İSTANBUL UNIVERSITY PRESS

Journal of Tourismology

RESEARCH ARTICLE

Thinking Imaginatively via Generative Vitality in Tourism Studies (After Deleuze)

Keith Hollinshead[1]

Abstract

This manuscript covers the commonplace restrictions of institutional thought within 'tourism' and 'the field of Tourism Studies'. It critiques Deleuzian ideas concerning the contretemps between emergent and open forms of nomadic conceptuality and established (or dogmatic) images of dominant understanding. In providing a synthesis of the Deleuzian conceptualities of rhizomatic thought, it offers three important and refreshing *planes of thought* on (i) the limitations of institutional 'knowledge'; (ii) the constancy of life as 'becoming'; and (iii) the brooding juxtaposition between the actual and the virtual. Thereafter, it builds up to six open 'Deleuzian paths' for reflexive action for those who work in travel, tourism, and related-mobilities. These *personal considerations* address the conceivable need in Tourism Studies for critical cartographies that suit the posthuman and interversal imperatives of today which demand an understanding which is often 'otherwise' and 'spiral' in its conceptual trajectory. Together, the six reflexivities constitute a Deleuzian call for researchers/practitioners in Tourism Studies to resist the hegemonic forces of mere 'knowledge-production' that *tend all-too-easily to deny creative and unfettered 'thinking'.* The manuscript thus seeks to widen the affirmative possibilities of thinking about the world and its different peoples, its different places, its different pasts, and its different presents.

Keywords

Tourism judgments, Deleuzian ontology, becoming, thinking otherwise, relationality, palpation

1 **Correspondence to:** Keith Hollinshead (Prof.), Independent Scholar, England. E-mail: khdeva@btopenworld.com
ORCID: 0000-0002-4219-9113

Nomadic Logic for Studies of Travel, Tourism, and Related Mobilities, and for Fields 'Beyond'

The French philosopher (and in many ways, anti-philosopher) Gilles Deleuze was a broad-minded conceptualist whose thoughtlines — often issued in tandem with his co-national, the psychoanalyst Felix Guattari — oxygenated thinking and practice in science, literature, and the arts (amongst many other things) during the 1970s/1980s/1990s. This manuscript seeks to examine the manner in which the writings and the political activism of Deleuze pungently brought new insights and fresh-to-different awareness into the disciplinary domains and institutional fields he inspected and which he sought to liberate from the crippling hegemony of over-fast domesticated perspectives and under-thought 'knowledges'. This manuscript here in the *Journal of Tourismology* thereby seeks to translate the thoughtlines of Deleuze to *the dogmatic images of thought* (his own term, there) that conceivably overcode or restrictively-authorise visions of the world in contemporary practices of tourism and travel. It is offered as a vital reflexive tribute towards more open and more fertile (or generative) imagination about the peoples, places, pasts, and presents which are encountered through the industrialised nomadicisms of global travel, and of the multiple (but so often under-recognised) ontological relationships which exist between them. The paper therefore queries the open-ness of the thinking (and, likewise, the constipated understandings) that regulates what gets seen and 'known' through tourism.

In this light, this paper provides an introduction to Deleuzian (or rather, to *Deleuzoguattarian*) conceptuality on both institutional thought and germinal life — notably with regard to the worldmaking agency and authority of tourism and Tourism Studies. It seeks to illustrate such dynamic Deleuzian thoughtlines by providing three planes of thought which colour in palpative Deleuxian conceptuality on rhizomatic ★ matters of becoming.

[Note: ★ = a rhizome is that unpredictable mix of connections between what might at first appear to unrelated or dissimilar objects, people, ideas and the unusual, unexpected, irregular chains that link such things together, however ephemeral that association may be (Young, Genesko, and Watson 2013). See Colman on how Deleuze and Guattari — in their philosophical praxis (Deleuze and Guattari 1987:12) — deploy the concept to follow such process of "networked, relational, and transversal thought without 'tracing' the construction of that map as a fixed entity" (Colman in Parr: 2013:232-3). For Bogue (1990:107), rhizomes are non-hierarchical random multiplicities "which cannot be subsumed within a unified structure" in contrast to arborescent (tree-like) totalities which tend to be hierarchical and stratified with limited and regulated connections.]

In providing this illumination into the strong Deleuzian view of the limitations of contemporary social theory and disciplinary knowledge, this paper here in the *Journal of Tourismology* [hereafter: JT] culminates in the provision of six reflexive

points by and through which those who research or work in travel and tourism, and related fields (and by extension, those who work in a or any domain or discipline in the social sciences cum humanities) can identify the axes of domination that constrain their imagination about the world, and through that learning and unlearning can help them fruitfully towards more creative visions of life in human and nonhuman realms, on towards a more fluid and discerning understanding of 'multiple realities' and of 'multiple possibilities', something that Britton (1991) critically demanded three decades ago, and which Behassen and Caton (2009) and Robinson and Jamal (2009) called for one decade or so ago.

