

3 Destination under Discipline: Foucault and the Transformation of Place Makers

Keith Hollinshead,¹ Milka Ivanova¹ and Kellee Caton²

¹University of Bedfordshire, UK and ²Thompson Rivers University, Canada

Introduction

This chapter argues that although Foucault wrote nothing explicitly about 'tourism' per se, his work as a philosopher of the everyday governmentality of things has much relevance for those who work in tourism management and tourism studies. The chapter is premised on the view that Foucault's subversive ways of thinking about undersuspected normalizing processes are important for those who ply their trade in global travel, as (for instance) the predominant 'Western' or 'North Atlantic' thoughtlines of industrially scripted tourism have historically suppressed other ways of seeing the world. Likewise, it is founded on the assessment that Foucault's deep insights into the vogue practices of 'total institutions' like asylums, prisons, clinics, etc., are also crucially important for those employed within (for example) large corporations or state promotional bureaux in tourism, where those sorts of bodies may similarly serve as enormously prejudiced *totalizing institutions* as they select and produce local places. Thus, the chapter is founded on the Foucauldian view that those who work within our governing organizations (in tourism, as everywhere else) are so rarely the rational and autonomous subjects we have tended to assume they are, but are – probably/more commonly – docile, passive and regularized individuals whose

output is meticulously supervised and controlled by received inheritances of thought about what the representational repertoire of places should always be.

Hence, there is conceivably much in Foucault's various studies of 'power', 'knowledge', 'habitual forms of practice' and 'freedom' that applies centrally to all that is carried out in and through tourism by and through these 'normalized' place makers. The chapter will therefore inspect how Foucault suggests that individuals within the organizations, the authorities, the corporations that 'govern' tourism may be regulated by forms of knowing and acting that strongly limit what is conceivable in terms of:

- What constitutes the viewable and projectable tourism product of places;
- How that inscribed product can be transformed through *rapport à soi* awareness to conceivably take on board other/alternative visions of inheritance or attractivity.

The chapter should be read in concert with the succeeding chapter in this book (by Hollinshead, Caton and Ivanova), and with the Appendix, which contains a glossary of Foucauldian terms applied to the possibilities of the transformation of place-making individuals in tourism/tourism studies, and ultimately (thereby) of the places/spaces/destinations of tourism themselves.

Prologue: Foucault and Transformation

Born in Poitiers, France, in 1926, and elected chair of the History of Systems of Thought at the Collège de France in 1970, Michel Foucault was one of the most original thinkers of the 20th century. His substantial conceptual work has rarely been drawn upon in tourism studies, yet it merits great consideration in the present context of transformation, as Foucault had much to say about the processes that govern change, particularly with regard to the relationship between individual agency and the larger structures in which it is enmeshed. He had much to say about the regimes of practice, which regulate not only how we think and behave, but what the received and current possibilities are for the metamorphosis of anything or any person. Foucault saw himself as, initially, an *archaeologist*, not of the hidden earth-bound history of objects (and, in his own terms, therefore of societies), but one of the undersuspected discursive practices of organizations/institutions/eras (and thereby of the individuals regulated within them) and, in his later work, a *genealogist* who inspects the legacy of things, or rather, the history of current concerns. Foucault's inspections of the genealogy of things tended to be pitched on a social rather than an individual level, where he explored the way notions such as insanity and deviance were articulated and policed through both social discourse and the materiality of institutions, but his techniques of deconstructing discourse and history have since been applied in a wide panoply of institutional settings. Boldly, his work does no less than to skewer the notion of *reason* itself as being merely the product of what is deemed acceptable under any given discursive and institutional regime, casting it simply as half of a binary pair with *non-reason*, which connotes that which is deemed unacceptable under conditions of the same. To present, Foucauldian conceptualities have been deployed in a litany of organizational/disciplinary/field/professional areas, by a multitude of scholars, consultancies and policy teams, to inspect the values that are held about a particular entity (or, rather, about the taken-for-granted assumptions that are in vogue to regulate how that entity is known and inspected).

Towards the end of his life, Foucault expanded his oeuvre beyond matters of *discourse* (i.e. what people say and communicate) and *praxis* (i.e. what people do conterminously in facilitating the speed of that discourse), to focus upon the technologies of power that are harnessed to network given knowledges (i.e. given assumptions/values) across society. Indeed it is his inspections of the networks of interconnecting mechanisms that exist of a given time/in a found place which are most useful for this book on the transformation of *individuals* because they shed light on the pre-ordained hierarchies of understanding that exist (then/there) *to condition the possibility of things*. Thus, for objects, if a thing is to be transformed, how is it currently classified in the world, and what is it assumed to be coherent with? And thus, for individuals, how are they currently regulated by the institutions they live within/work within/play within, and how fixed or set are these identities assumed to be? In the paragraphs that follow in this chapter, then, an attempt is made to show how there is indeed immense opportunity for the deployment of Foucauldian theorizations in tourism studies, where 'tourism'/'tourism studies' may indeed be regarded as (variously) a very strong management domain/academic discipline/professional field in the collaborative networking of understandings about places and peoples.

In his last years, Foucault was inquiring particularly deeply into the level of self-awareness that individuals have of the governing 'truths' which they are helping peddle – and of the degree to which they (as individuals) were themselves governed by these very networked truths. It is clearly crucial – in the adoption of Foucauldian thoughtlines – for an individual who consciously wants to not so much transform an object, a place or an event but to *transform himself/herself* to have a robust understanding of the sort of received 'truths' (i.e. the held assumptions/hailed interpretations) that one (he/she) may currently be participating in or be institutionally wedded to. If only Foucault – a widely travelled man in Europe, North America, and North Africa – had spent time inspecting how the world is divided through the doxa and cultural warrants of tourism, i.e. the commonplace values and assumptions of the field. Nonetheless, this

second volume on the possibilities of the transformation of objects, places and (most notably) *individuals* can indeed mine much of what Foucault had conceptualized about the conscious/unconscious role of vogue institutional expertise in the liberation of such things and such people.

Introduction: The Governance of Tourism and the Possibilities of Change through Tourism

This chapter (like all of the chapters in this book) inspects the role and function of tourism in transforming individuals and things. The particular emphasis of this 'Destinations under Discipline' chapter is to explain – via the medium of a distillation of the thinking of Michel Foucault (the sage commentator on power, knowledge and subjectivity) – how tourism is conceivably governed, and thereby what an individual or interest group may need to do or understand if it/he/she is to help transform society/the status quo/individuals through tourism. To this end, the chapter first introduces readers to the general concept of 'governance' and to the distinct Foucauldian concept of 'governmentality'. The chapter proceeds by delineating the relevance of Foucauldian insight on authority and agency to tourism contexts before dwelling on Foucault's view that 'tourism', like all human fields of play/zones of activity/institutional realms, is a territory where certain forms of dominance are at work and certain forms of reciprocal suppression or subjugation may also be identified. But the chapter points out that Foucault's inspection of the governmentality of things in each or any arena is richly and deeply nuanced. It seeks to explain that the way the world is seen through the Foucauldian lens is not necessarily complex, but it does demand that analysts of Foucauldian sorts of institutional action in any field take time to take on board how Foucault maintains that the key phenomena of 'truth', 'knowledge' and 'subjectivity' are historicized not only in the given period but in *the subject making* (and for this book, *the place making*) process. Working from the long-championed view of Crick (1989) that, relatively

speaking, tourism management and tourism studies are theoretically invertebrate – augmented by the increasingly supported view of Coles *et al.* (2006) that tourism management and tourism studies are highly insular and conceptually cramped – this 'Destinations under Discipline' chapter then calls for the translation of Foucauldian understandings about power, knowledge and subjectivity for tourism management/tourism studies. To that end, it draws attention to a litany of concepts and constructions on truth, governance, subjectivity, etc., which ought to constitute that gradus or field storehouse. The chapter, therefore, calls for the development of an enriched/enhanced conceptual vocabulary (viz. a glossary on the governmentality/governance of things, see Appendix), and thereby explains for the reader what its bedfellow chapter (i.e. Chapter 4 'The Normalization of Places and Spaces' by Hollinshead, Caton and Ivanova) contains. In offering this specialized abecedarium on Foucauldian thought vis-à-vis tourism and the possibilities of transformation, the authors of this pair of chapters implicitly call upon other social scientists and humanists within tourism management/tourism studies to produce a like gradus or glossary translating other critical thinkers on the governance of things to tourism settings and contexts.

