



## Deciphering tourism and citizenship in a globalized world



Raoul V. Bianchi<sup>a,1</sup>, Marcus L. Stephenson<sup>b,\*</sup>

<sup>a</sup> Royal Docks Business School, University of East London, Docklands Campus, University Way, London E16 2RD, UK

<sup>b</sup> Middlesex University Dubai, Dubai P.O. Box 500697, United Arab Emirates

### HIGHLIGHTS

- Tourism is expanding and influencing emergent forms of citizenship.
- International tourism is premised upon the right to travel and freedom of movement.
- Rights and freedoms of tourist mobility are materially and politically determined.
- Citizenship rights and responsibilities determine tourism mobility outcomes.
- Certain forms of tourism are equated with progressive ideals of global citizenship.

### ARTICLE INFO

#### Article history:

Received 16 October 2012

Accepted 18 March 2013

#### Keywords:

Tourism  
Freedom of movement  
Right to travel  
Citizenship

### ABSTRACT

Continued growth in global tourism is increasingly accompanied by claims that tourism has become a vital component of contemporary citizenship. This paper conceptualizes tourism's relationship to existing and emergent ideas of citizenship, with particular emphasis on the interplay between the freedom of movement and right to travel. In light of calls for the consideration of tourism as a vital social need and a human right, the work interrogates the degree to which the right to travel can be considered an integral citizenship right. Despite this position, international travel and tourist activities also embody diverse and often contested notions and practices of citizenship. Moreover, given that notions of citizenship signify duties and responsibilities, this paper critically reviews these implications in relation to tourism mobilities. The work fundamentally emphasizes that there are clear socio-economic and political disparities between the rights and freedoms of mobility, and access to the rights and privileges associated with the capacity to participate in international tourism and travel.

© 2013 Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved.

### 1. Introduction

Although over sixty years have passed since the United Nations Declaration of Human Rights, which enshrined the right to freedom of movement in an international charter of human rights, the attitudes of different states towards both the principle and practice of the freedom of movement remain highly ambiguous and politically charged. In a world increasingly criss-crossed by “multiple and intersecting mobilities” (Hannam, Sheller, & Urry, 2006, p. 2), the right to travel and the freedom of movement are far from being universally acknowledged, let alone institutionalised. If tourism is perceived to be both a social need and a universal right (McCabe, Minnaert and Diekmann 2011), then the notion that people

should be entitled to travel and to become tourists is one that goes to the heart of what it means to be a citizen in today's globalised and unequal world.

During the spring and summer of 2008, neo-fascist vigilante squads roamed the streets of Italy, and Naples in particular, where, together with members of Neapolitan organized crime syndicates, or *camorristi*, they orchestrated a series of violent attacks on Roma gypsies, urging their expulsion from Italy despite the fact that many were Italian natives (Kington 2008). Subsequently, the Italian interior minister embarked on a scheme to fingerprint Roma Gypsies, a move that bore dark echoes of Italy's fascist past and Europe's own miserable record with regard to the treatment of Gypsies and other 'ethnic minority' peoples. The following July, two Italian-born Roma girls, recently finger-printed by the Italian authorities, drowned on a popular beach frequented by working class Neapolitans after briefly entering the water to cool off. The two girls, who had simply been on the beach to sell trinkets, lay on the beach for several hours until an ambulance finally arrived (Popham, 2008). Despite claims that some local sunbathers attempted to

\* Corresponding author. Tel.: +971 (0)4 361 6252.

E-mail addresses: [r.bianchi@uel.ac.uk](mailto:r.bianchi@uel.ac.uk) (R.V. Bianchi), [m.stephenson@mdx.ac](mailto:m.stephenson@mdx.ac) (M.L. Stephenson).

<sup>1</sup> Tel.: +44 (0)20 8223 6306.

rescue the two girls, the subsequent uproar in the international press condemned the apparent indifference of those who continued to lounge in the sun and play ball games just metres away from the two dead bodies (Zagaría, 2008). Whilst discrimination and violence against Gypsies in Italy continues to be a very real concern, those who frequent these beaches, running adjacent to the many over-crowded working-class quarters, actually inhabit an impoverished region of Italy where the majority of its inhabitants do not enjoy the same standards of living and opportunities for leisure and travel as their wealthier northern counterparts. Thus irrespective of the view that mobility rights are apparently more widespread, this tragic incident serves as a stark illustration of the complex and differential mobility empowerments of 'holiday-makers' and other mobile 'denizens' with impoverished mobility rights.

The contrasting experiences of mobility amongst migrant workers, asylum seekers and refugees, compared to that of diplomats, businesspersons, academics and international tourists are indicative of the tensions and contradictions that define the *freedom of movement* and the *right to travel* in the context of a world that is simultaneously increasingly mobile, and yet more unequal. This conceptual paper thus examines the intersection between the freedom of movement and right to travel as the basis from which to interrogate and discuss the emergent and differentiated relationship between tourism and citizenship. In this regard, it considers how the differentiated mobility rights and freedoms that are implicated within asymmetrical flows of global travel, and which underpin 'our' sense of entitlement to travel and to become tourists, challenge, extend and re-define the scope and meaning of citizenship.

## 2. Thinking through citizenship in the age of global mobility

### 2.1. Conceptualizing citizenship

It is initially important to consider the concept of citizenship and its transformation in recent decades, especially in the context of the dramatic realignments of market forces, state power and social identities. Classical models of citizenship are usually associated with the ancient civilizations of Greece and Rome, where citizenship status was mainly bestowed on members of the male slave-owning classes. More recently, modern ideas of citizenship emerged in the context of the bourgeois-republican state in revolutionary France in the 18th century. Subsequently, debates regarding the relationship of the state to the right to the freedom of movement forcefully entered the political lexicon in the context of the expansion of imperial powers and the associated mass movements of people (Torpey, 2000).

For the best part of the 20th century, established notions of citizenship have been wedded to ideas of statehood and nationality, and rooted in the evolution of industrial (class) society. One of the most influential conceptual formulations of citizenship is associated with the work of British sociologist, T.H. Marshall (1992 [1950]) whose conception of citizenship revolves around the formal civil, political and social citizenship rights that evolved in tandem with the growth of the liberal-democratic nation-state. Marshall's ideas on citizenship, specifically, social citizenship, are anchored in notions of Keynesian redistributive justice as a means of reconciling formal political equalities with the inequalities of capitalism. Marshall's fundamentally liberal conception of citizenship implied a series of covenants between the individual and the state which were enshrined in law, enabling citizens to make specific claims from the state and in doing so they would respect its laws and contribute to the maintenance of public wealth through taxation. Rather than offer any kind of explicit challenge to

capitalism, Marshall saw the advancement of such liberal-democratic citizenship rights as a means of compensating for the class inequalities inevitably produced by the workings of capitalist markets. Somewhat paradoxically, Turner (1986, p. 23) notes that by undermining feudal regimes and driving the construction of modern states, the growth of industrial capitalism also made possible the emergence of modern citizenship.

The forces associated with globalization, together with intensified and widespread movements of people and monetary resources, along with the re-scaling of states, have transformed conceptions and practices of citizenship. Citizenship does not merely refer to a set of static rights and duties organized and enforced within a politico-legal national framework, but can be defined as:

that set of practices (juridical, political economic and social) which define a person as a competent member of society, and which as a consequence shape the flow of resources to person and social groups (Turner, 1994, p. 2).

Citizenship also constitutes a lens through which to explore issues concerning the utilization and control of productive resources, and social relations between different actors and institutions. In short, citizenship concerns power and inequality, and the formation of social identities and how these are aligned within and across different states. Isin and Wood (1999, p. 4) identify citizenship in relation to the struggle of social groups with common interests who are no longer exclusively bound through their membership of the nation-state. Such groups formulate and claim new rights or seek to expand existing ones in ways that transcend existing politico-legal conceptions of rights and duties associated with the sovereign-territorial state. Globalization has thus simultaneously transformed the scope and meaning of citizenship from 'above' and 'below'. As states have become increasingly transnationalized the definition of citizenship has been extended beyond the confines of the nation-state (e.g., EU citizenship). At the same time, new spaces of contestation and demands for citizenship have emerged through what Beck (2005, p. 6) refers to as the "counter-power of global civil society". In the process, these transformations have given rise to increasingly fluid and diverse conceptions of citizenship.

Far from being a static notion, citizenship has always been fluid and contested, and one that has been redefined over time in accordance with changing historical and political circumstances. Historically, citizenship has been closely associated with national identity. Whilst the ideals of national citizenship may provide the raw material for discourses of national identity and serve to underpin the legitimacy of state power, struggles by new social movements can potentially generate new rights and definitions of citizenship. They may seek to extend existing rights of citizenship to oppressed minorities (for example, the civil rights movement and women's movements) or indeed to assign citizenship status beyond human beings altogether – i.e., to nature and the biosphere (Van Steenberg, 1994). In addition to a set of legal obligations and entitlements guaranteed by the state, and to some extent, supra-state entities like the EU, citizenship encompasses the "practices through which individuals and groups formulate and claim new rights or struggle to expand or maintain existing rights" (Isin & Wood, 1999, p. 4). This is an aspect of citizenship that is problematic in so far as it cannot be encompassed entirely within the framework of the nation state, and is one that has become increasingly significant in the context of issues of a globalised nature that transcend particular state jurisdictions (e.g., human rights and climate change). In addition, the umbilical link between citizenship and statehood is increasingly challenged by the globalisation of capitalist markets, manifold cross-border movements and

affiliations, and polycentric forms of governance and state power (Soysal, 1994). The rather paternalist relationship between the citizen and the state envisaged by Marshall has been further eroded by the dismantling of the social-democratic state upon which the foundations of the welfare state and social citizenship were built.

