

Re-thinking the contributions of Dean Maccannell

A new theory of leisure class placed under debate

Korstanje, Maximiliano E.

Department of Economics, University of Palermo, Argentina

Abstract. Today, Dean Maccannell has become in one of most important scholars in tourism fields. Not only his contributions have been quoted in whole literature and tourism-related journals, but also had taken as an obligated referenced for all who makes tourism their object of study. Under such a context, Maccannell have constructed his state-of-the-art from an axis linked to Marx-Goffman-Durkheim-Levi-Strauss's concerns. In consequence, he had not taken into account the different criticism and limitations this frame-work represents. The present paper shed light critically about the theoretical problems of *The Tourist* as well as focuses on the problems these well-known scholars remain unresolved.

Key words. Tourism – Marxism – Symbolic interaction – Structuralism – Alienation.

Introduction

A work like *The Tourist* of D. Maccannell still is in an interesting invitation to meditate about the relationship between tourism and leisure class. Even if originally T. Veblen –who has been considered the leisure class theory's father- had never interested in analyzing the behavior of tourists nor the social conditions under what this industry was based on, there has been a strong an academic interest in linking this theory with tourism. Led by an Iranian student who at classroom claimed “*all we are tourists*”, Maccannell focuses on a modern theory of motivations. In the threshold of a global world, tourism is resulted in an invisible technologic revolution which has changed its references about authenticity in the line of two antagonist streams: existentialism and mass consumption. In fact, this remarkably insight book seems to be dedicated to the Frank Young's influence who had dedicated his life in analyzing how macro social nets work in combination with cultural studies.

Even though many researchers had been devoted in emphasizing the contributions of Maccannell's sociological contributions in tourism-related journals (DANN, 2005; HELPBURN, 2002; WICKENS, 2002; MARRERO RODRIGUEZ, 2006; SCHLUTER, 2005; XIAO & SMITH, 2007; CROUCH, 1993; MCNOUGHTON, 2006; CHHABRA, 2008; RYAN & HUYTON, 2002; RILEY AND LOVE, 2000; NILSSON, 2002; STONE & SHARPLEY, 2008; NOY, 2008; LANE AND WAITT, 2007; HAUG ET AL, 2007; COLE, 2007; WANG, 2007; CLARK, 2009; CORONADO, 2008; BIANCHI, 2003; DESFORGES, 2000; NASH, 2001; HALEWOOD AND HANNAM, 2001; BELHASSEN, CATON & STEWART, 2008),

no attention was given to methodological problems and limitations of such a proposition demonstrates.

Under such a circumstance, the present paper is aimed at discussing in depth the state-of-the-art of a work that gained acceptance in tourism literature since couple of decades back, often cited by many researchers inside and beyond tourism as well as inside the anglophone body of research. *The tourist, a new theory of leisure class* is not only a sociology-related book but it is an invitation to follow the academic thread of Marx-Goffman-Durkheim and Levi-Strauss in application to cultural concerns.

Initial discussion

On an introductory chapter, Maccannell contends that in modern civilization there is bondage between tourists and workers; by the way, tourists can be defined in two different dimensions. A tourist can be very well a real person physically accustomed to travel throughout the globe while secondly, a same concept refers to a macro sociologic imaginary resulted from these modern global times. With basis on the influences of Claude Lévi-Strauss but first of all Emile Durkheim, Maccannell intends to create a symbolical bridge between structuralism and positivism; in other words, tourist attractions are precisely analogical with symbolized totems in primitive tribes. For that reason, it is not surprising that the main thesis of this book is to demonstrate empirically that the expansion of ideology takes in leisure as well as tourism as a vehicle towards the ideological conquest.

However, Levi Strauss acknowledged that structuralism had serious limitations

and was not able to be applied on modern industrialized societies. This observation leads Maccannell to make an appropriate distance from the founder of structuralism. For the other hand, Maccannell is convinced structuralism will allow explaining further about cultural inside and beyond the boundaries of industrialized societies. In the line of his work, he also realizes that the phenomenological approaches of E. Goffman in studying the daily social life are able to be applied in urban contexts. Nevertheless, a conceptual opposition of this nature based on a bipolar construction -modernism versus archaism- will come across with many obstacles which will be widely criticized at a later point.

Undoubtedly, a feeling of immense gratitude is owed to Maccannell due to his critical contribution in researching alienation and staged-authenticity issues. In a moment whenever almost all studies have been focused on outlining the economical benefits of tourism, he addressed the gap tourism creates in accessing to wealth distribution and poverty relief. Hints to such effect prompted this scholar to affirm that tourism did not emancipate but reinforce a previous productive structure.