It is important that those who work as researchers in Tourism Studies or as practitioners in tourism management and tourism development think about these Deleuzian matters of 'becoming' because they relate to projections of 'being' and 'difference' that are articulated every day in a banal and mundane fashion through tourism and travel, here, there, and everywhere (Bauman 2003; Adey, Bissell, and Urry 2010). Indeed, tourism could be said to be the business of difference-declaration, difference-making, difference-concretisation par excellence as it defines places and spaces and as it declares how particular peoples, places, pasts, and presents ought to be seen, or can be seen (Buck 1993; Kirshenblatt-Gimblett 1994; Rothman 1994; McKay 2009). Thus, in probing these nuanced Deleuzian matters, this manuscript seeks to reflexively question **the quality, the tenacity, and the artfulness (or otherwise) of the foundational knowledges** that those who work in quotidian fashion in Tourism Studies monger and peddle each day, each week, each month, in the academy, across the field, within the journals, and at the conferences. The paper thereby stands as an important warning about **unthought essentialism** — i.e., about the unthinking naturalisation of 'things' and the unthinking normalisation of populations, territories, inheritances, events, whatever, through tourism and Tourism Studies (refer here to Richter 1995; Clifford 1997). Tourism is conceivably the world's most virulent declarative agency for labelling subjects-in-the-world (Horne 1992; Mavrič and Urry 2009). It is critical that all who work in senior positions in the industry or in the field's research scholarship inspect how places and spaces are not so much ordered by foundational understandings but pre-ordered by it (Franklin 2009; Hollinshead and Ivanova 2013) by the authoritative signifying primacy of 'tourism'. It is cardinal that those senior incumbents in the field take on board reflexive Deleuxian considerations on the worldmaking power they routinely exercise (Hollinshead and Caton 2017; Hollinshead and Suleman 2018) as — let us be clear about it — they work as 'tourism judges' about the world's visitable histories, cultures, natures, and spiritualities (Thomas 1994; Hollinshead and Kuon 2013). This need for reflexive vigilance is no small imperative. Every senior player in the field must learn to regularly think about what Deleuze would term the constrained or enabled 'generative vitality' of the people-making orientations, the place-making narratives, and the past-making

assumptions they industrially or scholastically deal in (Saxena 2015 [on the need to cultivate Deleuzian approaches in Tourism Studies]).

Introduction — Thinking Creatively / Thinking Spirally / Thinking Otherwise:

Three Illustrative Deleuzian 'Planes of Thought'

The three planes of relatability cum connectivity will now be illustrated in order in terms of the intercessive imagination-opening and animating (and often counter-actualizing) potential of travel and tourism, as **provoked** by Deleuzian philosophy:

Plane-Of-Thought 1:

There Is Always More To Know

To repeat the point, Deleuze is not a philosopher that hunts for conceptual stability in and of things, for (paradoxically) to him the function of philosophy is not to settle things but **to disturb them** (Deleuze and Guattari, 1994: 2). In his view, philosophy cannot uncover everything and put all things firmly in place in any setting or scenario, for there is always more going on than one can ever see or roundly contemplate in every locale and in every context: there are always other things going on outside of or beyond our own codification of and about the world, whomever we are. "There is always something more, more than we can know, more than we can perceive" (May, 2008:171, on Deleuzian outlooks on the world). Accordingly, the ontology of Deleuze is never complete, and like Foucault (his fellow French thinker on knowledge, power, and discursivity), he recognizes that what so often appears to be natural and irrevocable is — contrary to such expectations — historical and contingent. Hence to Deleuze, the objective of philosophy is not to closely capture and scrupulously delineate 'difference', but (again) **to palpate it** conceptually (refer to May, 2008:20, here, on the necessity to 'palpate' things, ideas, and/or events that cannot readily be comprehended). Thus Deleuze searches for fresh concepts which usefully and contextually feel for suspected 'difference', and touch upon it or sense its presence and its possible shape(s) (plural) and its imaginable linkages (plural). To Deleuze, assessments of things that are seemingly comprehensive are dangerous and perhaps (probably?) overdetermined. Once more, to Deleuze, it is not 'knowledge' that should be regarded and esteemed but 'thinking', viz., continuous, and vigilant thinking about the world and its multiple spheres, its multiple layers, its multiple happenings: "there is always more to think" (May 2008: 21, on Deleuzian infinite-multiplicities and infinite-connectivities) in each and every milieu, at each and every 'event', at each and every junction.

Plane of Thought 2:

All Life Is Constant 'Becoming'

In Deleuze's judgment, the major misapprehension of Western thought is that it starts from entities which are presumed to exist as concrete things and which are located or 'known' at a point of reality where they 'transcend'. In contrast to such intact and consummate 'things', Deleuze critiques the forces that first produce those held realities or hailed terrains be they cultural, political, whatever (or rather be they rhizomatic interactions of culture with politics, or with whatever else) (Buchanan, 2000). Thus, for Deleuze, life is an ongoing process of interaction and connection as such forces constantly mutate and intersect here, there, and everywhere. In his view, the relationship of people, of things, of ideas, with the world is always dynamic — i.e., it is one of ceaseless change and abiding flux where any such interaction or connection can generate a lines-of-flight through which (for instance) people can be recreated or otherwise recreate themselves. Indeed, to Deleuze, human life is inherently creative, influenced by rhizomes and lines-of-flight which are incidental and propagative, but which i-m-p-o-r-t-a-n-t-l-y are *not* foundational (Colebrook, 2002:52). These rhizomata (and the influences and the changes they help occasion via particular lines of flight) exist on a plane of immanence which (to him) is always multiform, open, and protean. Yet, to repeat a point, this immanence (these immanences) — these complex and dynamic acts of **becoming** — are not generative of some fixed 'being' or solid 'entity', for they tend to lack uniformity and homogeneity, and (significantly) they do not work towards any particular end-point or culminatory goal.