Now, in homage to the long-standing criticism of Crick (and also to the aforesaid late condemnations of Coles *et al.* thereafter), who is indeed going to painstakingly decipher and oppositely interpret for tourism management/tourism studies . . . let us see . . . the political philosophy of Gramsci, the semiotics of Kristeva, the hermeneutics of Ricoeur or the interpretations of whichever other applied philosopher? If you start your glossarial work now (whoever you are!), you'll just keep in time for the second edition of this book, and you can certainly help transform/transfigure/transfuse the field from its Crick-recognized (and Coles-Hall-Duval-identified) seeming conceptual tranquillities.

Oh, and in that same vein but by extension: who is going to work in like fashion on Adorno, Mbembe and Spivak, that is, in conceptual arenas distant from the continental philosophy of Europe?

Background: The Governance of Things

Tourism and governance: Evolving studies

Many commentators on tourism and travel have registered the fact that tourism – with its very long chain of distribution and its very large array of competitive private-for-profit corporations/private sector organizations/special interest groups/sanctioning bodies/general community institutions – is inherently a matter of polarization (Williams and Shaw, 1988), an arena of contestation (Greenwood, 1989) and realm of intervention (Lanfant *et al.*, 1995). Despite this sizable concurrence of opinion, the very subject of decision making in tourism management/travel development *per se* has (paradoxically) long been recognized as an understudied arena of the twin fields of tourism studies/tourism management (hereafter, reduced to tourism studies, for convenience). While Richter (1983) was disturbed by a particular absence of political science conceptuality in tourism studies, Matthews and Richter (1991) (together) were concerned about the general infrequency of studies of policy and governing action in the field (the twin fields). And Hall (1994) produced an impressive cross-national and trans-continental study of decision making in tourism that sought to make manifest the poverty of treatments of ‘ideology’, ‘values’ and ‘power’ at work in tourism studies.

Here and there, singular studies of the practical character of tourism in specific places have cropped up in tourism studies over the past couple of decades. While Buck (1993) generated a deep-seated critique of the mythopolitics at work in Hawaii, McKay (1994) produced a detail-informed, longitudinal investigation of reality making in Nova Scotia. While Tunbridge and Ashworth (1996) inspected the force of heritage tourism sites and attractions as a local/regional/national resource, Rothman (1998) informed us how tourism can indeed become a highly colonized zone even within large cosmopolitan countries where supposed culture and inheritances of ‘natives’ (here broadly meaning ‘original’ or longstanding locals) became ordinarily but under-expectingly pilaged by both ‘neonative’ and ‘non-native’

outsiders. And, while Morgan and Pritchard (1998) have drawn our collective attention to the commonality of the power games that exist in the routine image work and identity projection of tourism, Forest *et al.* (2004) have made it transparent that the political battles of tourism between ‘official memory’ representations of place and so-called ‘unsanctioned memories’ are not just practices of old totalitarian eras, but are commonplace everywhere; indeed, as Jeong and Santos (2003) demonstrate, official and unsanctioned memory is a site of cultural struggle and intersects with the realm of identity politics in myriad ways (e.g. through gender, generational and religious affiliation of various sectors of the populace). In a nutshell, we may call all these political things and all of these policy things (which we are recognizing inherently do exist in/through/about tourism!) as matters of *governance*. Over the past three decades or so, we have begun to realize that the landscapes, the seascapes and the mythscapes of travel places are not just backdrop phenomena for the human tourist or the industrial tourism activity: they are themselves made by place making people (Bender and Winer, 2001). And these matters of place manufacture – these matters of place *governance* and space *governance* – depend crucially upon the particularities of time and locale (Meethan, 2001). To Kirshenblatt-Gimblett (1998), these vital place-sustaining and place-reducing acts of governance are idiosyncratic, coercive and dynamic matters of ‘madness’ and ‘hereness’. To Hollinshead (2004), they are variable, counteractive and open-ended ‘world-making’ processes. And to Kirshenblatt-Gimblett (1998), to Bender and Winer (2001), to Meethan (2001) and to Hollinshead (2004), and all, the field of tourism studies (and related fields) must learn how to equip itself (themselves) with a much richer and more relevant conceptual arsenal in order to explore these (essentially) powerful and differentiating place-bestowing/place-authorizing/place-legitimizing *ubiquitous deeds of governance* (Caton, 2013). Currently, the conceptual health of tourism studies is stagnant and even contemptuous of so-called ‘outsider’ views (Franklin and Crang, 2001); it is indeed deemed by Franklin (2009) to be in strong need of the cultivation of much more ‘generous and gen-minded’ conceptual penetrative/interpretive critique.

Foucault and governance: Foucault on 'governmentality'

Given that tourism is inherently a highly contested arena – and that matters of governance are thereby intrinsically central to so much that occurs in tourism – it is the premise of this chapter that Foucauldian insights on contests of power/knowledge/truth/privilege (however the particular applying analyst terms it) should ordinarily be able to shed considerable light on what is 'governed' or 'controlled' in tourism, and what is 'regulated' or 'made subject' through tourism – and thereby what the possibilities of transformation of this or that are in any given context or found setting. Accordingly, this chapter seeks to serve as something of a primer for those who work in tourism studies who are not well versed in Foucault's work on the formation of subjectivity (i.e. on how all sorts of things/ideas/populations may be controlled/governed/regulated by the day-by-day activities of all sorts of institutions or individuals *en groupe*, such that they absorb this governance into their own identity construction process and thereby become resistant to transformation or find themselves otherwise not in a situation that is open or responsive to immediate change). Thus, the chapter seeks to show how all kinds of peoples/places/programmes can readily be 'made subject' to the particular 'received' and/or the 'everyday' institutional governances of tourism – or, put another way, subjugated to the Foucauldian *governmentalities* of tourism (Burchell *et al.*, 1991) – thus helping would-be tourism understanders/interveners in the realms of academia/industry/government to gain something of an awareness of the limits of individual transformative agency (or, more optimistically, at least a sense of what it is up against) in realizing itself amid the power-knowledge nexus of tourism thought and practice. The chapter attempts to show how a distilled Foucauldian inspection of governance (i.e. of the governmentality of things) can lead place making researchers (and administrators, managers and programmers!) in tourism studies to the realization that matters of 'control' do not always have to be hard and concrete consciously exercised matters of 'right', 'law' and 'punishment', but that they can also concern seemingly small and 'soft' techniques of normalization and of

undersuspected in-group naturalizing 'talk' about things (which those who engage in those controlling activities may themselves not be conscious of – or may only be partly conscious). For a recent and general critique of the sorts of mentalities and techniques involved in Foucauldian notions of rule, see Dean's (2010) inspection of 'governmentality' and the normalizing formation of political power.

For those who have read the prologue to this chapter but who are not clear about who Foucault was, it should be repeated at the outset that he was (1926–1984) an important catalyst in French philosophy who probed the routine discursive activities (i.e. the everyday talk) and the routine praxis (i.e. the everyday deeds) of institutions that can over time grow to extend 'influence' over things or 'influence' over people without there ever necessarily being any structural order or fully determinate 'power' to that ordinary dominance (Gutting, 1994). Thus Foucault – heavily persuaded himself by the thinking of Nietzsche – was an acute reasoner who sought to uncover the circumscribing 'rules' (or the 'historical conditions') that helped form the prevalent discourse and praxis which seemingly operates within and/or through group/institutional/organizational practices and which orders the meanings held in currency *there* (Dreyfus and Rabinow, 1986). Principally, those who work with the Foucauldian ideas on the governmentality in and of things thereby tend to concern themselves with inquiry into power (which, to Foucault himself, is generally understood to be *power-knowledge* and not 'power' alone) as a dispersed way-of-knowing that courses through group/institutional/organizational practice to thus govern the understandings that reside and proliferate *there* (O'Farrell, 1997). Significantly, this 'power' (i.e. this power-knowledge) is not just or axiomatically repressive, but also (and better regarded as being) 'productive' (Davidson, 1994). Thus, Foucauldian power-knowledge should not just be seen as that force or those forces which repress(es) the possibility of change or transformation in people or things, but as that force or these forces which has/have 'produced' (i.e. brought about/catalysed/enabled) the current state of dominance over the given individual or within the given area of phenomena *abc* over the suppressed or silenced phenomena *xyz*.