The concept of leisure Class

Taking its cue from Theorstein Veblen, the question as to whether leisure and work are complemented is put under scrutiny. Whether working life follows a logic embedded in bureaucracy, save, and sacrifice, inversely tourism refers to leisure, pleasure and mass consumption. An absolute or relative privation in on of these spheres will be reverted in the other one. From his point of view, a scientific

study of the role played by tourist in modern societies should not be dissociated from leisure. Maccannell notably focused his critical approach by alternating ethnographic with structural analysis methodologies.

It is not surprising that Veblen claimed in his book a substantial criticism by respecting to the contemporary culture. In such a work, he assures that economic life is driven not by notion of utility but social vestiges from pre-historic times. In ancient times, once a conqueror took control over their enemies, manual work was relegated to subjugated people who had the chance to be subdued in slavery or die. In aristocracy, the time that had not incurred in manual work was destined to emulate prestigious and honor purposes. Whereas, tribes became from an agrarian to industrialized stadium, the relationships between workers turned more complex and broader. In turn, Veblen defined the conspicuous consumption as the waste of money and resources by people aimed at displaying a higher status than others. One famous example, Veblen utilizes is the usage of silver utensils at meals, even though those are made of cheaper material worked just as well or, in some cases, better. In sum, Veblen contributions were originally intended to demonstrate as to how the subjugation of women in daily social life are associated to growth of sports and the influence of religion in consumption. Nevertheless, even if for Veblen societies are divided inevitably in many strata, only two are predominant: productive and leisure class. Basically, history is a reflection of the forgoing pass of economic production. In a savage stage, material conditions are subject to subsistence economy while these aspects make more complex groups enter in conflict at odds in order for them to obtain more grades of surpluses.

The possession of richness assigns an emulative distinction inside and beyond the imaginary of these groups. These kinds of symbols are used at disposal to create a circle of membership in and out-group boundaries. The need of ostentation in leisure class is based on conspicuous composition along with specific codes enrooted in linguistic and esthetic. Under a same typology that comprises scholars, warriors, priests and politicians, Veblen refers to the Leisure class. Anyway, nothing he appears to mention about tourists. For that reason, it appears that Maccannell fully misunderstood

what Veblen termed as leisure class. After further examination, it is imperative to mention that middle class uses and abuses of tourism irrespective of other classes. Also, Maccannell define the tourist visit as a ritual whose end of differentiating involved components that live inside a certain society. Since these kinds of manifestations look for authenticity in elaborated good, in recent times huge attention garnered the constant anxiety for novelty that characterizes the curiosity of modern tourists.

Furthermore, Levi Strauss and Durkheim, imagination and experience work as a type of social consciousness that lead the behavior in a micro level such as other expressions such as nationalism and religion. But ¿what does it really mean?, ¿is tourism part of ideology?. If so, ¿how it works?. To respond these questions, Maccannell acknowledges that it is necessary to introduce the polemic Marxian thesis about history.

Consumptions and Marxism: irreconcilable perspectives

At a first chapter entitled *the modernity and production of tourist experiences* Maccannell emphasizes that Karl Marx does not initiate his analysis of social structure based on the individual action but thru the combination of material and symbolic forces. Philosophically, in a similar manner to Durkheim, for Marx the image of a society is forged in the projection of all consumer deprivations and desires; that way, alienation effectively culminates in a broader capitalist mode of production which evolves in the line of time. On such a work it is condensed a notable gap between commodities and elaborated goods in association with the concept of added value. The consumptions of these elaborated goods not only contribute to workers alienations but also reproduce quickly the dynamic of capital. The relationships between workers and owners are determined by macro sociological structures embodied in the root of society. As much greater is the distance between final price and worker salary, faster the reproduces the social inequalities.

That way, Marx's interpretation leads Maccannell to affirm tourism and modern consumptions help the society offsetting those imbalances produced by manipulation of workers. If Marxian scholars would catch a glimpse of this book would claim that a sociologist of bourgeois like Maccannell is unable to under-

stand the principle of history and added value revealed by Marx (a similar issue was argued against P. Berger in his interesting study of capitalism).

Basically, for our American scholar capitalism comprises an economic process capable to transform the consumption of goods in a symbolic more elaborated expression. In one of his paragraphs author explain "*Marx was the first who discovered the symbolic feature or fetishist in compsumption's goods: its capacity to organize meaning around the necessity or desire because of reasons which lie beyond our own will and material needs*". (MACCANNELL, 2003: 29). However, there are some points that should be discussed in depth since they have been superfluously treated.