What always intrigues Deleuze — for living things — are the ways in which such beings are able to develop 'experience' from these influences of flux and these acts of 'becoming', and this he terms 'contraction' (Colebrook, 2002:35). But this contraction does not produce 'essences', per se, for to Deleuze **it is the multiplicity of relations and the latent possibilities of becoming that ought to be deemed to be 'essential' and not 'the thing' or 'anything' itself**. To Deleuze, then, life is a matter of interacting codes and influences, *and all life is thereby potentially productive*. Such irruptive encounters and such incursive experiences through 'becoming' force people to think, and thought itself can be creative as the given people connect and reconnect with other things and/or with other forms of life and/or with other ideas or images on these multiform planes of immanence or along these empowering or inaugurative lines-of-flight. Thus, while humans can thereby transform themselves through these acts of happenstance becoming, *it is thought itself* which can roam and 'slip' beyond established strata to become nomadic and proliferating. Hence, to Deleuze, 'life' is always opportunistically fertile and potentially productive, and 'thought' is thereby always fecund and potentially generative. And to him, life is always a mix of active multiplicities — relating to intensive forces of change (Roffe, in Parr 2013: 181/2).

Plane of Thought 3:

There Is No Distinction Between The Actual And The Virtual

To Deleuze, there is no merit in suggesting there is a real world out-there which we simply perceive and then axiomatically represent. He salutes not the image *of* something for the observer, but the act of seeing (viz., the seeing sensation itself (Colebrook 2006: 102)). To him — following Bergson (see Bergson 1988, [first published 1908]) — the actual (world) and the virtual (world) in fact constitute a *co-presence* and are tightly imbricated presences within and amongst each other. Thus, to Deleuze, **both the actual AND the virtual are 'real'**, and images and representations are no mere copy of a or the actual world but are themselves actual-virtual matter, for (to him) there is no difference between an image and a thing.

To clarify this important matter, under Deleuzian understandings, the virtual is thereby real without being present, and ideal without being abstract (Bogue 1990: 42). Said another way, the virtual is 'real' in that it subsists rather than exists, and it has *extra-being* rather than mere being (Bogue 1990: 59). In this Bergsonian light (to Deleuze), the virtual is thereby real but not actual (De Landa 2012: 227). While an envisioned possibility is merely "a pale and imagined version of the actual world, virtual difference [i.e. the virtual] and becoming is [rather] the very power of the world" (Colebrook 2003: 97). Consequently, to Deleuze, life is best seen as or mostly-richly-understood as a virtual multiplicity of not so much things or definite objects but of contemplations about the world and of imagined 'contractions' of events in the world and of responses to the world. It is these contemplations that subsequently create, produce, make distinct but-always-changing human beings and distinct but-always-changing objects. Hence, under Deleuzian thoughtlines, "there is not a world (actual) that is *then* represented in images (virtual) by the privileged mind of man (the subject). **Life is just this actual-virtual interaction of imaging** … [and] anticipation goes beyond what is actual [and thereafter] also produces a new actual. The image is neither actual nor virtual, but the interval that brings actuality out of the virtual" (Colebrook 2003: 87-88; emphasis added).

Hence, to Deleuze the real is not an actual substance which is then captured or regulated through virtuality, it is more properly seen (in each and every place) to be a something that is assumed to be 'different' from the teeming virtual realm around us. For Deleuze, the mind is thereby just a kind of camera that has prehended (*not* 'comprehended' here!) the world at a single juncture of time, and the images which the mind 'arrests' or 'produces' then act upon the world and upon each other, consequently generating and/or consuming further 'represented' (or rather further 'real') actual or virtual entities.

Through these views, Deleuze suggests that **there is no distinct and concrete domain which is then perceived and represented via the virtual domain as if**

there is always and everywhere an actual, distinctive, and rigid divergence between 'the actual' and 'the virtual'. Hence (to him) actual subjects do not precede a or any virtual perception: the virtual realm of sense exists alongside and is indeed dovetailed with the actual realm of so called 'being': thus, this virtual realm indeed constantly acts upon and influences what other philosophers (or other ordinary individuals) might consider to be the realm of actuality. To Deleuze, virtuality is thus no pale version of the real (Colebrook, 2002:172), and it exists *as an open and positive domain of inhuman power* itself — an important point for Deleuze (1990) — which then acts upon people via art, via fantasy, via whatever, amongst a plenitude of other influential 'signs', 'codes', 'systems', and 'series' which are embedded in (for instance) biology, genetics, history, politics (Colebrook, 2002:xliii).

