be able to be reproduced at the local level without ever leaving your home.⁴⁷ The assumption that cosmopolitanism must arise out of travel, consumption or metropolitan residence is challenged by the idea that it can be attained in the process of creating an environment appealing to incoming guests or tourists. Further, James Clifford who first presented a challenge to the idea that cosmopolitans must be elite and tied to class and ethnicity suggests the idea of 'discrepant cosmopolitanisms' that reflect the modern day reality of those differential often violent displacements that force locals to travel.⁴⁸ This idea of force and additionally 'choice' highlights the importance of recognizing cosmopolitanism and its actors as part of spectrum that considers level of choice involved in the engagement with the other. Whether that engagement results in a cosmopolitan consciousness is yet to be explored.

Additionally, the recognition of the unique, and often hidden roles of women in the cosmopolitan project is worth consideration. It has been observed that women in particular '*act as protagonists in initiating cosmopolitan exchanges*' as a result of the association as women generally moving about more easily in mixed neighborhoods chatting and borrowing things from each other and attending weddings, funerals and other relational activities.⁴⁹ An insightful consideration of this as well as the complexities of any universal benefits from a closer look at feminism. Envisioned by many to be a 'global touchstone for all humankind', it instead has had to accept the plurality of feminisms itself versus one universal feminism. Of particular interest is the suggestion of *cosmofeminism* which highlights the questions of who is the 'subject of world citizenship' and the second question of how can one consider the intimate under its sign without restricting intimacy to the domestic sphere? The proponents argue it must take a focus on the intimate sphere versus a relateness to the other (i.e. nationalism and globalization) in that sequentially it will open up the

47 Notar, "Producing Cosmopolitanism at the Borderlands: Lonely Planeteers And "Local" Cosmopolitans in Southwest China."

48 (TCS).

49 Bayet, "Everyday Cosmopolitanism."

domestic sphere that would not longer be confined to the private.⁵⁰ As a result, this could allow one to recognize domesticity *and* intimacy beyond the private.

Through such a widening, it allows a *cosmofeminism* discourse as a sign of an argument for a situated universalism inviting others to join in a broader debate that also recognize their own situatedness. In essence, this forces the larger networks to view their own nature as relations among others. By suggesting this broader view, a different picture of more public universalism could be generated that makes the domestic sphere subversive of think claims to universalism.⁵¹ Most pertinent to the focus of this inquiry is that by using this broader understanding of domesticity and intimacy, it is possible to engage with tourism on a number of levels. If feminism, which is generally focused on the domestic and intimate, can be brought into the public, so might tourism as it is generally seen through anthropological lens be viewed in a synonymous way that this broad and massive *tourism industrial complex* is indeed made up of many important intimate relations.

In light of the historically narrow conceptions of cosmopolitan actors as being those who are 'worldly' or well-traveled or even 'citizens of God', such broad considerations provide immense breadth to how we conceive of the global cosmopolitan actors. By challenging the idea that to be 'worldly' or hold a consideration of responsibility beyond oneself one must move across the globe the assumption that travelers are cosmopolitan while locales are not is undone. Further, the assumption that a statement of 'shared universal values' by the West equates to a sense of cosmopolitan obligation is not necessarily true. The ability of a *cosmofeminism* to keep the situated rather than universal subject in foreground, is particularly useful in considering how it is that the private and often intimate sphere of tourism might be brought into the public sphere.

50 Pollock et al., "Cosmopolitanisms."p.583-584

51 Ibid.p.585

Exploring Tourism with Cosmo Criteria

With a widened yet focused lens, it is possible to interrogate tourism by applying an initial framework of reconsidered and synthesized cosmopolitan criteria. By moving beyond the intricacies of definitions and considering Appiah's moral obligations through the broader concepts of global responsibility, global governance and global actors within tourism, the latent cosmopolitanism within tourism in the 21st century can be exposed. To do this, the following questions are used to interrogate tourism as part of this preliminary cosmopolitan framework:

1. *Where is the Global Responsibility* within tourism?
2. *What is Global Governance* within tourism?
3. *Who are the Global Actors* involved or affected by tourism?

These criteria are not definitive litmus tests in and of themselves, nor are the extent of answers provided exhaustive. However, through an initial exploration of tourism with these cosmopolitan criteria, initial sites of latent cosmopolitanism can be unearthed along with further questions to be included in such a framework. Using wider definitions of cosmopolitanism beyond the elite abstractions to interrogate tourism provides a foundation from which a *cosmotourism* discourse can begin. Prefacing these considerations is a brief introduction to global tourism in the 21st century allowing for appreciation of the magnitude of this industry and the need for attention. Concluding this section is the emerging role of anthropological tourism as it provides an initial engagement from which this broader cosmopolitan framework for tourism can be positioned. Put together, the focus on cosmopolitanism changes from one of rhetorical and abstracted narrow parameters to one of relevance and allows for an initial yet robust consideration of tourism below.

Seeing the *Tourism industrial complex*

Despite the plethora of articles and inquiries in a broad range of cosmopolitanism theory, the focus on abstractions has led to an oversight of what many suggest is one of the most powerful cosmopolitical phenomena of our times - global tourism. Tourism is so often, particularly in the West, considered a light-hearted flippant activity that, if anything, should not be taken seriously or it risks losing its appeal. Many lack an awareness of how this industry has grown, highlighted by the definition in the Merriam Webster dictionary which states, in its first entry that tourism is:

*- the practice of traveling for recreation.*⁵²

⁵² Merriam-Webster, "Tourism," in Merriam-Webster Online (2009).

Behind this limited awareness, and arguably linked to its positioning outside of the public sphere, tourism has developed into a massive global industry and is now considered the largest export in the world. Such an oversight is particularly shocking when one realizes the extent to which the tourism industry affects the web of international relations in every country in the world either via economic, social, cultural, environmental, or political ramifications of both elites and non-elites. Due to this pervasiveness, the term *tourism industrial complex*⁵³ most accurately captures its role in the world, similar to the name coined by Eisenhower in references to the military industrial complex. Such a robust term is useful as tourism is often solely conceptualized as a lighthearted, emotive connotation affiliated with a holiday taken by privileged Eurocentric West without any broader contextualization. This industrial complex is organized under, at least superficially, the United Nations World Tourism Organization (UNWTO) that is a United Nations Specialized Agency responsible for overseeing and addressing global tourism issues along with a plethora of transnational corporations (TNCs).

A number of factors have led to the growth of tourism not limited to the increased ease with which we can travel including the removal of trade barriers, improved technology and transport, internet and labor migration to name a few. Such openings have also expanded the number of actors involved with tourism industry, particularly private entities. As Hemingway suggests such developments have resulted in greater supranational attention along with a deconstruction of state sovereignty noting the growing role and power of TNCs and the New International Economic Order (NIEO). As has led to my inquiry in this topic, she notes that 'there has been surprisingly little assessment regarding the impact of tourism, despite claims of it being one of the largest and fastest growing industries in the world.'⁵⁴ According to the UNWTO, tourism is number 1 in international services trade and responsible for:

40 % of global trade in services
6 % of total world trade
3 % of global employment or 192 million jobs
1 in every 11 formal sector jobs (or 251.6 million) by 2010.

