

Julio ARAMBERRI*

DVA I POL TEMELJNA MITA U ISTRAŽIVANJIMA TURIZMA

TWO AND A HALF FOUNDING MYTHS IN TOURISM RESEARCH

SAŽETAK: U ovom radu razmatraju se tri vodeće struje razmišljanja u kvalitativnoj sociologiji turizma. Prva od njih je MacCannellova autentičnost, druga je Turnerovo osobno oslobođenje, a treća je Boorstinova komodifikacija. Ovaj rad kritizira MacCannellovu ideju autentičnosti, kao i obećanje osobnog oslobođenja kojeg predlažu Turnerovi sljedbenici. Oni predstavljaju dva osnovna mita u sociologiji turizma, idealizirajući ponašanje turista i, na taj način, zamagljujući naš pogled na stvarnost. Treća struja – kritika komodifikacije – može se prilagoditi bilo kojem od njih te stoga predstavlja samo polovicu mita.

KLJUČNE RIJEČI: mitovi, autentičnost, osobno oslobođenje, komodifikacija, istraživanja turizma

SUMMARY: In this paper three mainstream currents in the qualitative sociology of tourism are discussed. First of them is MacCannell's authenticity, the second one is Turner's personal liberation and the third one is Boorstin's commodification. This paper criticizes MacCannell's notion of authenticity and the promises of personal liberation proffered by Turner's disciples. They represent the two main myths in the sociology of tourism by idealizing tourist behavior and, in this way, blur our views of reality. The third strand – the critique of commodification – adapts itself to both and therefore it is just a half of myth.

KEYWORDS: myths, authenticity, personal liberation, commodification, tourism research

* Professor Julio Aramberri, Faculty of Languages and Cultural Studies, Hoa Sen University, Vietnam, e-mail: julio.aramberri@hoasen.edu.vn

UVOD

Ovaj rad originalno je bio pripremljen za konferenciju „Mitovi u turizmu“. Stoga započnimo s definiranjem mita. U Meriam Webster rječniku moguće je pronaći ukupno četiri glavna značenja te riječi, od kojih se drugo – „priča koja je izmišljena kao prikriveno objašnjenje istine“ – čini najtočnijim. Mit je pripovijetka koja prepoznaje činjenicu, ali ju umata u maglovito okruženje koje promatraču onemogućava stjecanje točne ideje o njemu. Moje je mišljenje da se s tri vodeće struje razmišljanja u kvalitativnoj sociologiji turizma događaju sljedeće promjene.

Najpoznatija je MacCannellova koja je poslužila kao osnova za potpuni napad na vodeće pravilo istraživanja u turizmu koje se primjenjivalo sve dok on nije objavio knjigu *The Tourist* (1976). MacCannell je tako utroput za temeljitu kritiku modernog masovnog turizma. Njegovi su stavovi mnogo puta citirani, iako je upitno bi li se njegovi sljedbenici isto toliko potrudili kao on u svojim kritikama. Prije njega je Boorstin (1961) također dao lateralni doprinos istraživanjima u turizmu, klasificirajući većinu turističkih aktivnosti kao raznovrsne priredbe pseudo-događanja koja odražavaju banalnost i konformizam modernih potrošača i putnika. Turizam je za njega bio samo još jedan asortiman usluga, industrijski proizvedenih i upakiranih, na antipodima rafinmana i sofistikalije. Odražavao je komodifikaciju svakodnevnog života u masovnim društvima. Konačno, treća je glavna struja prihvatila poglede Victora Turnera o podjeli između posla i dokolice u modernim društvima. Njegovi sljedbenici tvrde da jaz između rada i igre otvara prostor slobode za turiste sukobljene sa strukturama svakodnevnog života.

Svaku od ovih strategija moguće je sumirati jednom riječi. Za MacCannella to je *autentičnost*. Moderni ljudi teže, na putovanjima i općenito, naći dublje značenje svojih života, iako zbog razloga koje će se kasnije

INTRODUCTION

This paper was originally prepared for the conference is Myths in Tourism. So, let us start by defining myth. Out of the four main meanings of the word found in Merriam Webster, the second—“a story invented as a veiled explanation of a truth”— seems the most precise. A myth is a narrative that recognizes a fact, but wraps it in a surrounding fog that prevents the observer from obtaining an accurate notion of it. In my view, this is what happens with the three mainstream currents in the qualitative sociology of tourism.

The best known is MacCannell's. It provided the basics for an all-out assault on the central tenets of tourism research, as practiced until the time he published *The Tourist* (1976). MacCannell thus paved the way for an in-depth critique of modern mass tourism. His views are widely quoted, although it is doubtful whether his followers would go to the same lengths as he did in his critique. Before him, Boorstin (1961) had also made a lateral contribution to tourism research, by classifying most tourist activities as sundry shows of pseudo-events reflecting banality and conformism on the side of modern consumers and travelers. Tourism for him was but another set of services industrially produced and packaged, on the antipodes of refinement and sophistication. It reflected the commoditization of everyday life in mass societies. Finally, the third main strand adapted Victor Turner's view of the split between work and leisure in modern societies. For his followers, the gap between labor and play opens a space of freedom for tourists confronted by the strictures of everyday life.

Each one of those strategies can be summarized in one word. For MacCannell it is *authenticity*. Modern people strive, in travel and in general, to find a deeper meaning to their lives although, for reasons to be developed later, their quest remains unful-

otkriti, njihovo traganje ostaje neispunjeno. Turnerovi sljedbenici, s druge strane, smatraju da turizam otvara prostor za osobno *oslobođenje*. U pravim uvjetima, turizam oslobađa i dozvoljava svojim sudionicima da žive manje otuđene živote. Konačno, istraživači koji slijede Boorstinove smjernice žustro kritiziraju *komodifikaciju*. I tako je moderni turizam postao još jedna vrsta robe, trivijalan i banalan.

Kako za svaku od ove tri struje imam puno rezervi, obrazložiti ću svoj odmak od svih. MacCannellova ideja autentičnosti, kao i obećanje osobnog oslobođenja kojeg predlažu Turnerovi sljedbenici, predstavljaju osnovna dva mita u sociologiji turizma. Oba idealiziraju ponašanje turista i, na taj način, zamagljuje naš pogled na stvarnost. Treća struja – kritika komodifikacije – može se prilagoditi bilo kojoj te zbog toga nije potpuni mit, već samo njegova polovica.