In the past two decades, a number of researchers in tourism studies have sought to encourage the flowering of Foucauldian scrutiny in their field. To some, Urry (1990) kick-started the process. Certainly, Urry borrows the Foucauldian term 'gaze' – derived from the strong French concept *le regard* – in the title of his much-sold text, but Foucauldian ideas are hardly elaborated in the Urry work, and we do not learn much about the Foucauldian magisteriality of institutions expressly from him. Thereafter, Hollinshead (1999) calls upon tourism studies researchers to make much more searching use of Foucauldian power of surveillance (*le regard*) and of ocularcentric outlooks in their investigative agendas, and Cheong and Miller (2000) make an apprised case for the omnipresence of Foucauldian sorts of 'power' (which 'disturbingly' they regularly refrain from discussing as 'power-knowledge') in tourism settings. While the kind of Foucauldian normalization that Cheong and Miller refer to may be rather too *consciously held* and too *consciously exercised* for many seasoned Foucauldian conceptualists (who prefer to inspect the *unrecognized* or *under-recognized* normalization of things), their short paper is a useful orienting paper to the kinds of gazes that can and do govern people making, place making and past making in the networks of tourism. In like vein to that of Hollinshead (1999), Cheong and Miller pointedly inform those who earn their salt in tourism studies that while the destinations of tourism are routinely the products of the networked discourse of tourism, *any* serving planner/programmer/practitioner in tourism can indeed be 'disciplined' through tourism, and *anyone* can be caught up in the conduct of that governing repressive or productive disciplinarity. Such are the ubiquitous 'truth-making' (i.e. the vogue attraction making, the vogue myth making and the vogue tourist making) rituals of Foucauldian governmentality. In more recent years, such entreaties for engagement in Foucauldian studies of universalist authority and normalizing agency have been further supported by Church and Coles (2006) (notably in contrast to other perspectives on power from Lukes, 2005) and by Ayikoru and Tribe (2007) (who seek to pinpoint the relevance of Foucault's work on the archaeology of things and

the genealogy of things) for discursive inspections in critical tourism inquiry. For a simple background on these acts of Foucauldian 'archaeology' and 'genealogy' and for a basic introduction to Foucault's conceptual tools on the normalization and governance of things, see Oksala (2007).

Clarification of purpose: Foucauldian sapience in tourism studies

In seeking to clarify how Foucault's ideas on the governmentality of things may be frequently and readily applied to the settings and the contestations of tourism, the purpose of this first of the two bedfellow chapters (on the Foucauldian analysis of empowerment, sovereignty and the technologies of government) is to acquaint those tourism studies scholars who consider themselves to be Foucault-raw with a large mix of Foucauldian conceptual approaches to *governmentality*, to *normalization*, to *subjectivity* and all. Hence, the end product of the two cousin chapters on Foucauldian notions of dominance and suppression is the generation of a short working glossary of Foucauldian concepts (see Appendix), which are first introduced in general terms, and then further expounded upon in tourism research contexts, *ipso facto*. There may indeed be a number of Foucauldian informed studies of the governance of things in tourism studies (per se) already, e.g.:

- The mammoth study of Hollinshead (1993, *The truth about Texas: A naturalistic study of the construction of heritage*. Collage Station, Texas. Texas A&M University [Department of R.P.T.S.]. Unpublished doctoral dissertation) into the state fabrication of 'decent Lone Star State citizens' via the 'wilful nostalgia' discourse and the will-to-truth praxis of governing heritage tourism in Texas;
- The examination of Thomas (1994) of the complex cultural processes involved in the colonial representation of travel notably in the Solomon Islands and across the wide Pacific;
- The joint Foucault-informed and Gramsci-inspired inspection of McKay (1994) on the

manipulation of dominant registers of cultural identity in Nova Scotia;

- The critique of Lidchi (1997) on the discursive formations which undersuspectingly constitute distant indigenous populations as 'other';
- The commentary of Philips (1999) on the development of theme parks as bounded space.

However, each of these deep scrutinies assumes that the reader has already become reasonably well versed in the ABCs of Foucault (i.e. perhaps in the **A**lternities, in the **B**io-politics and in the **C**anguilhem-tendencies [Canguilhem, 1988; Eribon, 1991, pp. 101–105 and 142–143] of Foucault's mining of normalization and naturalization). None of these tourism studies investigators takes time off to break the reader gently into Foucault's thinking on, for instance, *epistemes* (see Table 4.1 in Chapter 4 for some critical observations on the Foucauldian term 'episteme'), into his mapping of juridical sovereignty or into his tracing of the micro-power play of dominance, which may exist to frustrate change, to legitimize a currently altered social behaviour or to elevate a currently ostracized view on the world. All of these authors (Hollinshead/Thomas/McKay/Lidchi/Philips) tend to assume that the reader no longer wears conceptual Foucauldian 'L' plates.

In providing the contextualized glossary, the goal of the two chapters is to provide a conceptual vocabulary that can help a larger proportion of tourism studies researchers *think differently* about the contestation which they themselves inquire into in tourism/travel settings, for the *sine qua non* of Foucauldian insight is the very effort to resist that (whatever it may be) which is *seemingly/already evident* in order to see not only beyond 'the obvious facts', but to ruminate on how those particular perspectives became 'facts' and 'obvious understandings' within that setting, in that context or at that moment. Thus, Foucault is readily labelled as 'The Great Subversive'! Above all, he is the social theorist cum cultural critic cum creative historian who makes us recognize how we have been mainstreamed or disciplined in so many unsuspected and undersuspected ways as

we work within our institutions, as we think within our fields and domains and as we inhabit our local/regional/national customs.

Anyhow, by setting the scene on governmentality and normalization, this chapter offers a primer to help demystify The Great Enigmatic Thinker (i.e. Foucault) (Eribon, 1991, p. x) – that is, it seeks to critique Foucault as an original but difficult-to-grasp thinker whose apparently relativist and apparently irrealist work has been misunderstood, misquoted and misrepresented to epic proportions (Prado, 2000, p. viii). We know that (in populist across-the-community humanism) the work of George Orwell heads the lists of works that people lie about having read (at least in the UK, anyway [Palmer, 2009]). Given Prado's (2000) condemnation of the volume of the velocity of misapplications of Foucauldian thought, one wonders – in supposedly refined across-the-academy social science – whether the work of Michel Foucault tops the list of works that academicians lie about having read!

With this clarificatory mission in mind, hopefully the conceptualities aired in the glossary accompanying Chapter 4 (see Appendix) can help encourage something of a new wave of policy analysts, political scientists and power monitors to re-energize tourism studies scholarships and thereby begin to satisfy Messrs Matthews, Richter, Hall *et al.* Hopefully then, the field can gain or develop a much fuller body of inquiry inspecting not only how tourism mediates, disciplines and limits the geopolitics of the world, but how (reflexively) tourism studies scholars themselves have indeed mediated, disciplined and limited that accumulated knowing. Yet in so doing, it is not the function of this pair of glossarial chapters to issue forth a whole new regime of adamant Foucauldian orthodoxies: it is – to already repeat the point – the function of the two chapters in tandem to help readers help themselves by cultivating the capacity to see through different lenses what is governed in and through tourism (and through tourism studies!) disparately/dissimilarly/diversely. After all, as Foucault is rumoured to have said, 'when one has won or developed an interpretation, there [sadly] interpretation [itself] ends'!

Focus: Foucault and Endless/ Repeated Play of Dominations

One Thousand Foucaults Reduced to Six

Before a breakdown is given as to the composition of the glossary for Chapter 4 (see Appendix), perhaps it is advisable to provide a few paragraphs giving a fuller panoramic picture of Foucault's catalytic contribution to understanding about governance/governmentality and thereby to the possibilities for a *transformation* in the local/contextual order of things, where 'order of things' is a noted Foucauldian term in and of itself (Foucault, 1973; see Prado, 2000, pp. 21–22). This is never an easy task, when dealing with an individual philosopher or thinker who 'wore masks and . . . was always changing them' (Dumézil on Foucault, in Eribon, 1991, p. xi): that is, for an intellectual who (after Char) was fond of developing 'legitimate strangeness' (Eribon, 1991, p. x). The effort to get to grips with Foucauldian thought faces the immediate difficulty that there were 'several Foucaults – a thousand [different] Foucaults' (Eribon, cited in Prado, 2000, p. 13). Thus, for the sake of introductory simplicity (with all of its hazards!) the following six assessments of Miller may be useful to novitiate venturers into Foucauldian territory of domination and subjugation through the governmentality of things. To Miller (1993), as further slenderized by Prado (2000), Foucault's opus on the normalization/naturalization of things raises questions about matters '1' to '6' below:

1. The reach of power (i.e. of the effectivity of agency, how one is or things are disciplined/normalized institutionally).
2. The limits of knowledge (i.e. of the institutional range of particular power-knowledge formations and notably (for this chapter) what is dominant and what is subjugated, and what possibilities exist for change/transformation where the current/epistemic order of things is significantly altered).
3. The origins of moral responsibility (i.e. especially for the self-exercising 'agency' and/or self-exercising 'power-knowledge').
4. The foundations of modern government (i.e. how the governmentality of this or that came to be that way now).