First of all, Marx had never concerned about the advent of capitalism but just he was concerned on British industrialism; in the war between United States and Mexico in 1847 Marx wrote two articles from New York giving his support to United States in such an enterprise. An agrarian society like Mexico had no chances to defeat an incipient industrialized society like USA (Fillipi, 1988) (Korstanje, 2007); by the way, the supposed revolutionary standpoint in Marx was not empirical as argued Maccannell but theoretical. A conflagration of this nature gave Marx an empirical test about the effectiveness of his theory. Whereas industrialized societies will overwhelm to the unindustrialized ones, civilization goes in a trace towards the end of conflicts. The underlying problem is this ethnocentric point of view in Marx unwittingly legitimated the capitalism expansion in all globe. The paradox is that one of most critical scholar overview (like Marx and Engels) about capitalism contributed in fact to its own later reproduction.

Undoubtedly, one of clearest arguments against Marxism is proposed by C. Castoriadis who argues that that Marx was the first scholar who demonstrated a theory may not be understood beyond the boundaries of historical praxis. The question as to whether Marxism became in ideology should be interpreted from various perspectives. Not only has this theory been transformed in a dogma adopted substantially by socialists countries, but also as a vehicle towards the historical knowledge as well as material development. Underpinned by the proposition of interpreting the light of history in social imaginary, on his introductory chapter Castoriadis recognizes that capitalism is

circumscribed to irreconcilable contradictions manifested in periodic crisis because of over-production, excessive degree of surpluses as well as increasing human's exploitation. Broadly speaking for Castoriadis, K. Marx disregards the influences of working classes in the distribution of wealthy. Second contradiction of Marxism lies in the incongruence between alienation and production. Marxian scholars are enrooted in the belief that modern workers are dehumanized at hands of capitalism. Unless otherwise resolved, Castoriadis observes such a premise should be very well put under scrutiny since this activity cannot prosper without human intervention (CASTORIADIS, 2007).

Whatever the case may be, Castoriadis contends Marx mistakes when refers to the contradiction between productive forces and material basis. A clear example will illustrate this, whenever water contained inside a saucepan boils, the lid is pushed by resulted gas. This is not a contradiction between gas pressure and the lid, but just a tension which should be well-explained by mechanical laws. In a similar way of reasoning, it is erroneously to affirm productive forces are in contradiction with material basis. For other hand, Marx centered his analysis on a passage from feudalism towards capitalism assuming that a same process applies for all societies in other stadiums in the line of history. For that reason, philosophically Castoriadis emphasizes that Marxian thesis about the class struggle should be in part reconsidered. For other hand, our French philosopher proposes a straightforward explanation; societies elaborate their own imaginary-related meaning in regard to technical production as well as the relationships involved in such a process. Automobile industry blossomed in England and France at the same time, but it leads toward two different realities; in England workers are constantly on strike and struggle against management interests while in France proletariat abides by the rules to the extent avoiding the conflict with certain indifference. It is not surprising that there is not in history substances which determine the behavior of others, for that it is an illusion to say that ideology determines economy or institutions of other nature. On contrary, both are part of other broader process in which case converge the imaginary institution of society. As a staunch enemy of doctrinaire Marxism, Castoriadis is convinced that ideology

does not condition in such the social life; formed originally of images, beliefs, and practices each society builds a reality about the surrounding environment what we usually call reason. This afore-mentioned construal not only determines what people feel, fears, hate and love emphasizing in their preferences and priorities but also depicts the proper meaning of existence (CASTORIADIS, 2007).

A second limitation of Maccannell's review is related to his tendency in conceiving concepts in a supposed opposition that had never existed before. Capitalism and Communism are two side of the same coin since both are based on the weberian concept of rational logic. Under that circumstance, Weber explained brilliantly as capitalism and protestant ethic formed an ethos capable to transform traditional manner of productions in a larger accumulation process. Hence, capitalism is not characterized by the lines of consumptions but in an ability to follow up the productions of goods (WEBER, 2004; WEBER, 1985; SOMBART, 2005). The consumption is not the causality of two variables but just a consequence. Let us revise these concepts again, both, communism and capitalism appear to be united by an similar necessity: rational control in all their ways of production and channel of distribution. (BERGER, 1989).