Mit broj 1: MacCannelova autentičnost

MacCannelov pristup turizmu je najbliži općoj teoriji u području u kojem nema mnogo ambicioznih ideja. Stoga nije slučajno da se njegovom radu pristupa s poštovanjem te da ga se često citira. MacCannellov je rad stoga postao obavezna postaja općenitih rasprava o prirodni turizmu. Međutim, on je na mnogim mjestima naglasio da *The Tourist* nije knjiga o turizmu. Ako bi ga išta moglo iznenaditi, onda bi to bilo smatrati ga stručnjakom samo za turizam. Njegov se najpoznatiji rad bavi turizmom, ali on je proučavao i mnoga druga područja kulture – kult filmskih zvijezda (1987); politiku (1984); pornografiju (1989a); krajobraz (1992b); žanr *film noire* (1993); urbanizam (1999b; 2005); semiotiku (1989b; MacCannel i MacCannell, 1982); marketing (2002); strukturalizam i simbolički interakcionizam (1986, 1990a); uz knjige *The Tourist* (1976 i 1999a), *Empty meeting grounds* (1992a) te nedavno objavljeno djelo *The Ethics of Sightseeing* (2011).

Turner's followers, on the other hand, consider that tourism opens a space for personal *liberation*. Given the right conditions, tourism engenders freedom and allows its practitioners to conduct their lives in a less alienated way. Finally, researchers that tread on Boorstin's footsteps conduct a spirited critique of *commodification*. Modern tourism has become another merchandise, trivial and trite.

I have many issues with all three of them, so I will reason my distance with all of them. MacCannell's notion of authenticity as well as the promises of personal liberation proffered by Turner's disciples represent the two main myths in the sociology of tourism. Both idealize tourist behavior and, in this way, blur our views of reality. The third strand—the critique of commodification—can adapt itself to any of them, in this way, it is not a complete myth. Just a half of it.

Myth #1: MacCannell's Authenticity

MacCannell's approach to tourism is the closest thing to a general theory in a field where one finds few ambitious proposals. It is therefore no accident if his work is addressed with reverence and profusely quoted. MacCannell's work has thus become a mandatory stop for general debates on the nature of tourism. However, he has made clear in many places that *The Tourist* is not a book about tourism. If anything might surprise him, it would be being considered just a tourism expert. His best known work grapples with tourism, but he has covered many other areas of cultural studies—film star cult (1987), politics (1984), pornography (1989a); landscaping (1992b); the film noir genre (1993); urbanism (1999b; 2005); semiotics (1989b; MacCannell and MacCannell 1982); marketing (2002); structuralism and symbolic interactionism (1986; 1990a) plus *The Tourist* (1976 and 1999a), *Empty Meeting Grounds* (1992a), and his recent *The Ethics of Sightseeing* (2011).

MacCannell cilja puno dalje od struke u mnogim područjima. Zbog očitog nedostatka fokusa, on poput Arhilejevog ježa, samo želi dokazati jednu veliku stvar – teksturu moderniteta sa svim njenim prednostima i manama. Ako je odabrao turista kao glavnog subjekta svojih istraživanja, to je zbog toga što je, prema njegovom mišljenju, turist najbolja metafora za razumijevanje stanja „modernog-čovjeka-općenito“ (pisao je u vrijeme kada feminizam još nije izrazio svoj zahtjev za inkluzivnijim rječnikom). Ne daje nova rješenja za ovo ili za ono područje istraživanja u turizmu. On želi ući u raspravu s najvećim znanstvenicima u području sociologije, od Marxa do Lévi-Straussa do Durkheima, Webera, Goffmana, Foucaulta. Ipak, to bi značilo neovlašteno ograničavanje širine njegova rada jer, teorija bi trebala biti samo čekaonica za djelovanje. Kako negdje otvoreno kaže, temelj je njegova rada turizam (metafora za modernitet općenito, kako je upravo spomenuto), ali također i revolucija: ta „dva pola moderne svijesti – želja da se prihvate, čak i poštuju, stvari onakve kakve jesu s jedne strane, a s druge strane želja da se stvari preinače“. Ako se turistu, odnosno modernom-čovjeku-općenito, pruži čvrsto uže, on će biti spreman ostaviti iza sebe labirint u kojem je zarobljen.

Počnimo s velikom hipotezom. Kao turist ili u bilo kojoj drugoj ulozi, moderni-čovjek-općenito u samouništavačkoj je potrazi za autentičnošću. MacCannell ne objašnjava što podrazumijeva pod pojmom moderni-čovjek-općenito, kao ni što podrazumijeva pod autentičnošću. Uostalom, MacCannell pjeva *a cappella* s Rolling Stonesima. Bez obzira na to koliko se trudio, moderni-čovjek-općenito ne može naći svoje zadovoljstvo. Turist je u potrazi za Goffmanskim „povratkom“, moglo bi se reći za suštinom ili strukturom koja će otkriti unutarnju istinu onoga što vidi, ali se uvijek hvata u koštac s nekim umjetnim „paravanom“ kroz koji ne može istinski prodrijeti. Moderni-čovjek-općenito uvijek je prevaren. Kako to? MacCannell navodi nekoliko razloga, iako nisu svi od njih

MacCannell aims much higher than at expertise in many fields. For all the apparent lack of focus, he, like the hedgehog of Archilochus, only wants to know but one big thing—the texture of modernity with all its trappings and all its traps. If he chose the tourist as his main subject it is because, according to him, the tourist is the best metaphor to understand the plight of “modern-man-in-general” (he was writing when feminism had not yet stated its claim to a more inclusive vocabulary). He does not provide new recipes for this or that area of tourism research. He wants to lock horns with the greatest social scientists from Marx to Lévi-Strauss with stops at Durkheim, Weber, Goffman, Foucault. And still this would limit the breadth of his work in an unwarranted way. Because Theory should just be the waiting room for action. As he puts it bluntly elsewhere, the foundation of his work lies in tourism (a metaphor for modernity in general as just mentioned), but also in revolution, those “two poles of modern consciousness—a willingness to accept, even venerate, things as they are on the one hand, a desire to transform things on the other”. Give the tourist, that is, modern-man-in-general, a solid thread and he may be ready to leave behind the labyrinth wherein he is entrapped.