5. The character of historical inquiry (i.e. how things are always potentially subjected to an endless and repeated play of old and new dominations). In this respect, and at the macro-social level, Foucault *does not expect that any change or transformation can ever catalyse a blissful/wonderful/brilliant future world free of domination*. Following a particular change or supposed transformation, and at the macro-social level, all that can ever transmogrify is in fact rule by a new mix of dominances, where a new panoply of subjugation/suppression/silences are then felt or are then experienced 'there'.

6. The nature of personal identity (i.e. the quality of one's life as an agent of the exercise of power-knowledge – and its petty dominations – and how it ought fundamentally be seen as a 'work of art'). Here, Foucault does indeed suggest – happily for the readers of this book! – that a or the reflexive self can indeed learn to cultivate the act of transforming oneself as one becomes more alert to the play of dominations that one is caught up in.

Given that rather hasty and simplistic reduction of the multifaceted and multilevel work of Foucault to a dangerously few lines of explanation, a number of important caveats should conceivably be added to help clarify the above matters '1' to '6'.

First, *Foucault tended to probe the manner in which individuals in groups/institutions/practices (and hence governances, governmentality, governments) were 'produced' – and also, significantly, helped further 'produce themselves' – as norm-directed individuals*. Thus Foucault was not so much concerned with the force used to redress wrongs, for (to repeat the point) he conceivably saw no possibility for a fully cleansed and thoroughly corrected world ahead. Foucault's concern (as the archaeological and genealogical metaphors previously mentioned imply) was predominantly with how things have come to be ruled and thereby by how they are governed now in that light. In repeatedly seeking to generate historicities of the present, he sought to highlight 'the unrecognized' and 'the under-recognized' in everyday institutional talk and in everyday institutional action. Ergo – for this book on change and transformation – the reflexive Foucauldian place-making individual should (in order to

transform lived or experienced possibility) learn to identify and situate the complicities by and through which he/she has helped the facilitation, the efficient subjugation and the effective control of the order of things in the given institutionalized arena – or rather in the making of place and the shaping of place through tourism/tourism studies.

Second, Foucault tended to inspect the reciprocal tensions that exist between competing things, between competing knowledges or between competing effects or wills which contest to normalize the world. He thus delved into the ways in which institutionalized individuals came to be constituted as servants of that ongoing normalization (i.e. as agents of a ruling vision of normalcy). Foucault was not so much concerned with *de jure* 'law', but with 'the totality of juxtapositions' that applied within and around a given or found institution (i.e. within the throbbing multiplicity of its dynamic and fluid force relations – that is, within its discourses, desires, defaults and deeds).

Third, Foucault tended to inspect the above *total structure of 'force field actions' upon other actions*. Thus, Foucault was not so much concerned with what an individual did to persuade other individuals via any strictly conscious act of compelled command or via any decided act of promotion or propaganda, but rather what that individual might do under a or the mask of cumulative actions in the existing 'comportment-conditioning' environment – notably where undersuspected discursive acts were enhanced or deepened in effect by undersuspected matching acts of praxis (practical everyday action).

Fourth, Foucault tended to scrutinize the quiet and cumulative authority of regulatory disciplinary techniques by and through which discursive formations (and 'learnt' practices) prescribed things in piecemeal (additive) fashion. Thus, Foucault was not so much concerned with what the particular up-front 'law', 'rule' or 'truth' was (in terms of its formal veracity) – for, to him, there was no discourse-independent 'truth', of course – but what the power/knowledge relations had 'resultantly and blindly' created or produced at the historical moment or institutional milieu in question.

Finally, Foucault tended to vet how all of the above 'force field relations' and 'actions

upon other actions' generated *expert manufactured knowledge* about the order of things in that setting or context or at that moment. Thus Foucault was not so much concerned with the verifiable content of the facts that institutions, disciplines or fields (and their in-the-van specialists, savants and experts) had formally qualified in, but what that institution's cumulative will-to-truth, or its additive will-to-knowledge, had assumed to be natural and had thereby further manufactured/fabricated/normalized as a solid/fixed/located 'artefact'.

Foucault and the transformation of individuals

At this juncture, given the trajectories of this book, it is important to clarify what Foucault's insights on the normalization/naturalization of things mean vis-à-vis the possibility for *the transformation of individuals*. Perhaps this is done in a simple but effective manner by translating the aforementioned six habitual Foucauldian orientations ('1' to '6' above, as distilled from the work of Miller, 1993):

1. The reach of power: Foucault's discernments on networks and apparatuses of power often come as a jolt to many who may not have previously apprehended how they (as individuals) are ordinarily caught up in the ongoing exercise of various 'quiet' or 'undersuspected' plays of power – that is, in the everyday 'capillary' circulation of arbitrary (yet 'political') knowledges and received (yet 'political') truths that they themselves have not previously questioned and assumed to be 'so'. If one is to substantively transform oneself via Foucauldian light, one first needs to recognize one's likely banal and regular role in bolstering/furthering communication about (and the life of) various mandated or coerced understandings about the world.

2. The limits of knowledge: Foucault's discernments on the dominances and the subjugation that ordinarily course through each institution/each discipline/each field encourage members of those said institutions/disciplines/fields to become vigilant about what might lie beyond the limits of sanctioned knowledge – that is, in terms of how they themselves were silencing excluded population X, suppressing

excluded place Y or shutting out excluded interpretation Z. If one is to substantively transform oneself via Foucauldian light, one must learn to appreciate the role one probably/inevitably already plays, institutionally, in such exclusionary matters of the denial, deprivation and disenfranchisement of particular 'others'.

3. The origins of moral responsibility: Foucault's discernments on self-exercised 'morals' can help individuals cultivate a new sense of themselves as active agents. The Foucauldian cultivation of one's institutional job and/or one's fulfilment in life as a *work of art* is not necessarily a selfish matter (Schulzke, 2009, p. 187). If one is to substantively transform oneself via Foucauldian light, one ought to recognize that much of the necessary regard for moral responsibility involves self-constraint in the use of expertise for or over others. To Foucault, all expertise is 'dangerous' particularly when and where it might conceivably/unknowingly squash even the very possibility of other interpretations. To Foucault, when an interpretation (most notably an expert interpretation!) is reached, there dies the art of interpretation (Sharpe, 2005, p. 116).

4. The foundations of modern government: Foucault's discernments on the history of the present day governmentality of things instructs that in the modern age (i.e. roughly after the 19th century), power is no longer something that is always/inherently/solely consanguine with the government, *ipso facto*. While in previous centuries (to Foucault) 'power' may have predominantly been agnate with 'the state', power has become (by modern times) multiple and diffuse and thus relational rather than remaining something that has a singular, scarce or manifest hearth. The reader will find related discussions in the vast literature on globalization, which speaks to the 'unbundling of the nation-state' as the ultimate container of power or identity-allegiance, as well as in the vast oeuvre of Bauman (in, for instance, Bauman, 2000) on the present condition of 'liquid modernity' (See Hollinshead *et al.* (2014) for an adaptation of some of Bauman's ideas on liquid modernity to tourism studies/tourism management). To Foucault, then, 'power' (in modern times) is something that lacks essence, *and nobody holds it exclusively/perpetually*. If one is to substantively transform oneself via Foucauldian light,

then one ought conceivably to support the view that (in the modern age) there is no monotonous finality to the ways in which things are governed (May, 2005, p. 72), for new forms of surveillance, new types of normalization and new sorts of power are emerging at pace (May, 2005, p. 72). Since the world is found to be increasingly relational in its interpretations, things can indeed be changed fast! Those working in tourism encounter such artefacts of globalization daily.

5. The character of historical inquiry: Foucault's discernments on the so-called history of the present (and the epistemological break that has occurred to bring about a rejection of the received/unitary truths of the Enlightenment) instructs that the pull towards homogenous understandings of and about the world is now strongly resisted in the discourse and praxis of today (Hall, 1993). Many critical theorists – particularly Marxists (BBC, 2013) – are concerned that Foucault does not offer a better and more optimistic view of the world ahead, the world to be struggled for and attained. But, if one is to transform oneself via Foucauldian light, the adoption of a Foucauldian aesthetic of existence is not axiomatically an engagement in pessimism (May, 2005, p. 67). Things can be changed in and about the world: they just will never again be told via a single story (May, 2005, p. 69, drawing from the art critic, John Berger). On an individual level, this can actually be liberating, as the self as a single coherent entity can also be seen as a conceptual product of historical tradition (in particular, the Judeo-Christian-Islamic religious tradition, which has cast the self strictly as coterminous with an immortal soul existing in relation with its creator, thus leaving little space for more multitudinous notions of identity). Myriad transformational possibilities open for the self when it realizes that it, too, cannot be imagined as a singular entity with a singular story.