Today, the business volume of tourism equals or even surpasses that of oil exports, food products or automobiles.⁵⁵ As a result, it has become one of the major players in international

53 Note to reader: After deciding on the term 'tourism industrial complex' to capture the magnitude of tourism today, an extensive search was conducted and identified one existing use of this term in the following paper by Noel B. Salazar, "Experimenting With "Glocal Ethnography" As a Methodology to Study Tourism in Asia and Beyond," in Asia Research Graduate Workshop: Questions of Methodology, Researching Tourism in Asia (University of Otago, New Zealand: 2006).p.3

54 Sarah Hemingway, "The Impact of Tourism on the Human Rights of Women in South East Asia " International Journal of Human Rights 8, no. 3 (2004).p.275

55 Lucy Ferguson, "The United Nations World Tourism Organisation," New Political Economy 12, no. 4 (2007).p.557

commerce and represents at the same time one of the main income sources for many developing countries. By 2020, international arrivals are anticipated to surpass 1.5 billion up from the 842 million in 2006.⁵⁶ Therefore, it is by no stretch of the imagination that tourism is indeed an industrial machine that is only anticipated to continue expanding in its role both directly and indirectly via a variety of actors and governance structures that operate within varied conceptions of global responsibility. The ramifications of this industry are felt economically, socially, culturally, politically and more recently observed, environmentally on a variety of global actors. Despite this, the regular tracking of tourism as done by the monthly UNWTO Tourism Barometer⁵⁷ keeps a strong focus on the economic indicators.

With a greater awareness of the *tourism industrial complex*, the following questions briefly interrogate tourism as part of the cosmopolitan project by considering where the global responsibility and governance exists as well as the actors, both elite and non-elite, involved. Through this framework, key areas of latent cosmopolitanism are highlighted and lay the foundation for contextualizing tourism specifically within the broader cosmopolitan discourse.

Where is Global Responsibility within tourism?

Despite the very normative nature of much tourism activity, and particularly the emerging alternative tourisms, little connection with the normative concept of cosmopolitanism has been explored in depth. Therefore, this section, using the discourse and particularly Appiah's idea of moral obligation, reveals a number of areas where global responsibility is indeed embedded in the *tourism industrial complex*. Appiah's book, *Cosmopolitanism: Ethics in a World of Strangers*, builds on the 'citizen of the world' conception and realistically recognizes the potentiality of the concept in forging humanity and peace through obligation, while also recognizing the limitations of engagement with strangers particularly when it comes to our own well being. His assertions that the essence of tourism is about a connection with strangers regardless of whether that connection is chosen, unchosen, well intentioned or self-serving – he concludes there is still an interaction with the other and, a moral debate as to how that interaction should take place.⁵⁸ Using this premise allows for a realistic yet robust consideration of the *tourism industrial complex* and where the latent cosmopolitanism within it exists.

To begin, the UNWTO offers a plethora of examples that speak volumes of cosmopolitan qualities. For example, the *UNWTO Global Code of Ethics for Tourism* is the epitome of a call for global obligation to strangers in that it sets forth a manifesto towards how tourism can move

56 UNWTO, "UNWTO Website," <http://www.unwto.org/aboutwto/index.php>, viewed Jan 12, 2009.

57 ———, "UNWTO World Tourism Barometer January 2009," 2009.

58 Appiah, *Cosmopolitanism: Ethics in a World of Strangers*.p.87-100

beyond individual interests and instead towards a force of constructiveness and common good for all humanity. It includes the objective to contribute to the improvement of relations among different nations, peoples, cultures and religions.⁵⁹ Such normative agendas for tourism come from the top down as is clarified by Taleb Rifai, UNWTO Deputy Secretary – General who noted that “*while peace and stability are necessary conditions for a sustainable tourism environment, we also believe that travel and tourism can and should be considered as a further contributor to world peace and understanding.*” Additionally, the International Conference on Tourism, Religions and Dialogue of Cultures intends that tourism can make it possible to establish bonds of friendship among persons who might otherwise continue to view each other with wariness and mistrust.⁶⁰ Most overtly, the UNWTO, in its campaign to raise awareness of the positive impacts tourism can have on life, culture and economy, in short on society at all levels asserts ‘tourism enriches individuals, families, communities and all the world’.⁶¹ In light of these overt calls for responsibility beyond ourselves as tourism is indeed a contributing force to the broader effort of a peaceful world, a number of questions arise. For example, how does this *Global Code of Ethics for Tourism* balance the different conceptions of a peaceful world and happiness as Kant might ask? Appiah’s recognition of the reality that there is a moral obligation to strangers but it is limited by our own identities and roots challenges the utility of such codes. It is not to suggest that such endeavors are without merit, but when one realizes these codes have been constructed via elite state representatives while remaining at an abstracted level, the question of efficacy arises. It is surprising that despite the vast commentary from the UNWTO regarding cosmopolitan obligations, it has thus far not been considered with a robust discourse as such. The following highlights a similar situation for human rights, poverty and the development of alternative tourisms still left without a broader contextualization despite the latent cosmopolitanism involved.

Human Rights & Poverty

Although few articles directly address the issue of tourism and human rights, human rights are a key area that illuminates the cosmopolitan idea of moral obligation and responsibility to strangers. For example, Hemingway focuses on the disparate gender impacts of Southeast Asian (SEA) tourism on women of the ‘host’ communities as a result of tourism, and women, playing out often in the private sphere. Her article on impact of tourism on human rights is extremely insightful consideration of the web of actors and often those marginalized. She notes that the responsibilities of individual actors in the tourism industry translate into two moral, albeit non-justiciable, obligations: *a positive obligation* to bear witness to human rights violations, and a *negative obligation* to abstain from involvement in abusive aspects of the industry. Moreover, she

⁵⁹ See <http://www.unwto.org/index.php> for full Global Code of Ethics for Tourism

⁶⁰ UNWTO, “Promoting Peace and Understanding through Tourism,” UNWTO NEWS, 2007 XXI.p.7

⁶¹ ———, “UNWTO Global Campaign Stresses Importance of Tourism,” UNWTO,

<http://www.unwto.org/newsroom/Releases/2004/february/campaign.htm>, viewed Feb 10, 2009.

notes that even individuals can be held accountable and be tried before international court if their actions are found to constitute a crime against humanity and suggests a coordination of efforts to understand the negative impact of tourism on local communities.⁶² These considerations of human rights are directly in line with both Appiah's suggestion to do the least harm possible and Linklater's suggestion of the 'no-harm principle'.

The issue of human rights is an example that reflects the heart of the tension between state sovereignty and the rights of humanity as a whole. Interestingly, the burden of tourism on women arises in developing countries is the focus of Hemingway's work which recognizes that women carry an unequal burden of poverty, and, in Southeast Asia (SEA), the poverty created by developments in tourism has resulted in a growing number of women resorting to prostitution fueling a surge in sex tourism. Further, she examines the roles of states, corporations, and individuals under existing international and national law, corporate initiatives and the evolving concept of responsible tourism may address these problems.⁶³ Her work also considers the local ramifications of privatization of water rights and the role of transnational corporations (TNCs), the ramifications of ecotourism, the commodification of culture, poverty and sexual exploitation as they relate to tourism. Additionally, international aid and development scholars have and continue to look more closely at the industry of tourism as it is used often as a key tool for development in the Global South particularly via the Breton Woods institutions. These extremely normative and pragmatic consideration of tourism within IR that supports the need for more considerations to take place within a semi-structured cosmopolitan framework.