Cultural and Tourist Experiences

Despite his anfractuous efforts in relating Marxian structuralism with phenomenological goffmanian interaction -we had already dealt with in the introductory chapter- Maccannell succinctly detaches *cultural as well as tourist experience* in three perspectives: a) a front stage wherein image is represented virtually and theatrically to viewers, this aspect of experience is termed *Model*; b) a second ones is related to internal feelings -so-called *influence*- at time of observing these type of scenes such as emotions, fears and illusions. Truthfully, c) third component -taken into account under the name of *agent* worked intermediating among *model* and *influence*. Whereas *Model* represents an ideal to follow in the mind of consumers, *Agent* is linked to features to interrelate internal emotions with ideal depictions. By keeping with authenticity tourist are prone to play two roles: tourist experience can be lived as authentic or spurean, simply as a questionable copycat of a broader original. Whatever the case may be, alienation is

present not only in industries wherein culture is the main resource to be exploited (in more sophisticated forms like experiences) but also in tourism. This issue not only will remain once and once again throughout the book, but also it will be one of his more important contributions in tourism fields.

An all-encompassed treatment is given to tourist life and its influence on tourist attraction in the core of social imaginaries. From an ethical perspective, Maccannell explains convincingly why poverty represents an attraction for some visitors. In general, every experience needs from tourists, an excursion and a marker-indicator for further orientation. It is often assumed that modern citizens appear to be in a search of "the difference" anytime and anywhere. Most likely, a person who visits a destination is transforming an experience into an empirical linkage between all components that encompasses the tourist system.

The day of Maccannell went a wrong pathway.

In chapter number 3 and 4, our American sociologist focuses on urban leisure as an alienated style of life manifestation. Also, Maccannell defines as alienated leisure as every experience, exhibitions or visits that do not permit the individual emancipation of the routine. As example author refers to *Yields Tours* conducted in the inception of industrialism in urban cities. To the best of our knowledge, Maccannell follows the structuralism method by comparing the old form of leisure in Paris in XIX century with modern natural and cultural tourism. Readers ought to remind that structuralism emphasized the likelihood to analyze two or more historical processes by their resemblance in the line of the same hypothesis. The main thesis on this chapter is aimed at demonstrating that scenification of work reconciles two antagonist tendencies as work and pleasure sensitizing by means of aesthetic. Whether in XIX century workers have been integrated to industrial production, today integration implied the manipulation of worker as an attraction.

In these lines, the rest chapters 5, 6, 7 and 8 are dedicated to demonstrate a tension among cultural and the systems of beliefs in which tourism reproduce a scenefication with the end of legitimating a previous order. Even though it is truth that these kinds of structures may be authen-

tic or spurean depending on the case, Maccannell is convinced that modern tourism as well as ideology is the key factors for what capitalism have widely sparked. A return to authenticity of leisure may equilibrate the negative consequences resulted from tourism. This is the case of social degradation, which enrooted in the poverty, is being naturalized through the eyes of tourists. Under such a circumstance, alienation is no other issue than a superficial knowledge about things and people. Following the prejudice of Durkheim, Maccannell consider that in primitive tribes the family is situated in a private sphere as well as social life happens in harmony respecting traditions and honouring the social liaison. Inversely, in modern societies bondages are broken down, perceived instability surfaces at the time alienation advances.

Misusing a fragment of American anthropologist M. Mead (1955) wherein she emphasizes that in field-work, one should covers all spaces and sites in tribes recording from all the manners the natives consume certain food until the sacral experiences captured in ceremonies, Maccannell affirms within modern societies nothing is what it seems to be. That way, ethnography should be deemed as a prerequisite to explore in every corner of native community. Let readers remind that this should be contextually understood as a product of colonialist prejudices which pointed out natives lived in an atmosphere of free exposition and communion.

The idea that natives are peaceful, of an overtly generosity or cooperative and kind-hearted people was an idea that accompanied to first anthropologists and sociologists throughout XIX century. Indeed a much more time later, decolonization process revealed that these peaceful and pristine societies have been quite far away to be as first ethnologists originally described (KORSTANJE, 2008). It looks that Maccannell had never come across with the real problems and formal procedures that an ethnographer should follow to be welcomed in a Melanesian or African tribe. Natives are not so disinterested in showing their privacy on the eyes of a stranger. The British scholar, B. Malinowski in *Crime and Customs in Savage society* documented how natives appoint to manipulate social rules according their convenience and situations (MALINOWSKI, 1985). In such a lesion of ethnography, Malinowski

examined how strategies in natives along with taboos and prohibitions are not so ingenuous than Europeans considered as well as there has been a strong line between public and private life (front and back-stages). But not only this, Malinowski has been excluded from ritual ceremony called Kula because of an accident that native attributed to a bad sake. The hypothesis of Maccannell in this regards had no scientific support.