Let us start with the big hypothesis. As a tourist or in any other role, modern-man-in-general is on a self-defeating quest for authenticity. MacCannell does not explain what he understands by modern man in general, or by authenticity, though. Anyway, MacCannell sings *a cappella* with The Rolling Stones. No matter how hard he tries, modern-man-in-general can't get no satisfaction. The tourist looks for a Goffmanian “back”, one would say an essence or structure that will reveal the inner truth of what he sees, but always finds himself grappling with some staged “front” that he cannot truly pierce. Modern-man-in-general is always cheated. How come? MacCannell mentions a number of reasons, not all of them consistent. In his coda to the second edition of *The*

dosljedniji. U završetku drugog izdanja svojeg *Turista* (1999) krivnju svaljuje na povećanu prisutnost korporacija koje su kolonijalizirale industriju. Kada je prvi put objavio tu knjigu (1976), kako sam priznaje, korporacije su bile puno manje dominantne; međutim, njegov zaključak u toj početnoj fazi je bio potpuno isti – turisti su već biti frustrirani svojom potragom. Stoga je morao postojati drugi krivac od uobičajenih korporativnih sumnjivaca. I tako se on vraća još dalje u prošlost. U drugim dijelovima svojega rada on pretpostavlja da se položaj modernog čovjeka općenito nije promijenio u 150 godina, više ili manje od početka industrijske revolucije. Ponekad se krivnja svaljuje na neolitsku revoluciju. Štoviše, ovaj nas put vodi još dalje u prošlost. Krivnja pada na podjelu rada, podjelu koja je u pogledu spolova i rada praktično stara kao i pojava čovječanstva na zemlji.

Moglo bi se tako smatrati kako je bezuspješna potraga za autentičnosti strukturalna – komponenta ljudskog stanja –, ali MacCannell za to ne želi čuti. On tvrdi da neki ljudi, koje naziva „primitivnima“, žive potpuno izloženi svojim odgovarajućim polovicama. Nema tu lukavih napadača. Nažalost, on ne objašnjava dovoljno precizno tko su ti primitivci i gdje ih se može naći. Ipak, vjeruje da bi moderni čovjek općenito, ukoliko postane više nalik njegovim misterioznim primitivcima, mogao izbjeći tu iritirajuću sudbinu. Može li to postati istina? Da, ukoliko smo spremni odbaciti podjelu rada i novac kao glavni medijator društvenih interakcija odjednom. Doista?

Čini se da MacCannell vjeruje u to. Kao primjer izdvaja svog ujaka, gospodina Meskimena koji je cijeli svoj život upravljao smetlištem isključivo po principu (robne?) razmjene. Teško je povjerovati da bi gospodin Meskimen koristio svoje razmijenjeno smeće kao legalnu ponudu za svoje namirnice, ali čak ako je to i učinio, odbacivanje novca jednom zauvijek samo je himera (iluzija) u opće prihvaćenim ekonomskim uvjetima. Ako vjerujete u to, slobodno možete vjerovati i u Zubić Vilu.

Tourist (1999) he blames the increasing presence of corporations that have colonized the industry. When he first published his book (1976), as he himself concedes, corporations were much less dominant; however, his conclusion at this initial time was the exactly the same—tourists were already frustrated in their search. Therefore, there must be other culprits than the usual corporate suspects. So, he goes further back into the past. In other parts of his work he conjectures that plight of modern man in general was already there 150 years ago, more or less at the start of the Industrial Revolution. Other times, it is the Neolithic revolution that is blamed. Even more, this trip into the past takes us further back. It is the division of labor that one has to blame, a division that in gender and in work is practically as old as the apparition of mankind on earth.

One might think that, in this way, the fruitless pursuit of authenticity is structural—a component of the human condition—, but MacCannell will have none of that. According to him, some people that he calls “the primitives” live totally exposed to their relevant others. No elusive backs here. Unfortunately he is not too precise as to who those primitives are and where can they be found. However, he believes that if modern-man-in-general became more like his mysterious primitives, he might escape this vexatious disposition. Can this become true? Yes, if we are ready to dispense with the division of labor and with money as the main mediator of social intercourse in one slam-dunk. Really?

MacCannell seems to believe it is. He salutes as an example his maternal uncle, a Mr. Meskimen who all his life operated a junkyard on a strict barter base. It is difficult to believe that Mr. Meskimen would use his bartered junk as legal tender for his groceries, but even if he did, getting rid of money once and for all, is but a chimera under prevailing economic conditions. If you believe it is, you might as well believe in the Tooth Fairy.

Međutim, on inzistira na tome da će autentičnost kao slabljenje odnosa posredovanih novcem biti moguća ako se moderni-čovjek-općenito pripremi za revoluciju. Što MacCannell podrazumijeva time? Kada je bio mlađi, čini se da je pod time mislio na nagli i nasilni kraj hegemonijskog imperijalizma, većinom u SAD-u. Nedavno je krenuo puno opreznijom stazom. Revolucija sada označava reviziju zapadnjačkih ego ili osobnosti. Tvrdi da je „čovjek koji je postavljen kao ideal korporacija 21. stoljeća na zapadu mišićav, plitak, pohlepan, nekritičan, hedonističan, šovinist, sebičan i zao. To je vrlo različito od azijskog ideala glavnog izvršnog direktora koji doprinosi i klasičnoj filozofiji, poeziji ili slikarstvu“. Ako pretpostavite da bi azijski direktor kojeg opisuje mogao biti neki kineski Veliki vođa, u njegovoj vizualizaciji pomoći će vam Andy Warhol.

U svojem je posljednjem djelu *The Ethics of Sightseeing* dodao izraženiju modulaciju ovog ishoda. Možda zbog naklonosti prema mekoći i dobronamjernosti koja se obično javlja u starijoj dobi, MacCannell sada misli da se svaki ego, muški i ženski, zapadnjački i nezapadnjački, može okrenuti nabolje ako slijedi progresivni pogled na moralnost koji se dokazuje u prihvaćanju različitosti, poštovanju Drugog i suzdržavanju od demonizacije različitosti i manjina. Do sada je bio uvjeren da su podjela rada, novca i kasni kapitalizam izgradili tamnicu od koje moderni ljudi ne mogu pobjeći. Sada se čini da možda vidi neko svjetlo na kraju tunela. Tako prolazi njegova autentičnost.