6. The nature of personal identity: Foucault's discernments on the political gains that can accrue from the conscious practice of self-freedom is a call (when an important/incremental advancement or transformation is sought) to invest not exclusively in the power of intellectualism or in the authority of scientific discourse, but in the simulative properties of the reflexive and aware 'self' (Hughes, 2010). This

Foucauldian concern for what could be called 'emotional intelligence' (or perhaps 'emotional freedom') constitutes the effort to become more open to other influences outside of oneself, but the effort requires greater awareness of 'the self' than of 'the other', *per se*. If one is to substantively transform oneself via Foucauldian light, one is therefore caught up in the Nietzschean effort 'to ethically create ourselves [i.e., one-self]' (Beaulieu, 2005, p. 114). This effort comprises the transformative endeavour to replace the traditional view of morality with a creative/contemplative aesthetics where the individual learns to examine who he/she is (in the present) and how he/she has come to be that way. Hence, this Foucauldian aesthetics is no 'canon' in terms of 'normal' moral (or ethical practices), but rather constitutes a more 'spiritual' exercise when the liberated self (i.e. the individual who is more self-aware of his/her participation in ongoing regimes of discourse and praxis) learns how to imagine new alternative sets of possibilities for living (May, 2005, p. 76). Put another way, if one is to substantively transform oneself via Foucauldian light, one learns to develop one's autonomous capacity for interactivity, to think interactively and to live interactively, regulating one's conduct in terms of both technologies of governance and cultivated technologies of the self (Lemke, 2000, pp. 2–4). In this Foucauldian light, governmentality is a highly mobile thing and exists on a continuum extending 'to the self' (Lemke, 2000, p. 12); hence, the individual acting to transform himself/herself is potentially a matter of governmentality and of imaginative, germinal acts in the ideative pregnant praxis of self-coercion.

Such is Foucault's opus into the learned 'talk' of groups and practices: such is Foucault's longitudinal vigilance of and over the practical 'acts' and in-field 'doings' of groups, associations and disciplines. But the novitiate reader should always learn to appreciate and remember that *the philosophical Foucault* of the 1950s, in approaching these governmentalities, was considerably different from *the archaeological Foucault* of the 1960s and *the genealogical Foucault* of the 1970s, who mongered his trade in the historical mapping of the normalization/naturalization of things, and who was in turn considerably different from *the ethical Foucault* of the

1980s (Prado, 2000: 23). Indeed, while Foucault appears to be not so much interested in how an institution should transform itself to bring on a better/ameliorated/mended world, he became increasingly interested in how the given individual should cultivate his or her own transformative practices of the self. Such practices should be cultivated to help that individual free himself/herself of 'his-self'/'her-self', and so to Foucault, matters of ethics were matters of creative activity that involved the alert and aware individual training or transforming 'one-self by oneself' (Oksala, 2007, p. 96; emphasis added). In this regard, Foucault understood that individuals are not only incarcerated within (and internalize) the institutional/organizational exercises of discourse and praxis beyond these settings and contexts (Mitchman, 2009). They not only, therefore, internalize the management/administrative/networking imperatives of these borders in the field of concern for these institutions/organizations, but also can readily uphold those values and assumptions in their own selves beyond those arenas and realms. Where such 'power' (or rather read *power-knowledge* in Foucauldian terms) is strong, the individual is poor/weak/slow at *thinking otherwise*. In Foucault's judgement, the individual therefore needs an acute/cultivated/developed *rapport à soi* (self-rapport) in order to conceive of new/different/other ways of being (Mitchman, 2009). If the individual is to play a potent part in transforming the world along lines of understanding inheritances that transgress these institutional/organizational games of truth, then that process obliges the individual to first disassemble himself/herself, or rather to engage in conscious processes of self-transformation. While Heidegger's philosophical project to recognize and construct other/different/anti-worlds is based on experiences of 'being', Foucault's equivalent effort to identify and build anti-worlds is based on experiences of and about 'power' (*power-knowledge*) (Mitchman, 2009).

Thus, towards the end of his lifetime of inspection of rule and governmentality, Foucault came to realize that he had perhaps dwelt too much on matters of 'dominance' and 'power', and his late works tended to investigate not so much how power-knowledge networks constituted 'subjects' or individuals, but how effective that subject's own role had been in composing/

enabling/limiting himself or herself. Foucault's ethical practices of the self thus may be seen to be an *aesthetics of existence* where each person's life becomes a *work of art* (Foucault, 1998). Interestingly, in terms of self-transformation, Foucault stated that the purpose of each book he wrote was not so much to augment his past works, but to actively replace them – that is to more or less kill them off, and move on from 'old thinking'. He did not wish to transform his old ideas with or by each new book; rather, he sought to demote, deplume or dismiss them. In this regard, Rayner (2007, p. 60) maintains that Foucault does not seek to produce 'demonstration books' (which target a veridical truth of some kind) but 'experience books' (which help the reader take on radical outlooks on the history of truth and upon his/her own life and institutional experiences).

The problem in trying to make firm determinations of what Foucault decidedly or finally thought is that he died before he had completed his intended summary or 'clarifying' work: he never pulled all of the conceptual strings of his provocative mix of challenges to orthodoxy together. His impressive interdisciplinary work and his multi-cited critique of habitual forms of belief and practice remain an array of distinguished but different-in-subtle-ways contributions to political thought (Moss, 1998). Perhaps if he had died at 67, 77 or 87 (rather than at 57) he would have nicely and neatly unified all the poles of his inspections of power-knowledge coherently for us? No, probably not! If Foucault had lived another 10, 20 or 30 years, he would have delightedly found another 1000 masks to wear (after Eribon, 1991, pp. 318/319)! Or he might have just settled down upon his pet 1980s interests in 'the philosophical life' – i.e. in the personal aesthetics of life – and not bothered to coherently tidy up his old ideas on archaeology and genealogy and his latest ideas on self-culture (and *the reflexive self*). He is alleged to have mused to academics in California in his later years about the need to admit (or stylize) one's life in terms of what one does and is: '[In] our society, art has become something which is related only to objects and not to individuals . . . But couldn't everyone's life become a *work of art*?' (Dreyfus and Rabinow, 1982, p. 23; emphasis added).

And there we have it. There we have Foucault's codicil for those who work in tourism/

tourism studies to internalize: recognize that your work in tourism on peoples/places/pasts/the present is itself a *work of art* – that is, it is or could/should be seen as a serious life-course endeavour that contributes to the way the world 'is seen', the way the world 'is governed' and the way the world 'produces'. While the early Foucault (of his periods prying into the archaeology and the genealogy of things) might have drawn most attention to matters of repression as encapsulated within the dominance of some forms of discourse and praxis over other forms of talk, and deed, his later work on the reflexive self decidedly draws attention to matters of stimulation and is encapsulated within the capacity of individuals to engage in *self-disclosure*. Hence, the 'technologies of domination' uncovered in Foucault's early work refer to the ways in which individuals are submitted to (and submit themselves to) particular forms of domination (see Foucault in Martin *et al.*, 1988, p. 18). But Foucault's later work tends to privilege instead certain refreshing/corrective animated technologies of the self-generating new 'techniques of self-revelation' and a proliferation of new (non-dominant/different/transformed) ways of knowing (Foucault in Martin *et al.*, 1988, p. 18). Consonantly, the maturing Foucauldian *hermeneutic of the self* (Hughes, 2010, p. 49) of his later writings is an excitation or tonic for new/fresh/transformed ways of seeing things. It promotes and provokes a re-ordering of what is visible and invisible in the world where Foucault is not just interested in what is *proscribed* (under matters of dominance and subjugation) and what is permitted (under the internalization by individuals of those proscriptions), but of what is *possibled* (i.e. made possible as the individual learns how to harness his/her *rapport à soi* and transcend both those proscriptions and permits/permitivities). Although Foucault did not use such terminology himself, one could crudely suggest that Foucault's later writing on the need for 'individuals' to cultivate their own creative 'art of existence' (or 'ethics of existence'; Beaulieu, 2005, p. 113) is tantamount to the aware and confident development of a or the *positive self*. For an interesting (and in-part Foucault-inspired) reading on 'the positive' vis-à-vis 'the negative' self, see Pearce (undated: pers. coll.) on the need for distinctive 'culture studies' understandings for the Caribbean.