Closely linked to human rights is poverty and its close relationship the *tourism industrial complex* today. A key example of this connection from the elite level is a World Economic Forum (WEF) report underscoring tourism's role in fighting poverty which concludes there is '*socio-economic importance of the sector (tourism) and its relevance for policy-makers, the importance of tourism for the poorest countries and its export potential and the dominant position of the industrialized states*'.⁶⁴ With such a report being the first of its kind from the WEF noting the national barriers to competition in the sector and the focus on the economic side of the tourism equation, the need for attention to this industry from a more multi-faceted and robust framework and becomes apparent. Further, the UNWTO highlights the potential for poorer countries in that they have favorable attributes such as nature, culture and heritage as well as a favorable trade balance and abundant labor force. This is significant in light of the magnitude of the trade they are speaking of in which developing countries generated more than \$200 billion in earnings in 2005, four times greater than 1990 while also expanding market share from 28.6 to 40.3 per cent. Moreover, it is the

62 Hemingway, "The Impact of Tourism on the Human Rights of Women in South East Asia ".p.293

63 Ibid.p.276

64 UNWTO, "Promoting Peace and Understanding through Tourism."p.12

poorest countries seemingly most affected as the LDC's, 50 of the world's poorest countries primarily in Africa growing in arrivals exponentially by 48 per cent from 2000-2005 – triple the global rate.

As a result of such findings, the UNWTO suggests that tourism be mainstreamed aspect of national Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers (PRSP) and financing institutions recognize this impact. The UNWTO Assistant Secretary General Geoffrey Lipman said 'The Report underscores UNWTO's longstanding 'Liberalization with a Human Face Strategy' which calls for pro-development policies, to increase tourism competitiveness of poor countries.'⁶⁵ When such suggestions for pro-poor tourism are presented, it is critical to ask to what extent those 'poor hosts' in the tourism fed countries were consulted as this wave of tourism for development evolved. However, while tourism's role in development has been acknowledged by a growing number of researching in the field of tourism studies, it has been all but ignored by political scientists and international relations scholars.⁶⁶ Therefore, who has been debating the cost benefit analysis of this seeming silver bullet for 'raising up the Global South'? And, is it possible to both support a liberalized market and the varied set of actors and particularly the marginalized non-elite? Such questions are overdue for attention and currently left to a small few within tourist studies and peripheral IR areas such as development and IPE that are engaging in such critical issues.

Additionally, Chambers, a key anthropologist focused on tourism, notes that it is important to realize that tourism is valued as a development strategy not only because of its hoped for economic benefits, but also because it can serve important ideological and political purposes. He references the idea of tourism-related suppression that affects a local community and might take such forms as police surveillance, abridgements of free speech, forced migration, and homelessness, and prohibitions against contact between locals and tourists.⁶⁷ However, despite the many negative ramifications when responsibility is lacking, there is a positive correlation that has been the example of tourism responses to Myanmar (Burma). In this sense, Chambers highlights the political phenomena of where the tourist dollars are pulled out due to political upheaval. He also notes the increased tourist interest in eco-tourism may be encouraging some governments to support environmentally stable tourism.⁶⁸ Hemingway's recommendation that there be coordination of efforts to address human rights violations resulting from tourism in conjunction with Chambers suggestion of positive influence on human rights via tourism provide significant openings for further discussion. Such considerations highlight the complexities

65 Ibid.

66 Derek Hall Frances Brown, "Tourism and Development in the Global South: The Issues," *Third World Quarterly* 29, no. 5 (2008), p.841

67 Chambers, "Can the Anthropology of Tourism Make Us Better Travelers? ."p. 37

68 Ibid.p. 38

inherent tensions of the cosmopolitan project that ask whether what is good for some is indeed good for all come to mind along with the challenge of differentiating intentions as being of cosmopolitan intent that will truly value those strangers among us.

Alternative Tourisms

Concerns over human rights and poverty as they relate to tourism have translated, along with other less altruistic motives, into a growing field of alternative tourisms packaged as responsible tourism. Over the last 20 years, tourism has stratified into variations of itself at a rapid rate as a rise of the alternatives to mass tourism developed including: eco-tourism, cultural, heritage, responsible and most recently pro-poor tourism in response to the link between development of the 'Global South'. The majority of these stratifications are premised, in at least a 'messaging' sense, on an attempt to improve a human condition or address a global issue.

Despite this growing area, there is a gap of knowledge as to how the cosmopolitan abstractions translate into practice. This is most evident as a tourist who, in an effort to seek out understanding of responsibility on a broader level within the arena of tourism, can only stumble upon a usual top ten list of something to the extent of 'how to be a good traveler'. A key example are from those who run and research numerous travel abroad programs eventually offering up simplified 'Tips for Tourists'. However, these lists generally do not reach beyond the standard 'do not give candy to children' and 'be respectful' directives that have little if any relevance to any future interaction, let alone the tourism industry as a whole. In one respect, it suffices Appiah's consideration that all cosmopolitans should have a curiosity to understand the ramifications of their actions. However, that said, the lack of contextualization of such 'tips' and understanding within a broader cosmopolitan framework reduces the ability for any guidance to be effective. As John Urry and Mimi Sheller suggest in the book *Tourism Mobilities*, it is useful to recognize the evolving nature of tourism.⁶⁹ The development of alternative tourism presents a number of normative inquiries and is reflected in literature under the guise responsible or ethical tourism.

However, the extent to which such tourisms are indeed globally responsible remains unknown. For example, The UNWTO Asserts that tourism is the best means to foster employment prospects in developing countries and its ST-EP (Sustainable Tourism Eliminating Poverty) initiative is a prime example of what they say is taking a 'fresh approach' to sharing this message.⁷⁰ As such, the idea of pro-poor tourism has evolved wherein one who supports tourism in developing countries is assumed to be contributing to the elimination of poverty for that host community. However, such conclusions are yet to be proven and further inquiries are needed to

69 Mimi Sheller and John Urry, "Places to Play, Places in Play," in *Tourism Mobilities* (Routledge, 2004).

70 UNWTO, "Promoting Peace and Understanding through Tourism."p.13

do so particularly by those outside of the industry. For example, a common debate amongst travelers is to what extent their small fiscal input to the tourism market has a larger trickle up or down affect. Chambers highlights, from an anthropological perspective, the gap in knowledge to make informed responsible consumption practices.⁷¹ It is this quest for how best to apply cosmopolitan theory and particularly among non-elites who are asking for it, that lacks a foundation of knowledge. Anthropology offers useful insights at the local level, but lacks comprehensive theories related to consequences of behavior within the broader cosmopolitan dynamic.

Whether via Kantian recognition of variable happiness, Linklater's no-harm principle or Appiah's moral obligation to strangers, this brief initial look at tourism has highlighted the latent but pervasive role of moral obligation being deployed in areas of human rights, poverty and the emerging alternative tourisms. However, as Chambers notes there is no greater gap in the anthropological study of tourism as the one that exists in the reluctance to study hospitality as an important and dynamic partner to travel and with better understanding would help mature tourism theories and make us better travelers.⁷² Such reluctance is currently paralleled in the cosmopolitan discourse that has thus far ensured tourism stays outside the public sphere of consideration. Without a more robust discourse at the global level, the understanding of such obligations and the effort to translate those abstract obligations into practice will continue to stagnate allowing its governance structure and actors to continue without the guidance and oversight needed.

What is Global Governance in tourism?