Finally, on last chapter 9 Maccannell brought into view on a couple of practical applications in respecting to the development of tourism in third world. As a previous argument given until Maccannell's book, there has been not any intention to fulfil a gap wherein Marxian theoretical literature failed to fulfil. In recognition to that, two main issues will be thanked to our American sociologist. In one hand, he centred his analysis in a dialogue with two dispersed streams -like symbolic interactionism and French structuralism-. This immense task deserves recognition. For the other, he was the first scholar in outlining the basis for a scientific study of modern alienation applied on tourism. Nonetheless, some other issues wherein Maccannell founded his theory should be fully re-considered. The analytical axis on Maccannell book is fourfold, Marx, Goffman, Durkheim and Levi-Strauss. Historically, Darwinian's revolution not only influences on biology realm but also expanded its horizon towards other disciplines like philosophy and economy, in minds such as Marx and Durkheim.

In his book the elementary Forms of Religious Life, Durkheim questions ¿how did religion contribute to the maintenance of social order? and ¿what was the relationship between religion and capitalist society?. Both issues were alternated in an explanation oriented to show that capitalism would undermine traditional religious commitment and thereby jeopardize normal cohesion of society. He believed that society rests on individuals and social customs. In that instance one might to think, religion was a mechanism capable to protect human beings from their cruel environment. In general, Durkheim was concerned about religion as moral and communal manifestation condensing four functions related to a) disciplinary, administrating principles, b) cohesive bringing people together, c) vitalizing, to boost the spirit of community, and d) euphoric such as happiness, confidence and well-being.

Even though his development is coherent with his previous argument about totemism, Durkheim has been widely criticized because the lack of empirical evidence to support his hypothesis. In addition, he forced the practices and customs of ethnographies on Melanesian tribes to an all-encompassed theory of religion. Like in many others scholars, Durkheim have been extremely concerned on the possibility religion to be disappeared. Most precisely, not only that prophecy had not occurred but also he has been recently accused to manipulate in his favour an amount of 42 over 100 original quotations in Spencer and Gillen in the study of Melanesian tribes (SERRANO, 2000).

Within this posture, Durkheim was convinced that industrialization and other associated forms like nationalism will gradually replace the religion in the core industrialized societies. From his point of view, evolution o totemism in Australia should be analyzed in comparison with a supposed origin of civilized societies. As things have been progressed, European countries shared with natives a same point of start. Nevertheless Europeans had evolved to superior forms and Australian had petrified in the threshold of time. In a similar manner, Stanner (well-documented by professor Prades) said "Durkheim is not a sociologist, he never stood in Australia, he is a speculative philosopher" (PRADES, 1998).

Even, Malinowski has dedicated a full-length explanation about errors that had incurred Durkheim in his totemism-treatment as well as his prejudice about the frankness of natives (BOSSERT, 2001). Once again, a glitch like this has been passed to modern literature and adopted by tourist scholars without qualms. The analyst of Arunta, at hands of Durkheim, has aimed at understanding the ways of how religion works in primitive communities but failed to explain further about modern practices. Methodologically, not only Durkheim has never visited Australia to support a thesis of this nature but also has been broadly ridiculed because he forced *The native tribes of central Australia* in regard of his convenience – a second bad influence for Maccannell-. This position not only shows a weakness in durkheimian argument but also reflects serious problems in the foregoing literature about this topic. The discussion based on Durkheim unfortunate hypothesis will be more fruitful whether his dogmatic character

would not prevent a critical frame-work in life. In such a consequence, all critical streams about this scholar came later the death of Anne du Sociologique founder (Steiner, 2003).

Authenticity vs. alienation

The cases of Goffman and Levi Strauss are less polemical than utopian Marx or the obsessive Durkheim. It is clear that Goffman has had participation and contact with G. Mead and Blumer who were working on the bondage between personality and face-to-face interaction issues. From an innovative perspective like dramaturgical, Goffman realized that society was not a homogeneous construal. Also, he suggests that social life must be studied as a theatre wherein rear room wherein are representing all occulted feelings that never transcend a front stage –facade-. It is hipotethized that human beings move looking for egoism as well as dark interests in the line of their proper goals.