The targets of Foucauldian scrutiny in tourism studies

If Foucauldian thought is to be of some sort of generative value in helping catabolize the quantity and quality of research into the exercise of policy, politics or productivity in tourism, it is important to clarify how his endeavours to gauge (i) the reach of 'power'; (ii) the limits of 'knowledge'; (iii) the origins of moral responsibility; (iv) the foundations of modern government; (v) the character of historical inquiry; and (vi) the nature of personal identity may be suitably positioned in tourism studies. To that end, a list of fitting *critical targets* is now supplied to indicate how Foucauldian inspections of the structures of power-knowledge and of the relations of truth can fruitfully be used. The following six 'target' areas of Foucauldian governmentality are not offered to fit in any respectively neat and exact fashion to the above '1' to '6' areas of Foucauldian thought, though: they are merely offered as general illustrations of Foucauldian conceptuality as a prompt, or as a visualizing resource, in terms of who is conceivably doing what to whom through tourism (or tourism studies research!) in the given context, based upon understandings of why/how that 'who' has internalized that particular form of 'what-ing'.

Exemplar 1: Tourism and surveillance

Foucauldian conceptuality generally asks for a shift of focus from power itself as the enforcement of laws towards power-knowledge as the surveillance of things. Ergo, in tourism studies, when destinations or attractions become essentialized under a singular vision or under singular visions, it is not only of significance to study how these 'places' become so (apparently) essentialized, but also how tourism brands, development corporations and travel programme managers might have become complicit (or compliant!) themselves in those very acts of normalization without always being aware of their highly collective or highly coerced role. Accordingly, in terms of the transformation of things, Foucault appears to be not so much interested in how a new sought transformation might be achieved, but how individuals acting within a group or institution might relate to a new hegemony, an arriviste habitus or a fresh

dividing practice that had emerged, and whether that transformation was sufficient itself to constitute an episteme (i.e. a period of history that evolves around specific worldviews/specific discourses/specific practices) (Danaher *et al.*, 2000, p. 16–21) or not.

Exemplar 2: Tourism and truth

Foucauldian conceptuality is inclined to regard 'truth' not as 'how properly things are or properly ought to be veridically' but as the highest-order value (i.e. the most prevalent *de facto* value) that occurs in a given practice or set of practices. Ergo, in tourism studies, investigators might seek to search not so much for the exact essence of a projected people, place or past in corrective contrast to the articulated essence that is in vogue within the representational activity of tourism/travel, but for the manner in which that believed or normalized essence has in fact come to be interpreted in the way it has. Thus, Foucauldian inquiry might seek to uncover whether there has or has not been continuity in those acts of essentialism there in that setting/in that institution/in that era, whether the projectivity of place has been 'haphazard' or not and whether current projections of peoples/places/pasts today contain within them the reinterpretation of predecessors' interpretations (viz. where the contemporary 'truth' has over time become the incremental product of 'an ancient proliferation of errors' (Foucault, cited in Prado, 2000, p. 35). Accordingly, in terms of possibilities of the transformation of things, Foucauldian lines of inquiry are inclined to inspect the local institutional order of things (viz. the combined knowledges, discourses and practices within an episteme), which work in tandem to make some truths possible and explicable but other truths not only unsayable but unthinkable. Hence, to Foucault, truths do not tend to occur naturally, but are 'produced' to advantage/support/valorize a given social group. To Foucault, all social and institutional activities may be seen to be the struggle for supremacy between different sections of society. And in this light (to Foucault) subjectivity is not the commonly held sweet reason that identity is an exhibited truth or the outcome of our conscious, self-directing self or selves, but is instead a composition produced through the interplay of

dominant institutional discourses, ideologies and practices. Foucault thereby did not peddle the view that individuals could ever attain much by consciously equipping themselves with a new self-governed identity: all identities we create through policies of power and knowledge, and the subjectivation of individuals (and also of places) operate through the internalization of these institutional/disciplinary/field norms (or held 'truths'). Individuals in shaping themselves – and in shaping others – modify their behaviours and their statements (projections) with regard to 'the normal' (i.e. the normalized). Such is *the coercive power of subjectivation* (subject making) (see Foucault's 'The Ethics of Care for the Self as a Practice of Freedom' in Rabinow, 1998, pp. 281–201).

To Foucault, then, truth is not just an arcane matter of philosophical reflection. As Table 3.1 suggests, Foucauldian 'truth' is something that can have its own 'agency', that is, its own *non-human agency* life force. As Table 3.1 proposes – drawn from Hollinshead's (1993, *The truth about Texas: A naturalistic study of the construction of heritage*. Collage Station, Texas. Texas A&M University [Department of R.P.T.S.]. Unpublished doctoral dissertation) study of the normalized construction of heritage in Texas – 'truth' (to Foucault) can act as a coercive regime of understanding that circulates through the capillary networks and thereby via the ordinary relations of the institution (i.e. through its *dispositif* [its apparatus]). So, in tourism studies, there is indeed held/circulating truth (or rather, there are held/circulating 'truths') about things.

In this light, normalized truth may be found in tourism (or in tourism studies), within an immense range of 'sites' and 'locales of action'. Researchers could have fruitfully deployed Foucauldian inspections of truth in the following (amongst other) exemplar settings.

EXEMPLAR 2.1: TRUTH CIRCULATION AND THE NORMALIZATION OF A PLACE On research into the authenticity of Mark Twain's connections with Hannibal, Missouri (see Powers, 1986, on the collective 'institutional' or 'bandwagon' entrepreneurial parody of the past of the town of Hannibal). In this important work, Powers shows how Hannibal was transformed not so much carefully through the self-governing efforts of local individuals forging a new identity for the historic township, but through the runaway and complicitous and almost uncontrolled bombast of the promotional agencies in tourism there, whose institutional predilections for world-beating grandiloquence in discourse and for world-beating magniloquence in practice was almost unbounded. Here, one might suggest that Foucault would have relished applying his will-to-power notions of the inflected bombast that characterized what one could call the will-to-elevation of Hannibal as a lead tourism drawcard or destination.

EXEMPLAR 2.2: TRUTH CIRCULATION AND THE NATURALIZATION OF A PLACE On research into the important aspects of Scottishness that powerbrokers in heritage feel 'should' form the bed-rock promotion (i.e. the branding of Scotland;

Table 3.1. Foucault's assertions about truth: 'Propositions' on the political economy of truth. (Adapted from Foucault as interviewed by Alessandros Fontano and Pasquale Pasquino as translated by Paul Patton and Meaghan Morris; Morris and Patton, 1979, p. 47. This table was originally published in Hollinshead, 1993, *The truth about Texas: A naturalistic study of the construction of heritage*. Collage Station, Texas. Texas A&M University [Department of R.P.T.S.]. Unpublished doctoral dissertation.)

Truth is the ensemble of ordered procedures by which groups/institutions/societies produce, regulate, distribute, circulate and take action upon articulated statements

Truth is linked to a regime of truth, which is a circular system consisting of both the set of relations of power that produce and sustain it, and the effects of power that induces and redirects it

Truth is present everywhere: the regime of truth functions as the ideological, the super-structural and the conditioning formative force behind, for instance, both capitalism and socialism

Truth is not just a realm of consciousness: it also acts as an institution, which produces and exists as a political economy in its own right

Truth is a system of power, which generates social, economic, cultural and other forms of hegemony

see McCrone *et al.*, 1995) on 'Scottish stereotypes'. Here one might suggest that Foucault would have had a field day inspecting how some visions of Scottishness were normalized and others unconsciously written out over time, as some views of proper nationhood would be rendered sovereign (and even juridical), while others were additively suppressed.

EXEMPLAR 2.3: TRUTH CIRCULATION AND THE ESSENTIALISM OF A PAST On research into the ways in which corporate America collectively and almost systematically appropriates the 'Indian' other – that is, assumes quiet and ill-recognized responsibility for projection of the North American Indian other. (For an interpretation of such an appropriation of culture and history, see Sardar, 1998, on Disney's imperial institutional remodelling of 'Pocohontas'.) Here, one might suggest that the faithful or reverential Foucauldian analyst would wish to explore how, even today, indigenous populations in North America have to struggle against the many sorts of Foucauldian micro-power (Danaher *et al.*, 2000, p. 117) that bindingly shape the ways in which North American 'Indians' are understood and subjectified in tourism and through other so-called creative industries.

To repeat the point, while none of the authors of the works noted in the exemplars above explicitly utilized Foucauldian notions of 'truth', Foucault's concept of governing truth (being an ensemble of ordered procedures, a circulatory system, a conditioning formative force, an acting realm of consciousness and generative hegemony [as given in Table 3.1]) could all be readily deployed to examine the above field of tourism-scripted representations and tourism-scripted transformations.