Mit broj 2: Turizam kao oslobođenje

Victor Turner nije prvi spomenuo jaz između rada i i rintangja na jednoj i dokolice na drugoj strani, ali on je dodao određene obrate koji su ga učinili vrlo utjecajnim. Život je za njega neprekidni niz redovnog vremena za rad i izvanrednog vremena za nerad. Tomu se dodaje ritualni prijelaz između i unutar

However, he insists, authenticity as the waning of money-mediated relations will be possible if modern-man-in-general makes himself ready for revolution. What does MacCannell mean by that? When he was younger he seems to have understood it as the sudden and violent demise of hegemonic imperialism, mostly in the United States. Recently he has taken a more cautious path. Revolution now means a retooling of the Western egos or personalities. “The human type that has been put forward as a corporate twenty-first century ideal in the West is ‘hard-bodied’, shallow, acquisitive, uncritical, hedonistic, chauvinistic, selfish and mean. This is very different from the Asian ideal of a chief executive officer who also contributes to classical philosophy, poetry or painting”, he says. If you suppose that the Asian CEO he portrays might be some Chinese Great Helmsman, Andy Warhol will help you to visualize him.

He has added a more pronounced inflection to this outcome in his recent work on the *Ethics of Sightseeing*. Perhaps because of the trend to mellowing and benevolence that usually comes with old age, MacCannell now thinks that all egos, female and male, Western and non-Western may take a turn for the better if they follow the progressive view of morality exemplified in the adoption of diversity, respect for the Other, and abstention from demonizing differences and minorities. Until now, he was convinced that the division of labor, money and late capitalism had built a dungeon from which moderns could not escape. Now, he seems to eventually see some light at the end of the tunnel. *Sic transit* his authenticity.

Myth #2: Tourism as Liberation

Victor Turner was not the first to refer to a chasm between labor and toil, on one side and leisure on the other, but he added some twists that have made him quite influential. Life, for him, is a succession of the ordinary time of work and the extraordinary time of non-work. Add to that the rites of passage be-

svake pojedine faze. Preuzimajući svoju aluziju od Van Gennepa, Turner ističe da trenutak prijelaza, liminalnost između početnih i završnih faza rituala otvara put inače ignoriranim iskustvima slobode, kreativnosti, fuzije.

Upravo su kroz ta vrata neki od njegovih sljedbenika pronašli put k izjednačavanju turizma i neuobičajenog života i za zaključivanje da njegovi postupci otvaraju prozor nečemu što zovu oslobođenje. Ryanovi pogledi sažimlju ovu razdiobu 2000. Za njega, turizam je liminoid, odnosno on donosi obećanje o oslobođenju. Ryan se oduševio sa Shirley Valentine, glavnim likom u drami Willyja Russella iz 1986. godine, u kojoj protagonist, kućanica iz nižeg srednjeg staleža, očito umorna od istih sitnih poslova u kuhinji i dosadnog braka, prihvaća poziv prijateljice da odu na odmor u Grčku, upušta se u romanse s mještanimom i odlučuje zauvijek ostati u destinaciji koja joj postane dom. I evo sindroma Shirley Valentine – sada na dohvata ruke svakome i po cijeni paket-aranžmana. Dopust kao bijeg od uobičajenog života, Ryan naglašava zadivljeno, ima veliki potencijal mijenjanja životnog stila ljudi. Turizam i osobno oslobođenje čvrsto su povezani.

Nažalost, Ryan ne definira značenje oslobođenja. Štoviše, ne daje ni mnogo dokaza za svoju maestralnu ideju. Sve promjene u životu, bile one novi život drage Shirley ili odluka bivšeg srednjeg menadžera da postane instruktor jedrenja na dasci nakon odmora, predstavljaju sličan podvig oslobođenja. Isto bi mogli, smjeli ili trebali učiniti i ostali turisti, čak i ako nisu menadžeri srednje razine u Marks & Spenceru ili ako ih muči sumnja da Shirley neće za svog trenutnog grčkog dragog opet obavljati iste one sitne poslove koji su ubrzali njenu grotesknu preobrazbu. Čini se da je Ryan toliko obuzet stavom da oslobođenje uključuje bilo koju životnu promjenu da ostaje slijep na činjenicu da mnoge nisu nepovratne i da se oslobođenje često navodno događa kada se netko ponovno oslobodi svog bivšeg oslobođenja. Umjesto sindroma

tween and within one and the other. Taking his cue from Van Gennep, Turner stresses that the moment of passage, the liminality between the initial and the final stages of the rite opens the way to otherwise ignored experiences of freedom, creativity, fusion.

It is through this door that some of his followers have found a way to equate tourism with extraordinary life and to infer that its practice opens a window to something they call liberation. Ryan's views epitomize this dispensation 2000. For him, tourism is liminoid, that is, it bears the promise of liberation. Ryan becomes enthused with Shirley Valentine, the main character in a 1986 play by Willy Russell, where the protagonist—a lower middle class homemaker obviously tired of her repetitive cooking chores and a boring marriage—accepts the invitation of a female friend to a vacation in Greece, finds her groove back in romance with a local, and decides to stay in the destination—her new home from now on—for good. Enter the Shirley Valentine syndrome now at the reach of anybody for the price of a package tour. Leaves of absence from ordinary life, Ryan warns admiringly, have a great potential to change people's life-styles. Tourism and personal liberation go hand in hand.

Unfortunately Ryan does not define the meaning of liberation. Additionally, he does not offer much evidence for his sweeping notion. All changes of life, were they darling Shirley's new life or a former middle manager's decision to become a windsurfing teacher after a vacation both display a similar feat of liberation. So might, or could, or should do the rest of tourists even if they happen not to be middle managers at Marks & Spencer or if they doubt that Shirley will not end up doing for her present Greek paramour the same domestic chores that prompted her transfiguration. Ryan appears so smitten with the view that liberation includes any life changes that he remains blind to the fact that many are not irreversible and that often times liberation is also said to happen when one becomes once again free from one's previous liberation. Instead of Shirley Val-

Shriley Valentine, netko bi mogao završiti kao Corinne Hofman, bijela Masajka.

Ryan putuje dodatnim smjerom k oslobođenju. Prema njegovoj (ne)definiciji liminoida, oslobođenje se javlja u trenutku kada turizam prestaje biti eufunkcionalan (Ryanov vlastiti izraz) i postane društvena kritika koja otkriva nepravde, neučinkovitosti i nečudorednosti srednjestrujaških ekonomskih i političkih struktura. Ryan zna kako ugoditi gomili, ali eufunkcionalnost potonje formule ide predaleko. On nije prvi koji je predložio da turisti odbace kritički pogled na svoje aktivnosti i na one u sustavu koje udovoljavaju njihovim potrebama; srednjestrujaška literatura u području istraživanja u turizmu obiluje sličnim upozorenjima. Doduše, tek se nekolicina usudila predložiti da se turisti stave u ulogu proroka. Srećom! Zamislite da se neki okupe prema Ryanovu savjetu i potraže oslobođenje javnim izlaganjem nečudoređa srednjestrujaških ekonomskih struktura tijekom seks ture u Havani, ili prokazivanjem okrutnosti prema političkim protivnicima prema naredbama Vrhovnog Vođe Iranske vojne teokracije za vrijeme posjeta Qumu. Prije ili kasnije njihovo vježbanje oslobođenja završilo bi kao ne tako zabavno razgledavanje lokalnih zatvora.