There are a range of global governance endeavors underway to both directly and indirectly direct, order, regulate and navigate the *tourism industrial complex* worldwide. Generally uncontested as the most robust global governance entity for the *tourism industrial complex* is the United Nations World Tourism Organization (UNWTO). A specialized agency of the UN, it is the leading international organization in the field of tourism and serves as a global forum for tourism policy issues and a practical source of tourism know-how' as it self proclaims. It consists of representatives from the tourism industry, delegates of states, territories, enterprises, institutions, and other bodies, and thus, theoretically promotes the interests of a wide spectrum of stakeholders in the industry.⁷³ The UNWTO's current use of various tools to aid in its governance of global tourism including Codes of behavior, declarations and strategies provides an opportunity to explore Appiah's appreciation but also need for accountability of such institutions to the basic

71 Chambers, "Can the Anthropology of Tourism Make Us Better Travelers? ."p. 31

72 Ibid.p. 42

73 Ferguson, "The United Nations World Tourism Organisation."

needs of global actors. Further, his concerns of misuse of power that may cause harm and a risk of being unresponsive to local needs is considered below.

Declarations

Of primary interest in considering, the role of global governance in tourism is the UNWTO and its normative, and essentially autonomous, governance of the largest industry in the world. A key example of this normativity is its *Global Code of Ethics for Tourism* that serves as the manifesto for tourism's beneficial contribution to the global community. The Code includes ten articles covering extensive breadth of responsibilities and worthy of a full inquisition in a future inquiry. However, two items in particular are of interest including the prohibition of individual tourists from committing criminal acts and injurious or offensive conduct towards the host communities and provisions regarding non-discrimination and the elimination of all forms of exploitation, especially sexual exploitation. Despite the many articulations of responsibility, one must remember that it is not binding, and relies on the Regional Commissions and a World Committee on Tourism Ethics to implement and evaluate the principles.⁷⁴

A variety of additional declarations have been developed by the UN including United National Declaration of Human Rights states in Article noting responsibility of individuals in tourism. In 2001, the UN introduced the Draft Universal Human Rights Guidelines for Companies and although non-binding, it lays out clear universal standards for companies where the national law is deficient. Additionally, the UN Global Compact, UN Environment Programme (UNEP) Environmental Code for Tourism and the International Chamber of Commerce 'Business Charter for Sustainable Development' attempt to set guidelines for various actors, but lack any focus on 'host' communities. Hemingway notes that, as a result, human rights are often marginalized. Additionally, the United Nation's International Year of Tourism in 1967 and 2002 International Year of Ecotourism and the first World Ecotourism Summit in 2002 and created the Conference Declaration that urges the tourism sector to apply the principles of sustainability to all aspects of its business operations and cooperate with new industry sector reports on sustainability performance.⁷⁵ Such realities highlight the extensive connections with the cosmopolitan framework resulting in a number of questions including the contradictions set forth by an institution that arguably is focused on capital gains.

Poverty Reduction Strategies

Additionally, by looking at the various pro-poor tourism efforts of the UN and the Breton Wood institutions, it becomes clear that there is indeed a sense of responsibility to use tourism as a tool in reducing the disparities of the world. Various institutions are appearing enthusiastic and

⁷⁴ Hemingway, "The Impact of Tourism on the Human Rights of Women in South East Asia ".p.289

⁷⁵ Ibid.p. 287

committed to expanding the use of tourism as a critical cornerstone of poverty reductions strategy in the global south. For example, a Tourism Policy Forum in 2004 signaled this direction by noting that tourism would indeed become the new 'entry point' to development. Further, the World Bank recognizes that tourism features as a focal sector in 90 per cent of Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers (PRSPs) which serve as the key framework documents to receive donor support. Seen as a 'new paradigm' of development, a 2006 UNWTO document titled Poverty Reduction and Tourism: A Compilation of Good Practices has served as a working document and is considered as a significant contribution to a broad tourism development discourse as it is intended to serve as a guiding document of tourism policy makers internationally.⁷⁶ However, such endeavors are occurring with extremely political environments wherein agendas for an open market are serving as the cornerstone of tourism policy. As Ferguson notes, UNWTO's conceptualization of poverty reduction remains within a strictly market paradigm.⁷⁷ An additional critique of UNWTO activities identified two key aims that guide the institution: tourism as a tool for poverty reduction and development, and simultaneously the further liberalization of the tourism services sector. Tourism development as framed by UNWTO is presented, by them, as a problematic process because of the potential conflict between poverty reduction and liberalization of the tourism industry.⁷⁸ The inherent tension of the UNWTO's agenda to *both* promote tourism as a strategy to alleviate poverty while at the same time pushing for greater liberalization of the tourism services industry. Ultimately, she suggests that there needs to be critical analyses to understand how their policies will indeed affect outcomes.⁷⁹ Such inherent challenges highlight the latent cosmopolitanism and the concurrent need to understand the project as a whole and at the least, better understand the intentions and realistic ramifications of such seemingly mutually exclusive policy objectives.

The UNWTO is referred to by Ferguson as the global source of knowledge and expertise on tourism in the key position to influence the path of tourism development at all levels of noting the UNWTO 'looks set to be a significant institution for the analysis of global political economy'.⁸⁰ In many ways, the UNWTO operates as the epicenter of an otherwise seeming unregulated industry where unlimited power is a reality. Although its power is apparent, the a key question within the cosmopolitan framework is whether it is possible or ideal for an institution that is driven and supported by a clear political agenda is well suited to analyze their own policies that are crafted and implemented by those elites and often marginalizing the actual poor workers within the industry. Additionally, governance of private industry is limited, in that only two international

⁷⁶ Ferguson, "The United Nations World Tourism Organisation."

⁷⁷ Ibid.p.562

⁷⁸ Ibid.p.558

⁷⁹ Ibid.p.564

⁸⁰ Ibid.

processes exist that allow for direct scrutiny of TNC actions⁸¹ and these rely on voluntary cooperation of TNC's and therefore remain weak.⁸² Although Ferguson provides one of the few robust considerations of tourism that openly encourages critical engagement beyond the bounds of tourism, hospitality or anthropological studies, the trust in the altruism of the UNWTO highlights the need for a multi-disciplinary approach to the critical analysis of tourism governance. The ambitious normative agenda of the UNWTO, as well as the Breton Woods group, and its embedded neoliberal ideologies essentially unregulated provide the structure within which the largest industry in the world operates. This paper is not focused on the deduction of whether the key institutions governing the *tourism industrial complex* are a constructive or destructive force for greater good, but is focused on raising the question. By contextualizing these questions into a broader cosmopolitan discourse, the ramifications on global relations and the actors involved can be better understood.

Who are the Global Actors within tourism?

Using a broader conceptualization of cosmopolitanism that allows for the elite and particularly the non-elite to be considered beyond the abstract, it is possible to recognize the thick web of actors involved within the *tourism industrial complex*. The following provides an initial visualization of a pyramid of actors and briefly considers how the actions and consciousness of those actions within the thick web of relations affect the broader cosmopolitan dynamic regardless of the diffused level of power held.

Pyramid of Actors

A useful consideration of this broad range of actors is that of a three-dimensional pyramid wherein there are a large number of stratified actors visible and an additional proportion that exists but are not fully visible in the public sphere. It is useful to envision the bottom of the pyramid as the vast number of producers who supply the labor at the bottom. Behind the visible laborers such as those selling food or items as vendors and hospitality industry workers also exists the invisible or marginalized laborers that have yet to be recognized as actors. Even with a broader conception of cosmopolitanism, certain groups remain extremely marginalized as is the case with many of the domestic roles primarily held by women who provide immense 'value' to the industry but have yet to be recognized. Above this largest group are the tourists, most often of affluence and Western influence, who consume the products provided by the producers. Above the tourists are those who work within the tourism industry as agents, hoteliers and guides who interact and engage with the tourists by commodifying the tourist experience. Higher up and in

81 These include the OECD Guidelines of Multinational Enterprises (1976) and the ILO Tripartite Declaration of Principles Concerning Multinational Enterprises and Social Policy (1977).