Even though a situation like this looks to be real in some circumstances, Goffman did exaggerate and generalize this issue in all social life regardless that sometimes humans fraternize overtly each others in circles of humanism and unselfishness. A similar manner is observed in Maccannell when he outlines that in whole guests and hosts encounters dominate the competition, alienation, humiliation and falseness. Regardless the influence of Goffman in Maccannell, the epilogue of this acid review was reserved for the father of structuralism; Claude Levi-Strauss whole part of his life dedicated his efforts in understanding the myths in natural and cultural contexts. For him, myths are not only legend but also they were enrooted in a broader linguistic system. That way, his fascinating work is intended to highlight these systems work as an alternative mechanism to offset an inevitable discrepancy between cultural and natural realm. This French anthropologist set forward a theory in which case the bricolage and social beliefs condition the daily practices. For that reason, by pairing and comparing a bunch of mythological narrations like Oedipus and Percival, Levi Strauss concludes the structuration of human mind is based on a binomial opposition between two opposed meanings. In the conversation with linguistic Sciences, Levi Strauss supposed that all depictions and mythical systems allow comparisons with biological and cultural

features of the brain. From his point of view, environment- wherein humans have been adapted suggests inextricably a tension between the physical and transcendental needs (Levi-Strauss, 2003). A clear example will lead us to better understand this slippery matter; death symbolizes in people a troublesome interruption of transcendence and immortality. These types of irrational conflictive feelings are conducted though the application of a specific ritual process oriented to fertility. It is truthfully since we have born we are destined to die, but in all cultures of the globe the fear of dying is evident. Conceptually, in females birth is opposed to death like youth do in respecting to elderly age and so forth. This social convention not only reinforces political order but also resolve an ambivalent conflict an every person experiences because of presence of death. (PEIRANO, 2000; LEACH, 1954, 1965).

Nonetheless, Mary Douglas –a confessed durkheimian supporter- charged all her arsenal against Levi-Strauss due to his hypothesis seemed to be in error. From her perspective, myths only should be studied from individual practices embodied in social institutions which permit a potential macro-social legitimacy. It is fruitless to compare structures in abstract terms beyond economy, tradition, customs, and other social constructions. Simply, institutions and groups may be in resemblance each other, but this does not entail any type of scientific correlation. In accordance to this explanation, group A and B can be alike or similar in some features like colour skins, traditions, myths, cult and customs, anyway such a resemblance does not warrant an ethnical familiarity but a common adaptation of the same environment. Douglas assertively criticises to Strauss to confuse a peel with the core and projecting that findings universally. Superficially, once again two or more structures may look similar in a surface but in the core this does not imply any type of scientific causality.

Basically, a well-researched work conducted by M. Piglia regarding the historical evolution of ACA (Argentinean Automobile Club) in the lapse from 1926 to 1939 suggests that Maccannell's thesis has serious problems to explain the relationship between tourist experiences with the search of authenticity. In fact, she realizes that the notion of authentic or unauthentic are constructed according to social discourses shared by all consumers. In few words, every consumer is

strongly convinced they are buying an authentic experience. For that reason, in the case of camping grounds promoted by ACA assured their conditions of authenticity in the contact with the nature and a pristine environment. This experience was not only real for consumer but also for popular wisdom. The concepts of reality or authenticity are social constructs which depend on the contextual and political variables (PIGLIA, 2007: 145).

Final Comments

In sum, Maccannell contributions should be reconsidered along with all analytical evidence we have presented in this review where the basis of his theory is unsustainable. Taking into account the criticism towards Levi-Strauss, Marx, Durkheim and Goffman, the outcomes of Maccannell should be inevitably invalidated. The ideas that tourism is a mechanism to generate alienation and political hegemony would be trivialized as well as social structures determine the actions of stakeholders. Throughout one of more interesting essays dedicated in Spanish to the bridge between tourism and anthropology, M. Nogués Pedregal argues that Maccannell thoughtless mentioned tourism should be considered as an instrument capable to alienate in a context of pseudo-reality but these comments lack of veracity. Hence, such a statement has been functional for scholars to disaccredit tourism as a frivolous activity. In consequences, many researchers misjudged tourism accepting dogmatically the heritage of a Maccannell and applied sociology (NOGUES PEDREGAL, 2009:47). For other hand, it is not surprising that after 30 years no empirical research had had success in validating the model of authenticity detached by Maccannell. Inasmuch as Castaño has already emphasized, this was because the different stages that Maccannell thought, are not mutually exclusive and in fact overlap (Castaño, 2005). Basically, the simplicity of goffmanian thesis led Cohen (1979) to reduce the six scenarios proposed originally by Maccannell in only at two: real and represented. But more important is the fact that Maccannell had not been rigorous in the construction of this scheme nor the methodological limitations, which have been examined in this essay. Most specifically, a utopian posture invaded to our American scholar who has been associated with an evident fear that primitive and pristine world to be close at