Možda Ryan misli na oslobođenje putem društvene kritike samo u demokratskim društvima. Ako je tome tako, trebao bi imati na umu da nema potrebe lijepiti pretencioznu oznaku *oslobođenje* na nešto što je obična, zakonita i legitimna pojava u takvim političkim i društvenim srednjestrujaškim demokratskim strukturama. Ako je pravilno pročitao klasike, Ryan bi trebao znati da je ono što on shvaća pod pojmom *liminoid* upravo suprotno od onog na što je Turner mislio kada je sugerirao taj pojam. Za Turnera bio je to još jedan način isticanja uske veze između institucionalizirane slobode i običnog života u demokraciji – ne obećanje oslobođenja za cijenu paket-aranžmana.

entire's syndrome one might wind up with that of Corinne Hofman, the white Maasai.

Ryan travels an additional way to liberation. According to his (in)definition of the liminoid, liberation occurs when tourism ceases to be eufunctional (Ryan's own term) and becomes social critique, exposing injustices, inefficiencies and immoralities of mainstream economic and political structures. Ryan knows how to please a crowd, but the eufunctionality of the latter formula goes too far. He is not the first to recommend that tourists cast a critical gaze on their activities and those of the industry that caters to their needs; mainstream literature in the field of tourism research is replete with similar warnings. Few, however, have dared recommending that tourists assume the role of prophets. Fortunately. Imagine that some of them would rally to Ryan's advice and seek liberation by publicly exposing the immoralities of the mainstream economic structures when on a sex tour of Havana, or decrying the atrocities against political opponents endorsed by the Supreme Leader of Iran's military theocracy while visiting Qum. Sooner rather than later their exercise in liberation would wind up as a not so exciting tour of the local prisons.

Perhaps Ryan is referring to liberation by social critique just in democratic polities. If so, he should bear in mind that there is no need to pin the highfalutin *liberation* label on what is just an ordinary, rightful, and legitimate occurrence in such political and social mainstream democratic structures. If he has duly read his classics, Ryan should know that what he means by *liminoid* is exactly the opposite of what Turner was referring to when he floated it. For Turner, it is but another form of highlighting the close relation between institutionalized freedom and ordinary life under democracy—not the promise of liberation for the price of a packaged tour.

Mit broj 3: Kritika komodifikacije

Dva su primjera suprotnih temeljnih mitova koji nadahnjuju većinu istraživača. MacCannellov pesimizam, s jedne strane i Ryanove nade za oslobođenje s druge, dva su stava koje nije lako međusobno pomiriti. To je, međutim, postao isprazan zadatak polovice mita koji je u potražnji isto toliko koliko je i u nemogućnosti da se pretvori u slučaj. Ovdje se referiram na ono što se naziva kritikom komodifikacije. Modernitet, koja sada dobiva svoje pravilno u terminu moderni kapitalizam, zahtijeva komodifikaciju robe i rada. Oboje postaju međusobno razmjenjivi. Čovjek prodaje svoj rad da bi kupio robe i usluge koje konzumira kako bi mogao nastaviti raditi, odnosno kako bi prodao svoju radnu snagu, dobio plaću za to, te kupio nove robe i usluge koje uključuju i određena razdoblja za odmor. Takav je okrutan usud modernog-čovjeka-općenito. A to se odnosi i na turiste.

Marx je prvi krenuo ovim putem. Njemu je komodifikacija označavala iskorištavanje. Prisiljavajući radnike da prihvate minimalnu normu potrošnje, kapitalisti su bez nagrade prisvajali svu preostalu vrijednost crpljenu iz njihova rada. Taj nezakonito prisvojen dio njihovog rada nazvao je „višak vrijednosti“. Upravo je taj višak vrijednosti bio srž kapitalističkih koristi, korijen kapitalističke nepravde i, na kraju, ono što je sudbinski odredilo taj sustav.

Kritika komodifikacije, kao što su prikazali Wangovi 2000 sljedbenici, ide drugim smjerom. Ona zadržava „fasadnu“ retoriku oslobođenja, iako već pomalo iscrpljenu. Turizam, kaže se, započinje eroskim pokretačem, odnosno freudovskim principom zadovoljstva; stoga se prikazuje kao indikator obilja i društvenog bogatstva, kao i kolektivne sreće. Međutim, na dubljoj razini fenomenologije, u njemu se može pronaći i odraz mračnih snaga moderniteta. Turizam može dovesti i do razočaranja. U potrazi za principom sreće turist doživljava poteškoće koje mu na put stavlja svakodnevni život.

Myth #3: The Critique of Commoditization

These two are examples of the opposing founding myths that feed the imagination of most researchers. MacCannell's pessimism, on one side, and Ryan's hopes of liberation, on the other, are not easy to reconcile with each other. This has been, however, the vacuous task of a half myth that is as much in demand as it is unable to put together a serious case. I refer to what is called the critique of commoditization. Modernity, now assuming its proper name of modern capitalism, requests the commoditization of goods and labor. Both become interchangeable. You sell your labor to buy goods and services that you consume to keep on working, that is, to sell your labor force, get paid for it, and buy new goods and services that also include some vacation periods. Such is the harsh predicament of modern-man-in-general. And this covers tourists as well.

It was Marx who started this avenue. For him, commoditization meant exploitation. By forcing workers to accept a minimal consumption norm, capitalists appropriated without compensation all the remaining value extracted from their work. He called this illegitimately appropriated part of their labor force the "surplus value". This surplus value was the essence of capitalist benefits, the root of capitalist injustice and, in the end, what would make the system itself meet its doom.