82 Hemingway, "The Impact of Tourism on the Human Rights of Women in South East Asia ".p. 286

greater control sit the industry leaders and core TNCs that own and profit from the vast majority of this commodification process. Theoretically above, although not necessarily mandated to govern the actors, sit the national ministries of tourism and other state regulatory agencies. At the top, is arguably the UNWTO that as the core supranational organization provides the global governance discussed previously along with a variety of industry actors that remain invisible. Additional actors that are not always visible, include the civil society organizations and growing number of civil society networks that are working to provide pressure to those higher up the pyramid such as the World Social Forum as well as the vast informal internet efforts such as travelblogs that endeavor to connect individuals across the globe. Although neomarxist in nature and deserving of future attention, such a conception serves as an initial attempt to capture the actors but also the interconnectedness and division between the actors within and out of view.

This vast network of global actors engage in a variety of actions, that, when, interrogated more closely, reveal cosmopolitan tendencies. Of particular interest are those larger populations at the bottom of the pyramid that are operating within the broader complex global relations yet unaware. An example of this is the simple semantics of tourists to distance themselves from any negative aspect of tourism, is highlighted in the attempted differentiation of tourist from traveler. Chambers addresses this effort to subjugate the semantics of 'tourist' as being below that of the well intention culturally sensitive 'traveler' and states, 'despite their intentions, travelers are still tourists.' This effort of dissociation, what he terms a '*tourism of denial*' is at the foundation of what is missing in making such travel experiences enriching and suggests recognizing rather than trying to dissociate from tourism consequences is important.⁸³ A further example of this dissociation is the positioning of ethical tourism, discussed previously, which has been revered as a solution to the negative ramifications often associated with 'regular tourism'. However, it is important to question such framing within an 'ethical tourist' or 'responsible tourists' framework as being nothing more than that, a frame. Lisle's idea that the solution to the political, economic, cultural and environmental problems caused by modern mass tourism is to separate 'the ethical' from the political, the economic, the cultural and the environmental, arguably makes it possible to position 'ethical tourism' as the magic solution. Her conclusion is that ethical tourists have become 'New Puritans', who construct a pleasurable form of asceticism by pursuing virtuous, worthy, and morally improving forms of travel in a moral economy of which virtue and pleasure are always interlinked.⁸⁴ This consideration by Lisle highlights the complexity of the environment and context in which these actors exist and the variant motives involved that may initially appear cosmopolitan on the surface, but require a more robust exploration of the interior.

83 Chambers, "Can the Anthropology of Tourism Make Us Better Travelers? ." p. 30

84 Lisle, "Joyless Cosmopolitans: The Moral Economy of Ethical Tourism."

Consumer Consciousness

Although the focus of this paper is on the ability to see the larger conglomerate of actors and activities in the *tourism industrial complex*, Werbner raises a critical question about cosmopolitan consciousness. She asks in what sense does cosmopolitanism need to be grounded in an open, experimental, inclusive, normative consciousness of the cultural other. In doing so, she begs the question of whether travel without such an inclusive consciousness is cosmopolitan and asks, whether travel inevitably lead to such openness and reflexivity? She offers that sometimes it is the factory workers who offer a greater openness than the elite traveler.⁸⁵ Indeed, a woman in India who has never left her village may have a far greater conceptualization of cosmopolitan values than any traveler as she welcomes people to her home. Moving this idea beyond the individual is the essence of this paper and the contention that a broader global consciousness framed within cosmopolitanism is possible.

Additionally, the assumption that cosmopolitanism must arise out of travel, consumption or metropolitan residence is challenged by the idea that cosmopolitanism can be attained in the process. An additional example of this is the ethnographical study of Chinese shop owners in a tourist town of Dali and their production of cosmopolitanism for transnational travelers, and national tourists. The paper suggests that even those who do end up traveling, their cosmopolitanism has preceded their mobility as it looks at the café owners who have embraced a 'continuous' openness' to the world regardless of mobility. Instead, by learning several languages, learning to cook an array of foods, and learning to create a cosmopolitan atmosphere in their cafes for the transnational travelers and tourists who pass through Dali they represent a cosmopolitan consciousness. The author uses this idea of local cosmopolitanism among local shop owners to challenge current conceptions of cosmopolitanism and asks us to reconsider how we imagine others and ourselves in a globalized world.⁸⁶ However, in widening the actors to this extent, an underlying tension is the question is to what extent the diffused level of power and fiscal input of the non-elite tourism producers and consumers affect the overarching global network? The guidance available to global tourism actors is minimal or non-existent making the cosmopolitan obligation of understanding difficult and a global consciousness challenging..

I suggest Chamber's *'tourism of denial'* is also applicable to the denial that the cosmopolitan project has thus far had in relation to engagement with tourism. Instead, an enhanced awareness of what in fact cosmopolitanism means to the global actors in the 21st century can allow a stagnated discourse to move forward. As the sole arena to acknowledge and engage with the

85 Werbner, "Vernacular Cosmopolitanism."p.11

86 Notar, "Producing Cosmopolitanism at the Borderlands: Lonely Planeteers And "Local" Cosmopolitans in Southwest China."p 618-619

magnitude of tourism, anthropological tourism provides a stepping stone from which the broader cosmopolitan considerations and a *cosmotourism* discourse can progress and eventually include.

Building on Anthropological Tourism

One arena that has overtly engaged with tourism is the emerging anthropology of tourism discourse that despite being a relatively new field within anthropology, it is gaining interest and attention.⁸⁷ A number of debates exist within this discourse as to whether tourism is a constructive or destructive force in relation to culture and particularly the role of individual agency. A key contribution from this discourse is the recognition of individuals as key actors in shaping or constructing society, culture and events. However, despite this, one key contribution from the anthropology of tourism is its recognition of the complex and pervasive nature of touristic practices, the conventions and agency of hospitality and the often conflicting nature of various stakeholders. Most important from Chambers is the insight among global actors as agents within the cosmopolitan framework by his awareness that:

*'... it is fair to assume that most tourists are unaware of many of the consequences of their travel decisions, and it is not completely unreasonable to assume that better informed tourists might be less of a burden upon the places they visit. The question is, can anthropology actually teach us anything in regard to becoming better tourists?'*⁸⁸

For example, he notes, 'tourism is not an 'us' vs. 'them' kind of relationship, although it is often expressed as such in much of the literature as a host and guest interaction. Instead, he considers himself as *both* a host and a tourist which results in his ability to better appreciate the reciprocities that are necessary to keep the kinds of exchanges associated with travel from becoming reduced solely to commercial ventures.' Further, he suggests that what we learn of the world is never simply a result of how often or how far we travel but instead it is intimately related to how sincerely we receive strangers amongst us.⁸⁹ Such normative considerations run parallel to Appiah's considerations of ethics in a world of strangers and the moral obligations, global governance and actors involved. Further, Bhabha's reflection on the global context of the issue of global citizenship and his belief that cultural works ignite the issue of cultural citizen highlights the inherent connection between global and local forces.⁹⁰ The contrast of the anthropological focus on the individual actor highlights the fact that IR, and the cosmopolitan discourse is needed to raise consciousness of the complex thick web of relations within which they, and all of the tourism industrial complex, exist.