In addition, notions of '(multi)cultural citizenship' are increasingly significant in the context of the new dynamics of post-industrial capitalism, migration and tourism, not least in so far as the recognition of the plurality of cultural identities are to be reconciled with the pursuit of equality (Delanty, 2000; Isin & Wood, 1999). This reconfiguration of relations between citizens, states and markets has resulted in the loosening of individual attachments to the state, particularly where diasporic groups are concerned, and thus stimulated a number of debates around the question of 'post-national' models of citizenship and belonging (Soysal, 1994), and also notions of 'global' or 'world' citizenship (Heater, 2002; Isin & Turner, 2007). Ong (1999) refers to the emergence of 'flexible citizenship', a form of transnational citizenship that is forged in the context of the cross-border networks of kin and entrepreneurship, which emerged as a result of recent experiences of political upheaval and global market integration in East Asia. Each of these interpretations point to tensions within existing state/citizen ties, and the emergence of new citizenship affiliations that are being organized and constituted across national borders and constantly made and remade through mobility.

## 2.2. Conceptualizing the borders of tourism and citizenship

Given the transformations cited above, there is some evidence pointing to the emergence of a "new class of global nomads", particularly within the context of the rapid globalization of capital and free markets (Feroz, 2006, p. 54). Kingsnorth (2003, p. 22) refers to these "citizens of nowhere" as "Rootless, unburdened by the baggage of locality or the complications of history, they exist in every nation but feel attached to none". Notwithstanding the inherent generalization, the dissolving of public and private constraints on mobility has arguably reached its zenith in the context of the unimaginable forms of wealth now earned by a substantial minority of the world's population, or rather, and for whom border controls and lengthy security queues mean little. According to the 2012 World Wealth Report, 11 million individuals worldwide ("high net worth individuals") possess a total net worth equal to US \$42 trillion. What is all the more remarkable about such concentrations of wealth amongst a minority of the world's population is the fact that the fastest rate of growth has occurred *outside* the traditional centres of capitalist development, in Asia-Pacific, the Middle East and such countries as Brazil. Nonetheless, North America still accounts for the largest concentration of wealth overall (Capgemini and RBC Wealth Management, 2012).

Moreover, what marks these rootless cosmopolitans as distinct from previous epochs is there "newly acquired independence from territorially confined units of political and cultural power" (Bauman, 1998, p. 3), to the extent that they feel little attachment (nor obligation) to the values of any particular state and its citizens. In some quarters, the emergence of a globalizing business elite or "transnational capitalist class" (Sklair, 2001) is regarded as evidence of a decisive break from national models of citizenship. In addition, Falk (1994, p. 134) argues that the kind of homogenized global elite culture that one associates with the super-rich, and today's global bureaucratic and diplomatic elites, is accompanied by a "loss of cultural specificity and that could be connected with a special attachment with place or community". The quality of global citizenship attached to such elites is very weak and appears to offer little in the way of a challenge to the increased inequalities and social polarization associated with neoliberal capitalist

globalization. Nor does it appear to imply a collective set of values or discourse of solidarity beyond a common set of economic (class) interests. Such growing inequalities between citizens are inevitably manifest in international travel and in particular the growth of the hyper-luxury market. This 'niche' travel market is characterized by 'grand' boutique hotels, luxury cruise liners, 'royal-class' airport lounges, and privately owned islands. In the post-9/11 period, for instance, Hollywood celebrities have been "snapping up" remote islands in various locations around the world (Berlin & Carter, 2010, p. 4).

Despite the ability of a minority of wealthy travellers to circumvent the constraints imposed by the encumbrances of state-managed passport and visa regimes, not to mention of course, financial constraints, the state's central role in regulating, managing and striating the movement of people within and across international borders prevails. As international tourism has become an increasingly significant item of global trade and national income, states have come under pressure to remove bureaucratic constraints to cross-border travel, including restrictive visa regimes. In the UK, for example, it is estimated that visa liberalization could generate £2.8 billion in additional tourist expenditure, principally from emerging markets (BBC Radio 4, 2012). This role has been forcefully encouraged by the international representative agencies of tourism (e.g., UNWTO), and employers associations, including the World Travel and Tourism Council (WTTC) and the European Tour Operators Association (ETOA). This is particularly the case where national governments are slow to react to shifting geographies of travel and the opening up of new markets in East Asia (ETOA, 2010).

Citizenship 'entitlements' associated with tourism denote both the *right* to travel as well as the *ability* to consume an infinite variety of tourist experiences and commodities, free from 'unjust' or 'arbitrary' political interference. However, the negative freedom to travel without hindrance, which informs liberal conceptions of citizenship (see Berlin, 1969), is constrained by the unequal capacity to consume the pleasures of travel. This is primarily although not exclusively determined by access to adequate financial means to travel. The entitlement to travel, expressed as freedom from political impediment, is also contradicted by state interventions and controls on the movement of 'non-tourists' and 'risky' travellers. In addition, the enforcement of the right to travel for some may bring tourists directly into conflict with the rights of development of those whose impoverishment may be in some way linked to the expansion of tourism, or at the very least, whose experience of travel is through the cash-nexus in the form of wage-work for tourism. Higgins-Desbiolles (2007, p. 324) thus notes that: "...the act of enjoying this right to travel is an ideological act which is predicated on a system of inequity".

Held (1991, p. 23) notes the inherent contradictions between the role of the state vis-a-vis the well-being of its citizens. The state can fail to advance the rights of all citizens, particularly in terms of development rights set out in the 1986 UN Declaration on the Right to Development and the Millennium Development Goals in 2000. Nonetheless, the state may be the only institution powerful enough to protect citizens against abuses of corporate power serving to undermine democracy, freedom and human rights. Tourism then expresses a fundamental 'mobility paradox'. It is a progressive social force articulating closely with the values and principles underpinning the freedom of movement while at the same time constituting a predominant source of corporate profit-making and capital accumulation, processes serving to undermine development rights and prosperity for all, particularly, but not exclusively, within destinations.

Mobility has of course always been a marker of privilege. Veblen's (1970 [1899]) concept of the 'leisure class' in the 19th century

pertinently illustrates ways in which access to recreation was stratified on class grounds. These earlier manifestations of leisure stratification existed in the context of very different socio-economic conditions, and in a world where very few could aspire to the elitist pursuit of travel. As the technologies of rail and steamship transportation began to improve from the mid-19th century, travel opportunities developed for wider social groupings residing mainly, though not exclusively, in Europe and North America. Thomas Cook harnessed travel to encourage mobility to the masses (see Brendon, 1991), even going so far as to refer to his tours as “agencies for the advancement of human progress” (Boorstin, 1963, p. 96). His devotion to ideals of ‘temperance’ and ‘universal brotherhood’ inspired these early tours. Nonetheless, his social conscience was later eclipsed by a more business-focused mindset under the direction of J. M. Cook, complementing the British imperial outlook in the global expansion of tourism (Turner & Ash, 1975, pp. 56–59). By the 1930s, the economic gains of Fordist manufacturing techniques, which cheapened the price of consumer commodities, together with the monopolisation of 90 per cent of the world’s oil production, paved the way for the rise of an “automobile consumer class” in the USA and fuelled the expansion of a new culture of mobility (Urry, 2013, p. 43). In the aftermath of the Second World War, the advent of the jet engine and rising disposable incomes ensured the consolidation of uneven patterns of ‘north-south’ mobility that have more or less endured to the present day, as Northern Europeans flocked to the shores of the Mediterranean and North Africa in search of cheap sun and ‘exotic cultures’.

The European colonisation of significant swathes of the world’s territories gave birth to an informal network of places and foreign enclaves (e.g., the ‘European’ quarters of cities such as Alexandria, Beirut and Cairo), hosting transient communities of foreigners. In the midst of these cosmopolitan outposts of leisure, and emancipated living, evolved “new types of citizenship” (Rojek, 1998, p. 303). During the early part of the 20th century, members of the European intelligentsia, bohemians and artists were often attracted to exotic enclaves in places such as Antibes (Cote D’Azur), Deia (Mallorca) and Tangiers (Morocco), following in the footsteps of earlier colonial travellers and members of the leisured aristocracy. As Rojek (1998) points out, these spaces offered levels of anonymity and license for the kinds of emancipated lifestyles often associated with activities that would have attracted moral censorship in the participants’ home environments. The licentious behaviour and decadent lifestyles that flourished under the umbrella of colonial power, epitomised by Kenya’s notorious ‘Happy Valley’ in the 1930s, were privileges denied to all but a few members of the indigenous ‘third world’ elite. Nonetheless, this resulted in acerbic condemnations from members of the ‘third world’ intelligentsia. Franz Fanon (1968, p. 153), for instance, provided a thought-provoking description of Haiti’s subordination to the leisure desires of the metropole:

The national bourgeoisie will be greatly helped on its way towards decadence by the Western bourgeoisies, who come to it as tourists avid for the exotic, for big game hunting and for casinos. The national bourgeoisie organises centres of rest and relaxation and pleasure resorts to meet the needs of the Western bourgeoisie.