disappearance in hands of modernity. Sustainable tourism, development, patrimony, cultural tourism and other terms have born recently in literature as a response of this concern. Following this development, readers will come across with a bipolar locale wherein in one corner, authenticity and leisure is opposed to falseness, alienation and tourism.. But things appear no to be easier than this. In 1986, Pearce and Moscardo criticized Maccannell contributions by underestimating the importance of interactions in tourist destinations. For instance, front and back-stages are determined by the role that every actor plays instead of how the interaction emerges. For better or worse, authenticity also is not determined by the sites tourists visit; otherwise, the experience is shaped by the symbolic relationship between hosts and guests (PEARCE & MOSCARDO, 1986). Other problem of this book is that Veblen has never referred to tourists as exponents of Leisure class. Without a strong basis, afterwards the incursion of Maccannell, the tourists have been automatically identified with leisure class. For other hand, there is continuous search of betterness in his text that prevents a clear diagnosis by respecting to the issues he dwells on. In other terms, this well-documented book has got serious limitations in the construction of a sustainable theoretical frame-work. It is clear that structuralism like the other doctrines is very complex to understand. As a result of this, it is debatable the superficiality in the dealing of these theories. Perhaps, the complexity of structuralism and Marxism discouraged many other critical approaches upon Maccannell in tourism fields (most of them who are situated beyond anthropology and sociology). Ultimately, we acknowledge in the limitations in reviewing a traditional work like this, but strongly believe it is worth our time and efforts. Quite aside from this point, *the tourist* will still continue to be a traditional book that has been transcended the boundaries of the time and language as an unavoidable requisite for all who makes of tourism their object in study.

References

- BELHASSEN, Y; CATON, K AND STEWART, P. (2008). "The search for authenticity in the pilgrim experience". *Annals of Tourism Research*. Vol. 35 (3): 668-689.
- BERGER, P. (1989). *La Revolución Capitalista: cincuenta proposiciones sobre la prosperidad, la igualdad y la libertad*. Barcelona, Península.
- BIANCHI, R. (2003). "Place and power in tourism development: tracing the complex articulations of community and locality". *Pasos Journal*. Vol. 1 (1): 13-32.
- BOSSERT, F. (2001). *De La función al significado*. Buenos Aires, UNMSM Press.
- Castaño, J.M. (2005). *Social Psychology of Travels and Tourism*. Madrid, Thomson Ed.
- CASTORIADIS, C. (2007). *The Imaginary Institution of Society*. Buenos Aires, Ensayo Tusquets.
- CHHABRA, D. (2008). "Positioning museums on authenticity continuum". *Annals of tourism Research*. Vol. 35 (2): 427-447.
- CLARK, I. (2009). "Naming sites, names as management tools in indigenous tourism sites – an Australian case study". *Tourism Management*. Vol. 30 (1): 109-111.
- COHEN, E. (1979). "Rethinking the sociology of Tourism". *Annals of Tourism Research*, Vol. 9: 403-428.
- COLE, S. (2007). "Beyond authenticity and commodification". *Annals of Tourism Research*. Vol. 34 (4): 943-660.
- CORONADO, G. (2008). "Insurgencia y turismo: reflexiones sobre el impacto del turista politizado en Chiapas". *Pasos Journal*. Vol.6 (1): 53-68.
- CROUCH, D. (1993). "Empty meeting grounds". *Annals of Tourism Research*. Vol. 9 (3): 302-303.
- DANN, G. (2005). "The theoretical State of the State-of-the-Art in the sociology and anthropology of tourism". *Tourism Analysis*. Vol. 10: 3-15.
- DESFORGES, L. (2000). "Travelling the World: identity and travel biography". *Annals of Tourism Research*. Vol. 27 (4): 926-945.
- DOUGLAS, M. (1996) "Animales anómalos y metáforas animales" en *Estilos de Pensar*, Barcelona: Gedisa. - "Clasificado como Comestible" en *Estilos de Pensar*, Barcelona: Gedisa. - "La broma cósmica" en *Estilos de Pensar*, Barcelona: Gedisa
- DURKHEIM, E. (1992) *Las Formas elementales de la vida religiosa*. Madrid, Akal.
- FILLIPI, A. (1988). *Institutions and Ideologies in the process of Latin American independence*. Buenos Aires, Alianza.
- GOFFMAN, E. (2004). *La presentación de la persona en la vida cotidiana*. Buenos Aires, Amorrortu Editores.
- HALEWOOD, C & HANNAM, K. (2001). "Viking heritage tourism – authenticity and commodification". *Annals of Tourism Research*. Vol. 28 (3): 565-580.
- HAUG, B ET AL. (2007). "Little Norway in Spain". *Annals of Tourism Research*. Vol. 34 (1): 202-222.
- HELFBURN, S. (2002). "Tourist forms in life Nepal". *Annals of Tourism Research*. Vol. 29 (3): 611-630.
- KORSTANJE, M. (2007). "Thru the Eyes of Karl Marx". *Nomadas: journal of Social Sciences*. Vol. 17 (1). Complutense University of Madrid. Available at www.ucm.es/info/nomadas/17.
- KORSTANJE, M. (2008). "Cultural Tourism: to exotism rescue". *Journal of Cristobal colon University*. Vol 21 (1).
- LÉVI-STRAUSS, C. (2003). *El Pensamiento Salvaje*. Buenos Aires, Fondo de Cultura Económica.
- LEACH, E. (1954). *Political System of highland Burma*. London, Bell. - (1954). *Levi-Strauss, anthropologist and philosopher*. Barcelona, Anagrama.
- LANE, R AND WAITT, G. (2007). "Inalienable places". *Annals of Tourism Research*. Vol. 34 (1): 105-121
- MACCANNELL, D. (2003). *The tourist, a new theory of leisure class*. Moia, Spain, Ed. Melusina.
- MALINOWSKI, B. (1985). *Crime and Customs in Savage Society*. Buenos Aires, Planeta-Agostini.
- MARRERO RODRÍGUEZ, J R (2006). "El discurso de rechazo al turismo en Canarias: una aproximación cualitativa". *Pasos Journal*. Vol. 4 (3): 327-341.
- MCAUGHTON, D. (2006). "The host as uninvited guest". *Annals of Tourism Research*. Vol. 33 (3): 645-665.
- MEAD, M. (1955). *Male and Female*. New York, Mentor.
- NASH, D. (2001). "on travelers, ethnographers and tourist". *Annals of tourism Research*. Vol. 28 (2): 493-496.
- NILSSON, P. (2002). "Staying on farms: an ideological background". *Annals of tourism Research*. Vol. 29 (1): 7-24.
- NOGUES PEDREGAL, A. M. (2009). "Genealogy of troublesome relationship between anthropology and tourism". *Pasos*. Vol. 7 (1): 43-56.
- NOY, C. (2008). "Pages as stages: a performance approach to visitor books". *Annals of Tourism Research*. Vol. 35 (2): 509-528.
- PEARCE, P. L. & MOSCARDO, G. (1985). "The concept of authenticity in tourism experiences". *Australian and New Zealand journal of Sociology*. Vol. 22: 121-132.
- PEIRANO, MARIZA G. (2000). "A Análise Antropológica de Rituais". Serie de Antropología 270. Universidad de Brasilia, Brasil.
- PIGLIA,-2PRADES, J. A. (1998). *Lo Sagrado: del mundo arcaico a la modernidad*. Madrid, Ediciones Península.
- RILEY, R & LOVE, L. (2000). "The state of qualitative tourism research". *Annals of Tourism Research*. Vol. 27 (1): 164-187.
- RYAN, C & HUYTON, J. (2002). "Tourist and