87 Chambers, "Can the Anthropology of Tourism Make Us Better Travelers? ."

88 Ibid.p.29

89 Ibid.p. 41

90 Mohanty, "Towards a Global Cultural Citizenship: Interview with Homi K. Bhabha."

Conclusion: A Cosmotourism discourse

By problematizing the definition of cosmopolitanism and simultaneously identifying its lack of application, this paper has creatively set forth a preliminary cosmopolitan framework as a starting point for exposing the latent cosmopolitanism within the *tourism industrial complex* today. From the emerging role of alternative tourisms to the various declarations of the UNWTO manifestos for peace through tourism, the essence of moral obligation and the role of global governance infrastructure is pervasive. Additionally, the pyramid of global actors within tourism highlighted the role of non-elites, both corporeally and consciously, in the cosmopolitan project. Using cosmopolitan criteria, this paper discovered extensive latent cosmopolitanism throughout the *tourism industrial complex* yet ignored in the cosmopolitan discourse.

In light of the extensiveness of latent cosmopolitanism exposed in a brief, preliminary interrogation of tourism, this paper suggests the development of a *cosmotourism* discourse to continue an ongoing academically rigorous interrogation. In doing so, it becomes one of the 'cosmopolitanisms' that has thus far been marginalized (as arguably has feminism) in that it appears to be too intimate for consideration in the public sphere.⁹¹ Through the establishment of such a discourse, tourism can be brought to the forefront of international relations via cosmopolitanism.

However, such a discourse does not benefit from being led by or housed within an industry oriented UNWTO but instead in an objective and unbiased academic discourse that works to engage all the actors involved in the 'act of tourism' and begin to appreciate the *tourism industrial complex* for what it indeed has become across the globe. And, using a cross-disciplinary yet structured approach that maintains fluidity and appreciation for both its intimacy and its necessity to be seen in the public sphere, it could be led by IR scholars who can provide the overarching umbrella under which the ramifications and various stratifications could be situated. The expertise of anthropological tourism and its attention to the vulnerable and often dependent relationships are critical contributions to this effort. However, although anthropology is an essential partner in any *cosmotourism* endeavor as it takes a closer, critical look at the socio-cultural and often political arm of groups at the local level, it needs the leadership and broader contextualization IR could provide. Potentially led by scholars such as Appiah who can help situate tourism in the cosmos, this discourse could help us move beyond the 'top ten' lists for responsible travel and engage critical questions of how tourism can continue without ruining the lives of others. Moreover, by considering this within a broader IR framework the economic, social, and political

91 Pollock et al., "Cosmopolitanisms."p.585

forces at play, we may be much better positioned to make tourism choices and policy decisions that have fewer negative ramifications.⁹² As Chambers asserts, 'our tourisms persist despite us, and thrive as they always have in our ignorance of the consequences of our journeys.'⁹³ As such, a *cosmotourism* discourse provides an opportunity for this ignorance to be lifted and for a new enlightenment to begin.

The urgency of this engagement is significant with the reality that the motivations and ramifications of the *tourism industrial complex* are far from being understood yet of the highest magnitude. The current Secretary General of the UNWTO, in his opening address to the worlds 'leading travel trade show', ITB Berlin, made an open invitation for engagement in the reworking of the Global Code of Ethics for Tourism via a 'Roadmap for Recovery', by stating:

*'I want to publicly invite leading decision-makers from the private sector and industry organizations to join us, to help chart the way forward, in conjunction with organizations like the OECD, World Economic Forum and their counterparts at the regional and national levels.'*⁹⁴

From a preliminary search, it appeared that one academic had attended this conference of more than 9000 people, and I wonder how many IR scholars are aware this task is underway.⁹⁵ If IR scholars continue to ignore the field of tourism, it will continue to be understudied, under-evaluated, and its impacts unknown whilst billions of dollars in development and humanitarian aid continue to be channeled through this regime.⁹⁶ As one of the major social and cultural forces of our time, and "amongst the most genuine and authentic of all modern human experiences",⁹⁷ it is worthy of our attention within any endeavor towards a more cosmopolitan world. The economic, humanitarian and environmental ramifications of this massive enterprise are staggering and if allowed to operate with only a handful of external analyzers as the current discourse suggests, the opportunity for unintentional and potentially harmful, possibly self-interested agendas will be allowed to continue unfettered.

The hope is that by contextualizing tourism within the cosmopolitan framework via a *cosmotourism* discourse, IR scholars will engage. By doing so, a greater understanding of tourism, as both a constructive and deconstructive force will be possible as well as the identification of concrete opportunities for a more peaceful world. This paper has set forth an initial

92 Appiah, *Cosmopolitanism: Ethics in a World of Strangers*.

93 Chambers, "Can the Anthropology of Tourism Make Us Better Travelers? ." p. 43

94 UNWTO, "UNWTO Calls on Tourism Stakeholders to Join Roadmap for Recovery," UNWTO, <http://www.travelindustrywire.com/article37579.html>.

95 Show ITB Berlin Travel Industry Trade, "ITB Berlin Virtual Marketplace," http://www1.messe-berlin.de/vip8_1/website/Internet/Internet/www.itb-berlin/englisch/, viewed March 1, 2009

96 Ribeiro, "Cosmopolitanism."

97 Chambers, "Can the Anthropology of Tourism Make Us Better Travelers? ."p.30

way forward for a widened cosmopolitan discourse that is able to recognize and engage with the largest industry in the world. It has also provided an initial framework for tourism to be interrogated as part of this revised cosmopolitan project. With an ever increasing utilization of tourism as not only a commodity but an arm of various neoliberal institutions, now is the time for the IR community in its many derivations via human rights, development, and most importantly in, non issue specific IR scholars to respond to this invitation. How these disciplines and particularly IR paradigms engage with this discourse would likely be disparate ranging from a neomarxist consideration of labor division, realist concerns with vulnerabilities of power balance as well as those in peace studies and feminism focused on social justice objectives. Additionally, such engagement allows for recognition that it is not only tourism by choice that could fall within this discourse. As Chambers suggests, there is a need to recognize interactions as hosts with wealthy tourists, students, and associates from other places, but also to our relationships with others who are perhaps less fortunate although equally insightful visitors – those coincidental tourists, such as guest workers, recent immigrants, and refugees.⁹⁸ Most importantly, it is the recognition that the web of international relations is a vast dynamic web, which, as Sindjoun suggest, would benefit from seeing this dynamic discipline as one in transformation versus one in crisis.⁹⁹ As this paper has highlighted, the benefit of widening the lens to recognize transformations and new opportunities for understanding beyond historically held parameters is the essence of the cosmopolitan adventure.

In conclusion, a *cosmotourism* discourse will allow for intellectual non-industry generated debate about what the current, future and potential ramifications of tourism mean in any effort towards a more peaceful co-existence. Of particular focus should be those not conventionally invited to the table, but caught in the midst of the *tourism industrial complex* in the 21st century and most notably the producers stuck within the bottom of the pyramid. By expanding the quest for knowledge and understanding as to what our cosmopolitan universals entail and how they translate to tourism, we will, in the least, be taking one step forward towards fulfillment of our cosmopolitan obligation.