To Deleuze, **the virtual is a province of unfulfilled potentiality which is constantly syncopated with the actual to produce a dynamic rather than a static world**, where each active perception (and each unrealized or not-yet-realized perception) is only a 'fold' (or a creative possibility (Deleuze, 1993)). In this light, the whole world may best be seen as *a virtual expanse*. And this 'virtual expanse' may be both a range of where (institutionally) illusions of thought dominate (i.e., a plane of transcendence (Deleuze and Guattari 1994)) and a reach of virtuality where new possibilities of becoming and new fluxes of experience lie latent (i.e., a plane of immanence). In this regard, **sense is not something that deduces what is already actually 'there' in the world, it is something that appraises possibilities of 'becoming' as it opens out towards the virtual**. To Deleuze, the virtual has primacy in its juxtaposition with the actual, for *the actual is but a contraction of all of these multiple virtual possibilities* (Deleuze and Guattari 1987). And the proper sense of freedom is that understanding of and engagement with virtual potentialities which currently reside beyond current dominant outlooks over the world.

Under this embrace of the virtual, meaningful interpretations of 'difference', ipso facto, ought not then to be seen as those distinct characteristics which patently exist between already-recognized concrete-entities but rather as intensified possibilities which potentially exist between the sum total of palpable becomings. The problem for Deleuze (and for Deleuze and Guattari under joint Deleuzoguattarian valuations) is not only that so much of 'the virtual' is not recognized or is unperceived, but that virtuality itself is so commonly demeaned and not considered important under so many existing dogmatic institutional cum disciplinary cum en groupe knowledges. Even the past is seen by almost everyone — notably under Western dogmatic interpretations — as something that actually happened (i.e., as thereby something that is factually knowable rather than as a particular interpretation wrought from the infinite gamut of possible interpretations of 'becoming'). Significantly, the Bergsonian and Nietzschean influences that reside within Deleuze clearly posit the

past as nothing other than 'something perceptive' and thereby *not* as an actuality that can be decidedly 'known'. Accordingly, to Deleuze, the past is a virtuality that can indeed be roundly or specifically thought about and which can therefore be potentially 'retrieved' and activated in the imagined present, and for the imagined future, or indeed amongst other imagined versions of the past (Colebrook, 2002:170).

Recap: Tourism and difference: Deleuze and the need to constantly palpate both actuality and (especially) virtuality

In his richest paradoxical vein, Deleuze maintains that substance is no constant entity nor fixed quality, it is a 'thing' (or amalgam of forces) that folds, unfolds, and refolds in ongoing fashion (O'Sullivan, in Parr 2013: 107-108). Thus, to Deleuze, substance is not a constant identity there to be regularly perpetually affirmed: 'it' is not a or any being, 'it' is *becoming* (Stagoll, in Parr 2013: 25-27). In this regard, Deleuze (1990) rejects the Platonic view — i.e., the outlook that there are original beings which may subsequently become or be stimulated — that has driven so much received philosophy (Stagoll, in Parr 2013:27). To Deleuze, **there is no such fundamental being anywhere or anytime, but a constant immanence of becoming**, where 'becoming' (without a or any concrete grounding or a or any absolute foundational to things) is all there is (May 2008:61). Constantly, Deleuze does not value becoming over being, he significantly abolishes the opposition between them.

In this light, 'becoming' is thereby 'difference' which is yet to be actualised into specific identities (May 2008:60). Thus the future — or aspirational or adventitious potential — is not a limited or relatively empty void regulated by the unity of a fixed identity, it is full-to-overflowing possibility (Colebrook 2003: 46-49). Accordingly, what matters to Deleuze is not the actuality of an essential identity (and what ought to be known and labelled about 'it') but rather **the substantive *virtuality* that lies behind and within that identity, or rather, those possible identities, plural** (May 2008:61). Thereby, the multiplicity of the future is always with 'us' each, here and now. In like vein, to Deleuze, the past is part of every present. And to him, the future is part of every present. Ergo, there is always more to know about the force of the past (which contested pasts?) upon the present … and there is always more to know about the force of the future (which political futures?) upon the present. Consonantly, under his Bergsonian influences, time is always a subjective matter: hence it is non-chronological (Ansell-Pearson 1999: 33). And all of this need for **the palpation of force** — or rather, the palpation of difference and the palpation of time — lies here, there, and everywhere in and through tourism (as it does everywhere else, of course). And tourism conceivably plays (or can conceivably play) a significant role in helping all sorts of individuals 'become' in accordance with their own aspirations (i.e., their own vital, changing, dynamic aspirations). To restate the matter, like the realm of the

arts, tourism provides so many potential opportunities for the experiencing of life as 'becoming', i.e., of *being in the making* (Garoian 2015:491) in the Deleuzian sense.