Exemplar 3: Tourism and fabrication

Foucauldian conceptuality seeks to uncover not only how a thing is talked about and treated, but how that subject making (i.e. that manufactured or fabricated subject making) came about over time in the found institutional setting or within the encountered organizational disciplinary or field context. Ergo, in tourism studies, a projected 'people', 'place' or 'past' would tend to be regarded not so much as something that existed in any clearly knowable or definable

form prior to discourse, but as a product of the play of the particular 'talk' and 'deeds' there. In this light, the destinations of tourism are the manifestation of thinking/known/speaking activity 'there': they are 'made subjects', something that Kirshenblatt-Gimblett's (1998) geopolitical and performative concepts of the collaborative 'madness' and 'hereness' of places gets very close to, albeit without there being any ultra-strong or pointedly specific acknowledgement of Foucauldian insights in the work of Kirshenblatt-Gimblett. Both Foucault (on general matters) and Kirshenblatt-Gimblett (on exhibits in tourism and heritage arenas *per se*), subscribe to the view that there can be no correct 'viewpoint' or 'position' from or at which a 'people', a 'place' or a 'past' can be accurately accounted from. Both Foucault and Kirshenblatt-Gimblett could be said to be innate 'constructivists' (or if one prefers it, 'constructionists'/social constructionists'/social constructivists'; see Schwandt, 1994). Accordingly in tourism studies, what are the normative judgements (after Foucault) or the collaborative consciousness (after Kirshenblatt-Gimblett) that regulate how a destination has been historically known and/or is known? Where did the epistemic understandings change, as new 'truths' (i.e. new-held interpretations, fresh fabrications or emergent 'buried' understandings) rise to help transform a people, a past or a place through the industrial scriptive power of tourism?

Exemplar 4: Tourism and utterance

In his own investigative arenas in 'criminality' and 'sexuality', etc., Foucault's conceptuality on epistemic understanding tests for the relations that might exist between held outlooks (i.e. inlooks!), speakers and lived or experienced eras – that is, for the conditions of utterance that (in a particular setting or period) have and now 'regulate' how a thing is understood. Ergo, in tourism studies, an equivalent Foucauldian researcher/research team would tend to pry into the current and the past *economies of knowledge* (or games of truth) that were or are in vogue for a particular destination/myth/interpretation of culture or nature in order to assess when/where/how any sort of 'statement' control has been (or is) at work in favouring some

utterances and neglecting/suppressing/silencing others about that boundaried 'subject' (an undertaking also advocated by Tribe, 2006, who took tourism studies knowledge as the boundaried subject itself!). Accordingly, where the promotion and projection of a destination or place has changed, to what degree was that transformation *intentional* – and thereby an act of consciously scripted (non-Foucauldian) persuasion – and to what extent does it appear to evidence the disciplinary effects of the magisterial gaze and work within and through 'the quick coercions' of the industry's driving discourse and praxis?

Exemplar 5: Tourism and novel construal

Foucauldian conceptuality – especially under its genealogical form (Prado, 2000, p. 165) – constitutes 'a readiness to continually problematise established truths through [the] development of the alternative accounts of targeted facts, concepts, principles, canons, natures, institutions, methodological actions, and established practices'. Following Canguilhem (1978), it tends to inculcate an orientation towards *the governmentality of things*, which shows how received expert/disciplinary/scientific understanding does not much processually interpret data, but often precedes its very creation and collection in myriad disparate/contradictory/forceful ways. Accordingly, in tourism studies, a Foucault-inspired investigator would be inclined to inspect for those rival 'old' theories of and about (for instance) 'impact-mechanics'/'destination governance'/'resort-lifecycling', which have been overlooked or dismissed in mainstream circles, or for other 'alternative' registers of framing these very issues (Horne, 1992; Hollinshead, 2007) that have simply never been recognized/admitted/entertained in the field (read institutional domain, or aggregate *force field*). For instance, media studies/cultural studies has the extraordinarily rich collection of Shohat and Stam's *Unthinking Eurocentrism: Multiculturalism and the Media*, which has painstakingly unpacked much of the ethnocentric framing that has comprised 'the bad epistemic habits' of the global film industry (Labiana, cited as critic on the back cover of Shohat and Stam, 1994). In contrast, while

Echtner and Prasad (2003) have drawn attention to the (particularly colonialist) legacy of stereotypes, images and all other projections that have reified places through tourism and travel, tourism studies itself has no such longitudinal or latitudinal study of the ruling formations of colonialist discourse, of the governing imperial imaginary or of the normalizing 'tropes of tourism'. Tourism studies thereby remains a very youthful field in studies of governmentality in comparison to other domains of study of the place-performance industries (or the place-declarative industries . . . or the place-projective industries).

This chapter – the first of two bedfellow chapters on the possibilities of transformation of peoples, places, pasts and presents through tourism – has sought to show how Foucault's insights on dominant institutional discourse and on *what is thinkable and sayable within particular organizations/collective bodies/disciplines* at a point in time is of immense critical and creative value to those who work in tourism and/or tourism studies. In the companion chapter (by Hollinshead, Caton and Ivanova) an attempt is made to further advance understanding of these important matters of discursive knowledge (and the political economy of 'truth', doxa or held truths) by the provision of a glossary on 'the governmentality of things' where Foucauldian terms and concepts, such as capillary action, disciplinary mechanisms and juridical space are translated to tourism settings (see Appendix). To restate the point, the aim in providing the two chapters in tandem is to help those who work in the field of tourism/tourism studies know what might conceivably happen in their own management/development (or research) operational contexts when they seek to beneficially transform things by identifying and removing one particular dominant projection/representation/vision of that local world and thereby replace it with a seemingly better/improved/corrected one. Such are Foucault's views on the ordinary aesthetics of existence, and the zero sum games we are all involved in within our respective institutional contexts. Neither tourism nor tourism studies can be free of these petty but accumulative everyday/banal and competing/contesting *agentive acts of normalcy*.

References

- Ayikoru, M. and Tribe, J. (2007) Enhancing the interpretative and critical approaches to tourism education enquiry through a discursive analysis. In: Ateljevic, I., Pritchard, A. and Morgan, N. (eds) *The Critical Turn in Tourism Studies: Innovative Research Methodologies*. Elsevier, Amsterdam, pp. 279–292.
- Bauman, Z. (2000) *Liquid Modernity*. Polity, Cambridge.
- BBC (British Broadcasting Corporation) (2013) *Thinking Aloud: Foucault*: Radio 4 Broadcast. 21 August.
- Beaulieu, A. (2005) Reviewer: Timothy O'Leary: 'Foucault and the art of ethics'. *Foucault Studies* 3, 113–116.
- Bender, B. and Winer, M. (eds) (2001) *Contested Landscapes: Movement, Exile and Place*. Berg, Oxford.
- Buck, E. (1993) *Paradise Remade: The Politics of Culture and History in Hawai'i*. Temple University Press, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.
- Burchell, G., Gordon, C. and Miller, P. (eds) (1991) *The Foucault Effect: Studies in Governmentality*. University of Chicago Press, Chicago, Illinois.
- Canguilhem, G. (1978) *The Normal and the Pathological*. Trans. Carolyn Fawcett. Zone Books, New York.
- Canguilhem, G. (1988) *Ideology and Rationality in the History of the life Sciences*. Trans. A. Goldhammer. MIT Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts.
- Caton, K. (2013) The risky business of understanding: Philosophical hermeneutics and the knowing subject in worldmaking. *Tourism Analysis* 18(3), 341–351.
- Cheong, S. and Miller, M. (2000) Power and tourism: A Foucauldian observation. *Annals of Tourism Research* 27(2), 271–290.
- Church, A. and Coles, T. (eds) (2006) *Tourism, Power and Space*. Routledge, London.
- Coles, T., Hall, C. and Duval, D. (2006) Tourism and postdisciplinary enquiry. *Current Issues in Tourism* 9(4/5), 293–319.
- Crick, M. (1989) Representations of sun, sex, sights, savings and servility: International tourism in the social sciences. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 18, 307–344.
- Danaher, G., Schirato, T. and Webb, J. (2000) *Understanding Foucault*. Sage, London.
- Davidson, A. (1994) Ethics and aesthetics: Foucault, the history of ethics and ancient thought. In: Gutting, G. (ed.) *The Cambridge Campaign to Foucault*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, pp. 115–149.
- Dean, M. (2010) *Governmentality: Power and Rule in Modern Society*. Sage, Los Angeles, California.
- Dreyfus, H. and Rabinow, P. (1982) *Michel Foucault: Beyond Structuralism and Hermeneutics*. Chicago University Press, Chicago, Illinois (US edition).
- Dreyfus, H. and Rabinow, P. (1986) *Michel Foucault: Beyond Structuralism and Hermeneutics*. Harvester Press, Brighton, UK.
- Echtner, C. and Prasad, P. (2003) The context of third world tourism marketing. *Annals of Tourism Research* 30(3), 660–668.
- Eribon, D. (1991) *Michel Foucault*. Trans. Betsy Wing. Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts.
- Forest, B., Johnson, J. and Till, K. (2004) Post-totalitarian national identity: Public memory in Germany and Russia. *Social and Cultural Geography* 5(3), 357–380.
- Foucault, M. (1973) *The Order of Things*. Vintage, New York.
- Foucault, M. (1998) *Aesthetics, Method and Epistemology: Essential Works of Foucault: 1954–1984*. Vol. 2 (ed. James Fabion). New Press, New York.
- Foucault, M., Martin, L. H., Gutman, H., and Hutton, P. H. (1988) *Technologies of the self: A seminar with Michel Foucault*. University of Massachusetts Press, Amherst, Massachusetts.
- Franklin, A. (2009) The sociology of tourism. In: Jamal, T. and Robinson, M. (eds) *The Sage Handbook of Tourism Studies*. Sage, Los Angeles, California, pp. 65–81.
- Franklin, A. and Crang, M. (2001) The trouble with tourism and travel theory. *Tourist Studies* 1(1), 5–22.
- Greenwood, D. (1989) Culture by the pound: An anthropological perspective on tourism as cultural commoditization. In: Smith, V. (ed.) *Hosts and Guests: The Anthropology of Tourism*. University of Pennsylvania Press, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, pp. 171–185.
- Gutting, G. (ed.) (1994) *The Cambridge Companion to Foucault*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Hall, C. (1994) *Tourism and Politics: Policy, Power, and Place*. Wiley and Sons, Chichester, UK.
- Hall, S. (1993) Cultural studies and its theatrical legacies. In: During, S. (ed.) *The Cultural Studies Reader*. Routledge, London, pp. 97–109.
- Hollinshead, K. (1999) Surveillance of the worlds of tourism: Foucault and the eye-of-power. *Tourism Management* 20, 7–23.