Such a vitriolic stance towards early mass tourism in developing countries should be seen in the context of ‘third world’ nation-building, and an attempt by radicalized governments in newly-independent states in Africa and the Caribbean to forge a new model of citizenship out of the ashes of the colonial state (see Shivji, 1973). Nonetheless, for some states the development of tourism and nation building often went hand-in-hand (Hazbun, 2008). The 20th century also saw the expansion of the powers of the social

democratic state and universal welfare systems in Western Europe, which were fundamental to these new mobility freedoms. This resulted in the concomitant expansion of social rights, which included the right to paid holidays and government-sponsored ‘social tourism’ programmes (McCabe et al., 2011). However, it was not until the early post-war period that the question of the right to travel was associated with the freedom of movement and economic development.

Rojek (1998, p. 291) argues that, “we don’t think of tourism as a citizenship right until our freedom to travel is threatened”. Tourism has thus become more than simply a marker of status or citizenship (Urry, 1995). Rather, the right to travel and participate in tourism is increasingly regarded and invoked as an inalienable human right (WTO, 1999). This implies a universal entitlement to not only the freedom of movement or indeed leisure but also the right to consume other cultures and pass freely over their territories. Multi-scalar structural power relationships determined by the alignments of class, gender, ethnicity and religious affiliation, enable and constrain these movements, particularly where they involve crossing international borders. However, recent threats to the security of international travel serve as a reminder that the freedom of movement and right to travel are not only mediated by the perception and reality of risk and security, but also that international tourism often becomes enmeshed within a wider geopolitical framework where the right to travel freely may be contested or severely restricted. In this regard, Lisle (2007, p. 344) argues that international tourism has become deeply implicated in the “civilizational agenda of global security”.

The September 11th 2001 terrorist attacks on the United States together with a spate of deadly attacks against tourists and tourism installations from the mid-1990s until the early 2000s, taking place in North Africa, Middle East and Asia, question the ideological support for the universal right to travel (Bianchi, 2006; Higgins-Desbiolles, 2007). Not only did international tourism become increasingly intertwined with attempts to ‘better’ manage and regulate international travel in the name of security, an exaggerated climate of perpetual insecurity served to further constrain and inhibit the possibilities for international travel by ethnic minority citizens and in particular Arab and Muslim travellers. Whilst the citizens of some countries were deemed to be of low risk or benign, Arabs and Muslims became increasingly subject to ‘racial profiling’, and whose movements were designated as ‘risky’ or ‘troublesome’ (Lyon, 2003, p. 99). Such profiling reflects wider geopolitical imperatives, where different groups of mobile subjects and particular spaces are associated with different levels of risk. For example, travellers who have visited the Occupied Palestinian Territories, are often singled out for stringent interrogations as they pass through Israeli ports of entry and exit, and colour coded stickers are put on their travel documents according to the level of risk.

Multiple restrictions on people’s mobility, whether related to reasons of labour unrest (e.g., 2010 British Airways cabin crew strike), geo-political factors (e.g., through government travel advisories or restricting entrance to travellers from ‘risky’ states), or indeed, as a result of taxation (e.g., U.K. Air Passenger Duty), are often greeted with howls of protest by the media and/or the tourism industry itself. One important question remains: To what extent should ‘our’ right to travel ‘freely’ and ‘without hindrance’ be subject to legitimate constraint (and by whom)? Some scholars would certainly inquire whether such a notion should be countenanced at all (see Butcher, 2003), even if travel is undertaken in the name of a wider ‘moral’ purpose.

Yet, as Mike Davis (2007) recounts, even in the heart of a mobile society like the USA, recreational car use and tourism practically came to a standstill during the Second World War. Car sharing was encouraged by a combination of petrol rationing and fines for

individual recreational driving existed, reinforced by such slogans as, “When you ride ALONE, you ride with Hitler!” This illustration of course relates to the ability of a national government to curtail the *internal* (as opposed to cross-border) freedom of movement, in the name of wider moral objectives, namely the fight against Nazism. The various social, cultural and environmental consequences of tourism raise a spectrum of morally complex and ideologically contested issues. Such concerns focus on the rights and freedom of access to the cultural and ecological assets of host societies, many of which may be governed by complex forms of custodianship and the reciprocal duties (if any) expected of tourists in return for the right to pass freely and without hindrance through borders and over particular territories.

### 3. Freedom of movement and the right to travel in a globalised world

The shifting alignments between discourses of the freedom of movement and the right to travel, or to be a tourist, provides an illuminating lens through which to observe the manner in which tourism reinforces, extends and (in some cases) challenges ideas of citizenship. The progressive widening and democratisation of participation in international leisure travel is strongly associated with the acquisition of social citizenship rights and the struggle by the working class to capture the right to leisure in industrial capitalist societies, especially during the early 20th century. The idea of the right to travel as a fundamental freedom and an inalienable right took shape in the context of legislation providing for the right to paid holidays and leisure time in the industrialized nations, implemented during the inter-war period. Henceforth, numerous charters and conventions, including: Holidays with Pay Convention (Revised), (ILO, 1970), the Manila Declaration on *World Tourism* (1980) and the Montreal Declaration (McCabe et al., 2011) played a significant part in laying the foundations of universal access to leisure time and post-war freedoms of mobility. The establishment of numerous inter-governmental agencies (e.g., United Nations: UNESCO, UNEP, UNDP, ILO) after World War Two, amongst whose remit was to bring about the advancement of peace, education, development and democracy worldwide, also played a key part in framing the emerging post-war discourses and legal frameworks governing the freedom of movement.

Political support for the freedom of movement has been the most pronounced in liberal-capitalist democracies of the West. The intervention of the United States, amongst other dominant Western nations, in international travel was framed by the emerging geopolitical order of the post-Second World period. This grew in tandem with the expansion of the world capitalist economy and advances in transport technology, particularly aviation (see *Endy, 2004*), and the opening up of newly independent ‘third world’ states to foreign travel. However, as *Urry’s (2013)* observes, none of this would have been possible without securing access to the plentiful supplies of cheap oil, which for the past decade literally powered the development and globalization of carbon-fuelled economies, notably in North America and Europe. The benefits of such carbon-fuelled economics disproportionately accrued to the citizens of the North America and Europe, including of course the possibility for living mobile lives and participating in overseas travel.

The notion of international travel as a fundamental human right was then enshrined in Article 13 (2) of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights in 1948. However, while Article 13(2) stipulates that everyone, regardless of origin, has the right to leave a country, it is only the nationals of particular states who are granted the automatic right to return (*Goodin, 1992*). Although firmly placing tourism in the context of human rights, human rights are

meaningless and cannot be enforced without the acquiescence of the state. Indeed, it is this particular conundrum which defines the ambivalent reactions towards tourism to Burma and other states which abuse the human rights of their citizens whilst promoting tourism. In the absence of legitimate universal mechanisms to ensure that the rights of travel are balanced with reciprocal duties or obligations, the ability of tourism to provide a pathway to cosmopolitan or global forms of citizenship, as suggested by advocates of volunteer tourism (*Butcher & Smith, 2010*), would appear to be weak. Given that citizenship embodies the cultivation of solidarity, through which a balance between rights and duties can be constructed, appeals to tourists’ better nature through codes of conduct and awareness campaigns offer a rather limited basis for the development of citizenship ties between mobile and immobile peoples.

The Manila Declaration (WTO, 1980) contained the residues of earlier ‘welfarist’ dimensions of Western social democracies, underlining the obligation for all societies to extend the capacity of all citizens to participate in tourism, stating:

The right to access to holidays and to freedom of travel and tourism, a natural consequence of the right to work, is recognised as an aspect of the fulfilment of the human being by the Universal Declaration of Human Rights as well as the legislation of many States. It entails for society the duty of providing for its citizens the best practical, effective and non-discriminatory access to this type of activity (WTO, 1980, p. 2).

In recognition of the global inequalities fostered by the capitalist world economy, in an earlier preamble, WTO makes explicit reference to tourism as an instrument of equity and solidarity between peoples:

World tourism can contribute to the establishment of a *new international economic* order that will help to eliminate the widening economic gap between developed and developing countries and ensure the steady acceleration of economic and social development and progress, in particular of developing countries (WTO, 1980, p. 1).