The Reflexity On Nomadic Logic:

Thinking Creatively / Thinking Spirally / Thinking Otherwise

As stated above, practitioners and researchers who might struggle with the often enigmatic and sometimes paradoxical character of Deleuzian conceptuality on the nomadic logic of possible opportunity and vibrant life might find solace in the work of Parr (2013). In this glossarial work, an attempt is made to explain the meaning of a litany of Deleuzian terms, which Deleuze (and / or Deleuze and Guatarri) used to advance his (and / or their) diagnostic accounts of the making of institutional, disciplinary, en groupe knowledge and the nature of 'recognized' or 'authorized' difference. To some extent, the Parr collation comprises something of a lexicon on *anti-philosophy*, for Deleuze-the-philosopher so regularly railed against the intellectual abstractions of philosophy, ipso facto, as a uniform or totalized 'disciplinary' knowledge, just as he did against the illusions of the unity of any received discipline, any heralded field, any sure science, or any received institutional thoughtdom (May 2008:12). Like Foucault, Deleuze was a thinker who argued for those opportunities and those understandings which are positive and multiple, **where difference should interpretively rank over concretized 'uniformity'**, where flows interpretively count more than hailed 'unities' and where mobile, temporary, flexible arrangements interpretively score over held 'definitive systems' (see Maiolo 2012; and Tonkonoff 2017, here).

Hopefully, an inspection of the 'concepts' (as defined in Parr) can help those who work in Tourism Studies learn *to think otherwise* — or learn to think even further and beyond into 'otherwise', that is beyond their own possibly-institutionalized and possibly-overcoded dogmatic interpretations of and about other peoples and places. See May (2008: 114-121) therefore, on the openness of the future and on thinking within and for a vital world.

Yet, we must not run away with the pixies here: we must not over-determine or overcode Deleuze as he (himself) remonstrates against the sheer prevalence of institutional, disciplinary, en groupe overcoding. "The [Deleuzian] aim is not to rediscover the eternal or the universal, but [for each of us contextually in our own travelled-to and local settings] to find the conditions under which something new is [or can be] produced" (refer, here, to Deleuze and Parnet 2007: vii, in particular). This is *can see*, *can think*, and hopefully *can do* Deleuzian creativeness: it is the call for ubiquitous reflective and reflexive 'palpation'.

So, under Deleuzian thoughtlines, we must not expect to ever be able to interpret the world comprehensively and exhaustively. Like Foucault, he believes that as

soon as one has reached or made an interpretation (i.e., a decided explication on this or that), there danger lurks: see Hollinshead (1999/A), here, on Foucauldian governmentality and the diagnosis of 'things'. There is thus much inherent sense in the Deleuzian posthuman humility in and for all these conceptual understandings, even regarding the value in remaining open and fluid in one's interpretations not of distinct objects (i.e., the object singular), per se, but of 'the object multiple'. As May (2008: 172) puts it:

Deleuze's ontology [and his enabling vitalism] is not a resting place; it is not a zone of comfort; it is not an answer that allows us to abandon our seeking. It is the opposite. [The Deleuzian] ontology of difference is a challenge[:] … there is always more to know."

And it is thereby a form of **creative practical thought** (a form of affirmative consciousness) that requires one to dream actively and critically — that is, "to dream with one's eyes open" (Deleuze 1988: 20) and see and think openly, fluidly, dynamically vis-à-vis the productive event of becoming rather than the fixed and static thing — or in other words, the lively happenstance-occurrence rather than the rigid agreed-entity.

Prospect — Thinking With And Via Nomadic Logic:

Applied Deleuzian 'Generative Vitality' To Travel, Tourism, And Related Mobilities

This manuscript here in JT has covered the influential and provocative *alternative ways of thinking* of Deleuze in contrast to many of the received and traditional thoughtlines of institutions and disciplines. As an illustrative paper, it has sought to provide a brief conceptual primer for newcomers to Deleuzian philosophy. Hopefully, this manuscript has produced a clear-headed introduction to his metaphysical work and its political and ethical significances. Hopefully, this paper here in JT has reasonably situated his nomadic thinking vis-à-vis both the accelerating nobilities of our time and the liberating aesthetics of sensation that is conceivably being fertilised during the opening decades of the twenty-first century. And now, at the close of this manuscript on Deleuzian thought (and Deleuzoguattarian influence) it is useful to translate this compass of and about Deleuzian palpative scholarship to the particular arena of nomadic thought per travel, tourism, and related mobilities. And this will be carried out with reference to what I (an intentionally palpative author) deem to be six [6] cardinal points of deliberation for such conceptual nomadicisms:

• Reflection Point 1 For The Mobilities of Travel / Tourism:

The Need For More Critical Cartographics

Collectively, the insights given so far in this manuscript attest to the strong view of Deleuze that there is a distinct paucity of intellectual-academic reflection in most (almost all? / all?) fields of scholarship these days. His own thoughtlines seek to draw us beyond the centre of gravity of established disciplines and domains (and their oh-so-often over-concentrated / overcoded subject making — that is, beyond what Braidotti (2019: 136) (plainly a card-carrying member of the Deleuzian philosophical household) terms "the narrow and flat empiricism" and big data reductionism of social studies fields today.