The commoditization critique, as exemplified by Wang 2000 follows a different path. It keeps a façade of liberationist rhetoric, though a bit more jaded. Tourism, we are told, starts with an erotic drive, that is, in the Freudian pleasure principle; and is thus portrayed as an indicator of affluence and social wellbeing and of collective happiness. However, at a deeper phenomenological level, one can also find in it an expression of the dark sides of modernity. Tourism may also lead to disenchantment. In the search for the pleasure principle, the tourist experiences the obstacles posed on the way by everyday life.

Eros se sudara s Logosom. Turisti nesumnjivo proživljavaju svoje konfliktne težnje. Turizam je „ritualna aktivnost i slična religiji i institucija[...], koja sakralizacijom atrakcija kreira svijet nade, obećanja i ‘spasa’, ili ‘drugi svijet’ koji je u određenom odmaku od ‘Ovog Svijeta’. Zašto ljudi sudjeluju u takvoj aktivnosti razdvajanja? Mogu se nabrojati bar dva razloga. Prvo, imaju određene probleme s ‘ovim svijetom’ ili sa svojim egzistencijalnim prilikama. Drugo, posljedično tomu, ljudi preispituju zadane egzistencijalne uvjete/prilike u kojima se nalaze, te mijenjaju značenja svojih života zadržavajući određeni odmak – duhovni, društveni i prostorni – od svakodnevnog živoga i svega uobičajenog u godišnjim (ili polugodišnjim) razmacima.“ (2000:vii).

Zanemarimo li religioznu metonimiju, drugi dio definicije poprilično je neuvjerljiv. Imaju li samo turisti problem sa svojim egzistencijalnim uvjetima/prilikama na ovom svijetu? Čekaju li ljudi da se pobune tek kad uzmu predah jednom ili dva puta godišnje? Francuska je revolucija došla do vrhunca u srpnju 1789. godine, ali ne zbog toga što su siromašni radnici naišli na prebukiranje na francuskoj rivijeri. Još uvijek nitko nije utvrdio da se napad na Zimsku palaču u tadašnjem Petrogradu dogodio jer su Lenjin i boljševici odlučili promijeniti svoje živote nakon zaslužnog odmora tijekom ljeta 1917. godine. Njihove su vikendice na Krimu sagrađene godinama nakon toga.

Hipotezu da je turizam samoodrživi granični fenomen nije moguće potvrditi, a intuitivno je moguće zaključiti upravo suprotno. Tijekom i nakon svojih odmora ljudi uglavnom ne pokazuju aktivno otpor prema prevladavajućem društvenom poretku niti izražavaju bilo kakvu otvorenu želju da to primijene. Kolektivni pregovori o budućim uvjetima rada, ako i postoje, imaju sindikate koji zahtijevaju povećanje plaćenog godišnjeg odmora, ali ne i promjene sustava koji ih omogućava.

Stoga Wang tako stvara zagonetku. S jedne strane, modernitet se nameće svojim su-

Eros bangs against Logos. Tourists definitely experience their conflicting drifts. Tourism is “a religion-like ritual activity and institutions [...], which, through the sacralization of attractions, creates a world of hope, promise and “salvation”, or “another world” which is at a certain distance from ‘This World’. Why do people take part in such a distancing action? At least two reasons can be given. First, they have certain problems with ‘this world’, or with their existential conditions. Second, as a result, people question the taken-for-granted conditions of the existence in which they find themselves, and renegotiate the meaning of their lives through keeping a distance—spiritually, socially and spatially—from everyday life and normality on a regular and annual (or semi-annual) basis” (2000:vii).

If we leave the religious metonym aside, the rest of the definition is quite unlikely. Do only tourists have problems with their existential conditions in this world? Do people wait to bring them to the front until they take a break once or twice a year? The French revolution reached a climax in the month of July 1789, but not because the *sans-culottes* had experienced overbooking in the French Riviera. Nobody has—yet—made the case that the storming of the Winter Palace in then Petrograd happened because Lenin and the Bolsheviks decided to renegotiate their lives after a well-deserved vacation over the summer of 1917. Their *datchas* in the Crimea would only come years later.

The hypothesis of tourism being a self-sustaining liminal phenomenon does not stand up, and Intuitively, though, one sees the opposite. During and after their vacations, people in general do not show active resistance to the prevailing social order nor do they usually express any open desire to change it. If at all, collective negotiations about future work conditions have trade unions requesting more paid vacations—not changes to the system that provides them.

Wang thus creates a puzzle. On one hand, modernity imposes on its denizens by the

dionicima nedaćama Logosa, racionalnosti, proizvodnje i rada. S druge strane, oni se štite uz pomoć Erosa, dokolice, igre i turizma. Međutim, posljednji i ugrožava i ne ugrožava poredak Logosa. Samo je liminalni prostor slobode prisiljen na nestanak čim Logos pokrene sat. Vrijeme je prošlo i ljudi se ponovno pokoravaju starim obavezama, samo malo sretniji negoli na početku. Na taj način erotska zadovoljstva koja se suprotstavljaju Logosu odražavaju samo Logosovu vlastitu prepredenost. Oslobođenje na kraju rađa podređenost. Konačno, podvojenost modernog života nema rješenja.

Zapravo, ova kontradiktorna egzistencijalna autentičnost, kako ju Wang naziva, uglavnom služi kao izum za potkapanje MacCannelovih radikalnih pogleda na komodifikaciju. Kao što je već rečeno, MacCannell vjerojatno ne smatra da oslobođenje od nezvjesnosti ne bi bilo moguće prije trgovine, a da je, na kraju, podjela rada iščezla. Složili se s MacCannellom ili ne, kao u mom slučaju, ali bez obzira na to koliko distopijske bile njegove originalne ideje, one pokazuju konzistentnost pa čak i raskoš dizajna koji patetično nedostaje Wangu i mnogim drugima koji komodifikaciju pretvaraju u igru juniorske lige. Nakon Prometejske drame čovječanstva, za njih komodifikacija postaje srednjeročni zadatak. Nakon svih kritika upućenih njemu, turizam još uvijek može zaslužiti svoje otkupljenje, ako ga se ograniči s dozom primjerenosti ili poštovanja prema Drugima ili bilo kojom drugom kombinacijom benevolentnih riječi.

Stoga smo se udaljili pola kruga od Marxa. Za njega je komodifikacija značila ekonomsko iskorištavanje. Wangova razmišljanja ne idu u istom smjeru te se njegovi pogledi na komodifikaciju bolje uklapaju u ideje većine pripadnika Frankfurtske škole.