⁹⁸ Ibid.p. 41

⁹⁹ Sindjoun, "Transformation of International Relations--between Change and Continuity: Introduction."p.226

Bibliography

- (TCS), Theory Culture & Society Centre. Nottingham Trent University,
http://www.ntu.ac.uk/research/school_research/hum/29480gp.html, viewed Jan. 20 2009.
- Appiah, Kwame Anthony. *Cosmopolitanism: Ethics in a World of Strangers*. Edited by Henry Louis Gates Jr. 1st ed, Issues of Our Time: W.W. Norton, 2006.
- Bayet, Asef. "Everyday Cosmopolitanism." *International Institute for the Study of Islam in the Modern World (ISIM)*, no. 22 (2008): 1.
- Brown, Pauline Kleingeld and Eric. "Cosmopolitanism." In *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, edited by Edward N. Zalta, 2008.
- Chambers, Erve. "Can the Anthropology of Tourism Make Us Better Travelers? ." *NAPA Bulletin* 23, no. 1 (2005): 27-44.
- Cheah, Pheng. "Cosmopolitanism." *Theory, Culture & Society* 23, no. 2-3 (2006): 486-496.
- Chris Brown, Terry Nardin, and Nicholas Rengger, ed. *International Relations in Political Thought: Texts from the Ancient Greeks to the First World War*. Cambridge, 2002.
- Cohen, Steven Vertovec and Robin. "Conceiving Cosmopolitanism." In *Conceiving Cosmopolitanism: Theory, Context, and Practice*, 314: Oxford University Press, 2002.
- Ferguson, Lucy. "The United Nations World Tourism Organisation." *New Political Economy* 12, no. 4 (2007): 557-568.
- Forum, World Economic. "Defining "Home": Divided Loyalty or Dual Loyalty."
[http://www2.weforum.org/site/knowledgenavigator.nsf/Content/Defining%20 Home %20 0Divided%20Loyalty%20or%20Dual%20Loyalty_20037cef.html?open](http://www2.weforum.org/site/knowledgenavigator.nsf/Content/Defining%20Home_%200Divided%20Loyalty%20or%20Dual%20Loyalty_20037cef.html?open) , viewed Feb. 15, 2009.
- Frances Brown, Derek Hall. "Tourism and Development in the Global South: The Issues." *Third World Quarterly* 29, no. 5 (2008): 839-849.
- Hannerz, Ulf. *Transnational Connections - Culture, People, Places*. Edited by Davide Morley: Routledge, 1996.
- Hedrick, Todd. "Race, Difference, and Anthropology in Kant's Cosmopolitanism." *History of Philosophy* 46 no. 2 (2008): 245-268.
- Hemingway, Sarah. "The Impact of Tourism on the Human Rights of Women in South East Asia " *International Journal of Human Rights* 8, no. 3 (2004): 275-304.
- ITB Berlin Travel Industry Trade, Show. "ITB Berlin Virtual Marketplace." http://www1.messe-berlin.de/vip8_1/website/Internet/Internet/www.itb-berlin/englisch/, viewed March 1, 2009
- Knowles, Sam. "Macrocsm-Oopolitanism? Gilroy, Appiah, and Bhabha: The Unsettling Generality of Cosmopolitan Ideas." *Postcolonial text* 3, no. 4 (2007): 1-11.

- Linklater, Andrew. "Cosmopolitan Political Communities in International Relations." *International Relations* 16, no. 1 (2002): 135-150.
- Lisle, Debbie. "Joyless Cosmopolitans: The Moral Economy of Ethical Tourism." In *ISA's 49th Annual Convention: Bridging Multiple Divides*. Hilton San Francisco, San Francisco, CA, USA, Mar 26, 2008 2008.
- Merriam-Webster. "Main Entry: Cosmopolitanism." In *Merriam-Webster Online Dictionary* 2009.
- . "Tourism." In *Merriam-Webster Online*, 2009.
- Mohanty, Sachidananda. "Towards a Global Cultural Citizenship: Interview with Homi K. Bhabha." *The Hindu*, www.thehindu.com/thehindu/lr/2005/07/03/stories/2005070300020100.htm , viewed February 19, 2009.
- Notar, Beth E. "Producing Cosmopolitanism at the Borderlands: Lonely Planeteers And "Local" Cosmopolitans in Southwest China." 615-650, 2008.
- Pollock, Sheldon, Homi K. Bhabha, Carol A. Breckenridge, and Dipesh Chakrabarty. "Cosmopolitanisms." *Public Culture* 12, no. 3 (2000): 577-589.
- Ribeiro, G. L. "Cosmopolitanism." In *International Encyclopedia of the Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 2842-2845. Amsterdam-Paris-New York-Oxford-Shannon-Singapore-Tokyo, 2001.
- Salazar, Noel B. "Experimenting With "Glocal Ethnography" As a Methodology to Study Tourism in Asia and Beyond." In *Asia Research Graduate Workshop: Questions of Methodology, Researching Tourism in Asia*. University of Otago, New Zealand, 2006.
- Santos, Boaventura De Sousa. "The World Social Forum and the Global Left." *Politics & Society* 36, no. 2 (2008): 247.
- Sindjoun, Luc. "Transformation of International Relations--between Change and Continuity: Introduction." 22, no. 3 (2001): 219-228.
- UNWTO. "Promoting Peace and Understanding through Tourism." *UNWTO NEWS*, 2007 XXI, 16.
- . "UNWTO Calls on Tourism Stakeholders to Join Roadmap for Recovery." UNWTO, <http://www.travelindustrywire.com/article37579.html>.
- . "UNWTO Global Campaign Stresses Importance of Tourism." UNWTO, <http://www.unwto.org/newsroom/Releases/2004/february/campaign.htm>, viewed Feb 10, 2009.
- . "UNWTO Website." <http://www.unwto.org/aboutwto/index.php>, viewed Jan 12, 2009.
- . "UNWTO World Tourism Barometer January 2009." 2009, 6.
- Urry, Mimi Sheller and John. "Places to Play, Places in Play." In *Tourism Mobilities*, 240: Routledge, 2004.

- Vertovec, Steven. "Conceiving and Researching Transnationalism." *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 22, no. 2 (1999).
- Webb, Adam K. "Taking Back the Cosmopolis." *Modern Age* 50.2, no. Spring 2008 (2008).
- Werbner, Prina. "Vernacular Cosmopolitanism." *Theory, Culture & Society* 23, no. 2-3 (2006): 496-498.

Background Reading:

- Adams, Kathleen. "Generating Theory, Tourism, And "World Heritage" In Indonesia: Ethical Quandaries for Anthropologists in an Era of Tourist Mania." *NAPA Bulletin* 23 (2005): 45-59.
- Archibugi, Daniele. "Cosmopolitan Democracy and Its Critics: A Review." 437-473, 2004.
- Azarya, Victor. "Globalization and International Tourism in Developing Countries: Marginality as a Commercial Commodity." 949-967, 2004.
- Babb, Florence E. "Recycled Sandalistas: From Revolution to Resorts in the New Nicaragua." *American Anthropologist* 106, no. 3 (2004): 541-555.
- Bayart, Jean-Francois. "The Illusion of Cultural Identity." 212-213, 2006.
- Bendix, Regina. "Tourism and Cultural Displays: Inventing Traditions for Whom?" *The Journal of American Folklore* 102, no. 404 (1989): 131-146.
- Bhabha, Homi. "Race and the Humanities: The "Ends" Of Modernity?" 81-85, 1992.
- Bleiker, Roland. "Review Essay: Traversing Patagonia: New Writings on Postcolonial International Relations." Review of *The Global Politics of Contemporary Travel Writing*, Debbie Lisle, Cambridge University Press, 2006.
- Blok, Anders. "Tourism & Cosmopolitanism: Towards a Mobile Sociology. Interview with John Urry." 76-81, 2005.
- Clark, John D. *Worlds Apart* Civil Society and the Battle for Ethical Globalization, 2003.
- Conway, Janet. "Citizenship in a Time of Empire: The World Social Forum as a New Public Space." 367 - 381: Routledge, 2004.
- Cwerner, Saulo B. "The Chronopolitan Ideal: Time, Belonging and Globalization." 331-345, 2000.
- Dennison, Nash, Anne V. Akeroyd, John J. Bodine, Erik Cohen, Graham Dann, H. H. Graburn Nelson, Dymphna Hermans, Jafar Jafari, Robert V. Kemper, Alan G. LaFlamme, Frank Manning, Raymond Noronha, Oriol Pi-Sunyer, Valene L. Smith, Richard W. Stoffle, J. M. Thurot, Karen Ann Watson-Gegeo, and David Wilson. "Tourism as an Anthropological Subject [and Comments and Reply]." *Current Anthropology* 22, no. 5 (1981): 461-481.
- Duffield, Mark. "Development, Territories, and People: Consolidating the External Sovereign Frontier." *Alternatives* 32 (2007): 225-246.