As Deleuze recognised, progress in both 'social science' and 'science' fields advances through reductionism, but he maintains that that very dependency gives rise to weakness when it solidifies as the default framework for thinking there. To him, too many individuals and interest groups within dogmatic and established domains and discourses fixate themselves upon tried and tested angles and deny themselves *decent thought* about a or the larger order of things, regularly curtailing (i.e., reducing) involved phenomena to single-factor forms of analysis. Deleuze was adamant that those in specific fields should regularly question how the field (and they themselves within it) have identified populations and have classified the world about them, and accordingly whether the field (and themselves) have appropriately, fittingly, or tolerably attempted to reach out to the extended meaning of 'things' and have therefore thought roundly and connectively about the matter in hand (Mazzei 2013: 107). To Braidotti (2019:135) — in her Deleuzian take on the production of knowledge and the practice of the academic humanities — it is all too common for social science and humanities fields to deal in *murky objects* (of repeatable but limited vision) year after year — that is, all-too-frequently operating from **dualist inspection points** with their **facile binary classifications** and their **universalist assumptions**: see also Braidotti (2011:129 and 183/4) here. To Mazzei (2013:105), too much data gathering (even in the advanced qualitative inquiry realms of the social sciences) is 'unthought', hence her own salutation of Lather's (2007) clamour for 'getting lost' / 'becoming undone' *post-methodology work* these days. To Braidotti (2019:136), such Deleuzian condemnations of the stranglehold of transcendental empiricism (with its hackneyed universalisms) demands a more liberated understanding of what can reasonably constitute evidence-based thinking. And to her, this begets the resultant necessity for more *critical and creative cartography* work in social science / humanities fields where the studied figurations are painstakingly "located, situated, perspectival and hence immanent to specific conditions" (Braidotti 2019:136). In this palpative light, a critical cartography is a reasoned inquiry that "illuminates the complexity of on-going process of subject-formation [thereby enabling the generation of] subtler and

more complex [scrutiny of the embedded / involved] power of discourses" (Braidotti, 2019:85).

• Reflective Question(s) On The Nomadic Logic of Travel / Tourism / Related Mobilities:

How fixated (subject-wise) is, your own work? Would your own studies of regions, nations, the world benefit from palpative engagement with a more expansive and connective critical cartography? How clean and connected (or otherwise 'murky' and 'only superficially examined'?) are the destinations, the events, and the objects you currently work with or upon as you examine the particular pasts, presents, futures of 'tourised' places and spaces?

• Reflection Point 2 For The Mobilities of Travel / Tourism:

The Obligation To Work Commonly With 'Virtuality'

In his cultivation of posthuman grounds of thinking Deleuze (with Guattari) conceived of a parallelism between philosophy, the arts, and science where each of them have much to offer in illustrating the virtual possibilities of flourishing life (Braidotti 2019:143). But can studies of travel and tourism join such a parallel structure, and free understandings in the field from an undue dependency upon fixed identitics and upon fixed classifications of the world *where subjects and objects only have value or meaning in the realm of [representational] appearance:* see Baggini (2018:197), here? Can studies of travel and tourism play a leading role in not just representing the world descriptively, but in helping travelers (and host communities) creatively develop conceptual understandings about place and space (Coleman and Ringrose 2013:7)? In these respects, see the deployment of Deleuzian 'ontologies of becoming' in these respects by Massumi (2002) in his informed *Parables for the Virtual* publication. Perhaps those who work in tourism / Tourism Studies in China will inherently have a large advantage in these matters of virtuality and its communication; however:

> The very word for 'things' in Chinese (*wu*) does not mean 'entities in isolation'… . 'Wu' are better seen as 'phenomena, events and even histories' which are *always becoming*.
>
> (Bagini 2018:237, emphasis added [in italics])

Those studying travel, tourism, and related mobilities who may want to harness Deleuzian nomadic thoughtlines must learn how to think not so much in terms of taken-for-granted categories but rather in terms of the experiences which travelers (and locals) may have rhizomatically with (after Braidotti 2011:96) "unfamiliar forces, drives, yearnings, or sensations [and thereby via] a sort of spiritual and sensorial

stretching of the boundaries of what [it is possible to see or be]". Can those who work on such nomadic subjects therefore readily and easily place a stronger accent upon the felt *immanence* of rare ideas and / or unexpected experiences and upon the transformative force of 'the constant flows' that the travel or tourist 'event' (or the hosting opportunity) can give? Is it just too much of a ready and easy matter for those who work in tourism / Tourism Studies to deal in understandings predicated upon the view that "the other can never be fully known" (Caton 2018:199, in questioning 'projects of knowing' in tourism from an explicit Levinassian stance — after Levinas 1996 — as well as from an implicit Deleuzian one)? Are there many practitioners out-there in tourism operations who are skilled at communicating objects as being 'more than one' (after Manning 2013), and hence not projecting multiple objects, per se, but projecting *the object multiple* (after Mol 2003) and thereby *the objects multiple*? Where attention is drawn to 'the object multiple', communicators are engaging in the kinds of Deleuzian illumination of the inherent multiplicity of 'things' which those who work in philosophy, or in the arts (viz., Manning and 'dance' metaphorically), or in the sciences (viz., Mol and 'the medical sciences', literally) often work to, these days. And ... are there many managers or developers in tourism out-there who are experienced at communicating neo-vitalist Deleuzian possibilities for living which pointedly embrace the virtual and which, for instance, inform travelers (and reinforce host understandings) about biocentered resonances and/or cosmic rhythms "somewhere between the no longer and the not yet" (refer here to Braidotti 2011:203, for instance, on post-secular paradoxes vis-à-vis the spiritual and secular transpositions)?