Whilst tourism has seemingly become more democratised in post-industrial societies and globalised through the expansion of wealth in emerging centres of capitalist development (e.g., India and China), the so-called citizenship rights that are ascribed to tourists, whether real or perceived, are relatively ambiguous, undefined and unequally distributed. Although encompassed within a universal rights-based framework at a global level through the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the freedom of movement and right to participate in tourism is filtered through diverse ideological frameworks and discursive interpretations, as well as being simultaneously constrained and enabled by both material and socio-political constraints in distinct geographical contexts. For example, in contrast to the emergence of overseas travel in most Western societies, the current boom in outbound travel by Chinese citizens has not come about as a direct result of greater democratic freedoms and improved citizenship rights at home in the manner witnessed in many Western liberal democracies during the early days of travel. It is suggested, however, that Chinese tourists have readily embraced the freedoms to engage in foreign travel and conspicuous consumption overseas in exchange for continued acquiescence to one party rule (*Economist, 2010, p. 54*). China remains on course to become one of the world’s largest tourist markets, with outbound trips expected to increase from 39 million in 2011 to 71 million by 2016 (*Euromonitor International, 2012*). However, even as China becomes an increasingly globalised and mobile society, there are suggestions that the expansion of global travel may be peaking, due in particular to rising fuel costs and a

decline in living standards in the industrialized societies (Urry, 2013, p. 208). Nevertheless, for the foreseeable future, the aspiration for international travel in emerging economies appears to be closely linked to social status and the advancement of the rights of mobility.

#### 4. Mobility, tourism and 'post-national' citizenship in the European Union

The freedom of movement (work and residency) is a central principle and pillar that underlies the process of European enlargement as well as the European Union's attempt to build a sense of European citizenship. The four freedoms of movement (of capital, goods, services and persons) throughout the EU were enshrined as early as 1956 within the Treaty of Rome, although their implementation in practice has been a varied and uneven process. Initially, support for freedom of movement in the EU was motivated by the need to ease labour shortages in the north and poverty in the south. It was only later, during the 1980s that the emphasis switched from an earlier social democratic support for socio-economic mobility towards the freedom of movement as an integral mechanism of the European liberal economic order, and of course tourism, as a tool for stimulating economic development, enhancing cultural cohesion and fomenting the idea of European citizenship. In 1993, the Treaty of European Union (Maastricht Treaty), which amended the Treaty of Rome, bestowed equal rights of mobility (in theory) on all citizens of the EU. These rights were subsequently incorporated into and reinforced in subsequent treaties, and formally inaugurated the concept of 'European citizenship'.

The rights of free movement within the EU were reinforced and expanded in the Schengen Agreement (1985), an intergovernmental border agreement signed by France and Germany, giving rise to the notion of a 'borderless Europe'. The Schengen Treaty came into effect in 1995 opening up the possibility for passport-free travel for the citizens of seven (out of a total 15 EU states) signatory states. The Schengen Treaty itself took effect on 26 March 1995, under which seven of the fifteen EU member states<sup>2</sup> agreed to eliminate national border controls on the internal cross-border movement of citizens amongst the signatory states and create a passport-free travel zone. In addition, it was promoted as part of the continuing mission of the EU to create a sense of belonging and establish a stronger bond between the EU and the citizens of Europe (Samatas, 2003, p. 147).

Schengen entitles EU citizens who are members of signatory states to enter any other EU country without having to show a passport. However, Schengen Member states do reserve the right to curtail or restrict the right to travel and cross-border movement on grounds of public policy, public security or public health, as well as to carry out random identity checks throughout their territory. The latter of course is the source of constant tension between the authorities and ethnic minorities in such states as France. As Coles (2008a, p. 67) reminds us: "It is all well and good to be offered the right to travel but this is meaningless if the right to entry is restricted". Such contradictions between the rights of mobility and the right to enter came to a head in 2004 in the context of the accession of the so-called AC10 states.<sup>3</sup> Despite provision for the freedom of movement in the Maastricht Treaty, entrance of citizens from the new EU member-states faced numerous restrictions. This was partly due to fears fuelled by the populist 'tabloid' press in other

established EU member-states, particularly the UK and France, that the removal of border controls would stimulate a flood of migration and 'social benefit tourism' from the East in particular (Stephenson, 2006). This led to a number of restrictions being imposed on the entrance of new EU citizens from these states until 2011, and an even stricter quota system to be imposed on entrants from Bulgaria and Romania after their accession in 2007 (Coles, 2008b). In September 2011, the Netherlands and Finland (itself a recent entrant into the EU) vetoed the incorporation of these two states into the Schengen area on much the same basis, and as a consequence of pressure from right-wing populist parties (Pignal, 2011).

Sophisticated security, surveillance systems, biometrics and the Schengen Information System (SIS) have been used to toughen the EU's external frontier. These mechanisms, ostensibly put in place for 'security', have led to accusations of racism, discrimination and xenophobia towards immigrants and arrivals from 'third world' countries. Ethnic minorities with EU passports have also experienced significant levels of prejudice and suspicion (Stephenson, 2006; Stephenson & Hughes, 2005). Schengen thus constitutes a key instrument in what has been termed 'Fortress Europe', reinforcing differential mobility entitlements:

For Euro-enthusiasts, it is necessary for a wonderful, passport- and crime-free Europe; but for human rights activists it is a horrible, anti-democratic exclusionary system for creating a maximum-security 'Fortress Europe' (Samatas, 2003, p. 144).

Samatas (2003) surmises that, what is gained in terms of mobility freedoms and passport-free travel by European tourists and business classes is counter-acted by the simultaneous deployment of a complex electronic surveillance system. The SIS and draconian maximum-security infrastructure at the EU's external border, for instance, de-humanises migrants and refugees, and potentially criminalises immigration and asylum-seeking by linking it to crime and terrorism. However, the evidence suggests that rather than preventing terrorism or criminal activity, securitisation has criminalised migration and resulted in widespread discrimination amongst refugees and immigrants from 'third world' countries. The rise of 'spot checks' within the Schengen area has tended to target "dark-skinned people from the Third World who are treated as second-rate persons..." (Samatas, 2003, p. 148). Although EU policy-makers have been criticised for being late in recognising the value of tourism in fulfilling a number of EU goals (Lickorish, 1991), tourism is a beneficiary of the mobility and residency rights granted to all EU citizens. The EU has also sought to utilise tourism to encourage a greater sense of understanding and awareness of a pan-European sense of identity (and ultimately citizenship). Roche (2001, p. 87) argues:

The seasonal migrations of Europe's masses from the wealthier north to the relatively poorer South...are indeed likely to be potentially powerful vehicles of cultural Europeanization in the early 21st century.

The EU has deployed a range of interventions and cultural policies to try to forge a stronger sense of European cultural identity and citizenship, exemplified in such initiatives as the European Capitals of Culture programme (see Shore, 2000). At the same time, however, the eastward expansion of the EU coupled with the tense debate regarding the possible future accession of Turkey, reveals a number of ongoing tensions concerning definitions of citizenship within the EU and the repositories of identity that are to be found in its cultural heritage.

The desire to eliminate all controls on cross-border mobility within the EU is contradicted by the tightening of its external frontier, as well as the diffusion of borders throughout European space through, for example, the privatization of security and the use of

<sup>2</sup> This has now been extended to include 22 out of 27 EU member states along with 3 non-member European states.

<sup>3</sup> Republic of [South] Cyprus, Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Malta, Poland, Slovakia and Slovenia.

'remote control' surveillance, as occurred in the wake of the 7/7 London bombings (Rumford, 2006, p. 158). It has also been accompanied by the gradual increase of police surveillance and random internal checks, whether EU citizens or not. More recently, the growth of anti-immigrant feeling, fuelled by the electoral success of populist and rightwing parties in some EU states, has led to calls to suspend all or part of the Schengen Treaty. As Rumford (2007, p. 329) has argued, Europe is increasingly subject to a proliferation of borders and border regimes which are "experienced differently by different groups". Despite platitudes concerning the ability of mass mobility (tourism) to forge a post-national (European) citizenship (see Urry, 1995), Europe's external borders and restrictions on internal travel have progressively multiplied and strengthened. Rumford (2006) also points out that, the internal borders of states within the EU are themselves mobile. In response to fears over the 'flood' of immigrants from mainland Europe into the UK, the UK border has been extended 'into' Belgium and France through reciprocal agreements allowing for the checking of travel documents by UK border officials at Eurostar terminals in these countries. Such restrictions on cross-border travel by those deemed to lack the 'right credentials to travel' (Kaur & Hutnyk, 1999, p. 3), have led to desperate attempts to enter EU territory, illustrated by the tragic example of an Angolan man who had hidden in the undercarriage of a B-777 and fell nearly 2000 feet as the aircraft came into land at London's Heathrow airport (Topham, 2012).

Paradoxically then, the EU has presided over substantial enlargement of its external frontiers whilst simultaneously hardening its internal regimes of surveillance, especially in the name of security and the fight against organised crime, illegal immigration and terrorism. The intensification of xenophobia and Islamophobia in the aftermath of 9/11, partly contributed to an increased securitization agenda. Stephenson and Ali's (2010) work documents the range of racialized problems confronted by Muslims, or those perceived to be Muslim, whilst travelling and participating in tourism. The authors claim that these tourists are perceived at both a public and institutional level as a "threat to humanity, cultural harmony, and the global order" (2010: 251). Nonetheless, private industries serve to benefit financially from what has been aptly termed, the "globalization of fear" (Davis, 2001, p. 44), where policing and security has been increasingly commercialised (see Loader, 1999).