- Hollinshead, K. (2004) Tourism and new sense: Worldmaking and the enunciative value of tourism. In: Hall, C. and Tucker, H. (eds) *Tourism and Postcolonialism: Contested Discourse, Identities and Representations*. Routledge, London, pp. 25–42.
- Hollinshead, K. (2007) 'Worldmaking' and the transformation of place and culture: The enlargement of Meethan's analysis of tourism and global change. In: Ateljevic, I., Pritchard, A. and Morgan, N. (eds) *The Critical Turn in Tourism Studies: Innovative Research Methodologies*. Elsevier, Amsterdam, pp. 165–193.
- Hollinshead, K., Kuon, V. and Alajmi, M. (2015) Events in the liquid modern world: the call for fluid acumen in the presentation of peoples, places, pasts and presents. In: Moufakkir, O. and Pernecky, T. (eds) *Ideological, Social and Cultural Aspects of Events*. CAB International, Wallingford, UK, pp. 12–27.
- Horne, D. (1992) *The Intelligent Tourist*. Margaret Gee Holdings, McMahon's Point, Australia.
- Hughes, J. (2010) Emotional intelligence: Elias, Foucault, and the reflexive emotional self. *Foucault Studies* 8, 28–52.
- Jeong, S. and Santos, C. (2003) Cultural politics and contested place identity. *Annals of Tourism Research* 31, 640–656.
- Kirshenblatt-Gimblett, B. (1998) *Destination Culture: Tourism, Museums and Heritage*. University of California Press, Berkeley, California.
- Lanfant, M.F., Allcock, J.B. and Bruner, E.M. (eds) (1995) *International Tourism: Identity and Change*. Sage, London.
- Lemke, T. (2000) Foucault, governmentality and critique. Paper presented at the *Rethinking Marxism Conference, 21–24 September, University of Amherst, Amherst, Massachusetts*.
- Lidchi, H. (1997) The poetics and politics of exhibiting other cultures. In: Hall, S. (ed.) *Representation: Cultural Representations and Signifying Practices*. Sage, London, pp. 151–222.
- Lukes, S. (2005) *Power: A Radical View* (2nd edn). Macmillan, London.
- Matthews, H. and Richter, L. (1991) Political science and tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research* 10(4), 120–135.
- May, T. (2005) Foucault now? *Foucault Studies* 3, 65–76.
- McCrone D., Morris A. and Kiely R. (1995) *Scotland-the Brand: The Making of Scottish Heritage*. Edinburgh University Press, Edinburgh.
- McKay, I. (1994) *Quest for the Folk*. McGill and Queens University Press, Montreal.
- Meethan, K. (2001) *Tourism in Global Society: Place, Culture, Consumption*. Palgrave, Basingstoke, UK.
- Miller, J. (1993) *The Passion of Michael Foucault*. Doubleday, New York.
- Mitchman, A. (2009) Reviewer: Timothy Rayner: 'Foucault's philosophy and transformative experience'. *Foucault Studies* 6, 79–82.
- Morgan, N. and Pritchard, A. (1998) *Tourism, Promotion and Power: Creating Images, Creating Identities*. John Wiley, Chichester, UK.
- Morris, M. and Patton, P. (eds) (1979) *Michel Foucault: Power, Truth, Strategy*. Feral Publications, Sydney, Australia.
- Moss, J. (ed.) (1998) *The Later Foucault*. Sage, London.
- O'Farrell, C. (ed.) (1997) *Foucault: The Legacy*. Queensland University of Technology Press, Brisbane, Australia.
- Oksala, J. (2007) *How to Read Foucault*. Granta Books, London.
- Palmer, A. (2009) Incompetence will save us from Orwell's surveillance state. *Daily Telegraph*, 7 March, London.
- Pearce, M. (Pers. Coll.) *Caribbean Cultural Studies: What Specific Concepts, Theories or Approaches Can Comprise Caribbean Cultural Studies*. Available at: www.caribbeanculturalstudies.com/PDFs/essay.pdf (accessed 22 January 2015).
- Philips, D. (1999) Narrativised spaces: The function of story in the theme park. In: Crouch, D. (ed.) *Leisure/Tourism Geographies: Practices and Geographical Knowledge*. Routledge, London, pp. 91–108.
- Powers, R. (1986) *White Town Drowning*. Penguin, New York.
- Prado, C. (2000) *Starting with Foucault: An Introduction to Genealogy*. Westview Press, Oxford.
- Rabinow P. and Foucault, M. (1998) *Ethics: Subjectivity and Truth (Essential Works of Michel Foucault 1954–1984 v. 1)*. The New Press, New York.
- Rayner, T. (2007) *Foucault's Heidegger Philosophy and Transformative Experience*. Continuum, New York.
- Richter, L. (1983) Political science and tourism: A case of not so benign neglect. *Annals of Tourism Research* 10(3), 313–335.
- Rothman, H. (1998) *Devil's Bargains: Tourism in the Twentieth-Century American West*. University Press of Kansas, Lawrence, Kansas.

- Sardar, Z. (1998) *Postmodernism and its Other: The New Imperialism of Western Culture*. Pluto, London.
- Schulzke, M. (2009) Reviewer: Lysakes, J.: 'Emerson and self culture'. *Foucault Studies* 7, 185–188.
- Schwandt, T. (1994) Constructivist, interpretivist approaches to human inquiry. In: Denzin, N. and Lincoln, Y. (eds) *Handbook of Qualitative Research*. Sage, Thousand Oaks, California, pp. 118–137.
- Sharpe, M. (2005) "'Critique" as technology of the self'. *Foucault Studies* 2, 97–116.
- Shohat, E. and Stam, R. (1994) *Unthinking Eurocentrism: Multiculturalism and the Media*. Routledge, London.
- Thomas, N. (1994) *Colonialism's Culture: Anthropology, Travel and Government*. Princeton University Press, Princeton, New Jersey.
- Tribe, J. (2006) The truth about tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research* 33, 360–381.
- Tunbridge, J. and Ashworth, G. (eds) (1996) *Dissonant Heritage: The Management of the Past as a Resource in Conflict*. John Wiley, Chichester, UK.
- Urry, J. (1990) *The Tourist Gaze: Leisure and Travel in Contemporary Society*. Sage, London.
- Watson, S. (1994) "Between tradition and oblivion": Foucault, the complications of form, the literature of reason, and the aesthetics of existence. In: Gary Gutting (ed.) *The Cambridge Companion to Foucault*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK, pp. 262–285.
- Williams, A. and Shaw, G. (1988) Tourism policies in a changing economic environment. In: Williams, A. and Shaw, G. (eds) *Tourism and Economic Development: Western European Experiences*. Belhaven, London, pp. 230–239.