- Duruz, Jean. "Adventuring and Belonging: An Appetite for Markets." 427-445, 2004.
- Forum, World Economic. "Defining "Home": Divided Loyalty or Dual Loyalty."
http://www2.weforum.org/site/knowledgenavigator.nsf/Content/Defining%20_Home__%20Divided%20Loyalty%20or%20Dual%20Loyalty_20037cef.html?open.
- Foucault, Michael. "The Subject and Power " *Critical Inquiry* 8, no. 4 (1982): 777-795.
- Friedman, Jonathan. "The Ethics of Identity: A Rooted Cosmopolitan." Review of The Ethics of Identity. *Sunday Book Review*, no. June 12, 2005 (2005).
- G. Evans, M. Sahnoun. "Responsibility to Protect." *Foreign Affairs* 84 (2005).
- Glenn, John. "Global Governance and the Democratic Deficit: Stifling the Voice of the South." 217 - 238: Routledge, 2008.
- Grzybowski, Cândido. "The World Social Forum: Reinventing Global Politics." *Global Governance* 12, no. 1 (2006): 7.
- Guerron-Montero, Carla. "Travel." In *Encyclopedia of Anthropology*, edited by H. James Birx: Sage Publications, 2005.
- Gunesch, Konrad. "Education for Cosmopolitanism: Cosmopolitanism as a Personal Cultural Identity Model for and within International Education." 251-275, 2004.
- Hammond, John L. "Another World Is Possible: Report from Porto Alegre." *Latin American Perspectives* 30, no. 3 (2003): 3-11.
- Harkin, Michael Eugene. "Staged Encounters: Postmodern Tourism and Aboriginal People." *Ethnohistory* 50, no. 3 (2003).
- Hoivik, Tord. "Peace Research and Science. A Discussion Paper." 261-270, 1983.
- Hoskins, Janet. "Predatory Voyeurs: Tourists And "Tribal Violence" In Remote Indonesia." *American Ethnologist* 29, no. 4 (2002): 797-828.
- Jacobsen, Jens K. S. "The Tourist Bubble and the Europeanisation of Holiday Travel." 71-88, 2003.
- Kahn, Miriam. "Culture on Tour: Ethnographies of Travel." *American Anthropologist* 107, no. 4 (2005): 2.
- Kapadia, Kamal, and D. Asher Ghertner. "Transforming Place, Placing Transformation." *Interventions* 7, no. 1 (2005): 118 - 130.
- Kearney, M. "The Local and the Global: The Anthropology of Globalization and Transnationalism " *Annual Review of Anthropology* 24 (1995): 547-565.
- King, Diane E. "Transnationalism." In *Encyclopedia of Anthropology*, edited by H. James Birx, 220-225. Thousand Oaks: SAGE Publications, 2005.
- Krotz, Ulrich. "Parapublic Underpinnings of International Relations: The Franco-German Construction of Europeanization of a Particular Kind." 385-417, 2007.
- Lamont, Michele, and Sada Aksartova. "Ordinary Cosmopolitanisms: Strategies for Bridging Racial Boundaries among Working-Class Men." 1-25, 2002.

- Langman, Lauren, and Katie Cangemi. "Globalization and the Liminal: Transgression, Identity and the Urban Primitive." 141-176, 2004.
- Leggewie, C. "Transnational Citizenship: Cultural Concerns." In *International Encyclopedia of the Social & Behavioral Sciences*, edited by Paul B. Baltes Neil J. Smelser, 15857-15861. Amsterdam-Paris-New York-Oxford-Shannon-Singapore-Tokyo: Elsevier, 2001.
- Lejano, Raul P. "Theorizing Peace Parks: Two Models of Collective Action." 563-581, 2006.
- Liebersohn, Harry. "The Travelers' World: Europe to the Pacific." 380, 2006.
- Cosmopolitan Political Communities in International Relations." 2, no. 4 (1983): 46-b-.
- . "Cosmopolitan Political Communities in International Relations." *International Relations* 16, no. 1 (2002): 135-150.
- McCabe, Scott. "Who Is a Tourist?: A Critical Review." 85-106, 2005.
- McHUGH, Ernestine. "Moral Choices and Global Desires: Feminine Identity in a Transnational Realm." 575-597, 2004.
- Mignolo, Walter D. "The Many Faces of Cosmo-Polis: Border Thinking and Critical Cosmopolitanism." 721-748, 2000.
- Molz, Jennie Germann. "Cosmopolitan Bodies: Fit to Travel and Travelling to Fit." 1-21, 2006.
- . "Getting A "Flexible Eye": Round-the-World Travel and Scales of Cosmopolitan Citizenships." 517-531, 2005.
- . "Global Abode: Home and Mobility in Narratives of Round-the-World Travel." 325-342, 2008.
- Nava, Mica. "Cosmopolitan Modernity: Everyday Imaginaries and the Register of Difference." 81-99, 2002.
- Paley, Julia. "Toward an Anthropology of Democracy." *Annual Review of Anthropology* 31, no. June 26, 2002 (2002): 469-496.
- Patke, Rajeev S. "Postcolonial Cultures." 369-372, 2006.
- Pattberg, Klaus Dingwerth and Phillipp. "Global Governance as a Perspective on World Politics." *Global Governance* 12 (2006): 185-203.
- Poyer, Lin. "Maintaining "Otherness": Sapwuahfik Cultural Identity." 472-485, 1988. 2842-2845. Amsterdam-Paris-New York-Oxford-Shannon-Singapore-Tokyo 2001.
- Ribeiro, Gustavo Lins. "World Anthropologies: Cosmopolitics for a New Global Scenario in Anthropology." 363-386, 2006.
- Robert, Jackson. "From Colonialism to Theology: Encounters with Martin Wight's International Thought." 351-364, 2008.
- Santos, Boaventura de Sousa. "The Critique of Neoliberal Governance: The World Social Forum as Subaltern Cosmopolitan Politics and Legality."

- Siddiqi, Yumna. "Power Smashes into Private Lives': Violence, Globalization and Cosmopolitanism in Salman Rushdie's *Shalimar the Clown*." 293-309, 2007.
- Stronza, Amanda. "Anthropology of Tourism: Forging New Ground for Ecotourism and Other Alternatives." *Annual Review of Anthropology* 30 (2001): 261-283.
- Teivainen, Teivo. "The World Social Forum and Global Democratisation: Learning from Porto Alegre." *Third World Quarterly* 23, no. 4 (2002): 621-632.
- Tickell, Alex. "The God of Small Things: Arundhati Roy's Postcolonial Cosmopolitanism." 73-89, 2003.
- Wiles, Janine. "Sense of Home in a Transnational Social Space: New Zealanders in London." *Global Networks: A Journal of Transnational Affairs* 8, no. 1 (2008): 116-137.
- Wrobel, D. "Exceptionalism and Globalism: Travel Writers and the 19th Century American West." *Historian* 68, no. 3 (2006).