Za pripadnike te škole roba nije znak iskorištavanja nego masovne proizvodnje. Problem s robom ne leži u tome da ona uzrokuje otuđenje u međuljudskim odnosima, nego u tome što se proizvodi na jednak, serijski način. Wang opisuje i kritizira moderni

travails of Logos, rationality, production, and work. On the other, they protect themselves with the help of Eros, leisure, play, and tourism. However, the latter does and does not threaten the order of Logos. It is just a liminal space of freedom bound to fade away as soon as Logos runs the clock. Time is over and people go back to their former subjection, only a bit happier than at the beginning. In this way, the Erotic pleasures that counter Logos shine as but Logos' own cunning. Liberation in the end begets subjection. In the end, the ambivalence of modern life has no solution.

In fact, this contradictory existential authenticity, as Wang calls it, mostly serves as a contrivance to defang MacCannell's radical views on commoditization. As said, MacCannell would not think that liberation from contingency might be possible before commerce and, in the end, the division of labor have withered away. One can agree with MacCannell or not, as it is my case, but, no matter how dystopian, his original ideas showed a consistency and even a grandeur of design patently lacking in Wang and many others that turn commoditization into a junior-league game. From mankind's Promethean drama, for them commoditization becomes the quest for the medium term. After all the critiques leveled against it, if constrained by a dose of congeniality or of respect for the Other or of any other well-meaning combination of words, tourism might still deserve redemption.

We have thus come half circle away from Marx. For him, commoditization meant economic exploitation. Wang does not think along these lines, and his views on commoditization fit better with the ideas of most members of the Frankfurt School.

For the Frankfurters, a commodity is not a sign of exploitation but of mass production. The problem with commodities is not that they create alienation in human relations, but that they are all equal, and serially produced. Wang describes and critiques modern tour-

turizam na potpuno isti način. On je postao roba koju ljudi mogu kupiti ukoliko imaju novca: dizajniran je i pakiran na učinkovit način tako da je usluga predvidljiva, pouzdana i dosadna; njegova je organizacija obično prepuštena velikim korporacijama koje nude proizvode koji također nemaju smisla; on oblikuje značajne međuljudske odnose u mnoštvo banalnih i hedonističkih iskustava. Konačno, Wang optužuje komodifikaciju za loš ukus i nedosljednost, a ne za nepravilnost i nezakonitost. To je pitanje o kulturi, bilo visoke ili niske, a racionalne rasprave. Kada bi potrošači imali bolji ukus i preferirali ekskluzivnije proizvode, ili kada bi oni bili bolje dizajnirani ili skuplji, komodifikacija bi imala puno manje utjecaja.

Ovaj zaključak nije održiv. Statistički je oksimoron očekivati da će svi potrošači imati izvanprosječni ukus. Štoviše, posljedice su nepredvidive. Komodifikacija je pitanje ukusa, a ukus se doista uvijek skriva u očima onoga u koga se gleda. Gdje je moguće naći taj dobar ukus kojeg bi potrošači trebali steći? Tko bi bili naši mentori? Ne trebate brinuti. Znanstvenici će se rado dobrovoljno javiti za taj zadatak.

Wang oprezno završava pozitivnim tonom. Modernitet i turizam bi trebali biti spremni prihvatiti reformu. Kako? Više od svega, Wang preporuča da poduzetnici i posrednici u turizmu odbace dominaciju zarade kako bi mogli prihvatiti odgovornu etiku. Trebalo bi im dopustiti da teže profitu, ali da profit bude podređen interesima turista, lokalnog stanovništva i okoliša. Nažalost, nakon Wangove bujice riječi protiv trgovaca komodifikacijom, čini se da to više ne funkcionira dobro. Čitatelja koji je podvrgnut kratkom tečaju neophodnih odnosa između kapitalizma, moderniteta, komodifikacije i lošeg destinacijskog menadžmenta sada se poziva da prihvati, uz prave poticaje, tvrdnju da se isti oni poduzetnici i posrednici koji stvaraju kaos mogu pretvoriti u novu viziju odgovornosti i brige za čovječanstvo. To zvuči kao da pustite lažne eunuhe u Zabra-

ism in exactly the same way. It has become a commodity that people can buy if they have the money; it is designed and packaged efficiently so that services are predictable, reliable and trite; its organization is usually left to big corporations that offer similarly meaningless products; it morphs significant human relations into heaps of banal and hedonistic experiences. Ultimately, for Wang, commoditization is to be blamed for being in poor taste and inconsequential rather than for being unfair and illegitimate. It is a matter for the brow, whether high or low; not for rational argument. If consumers had better taste and favored more exclusive products, or if these were better designed or more expensive, commoditization would have less room to hold sway.

This conclusion cannot stand. It is a statistical oxymoron to expect that all consumers will have above average taste. Moreover it has unexpected consequences. Commoditization is a matter of taste and taste, indeed, always skulks in the eye of the beholder. Where to find that good taste consumers should acquire? Who will be our mentors? Not to worry. Academics will happily volunteer for the task.

Being cautious, Wang ends in a positive note. Modernity and tourism should be amenable to reform. How? Above all, Wang recommends that tourism entrepreneurs and brokers discard the dominance of earnings in order to embrace responsible ethics. They should be allowed to pursue profit, but profit should be subordinated to the interests of tourists, local people and the environment. Unfortunately, after Wang's tirades against the merchants of commoditization, this seems out of kilter. The reader who has been treated to a short course on the necessary relation between capitalism, modernity, commoditization and destination mismanagement is now invited to accept that, with the right prodding, the same entrepreneurs and brokers that wreak havoc can be converted to the new vision of responsibility and hu-

njeni grad i očekujete da nakon toga carske konkubine ostanu samo malo trudne.

Wang drži zadnji adut u rukavu. Vrlo često tržišta ne mare za brige čovječanstva, a lokalni su dobavljači žrtvovani za interese potrošača ili su preslabi da bi unaprijedili svoje vlastite. Država bi trebala uskočiti i premostiti jaz. „Razvoj turizma stoga nije isključivo ekonomski problem; vrlo je često i političko pitanje [...]. Kako bi se osiguralo da {turizam} postane igra u kojoj svi dobivaju, vlade i svi uključeni u javnu politiku moraju usvojiti etiku odgovornosti i brige za čovječanstvo“.