##### **5. Tourism, freedom and the market: the tourist as a consumer citizen**

Most tourists, however, whether 'independent' or those seeking the relative comfort and security of luxury hotels and segregated resort enclaves, probably spend little time thinking about the basis upon which they are able to travel 'freely' and without hindrance. Arguably, a taken-for-granted culture of mobility has taken root deep inside the social DNA of advanced capitalist societies, where travel for pleasure and leisure is no longer seen as a privilege, but rather, one amongst many inalienable rights to which one is entitled in a globalising world of mobile consumers (Urry, 2002). Additionally, the process of being a citizen of the developed world, where tourism is seen as a social necessity, implies that such individuals see themselves as rightful consumers of other peoples, places and cultures (Urry, 1995). Also, the presumption that a holiday is both a 'necessity' and a 'right', particularly amongst the privileged citizens of the rich world, suggests that tourism and the right to travel is progressively being defined by individualist and market-oriented values (Higgins-Desbiolles, 2006).

The association between travel, freedom and consumption has arguably reached its zenith in the context of globalizing

neoliberalism and the consequent expansion of "market civilization" (Gill, 1995). The fall of the Berlin Wall in 1989 and the collapse of the Soviet bloc signalled the opening up of new frontiers for travel as well as capital, ushering in a plethora of new places to be visited. In the course of these tumultuous events, "citizens openly declared their right to be tourists" as former citizens of Eastern bloc states proclaimed their right to travel (Munar, 2007, p. 347). Accordingly, individual liberty has come to be seen as coterminous with the freedom of capitalist markets. Furthermore, to challenge the untrammelled right to travel is interpreted in some quarters as a challenge to the progressive potential of tourism as means of development and modernity itself (see Butcher, 2003, p. 24).

The belief in the sanctity of the 'free market' and 'open' borders thus defines post-industrial tourism. This is reflected in the policy discourses of international organizations such as the United Nations World Tourism Organization (UNWTO) and the World Travel and Tourism Council (WTTC), both of which enthusiastically promote the opening of new markets and de-regulation of corporate enterprise, as well as the inalienable right to travel. According to the WTO (1999, p. 3):

the world tourism industry as a whole has much to gain by operating in an environment that favours the market economy, private enterprise and free trade [...] responsible and sustainable tourism is by no means incompatible with the growing liberalization of the conditions governing trade in services.

In this regard, tourism can be seen as the apotheosis of a (neo) liberal cosmopolitan global order based on a seamless harmony between the free movement of people, goods and capital. Privatized forms of tourism mobility are thus equated with freedom, and also perceived to nurture cultural exchange, peace, prosperity and sustainability. As tourism has become an increasingly significant component of the global trade in services the "freedom of travel (quite literally) is freedom of trade" (O' Byrne, 2001, p. 409). This in turn elides the distinction between the freedom of movement and the right to travel or rather, the right to tourism, a stance promoted by the UNWTO (see WTO, 1999). Whilst the freedom of movement is the result of hard fought political rights (to cross international borders without hindrance and/or to escape persecution), the right to travel, and in particular tourism, implies both the right to consume as well as the rights of capital (to profit). Indeed, one of the founding principles of the WTTC, which began life in the aftermath of the Cold War, was to aggressively promote the pursuit of international tourism; particularly given its strong ideological identification with such democratic rights as the freedom of assembly and the belief that tourism could intrinsically foster peace (Goldstone, 2001, p. 87).

The strength of the association between tourism and the sanctity of the right to travel is manifest in responses to political campaigns to boycott tourism. The right travel to wherever one pleases free from any politically motivated impediments, was unequivocally expressed by the Director of Sales and Marketing for the up-market bespoke travel company, Pettits Travel. In response to calls from UK campaigners to discontinue tours to Burma as a result of the human rights abuses that had been linked to tourism, the Director stated: "our clientele is literate and educated and more than capable of making up their minds" (Bleach, 2009, p. 2). The sanctity of 'our' right to travel to Burma prior to the 2010 release of pro-democracy leader, Aung San Suu Kyi, was also forcefully expressed by Guardian columnist Dea Birkett in reference to the campaign to boycott travel to Burma:

But aren't holidays supposed to be carefree times, for suntans and self-indulgence? Is it really such a crime to seek out somewhere you can simply enjoy yourself? Is spreading on

factor 10, rather than reading up on the local medieval history and contemporary political systems, the sign of a lesser mortal soul? (Birkett, 2000, p. 24).

Such views reinforce a negative conception of liberty in which the tourist should be free to travel and consume different places and cultures, unhindered by regulation and attempts by various governments, 'do-gooders' and NGOs to "morally regulate" travel (Butcher, 2003). Moreover, they also imply that, the heavy-handed regulation of the state (much less the intervention of campaigners!) is not necessary to ensure that tourism benefits both the traveller and destination societies. Rather, such outcomes, whether intended or not, should be left to the interplay of individual choice and the market. These discourses bear resemblance to the close alignment between neoliberalism's emphasis on free choice and individual rights and the populist embrace of the market espoused by "post-modern cultural radicalism", where markets are seen as anti-elitist and emblematic of the rise of a new consumer democracy (Frank, 2002, p. 257).

According to certain poststructural cultural analysts, tourism experiences are not just commodities but vehicles of self-expression, freedom and individual autonomy, where "individuals create their identities based on power and knowledge" (Ateljevic, 2000, p. 381). Ateljevic's (2000) point implies a re-working of MacCannell's (1999) assumption on tourists as 'alienated moderns' seeking authenticity in the lives of others. Of course, this conveniently ignores the fact that they are able to do so only as a result of the material circumstances and political privileges which enable them to enjoy the benefits of unhindered international travel in ways unimaginable to most of the residents of poor countries as well as a good number of disadvantaged families in rich states. The act of seeking peace or spiritual renewal amongst the world's poor is nothing new. However, what was once the endeavour of a few maverick aristocrats and those associated with the misguided utopianism of the hippy era has become a multi-billion dollar industry (see *Global Spa Summit*, 2010).

Conversely, those who are unable to travel or who lack the 'right' credentials for travel, may be seen to be as somehow inferior, particularly where social deprivation impedes access to travel (McCabe et al., 2011). Drawing attention to the conceptual distinction between 'tourists' and 'vagabonds', Bauman (1998, p. 96) suggests that the 'vagabond', his term for the impoverished majority for whom mobility is either experienced as coercion or is not experienced at all, is a "flawed consumer" who contributes nothing to "the prosperity of an economy turned into a tourist industry". The synthesis of tourist, citizen and consumer reflects a kind of market populism in which consumption becomes a substitute for (or rather a vehicle of) collective political agency (Frank, 2002). Silverman describes the 'new' market-led definition of the citizen as follows:

Citizenship is becoming conflated with consumerism- truly the revenge of the market against the state in the form of an aggressive non-liberalism armed with the new ideological construction of freedom in the form of buying power (1992, p. 151).

This stance however ignores the alignments of power and socio-economic discrimination, which shape people's mobility, thereby implying that their citizenship rights are in some way deficient, as defined through tourism. From the perspective of destinations themselves, where the rights to tourism are privileged above all else, it may hinder or prejudice the freedom of movement of locals as well as facilitate the enclosure and exploitation of such public assets as coastlines, sacred monuments and wilderness areas.

## 6. Tourism, cosmopolitanism and 'global' citizenship

The fact that tourism has the potential to make a considerable contribution to destination economies, or act as a force for peace and/or vanguard of democratization in authoritarian states, is for many, evidence of tourism's inherent cosmopolitanism and the benefits of travel (see Butcher, 2003; Schwartz, 1991; Steves, 2009). Becoming a tourist destination does not merely imply job creation and the potential for earning valuable foreign exchange, but also the means through which societies "enter the global order" (Urry, 2002, p. 143). In much the same way, having a site of national cultural and/or natural importance designated as a World Heritage Site marks a process whereby states acquire a certain global status as well as responsibility for preserving such sites 'for all humanity'. The implications are clearly indicated on the website of UNESCO's World Heritage Centre:

What makes the concept of World Heritage exceptional is its universal application. World Heritage sites belong to all the peoples of the world, irrespective of the territory on which they are located (<http://whc.unesco.org>).

Swain claims that, "tourism can be a vehicle for the common good of humankind" (Swain & Hall, 2007, p. 99). This suggests that certain touristic acts, such as volunteering or ecotourism, can be associated with the acquisition of the trappings of 'global citizenship'. It would thus perhaps seem reasonable to suggest that incipient forms of 'global' and/or 'cosmopolitan' citizenship are linked to those instances where tourism is mobilised as a 'force for good', for example, as a means of conservation or developing a platform for inter-cultural exchange. Equally perhaps, behaving as a 'responsible tourist' may personify acting in the manner of a 'good' global citizen.