- aboriginal people". *Annals of Tourism Research*. Vol. 29 (3): 631-647.
- SCHLUTER, R. (2005). *Hospitality and Tourism Research*. Buenos Aires, CIET.
- SERRANO, A. E. (2000). "Las fuentes de Información que utilizó Emile Durkheim para sustentar la teoría de la función social". *Razón y palabra*. Vol. 18. Available at www.razonypalabra.org.mx.
- SOMBART, W. (2005). *El Burgués: contribución a la historia espiritual del hombre económico moderno*. Madrid, Alianza Editorial.
- STEINER, P. (2003). *The Sociology of Durkheim*. Buenos Aires, Nueva Visión.
- STONE, P & SHARPLEY, R. (2008). "Consuming dark tourism: a thanatological perspective". *Annals of Tourism Research*. Vol. 35 (2): 574-595.
- VEBLEN, T. (1974). *The Leisure Class*. México, Fondo de Cultura Económica.
- WANG, Y. (2007). "Customized authenticity begins at home". *Annals of Tourism Research*. Vol. 34 (3): 789-804.
- WEBER M. (1985). *Ensayos de Sociología Contemporánea II*. Buenos Aires, Ediciones Planeta-Agostini. (2004). *Ética Protestante*. Buenos Aires, Ediciones Libertador.
- WICKENS, E. (2002). "The sacred and profane- a tourist typology". *Annals of Tourism Research*. Vol. 29 (3): 834-851.
- Xiao, H and Smith, S. (2007). "Knowledge Impact: an appraisal of tourism Scholarship". *Annals of Tourism Research*. Vol. 35. (1): 62-83.