Zvuči potpuno prekrasno, ali bi skeptici mogli pomisliti da bi Wangov san o intervencionizmu bez primjerenih kvalifikacija mogao rezultirati slučajem istih preferencija. Može li se ozbiljno očekivati da će tu ulogu dobro odigrati mnoge kleptomanične vlade koje nisu odgovorne prema svojim ljudima jer, ili ne obraćaju pozornost na demokratske procedure, ili im se otvoreno opiru? Spuštajući prema dolje, što ga navodi da pomisli da lokalne zajednice i njihove vlade neće doživjeti provalu interesa koji proturječe moćnima i onima kojima je oduzet posjed, onima koji imaju koristi od turizma i onima koju je nemaju, lokalnim poduzetnicima i lokalnoj radnoj snazi? Dosezanje ishoda kojima svi dobivaju, zahtijeva bolju analizu i bolje osmišljena rješenja od pretencioznog sredstva za smirenje nazvanog odgovorni turizam, kao i kraj komodifikacije u stilu frankfurtske škole.

Tako smo krenuli opasnim putem od kritike post-moderniteta prema zagovaranju elitnog moderniteta. Na kraju, kvalitativna sociologija turizma završava na način da ne nudi mnogo više od onog što je Boorstin predložio prije mnogo godina. Možemo učiniti mnogo toga bolje, ali ovo nije vrijeme za crtanje drugačijih planova.

* Članak je prerađena verzija pozvanog predavanja na Međunarodnoj konferenciji „Mitovi u turizmu“, koju su od 9. do 12. svibnja 2013. u Zadru organizirali Sveučilište u Zadru, Odjel za turizam i komunikacijske znanosti, i Ekonomski fakultet Sveučilišta u Zagrebu, Katedra za turizam.

manistic concerns. This rather sounds like a case of letting some fake eunuchs loose in the Forbidden City expecting that they will make the imperial concubines just a little bit pregnant.

Wang keeps a final trump card up his sleeve. Often times, markets do not care about humanistic concerns and local providers are sacrificed to the interests of the consumer or they are too weak to advance their own. The state should then step in and fill the gap. “Tourism development is thus not merely an economic issue; it is often a political issue [...] To ensure that {tourism} becomes a game in which everybody wins, an ethic of responsibility and humanistic concern must be adopted by governments and embodied in public policy”.

It sounds quite beautiful, but a skeptic might think that without appropriate qualifications Wang’s interventionist dream might yield a case of the same dogs *and* the same collars. Can one seriously expect that this role will be fairly played by many kleptocratic governments not responsible to their people because they either do not heed democratic procedures or openly rebut them? Going a rung down the ladder, what makes him think that local communities and their governments will not experience the gale of interests that oppose the powerful and the dispossessed, those who benefit from tourism and those who do not, local entrepreneurs and the local labor force? Reaching win-win results needs better analysis and more thoughtful solutions than highfalutin bromides about responsible tourism and the end of Frankfurt-style commoditization.

We have thus taken a hazardous trip from the critique of post-modernity to the advocacy of posh modernity. In the end, the qualitative sociology of tourism winds up by offering not much more than what Boorstin proposed many years ago. We can do better, but this is not the time to develop a different blueprint.

LITERATURA – REFERENCES

1. Boorstin, D.J. (1961). *The Image: A Guide to Pseudo-Events in America*. New York: Vintage.
2. MacCannell, D. (1976). *The Tourist: A New Theory of the Leisure Class*. New York: Schocken Books.
3. MacCannell, D. (1984). *Baltimore in the morning... after: On the forms of post-nuclear leadership. Diacritics*. Vol 14, No. 2, pp. 31-46
4. MacCannell, D. (1986). Keeping Symbolic Interaction Safe from Semiotics: A Response to Harman. *Symbolic Interaction*. Vol. 9. pp. 161-168
5. MacCannell, D. (1987). „Sex Sells“: Comment on Gender Images and Myth in Advertising. In D. Umiker-Sebeok (ed.) *Marketing and Semiotics: New Directions in the Study of Signs for Sale*. pp. 521-532. Amsterdam: Mouton de Gruyter.
6. MacCannell, D. (1989a). Faking It; Comment of Face-Work in Pornography. *American Journal of Semiotics*. Vol. 6. pp. 153-174
7. MacCannell, D. (1989b). *Semiotics of Tourism*. New York: Pergamon Press.
8. MacCannell, D. (1990). *The Descent of the Ego*. In S. Riggins (ed.) *Beyond Goffman: Studies in Communication, Institutions and Social Interaction*. pp. 19-40. New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
9. MacCannell, D. (1992a). *Empty Meeting Grounds: The Tourist Papers*. London: Routledge.
10. MacCannell, D. (1992b). *Landscaping the Unconscious*. In M. Francis, R.T. Hester (eds.) *The Meaning of Gardens*. pp. 94-102. Cambridge: The MIT Press.
11. MacCannell, D. (1993). *Democracy's turn: On homeless noir*. In J. Copjes (ed.) *Shades of Noir: A Reader*. pp. 279-297. New York: Verso
12. MacCannell, D. (1999a). *The Tourist: A New Theory of the Leisure Class*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
13. MacCannell, D. (1999b). „New urbanism“ and its discontents. In J. Copjec and M. Sorkin (eds.) *Giving Ground: The Politics of Propinquity*. pp. 106-130. London: Routledge.
14. MacCannell, D. (2001). *Remarks on the Commodification of Cultures*. In V. Smith, M. Brent (eds.) *Hosts and Guests Revisited: Tourism Issues of the 21st Century*. Pp. 380-390. New York: Cognizant.
15. MacCannell, D. (2002) The Ego Factor in Tourism. *Journal of Consumer Research*. Vol. 29. pp. 146-151
16. MacCannell, D. (2011). *The Ethics of Sightseeing*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
17. MacCannell, D. (2005). *Silicon Values: Miniaturization, Speed and Money*. In C. Cartier and A. Lew (eds.) *Seductions of Place: Geographical Perspectives on Globalization and Touristed Landscapes*. pp. 91-102. London: Routledge.
18. MacCannell, D. (2008). <http://lda.ucdavis.edu/people/websites/maccannell.html> (27 November 2008)
19. Ryan, C. (2002). *Stages, Gazes and Constructions of Tourism*. In Ryan, C. (ed.) *The Tourist Experience*. 2nd Edition. pp. 1-26. London: Continuum.
20. Wang, N. (2000). *Tourism and Modernity: A Sociological Analysis*. Amsterdam: Pergamon.

Primljeno: 4. travnja 2013. / Submitted: 4 April 2013

Prihvaćeno: 15. svibnja 2013. / Accepted: 15 May 2013