Discourses of 'ethical tourism' would thus appear to embody an appeal to some form of global 'civic' responsibility, acquired by virtue of partaking in ostensibly ethical forms of tourism. This echoes the view of Giddens (1991, 1994), emphasising that contemporary society is no longer organized around collective identities or informed by the politics of Left and Right. Rather, identity has become more individuated as a key site of political praxis, expressed through particular forms of consumption. Accordingly, ethical forms of travel and volunteering are increasingly associated with the acquisition of the attributes of global citizenship (Butcher & Smith, 2010). However, rather than challenge the systemic sources of power within the tourism political economy, the emphasis here lies on 'ethical consumption' and the rights of individuals rather than any realistic attempt to provide for the material foundations of a cosmopolitan form of citizenship.

Similarly, charitable donations to a range of local causes at the destinations, either by tourists themselves or indeed by travel companies keen to demonstrate some form of civic duty towards destination populations (see [http://www.tui-group.com/en/sustainability/social\\_commitment](http://www.tui-group.com/en/sustainability/social_commitment)), are increasingly embraced as the way forward to achieving sustainability throughout global tourism. This sits in stark contrast to the radical stance of an earlier generation of critics who situated tourism firmly within the iniquitous dynamics of global capitalism (Shivji, 1973). The evocation of global civic responsibility also extends to 'Gap Years' in which middle-class youth from the rich world participate in a range of beneficent projects in poorer countries. Arguably, such forms of tourism are as much about improving one's marketability in the fiercely competitive labour markets of neo-liberal capitalism as they are about acquiring the attributes of global citizenship (see Lyons, Hanley, Wearing, & Neil, 2012). Moreover, although volunteer tourism is traditionally perceived as a benevolent engagement with local people, it can also

be associated with the profit-driven imperatives of commercial tourism organisations (Tomazos & Cooper, 2012). This is further demonstrated by the growth of commercial profit-making volunteering companies and the acquisition of previously independent companies by large commercial entities such as TUI (Stein, 2012). Ultimately, claim Dalwai and Donegan (2012, p. 21), volunteer tourism is profoundly shaped by the unequal structures of racism and global capitalism which determine “access to resources, travel possibilities and the direction of volunteer tourist traffic from global North to the global South”.

Notwithstanding the limitations inherent in the nation-state based model of citizenship, the parameters of global and/or cosmopolitan citizenship are neither clear nor well defined (Isin & Turner, 2007). Nevertheless, conceptions of citizenship have been increasingly intersected by the pluralization of identities in tandem with new struggles over claims for group recognition/resources and rights-based discourses, which increasingly transcend national borders (see Isin & Wood, 1999, pp. 91–97). Within the transnational political spaces that have emerged as a result of globalisation and the proliferation of cross-border mobilities, new aspects of citizenship are being constituted in the context of myriad struggles over identities, resources and power (Nash, 2000). Such struggles encompass questions of ethnic and racial discrimination, women’s rights, sexual identities, globalised ‘anti-capitalist’ movements, as well as ‘new’ peasant and polyglot worker movements that have spawned through resistance to the economic restructuring and trade liberalisation programmes linked to neoliberal globalisation (Eschle & Maignascha, 2005; Kingsnorth, 2003). Since the early 1980s a plethora of movements, NGOs and community-based grassroots organisations have begun to articulate numerous demands against destructive forms of tourism development. Often such claims involve issues where tourism is implicated in the denial of rights, including access to land, water and fair wages. Social movements have the potential to advance the development of citizenship rights amongst marginalised groups in destination societies (Eriksson, Noble, Pattullo, & Barnett, 2009).

In certain geographical contexts, tourism has become aligned with wider social movements and emancipatory political struggles through participation in what is often termed ‘justice tourism’ (Scheyvens, 2002). Although embracing distinctive organizational forms, justice tourism involves the active engagement of travellers in educational and transformational forms of travel, which seek to advance mutual understanding, solidarity and equality between tourists and local peoples caught up in myriad webs of injustice. In so doing tourism may become embroiled in the “politics of cultural contestation” (Nash, 2000, p. 151), harnessing claims for new citizenship rights. Outfits such as the Alternative Tourism Group based in the Palestinian West Bank, have mobilised tourism as a means of highlighting the injustices of the Israel occupation thus aligning themselves with wider struggle for Palestinian autonomy, statehood and identity. Moreover, tourism has also emerged as a significant force in the context of political struggles for recognition by minority groups, such as the Ainu in Japan (Lewallen, 2011), Tsou in Taiwan (Hipwell, 2007) and the people of Goa (Routledge, 2001).

## 7. Conclusion

This paper has sought to explore the relationship between tourism and citizenship principally through the examination of the manifold intersections between the freedom of movement and the right to travel (and tourism). Tourists are often accorded a heightened status in contrast to other mobile subjects, which brings with it a range of privileges that often go beyond the reach of many in host societies, not just the impoverished, as well as a significant proportion of the population in developed capitalist economies.

Contrary then to the view that tourism can be considered as an element of cosmopolitanism, the complex articulations between tourism, capitalism, globalization, racism and geopolitics suggest that the relationship between tourism and citizenship cannot simply be harnessed to weak notions of cosmopolitan or rather, global citizenship. This is pertinently summarised by Hannerz (1990, p. 241) who states: “being on the move ... is not enough to turn one into a cosmopolitan”.

It has been argued that globalising tourism encapsulates the contradictory forces of mobility and freedom on the one hand, and immobility and disenfranchisement on the other. In this regard, tourism both bears the imprint of existing models of citizenship that have been forged within the containers of the nation-state, as well as acting as a vector through which notions of citizenship, moulded by the forces of globalization, transnationalism and extensive, albeit uneven, cross-border mobilities, are being extended, redefined and contested. Participation in international travel implies the politically guaranteed citizenship rights that come from being a fully recognized member of a state. Such rights then determine who has access to the right credentials for travel or the ‘right to have rights’. However, as Higgins-Desbiolles (2007) and others have argued, the right to travel is far from being universally-enjoyed nor is it accorded the same degree of importance by all states.

Whilst states have historically sought to constrain and enable cross-border mobility (whether of their own or foreign citizens) in accordance with their own distinctive ideological outlooks, the rise of neoliberal economics and capitalist globalization has marked an era in which new alignments of inequality and social polarization have accentuated asymmetrical patterns and flows of international travel. Moreover, a spate of terrorist attacks against tourists and the events of September 11th 2001 have provided a geopolitical force-field through which the mobility of those deemed to be a ‘threat’ or ‘risky’ travellers, has been increasingly subject to curtailment. Accordingly, at a time when the world is seemingly more connected than ever, particularly through web-based networks and social media, it is ironic that the material pathways of travel are being increasingly regulated, managed and constrained, for those without the ‘right credentials’ for travel.

Although the nation-state retains its monopoly on the ability to grant, administer and enforce legal citizenship rights, global realignments of power, wealth and mobility serve to expand and redefine existing conceptions of citizenship whether or not these have become explicit, challenging scholars to expand the meaning and application of citizenship rights. The movement of citizens across borders and the global reach of states implicate people – not least, tourists – in a complex web of practices and responsibilities, which extend beyond the borders of any one state. Given the disjuncture between the ‘rights of mobility’ monopolised by a minority of citizens vis-à-vis the rights of relatively ‘immobile’ populations (both ‘non-tourists’ and disadvantaged members of ‘host’ societies’), there are direct implications for our understanding of tourism and nascent concepts of global and/or cosmopolitan citizenship.

With this in mind, Isin and Turner (2007, p. 15) propose a “mobility and transaction tax...that applies in principle to everybody and that the resources from this cosmopolitan tax would create the funding to meet the needs of rights claimers everywhere”. Such a tax they argue would form the basis of cosmopolitan citizenry regardless of ethnicity, nationality and country of residence that would in turn provide the material foundations for the development of cosmopolitan citizenship (not ‘global’ citizenship, which they argue, implies, the reconstitution of a state at a global level). Such ideas do offer an interesting avenue to explore regarding the construction of transnational forms of solidarity and

the development of institutional mechanisms of cohesion between mobile and immobile populations, which could then form the basis of a tourist citizenship. However, given the hostile reaction by many to the ill-fated Balearic eco-tax (see Palmer and Riera, 2003), it is hard to imagine how such a 'cosmopolitan mobility tax' might be acceptable let alone implemented!

Notwithstanding emergent 'justice' tourisms as well as the expansion of tourist markets beyond the traditional epicentres of tourism, global tourism is predominantly organized around the values of liberal democracy and free market capitalism. Moreover, geo-political imperatives continue to lead to the proliferation of borders and the securitization of travel, often leading to the criminalization of the mobility of those deemed to be 'risky' or 'illegitimate' travellers. The disparity between the culture of mobility to which many of those in the rich 'north' have become accustomed over the past sixty years or so, is increasingly brought into stark relief by rising fuel prices and the growing threat of climate change, even as increasing outbound travel from emergent economies suggests the horizons for global tourism are unlimited.

Whilst the mobility of migrants, refugees and terrorists are conflated to appear as a uniform threat to the stability of the global order, the mobility of capital and of course tourists is seen as intrinsic to the advancement of peace, prosperity and security. However, global environmental threats, partly fuelled by the disproportionate ability of the citizens of the rich north to take advantage of carbon-fuelled technologies of movement since the early 20th century, are proving to be devastating for 'third world' economies. Also, the proliferation of borders at the gates of Europe and North America, has entrapped the majority of the world's inhabitants even more forcefully in a vicious circle of poverty and immobility.