 • **Reflective Question(s) On The Nomadic Logic of Travel / Tourism / Related Mobilities**

*Where in tourism programming and packaging are the leading sites of place or space where the intelligence conveyed does not depend upon a or any accuracy of representation (i.e., upon **the correspondence theories of truth** which bolster communicated statements via 'observable factual realities': see Braidotti 2013, here on 'Posthuman Life Beyond Theory')? Are there any (many?) operations already in existence in tourism across the continents which are competent at revealing how the hailed virtualities of populations translate (or have translated) into concrete actualities?*

• **Reflection Point 3 For The Mobilities of Travel / Tourism:**

The Invocation To Think Spirally And Otherwise

Many of the glossarial terms defined in Parr (and in other collations on Deleuzian terminology) address the Deleuzoguattarian caution that it is conceptually unhealthy to only ever deploy angles of rationality and intentionality to understand Deleuzian

matters of (for example) 'nomadicism', 'affect', 'becoming', whatever; refer here, for instance, to Mazzei (2013: 101 on the reasoning of Deleuze concerning the encompassing power of 'desire''). In order to interrupt or rupture **dogmatic (institutionalised) images of thought**, it is so often critically necessary — as many of the glossarial terms in Parr infer — for the researcher or practitioner in the given social science cum soft science field to self-helpfully *become undone* when inspecting Deleuzian 'events', 'encounters', 'experiences' (Mazzei 2013:96), for — to repeat a statement from earlier in this paper — "thinking is not something 'we' do, thinking happens to us, from without" (Colebrook 2002:38). The Deleuzian call for reflective and reflexive palpation is therefore for the researcher or practitioner to take time and space to think about the examined contexts in nonlinear or spiral ways, something that (for instance) Mignolo and Walsh (2018:10) demand when researchers who are normally caught up in 'the prison house of coloniality' have to learn whenever they have to uncover and interpret neo-colonial, decolonial, after-colonial impulses in untried or distant locales. For them (Mignolo and Walsh), the required imaginary for many observers in 'the conceptual West' (or from 'the conceptual North') is inherently Deleuzian and demands forms of engagement where one has "to learn to unlearn in order [to cothink with the decolonising population or to perhaps] relearn [local or lost narratives]" (Mignolo and Walsh 2018:254).

• Reflective Question(s) On The Nomadic Logic of Travel / Tourism / Related Mobilities

*Tourism is very much about the projection of difference and the quest for 'the other' (Urry 1990). But are there many researchers on travel / tourism who are proficient at becoming undone when they have to map or monitor 'other ways of knowing' without sailing into those other settings with an already totalised vision of the neoliberal system with its imperatives of advanced capitalism and entrenched globalisation? Perhaps many outreach researchers on travel, tourism, and related mobilities would gain from a reading of Stewart's Deleuze-inspired work **Ordinary Affects** and learn how to unlearn the destination and hosting settings as **a live surface** in order to grasp what are the "intensive, immanent, palpable, moving" potentials there (Stewart 2007:3-4)? Such palpated trajectories of inspection might indeed enable more researchers (and woke practitioners) to not only generally understand the world as **a generative flux** that **produces** realities (Law 2004:6), but specifically get to grasp the role of tourism (itself) as the **productive** (reality-making) generative flux. Such would be — such is — the intrinsic Deleuzian call for nomadic analysis translated to studies of travel and tourism when and where the researcher must learn to unlearn by 'thoroughly interrogating' the connections which*

*he/she can make there and the shifting relationship he/she will no doubt have to engage in: see Cole (2013:226-227), here. Such are the demands of **thinking otherwise** if the multiplicities of travel and tourism are to be accommodatingly gauged (May 2008:120).*

• Reflection Point 4 For The Mobilities of Travel / Tourism:

The Plea To Monitor The Geography Of Reason

It is the judgement of Deleuze that Western conceptualities are predominantly based on traditions of objectivity that rise over (i.e., seek to govern) all places and all times. The philosopher Flanagan (2010) — in striking a Deleuzian note — maintains that Western metaphysics is *transcendentally pretentious* in its assumptive goal of identifying what is really right or good, independent of culture and history. As Deleuze and Guattari often suggest, the almost totalitarian ontological profile of Western conceptuality can be exceedingly violent for other populations (and *internally* for Westerners themselves!) in many veins, viz., those of culture, spiritually, civilisation, cosmology, epistemics, et cetera. In colonial and neo-colonial settings, these forms of governing Western objectivity can indeed be 'belligerent' (Braidotti 2011:2006, taking a Deleuzian line in her own call for corrective neovitalist feminist thought to overcome such eurocentric transcendental presumptions) which Gilroy (2010; cited in Braidotti 2013:28) maintains involves 'the bellicose dismissiveness' of other cultures, other civilisations, and other 'generated lived possibilities'.