The globalisation of tourism, while extending the global reach of international travel, and embracing aspirant travellers from new territories, nevertheless embodies a restricted notion of freedom associated with neoliberal capitalist globalisation and the simultaneous welding of consumerist desires to notions of individual rights and notions of empowerment. If participation in tourism is to have anything to do with a robust formulation of citizenship, one that is extended to all peoples on the planet, it must first seek to decouple itself from the debased nations of freedom associated with neoliberalism and the unequal flows of mobility upon which much of contemporary global travel is based.

## References

- Ateljevic, I. (2000). Circuits of tourism: stepping beyond the 'production/consumption' dichotomy. *Tourism Geographies*, 2(4), 369–388.
- Bauman, Z. (1998). *Globalization: The human consequences*. Cambridge: Polity.
- BBC Radio 4. (2012). *Open for tourist business? Face the facts*. Broadcast on 11th July 2012. Retrieved 18 September 2012, from <http://www.bbc.co.uk/programmes/b01kmjj6>.
- Beck, U. (2005). *Power in the global age*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Berlin, I. (1969). *Four essays on liberty*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Berlin, R. B., & Carter, J. C. (March 5th 2010). Safe haven for you cash? Germans call on Greece to sell of its islands. *The Times*, 4.
- Bianchi, R. (2006). Tourism and the globalization of fear: analyzing the politics of risk and (in)security in global travel. *Tourism and Hospitality Research*, 7(1), 64–74.
- Birkett, D. (June 1st. 2000). Trouble in the paradise industry? *The Guardian*.
- Bleach, S. (22nd February 2009). Tour operators refuse to cut links with Burmese regime. *Sunday Times*2. Directions Travel Supplement.
- Boorstin, D. J. (1963). *The image*. Harmondsworth: Pelican Books.
- Brendon, P. (1991). *Thomas Cook: 150 years of popular tourism*. London: Secker & Warburg.
- Butcher, J. (2003). *The moralisation of tourism: Sun, sand...and saving the world*. London: Routledge.
- Butcher, J., & Smith, P. (2010). 'Making a difference': volunteer tourism. *Tourism Recreation Research*, 35(1), 27–36.
- Capgemini & RBC Wealth Management. (2012). *16th Annual world wealth report*. Paris: Capgemini. Retrieved 21 September 2012, from <http://www.capgemini.com/insights-and-resources/by-publication/world-wealth-report-2012/?ftcnt=10120>.
- Coles, T. (2008a). Citizenship and the state: hidden features in the internationalization of tourism. In T. Coles, & C. M. Hall (Eds.), *International business and tourism: Global issues contemporary interactions* (pp. 55–69). London: Routledge.
- Coles, T. (2008b). Telling tales of tourism: mobility, media and citizenship in the 2004 EU enlargement. In P. M. Burns, & M. Novelli (Eds.), *Tourism and mobilities: Global-local connections* (pp. 65–80). Kidlington, Oxon: Elsevier.
- Dalwai, S., & Donegan, B. (2012). From travellers to activist global citizens? Practitioner reflections on an activist/volunteer tourist project. *Journal of Tourism Consumption and Practice*, 4(1), 5–29.
- Davis, M. (2001). The flames of New York. *New Left Review* II, 12, 34–50.
- Davis, M. (2007). Home-Front Ecology: what our grandparents can teach us about saving the world. *Sierra Magazine*. July/August. Retrieved 4th February 2013, from <http://www.sierraclub.org/sierra/200707/ecology.asp>.
- Delanty, G. (2000). *Citizenship in a global age: Society, culture, politics*. Buckingham: Open University Press.
- The Economist. (18th–31st December 2010). A new grand tour. *The Economist*, 54–56.
- Endy, C. (2004). *Cold war holidays: American tourism in France*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.
- Eriksson, J., Noble, R., Pattullo, P., & Barnett, T. (2009). *Putting tourism to rights: A challenge to human right abuses in the tourism industry*. London: Tourism Concern. Retrieved 20 September 2012, from [http://www.tourismconcern.org.uk/uploads/file/campaigns/LowRes\\_Putting%20Tourism%20to%20Rights\\_A%20report%20by%20TourismConcern2.pdf](http://www.tourismconcern.org.uk/uploads/file/campaigns/LowRes_Putting%20Tourism%20to%20Rights_A%20report%20by%20TourismConcern2.pdf).
- Eschle, C., & Maiguascha, B. (2005). *Critical theories, international relations and 'the anti-globalisation movement'*. London: Routledge.
- ETOA. (2010). *Europe: Open for business? Reopening the debate on visa policy. Origin markets report*. London: European Tour Operators Association. Retrieved 18th September 2012, from [http://www.etoa.org/docs/visa-reports/2010\\_origin-markets-report.pdf?sfvrsn=2](http://www.etoa.org/docs/visa-reports/2010_origin-markets-report.pdf?sfvrsn=2).
- Euromonitor International. (19th December 2012). *Tourism flows outbound in China 2011*. Passport GMID. Retrieved 19th December 2012, from <http://www.portal.euromonitor.com/Portal/Handlers/accessPDF.ashx?c=98\PDF&f=5-201089-21345098.pdf&code=21A7M8eScCbPhB7C0sj5WxBMz0%3d>.
- Falk, R. (1994). The making of global citizenship. In B. Steenbergen (Ed.), *The condition of citizenship* (pp. 127–140). London: Sage.
- Fanon, F. (1968). *The wretched of the earth*. New York: Grove Press.
- Foroohar, R. (15–22 May 2006). Going places: special report. *Newsweek International*, 53–89.
- Frank, T. (2002). *One market under God: Extreme capitalism, market populism and the end of economic democracy*. London: Vintage.
- Giddens, A. (1991). *Modernity and self-identity: Self and society in the late modern age*. Oxford: Polity.
- Giddens, A. (1994). *Beyond left and right: The future of radical politics*. Oxford: Polity.
- Gill, S. (1995). Globalisation, market civilisation and disciplinary neoliberalism. *Millennium. Journal of International Studies*, 24(3), 399–423.
- Global Spa Summit. (May 2010). Spas and the global wellness market: synergies and opportunities. A report prepared by SRI International ([www.sri.com](http://www.sri.com)). Retrieved 23rd April 2013, from [http://www.globalspaandwellnesssummit.org/images/stories/pdf/gss\\_spasandwellnessreport\\_final.pdf](http://www.globalspaandwellnesssummit.org/images/stories/pdf/gss_spasandwellnessreport_final.pdf).
- Goldstone, P. (2001). *Making the world safe for tourism*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press.
- Goodin, R. E. (1992). 'If people were money...'. In B. Barry, & R. E. Goodin (Eds.), *Free movement: Ethical issues in the transnational movement of people and of money* (pp. 6–22). Pennsylvania: Penn State Press.
- Hannam, K., Sheller, M., & Urry, J. (2006). Editorial: mobilities, immobilities and moorings. *Mobilities*, 1(1), 1–22.
- Hannerz, U. (1990). Cosmopolitans and locals in world culture. In M. Featherstone (Ed.), *Global culture: Nationalism, globalization and modernity* (pp. 237–252). London: Sage.
- Hazbun, W. (2008). *Beaches, ruins, resorts: The politics of tourism in the Arab world*. Minneapolis/London: University of Minnesota Press.
- Heater, D. (2002). *World citizenship: Cosmopolitan thinking and its opponents*. London and New York: Continuum.
- Held, D. (1991). Between state and civil society. In G. Andrews (Ed.), *Citizenship* (pp. 19–25). London: Lawrence and Wishart.
- Higgins-Desbiolles, F. (2006). More than an 'industry': the forgotten power of tourism as a social force. *Tourism Management*, 27(6), 1192–1208.
- Higgins-Desbiolles, F. (2007). Hostile meeting grounds: encounters with the wretched of the earth and the tourist through tourism and terrorism in the 21st century. In P. M. Burns, & M. Novelli (Eds.), *Tourism and politics: global frameworks and local realities* (pp. 309–332). Kidlington, Oxon: Elsevier.
- Hipwell, W. T. (2007). Taiwan aboriginal ecotourism: Tanayiku national Ecology Park. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 34(4), 876–897.
- ILO. (1970). *International Labour Organization*. Retrieved 14th July 2009, from [http://www.ilo.org/dyn/normlex/en/f?p=1000:12100:0::NO::P12100\\_INSTRUMENT\\_ID:312277](http://www.ilo.org/dyn/normlex/en/f?p=1000:12100:0::NO::P12100_INSTRUMENT_ID:312277).
- Isin, E. F., & Turner, B. S. (2007). Investigating citizenship: an agenda for citizenship studies. *Citizenship Studies*, 11(1), 5–17.
- Isin, E. F., & Wood, P. K. (1999). *Citizenship and identity*. London: Sage.
- Kaur, R., & Hutnyk, J. (1999). Introduction. In R. Kaur, & J. Hutnyk (Eds.), *Travel worlds: Journeys in contemporary cultural politics* (pp. 1–13). London: Zed Books.

- Kingsnorth, P. (2003). *One no, many yeses*. London: Free Press.
- Kington, T. (17th May 2008). 68% of Italians want Roma expelled – poll. *The Guardian*. Retrieved 18th September, from <http://www.guardian.co.uk/world/2008/may/17/italy>.
- Lewallen, A.-E. (2011). Performing identity, saving land: Ainu indigenous ecotourism as a stage for restitution of rights in Japan. Report of the international symposium "Exploring Ethnicity and the State through Tourism in East Asia" Kanazawa University Japan—China intangible cultural heritage project report Vol. 13. Kanazawa University College of human and social sciences conference report (pp. 112–123).
- Lickorish, L. (September 1991). Developing a single European tourism policy. *Tourism Management*, 12(3), 178–184.
- Lisle, D. (2007). Defending voyeurism: dark tourism and the problem of global security. In P. M. Burns, & M. Novelli (Eds.), *Tourism and politics: Global frameworks and local realities* (pp. 333–345). Kidlington, Oxon: Elsevier.
- Loader, I. (1999). Consumer culture and commodification of policing and security. *Sociology*, 33(2), 373–392.
- Lyons, D. (2003). *Surveillance after September 11*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Lyons, K., Hanley, J., Wearing, S., & Neil, J. (2012). Gap year volunteer tourism: myths of global citizenship? *Annals of Tourism Research*, 39(1), 361–378.
- MacCannell, D. (1999). *The tourist: A new theory of the leisure class*. Berkeley: University of California Press. First published in 1976, Schocken Books.
- Marshall, T. H. (1992 [1950]). *Citizenship and social class*. London: Pluto.
- McCabe, S., Minnaert, L., & Diekmann, A. (Eds.). (2011). *Social tourism in Europe: Theory and practice*. Clevedon: Channel View Publications.
- Munar, A.-M. (2007). Rethinking globalization theory in tourism. In P. M. Burns, & M. Novelli (Eds.), *Tourism and politics: global frameworks and local realities* (pp. 347–367). Kidlington, Oxon: Elsevier.
- Nash, K. (2000). *Contemporary political sociology: Globalization, politics and power*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Ong, A. (1999). *Flexible citizenship: The cultural logics of transnationality*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- O'Bryne, D. J. (2001). On passports and border controls. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 28(2), 399–416.
- Palmer, T., & Riera, A. (2003). Tourism and environmental taxes with special reference to the 'Balearic ecotax'. *Tourism Management*, 24(6), 665–674.
- Pignatelli, (22nd September 2011). Bulgaria and Romania excluded from Schengen. *Financial Times*. Retrieved 10 November 2011, from <http://www.ft.com/cms/s/0/dd7d4fae-e51f-11e0-9aa8-00144feabd00.html#axzz1djtD70I>.
- Popham, P. (22nd July 2008). The picture that shames Italy. *The Independent*. Retrieved 31 July 2008, from <http://www.independent.co.uk/news/world/europe/article873743.ece?startindex=1>.
- Roche, M. (2001). Citizenship, popular culture and Europe. In N. Stevenson (Ed.), *Culture and citizenship* (pp. 74–98). London: Sage.
- Rojek, C. (1998). Tourism and citizenship. *Cultural Policy*, 4(2), 291–310.
- Routledge, P. (2001). 'Selling the rain': resisting the sale: resistant identities and the conflict over tourism in Goa. *Social and Cultural Geography*, 2(2), 221–240.
- Rumford, C. (2006). Theorizing borders. *European Journal of Social Theory*, 9(2), 155–169.
- Rumford, C. (2007). Does Europe have cosmopolitan borders? *Globalizations*, 4(3), 327–339.
- Samatas, M. (2003). Greece in 'Schengenland': blessing or anathema for citizens' and foreigners' rights. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 29(1), 141–156.
- Scheyvens, R. (2002). *Tourism for development: Empowering communities*. Harlow: Prentice Hall.
- Schwartz, R. D. (1991). Travellers under Fire: tourists in the Tibetan uprising. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 18, 588–604.
- Shivji, I. (1973). *Tourism and socialist development*. Dar-Es-Salam: Tanzania Publishing House.
- Shore, C. (2000). *Building Europe: The cultural politics of European integration*. London: Routledge.
- Silverman, M. (1992). The revenge of civil society: state, nation and society in France. In D. Cesarani, & M. Fulbrook (Eds.), *Citizenship, nationality and migration in Europe* (pp. 146–158). London: Routledge.
- Sklair, L. (2001). *The transnational capitalist class*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Soysal, Y. N. (1994). *Limits of citizenship: Migrants and postnational membership in Europe*. Chicago: Chicago University Press.
- Stein, N. (17 January 2012). Is 2012 the year of the volunteer tourist? *Travel Mole*. Retrieved 23 January 2012 from [http://www.travelmole.com/news\\_feature\\_P.php?news\\_id=1151074](http://www.travelmole.com/news_feature_P.php?news_id=1151074).
- Stephenson, M. L. (2006). Travel and the freedom of movement: racialised encounters and experiences amongst ethnic minority tourists in the EU. *Mobilities*, 1(2), 285–306.
- Stephenson, M. L., & Ali, N. (2010). Tourism, travel and islamophobia: post 9/11 journeys of muslims in non-muslim states. In N. Scott, & J. Jafari (Eds.), *Tourism in the muslim world* (pp. 235–251). Bingley: Emerald Group Publishing Ltd.
- Stephenson, M. L., & Hughes, H. L. (2005). Racialised boundaries in tourism and travel: a case study of the UK Black Caribbean community. *Leisure Studies*, 24(2), 137–160.
- Steves, R. (2009). *Travel as a political act*. New York: Nation Books.
- Swain, M. B., & Hall, D. R. (2007). Gender analysis in tourism: personal and global dialectics. In I. Ateljevic, A. Pritchard, & N. Morgan (Eds.), *The critical turn in tourism studies: innovative research methodologies* (pp. 1–8). Amsterdam: Elsevier.
- Tomazos, K., & Cooper, W. (2012). Volunteer tourism: at the crossroads of commercialization and service? *Current Issues in Tourism*, 15(5), 405–423.
- Topham, G. (2012). Stowaway from Angola highlights airport security problems. *The Guardian*. Retrieved 15 September 2012, from <http://www.guardian.co.uk/world/2012/sep/14/stowaway-angola-airport-security-problems>.
- Torpey, J. (2000). *The invention of the passport: Surveillance citizenship and the state*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Turner, B. S. (1986). *Citizenship and capitalism*. London: Allen and Unwin.
- Turner, B. (Ed.). (1994). *Citizenship and social theory*. London: Sage.
- Turner, L., & Ash, J. (1975). *The golden hordes: International tourism and the pleasure periphery*. London: Constable and Co.
- Urry, J. (1995). *Consuming places*. London: Routledge.
- Urry, J. (2002). *The tourist gaze: Leisure and travel in contemporary societies* (2nd ed.). London: Sage.
- Urry, J. (2013). *Societies beyond oil: Oil dregs and social futures*. London: Zed.
- Van Steenberg, B. (1994). Towards global ecological citizenship. In B. van Steenberg (Ed.), *The condition of citizenship* (pp. 141–152). London: Sage.
- Veblen, T. (1970). *The theory of the leisure class* (1899 edition reprinted). London: Allen and Unwin.
- WTO, World Tourism Organisation. (1980). *Manila declaration*. Madrid: WTO. Retrieved 5 February 2013, from <http://www.uniview.org/CMS/UserFiles/65.%20Manila.PDF>.
- WTO, World Tourism Organisation. (1999). *Global code of ethics*. Madrid: WTO. Retrieved 5 February 2013, from <http://www.unwto.org/ethics/index.php>.
- Zagaria, C. (20th July 2008). Bimbe rom annagete, lo sdegno sul web. *La Repubblica Napoli*. Retrieved 18th September 2012, from <http://napoli.repubblica.it/dettaglio/Bimbe-rom-annagete:-Uccise-dallindifferenza/1490675>.



**Raoul Bianchi** is a Principal Lecturer in Tourism and Leisure in the Royal Docks Business School at the University of East London. He holds a BSc in Politics and International Relations (University of Southampton) and an MSc in Tourism Management (University of Surrey). He was awarded a Doctorate in 2000 (University of North London) for his work on tourism, entrepreneurship and social change in Gran Canaria and has published widely in the sociology and international political economy of tourism. He has participated in a range of funded research projects on tourism development, sustainable tourism, World Heritage and the cultural politics of heritage, including on EU-TEMPUS and Euromed Heritage II research programmes.



**Marcus Stephenson** is an Associate Professor of Tourism Management at Middlesex University Dubai. He has a BSc (Hons) in Sociology and Social Administration, and an MA in the Sociology and Anthropology of Tourism and Travel. The University of Surrey was the awarding body for both degrees. He gained his PhD in tourism studies from Manchester Metropolitan University in 1998, and has taught in the field of tourism management since 1993. Marcus has also conducted research in the Caribbean, Middle East, Tanzania and the UK, and has also carried out research for various tourism-related institutions at both regional and international level. He has supervised a range of PhDs and has published extensively in the sociology of tourism field.