• Reflective Question(s) On The Nomadic Logic of Travel / Tourism / Related Mobilities

Thus, is the study of travel and tourism around the world regulated (still regulated?) by a single and crippling North Atlantic or eurocentric model of universalised objectivity, or as Telfer (2009:150) has phrased it for the field, has much progress indeed been made in "the repudiation of Westernization in favour of an endogenous model of change"? Has the recent turn of the century seen any substantive advances 'beyond the impasse' in the decent and faithful search for a new (non-Western) non-exploitative paradigm of development that (for instance) pays meaningful respect to Indigenous knowledge (Telfer 2009:153)? Is effective progress being made to undo the destabilising ontologies of tourism (across the continents) that have for countries 'interiorised difference as otherness' and which have been operational on the back of essentialising European prescriptions (Wearing, McDonald, and Ponting 2005; Grimwood, Caton, and Cooke 2018; refer also to Hollinshead [on Horne] 1999/B, here)? Is global tourism still built upon the sorts of abstract and universal North

Atlantic fictions which underpin the colonial narratives of tourism? Please see Richter (1995), here, on the over-influential role of the Western media in the fictional temporalities of global travel projection, and Huggan (2001) on the power differentials involved in the recognition and projection of (for example) India / Indians in and through tourism?

• Reflection Point 5 For The Mobilities of Travel / Tourism:

The Summons — Under The Denormalisation of Things — To Genunely Recognise The Hybrid And The Interversal

   Much of what Deleuze and Guattari write about concerns the possibility of (and the necessity of) denormalizing taken-for-granted-institutional-or-interest-group-views-of-the-world. Once the force of the rational and intentional (and the too-often-unquestioned!) making of 'the subject' is recognized, it is then possible — under Deleuzoguuattarian thought concerning the palpative effort to denormalize 'things', 'objects', and 'ideas' — to conceive of a multiplicity of new or emergent collective arrangements of things (i.e., of people, of concepts, of other things / et cetera) against 'power' (Mazzei 2013; Jackson and Mazzei 2018). For Braidotti (2019:148) such acts of denormalization and denaturalization are particularly required where neo-liberal momentum has captured or appropriated the academic humanities, and she draws upon the work of Noys (2014) who has plotted the malignant and insufficiently questioned velocities of advanced capitalism. For Walsh and Mignolo (in Mignolo and Walsh 2018:1-2), the required effort in understanding the integral relationships of humans (and other living organisms) to land, to territory, to the cosmos — within scholarship circles — is to *unsettle* (i.e., to denormalize or to denaturalize) "the singular authoritativeness of academic thought" about distinct people and over-stabilized North Atlantic abstract universal fictions, and instead recognize the world's *pluriversality* and thereby illuminate the under-recognized *interversal paths and* the under-appreciated *interversal relationships* between humans and non-humans organisms. Such is the Deleuzian summons **to think away from flat fixities of meaning** (Mazzei 2013). Stated another way, this Deleuzian call to denormalise is an appeal to open up "to emergent, inter-active heterogeneities, to the emergent spaces in between" (Wyatt, Gale, Gannon, and Davies 2011).

   • Reflective Question(s) On The Nomadic Logic of Travel / Tourism / Related Mobilities
   *In disciplinary terms, Deleuze and Guattari (1987) label such overcoded and supposedly self-evident or 'undeniably true' normalizations (i.e., the targets for denormalization) within fields and domains as **the micro-fascisms of our age** or the **micro-fascisms of our institutions**. In studies*

of travel and tourism, such acts of illumination and correction (or rather, of identificatory cleansing) — where eurocentric influences have been notably pungent in that micro-fascist representation of places and micro-fascist essentialization of peoples — might constitute what Walsh and Mignolo (in Mignolo and Walsh 2018:2) would call either 'pluriversal decoloniality' or otherwise 'decolonial pluriversality'. In this regard, Braidotti (2013) reminds us that such multiple worlds are not things or ideas of the future, for they are already here and around us. Ergo, in studies of travel and tourism, which are the representations of place and space that address such demanded matters of pluriversal decoloniality: where are the interpretations of site or territory sincerely and decently pluriversal?

Reflection Point 6 For The Mobilities of Travel / Tourism:

The Cue For Relationality --- Posthuman Connectivity

The work of Deleuze and Guattari calls for the need for (and benefits of!) humans relating to not just the broad human world of people, societies, and nations, but to the wider non-human world. Their writings foreground the need of humans to enter into communication with and engender understandings that generally reach across geopolitical territories and colonial divisions, and which particularly contend with the universalizing claims and the epistemic vehemence of Western cum North Atlantic forms of modernity. In practical terms, the thoughtlines of Deleuze and Guattari augur the critical necessity and creative enhancements to life that can be fertilized when humans acknowledge not just the contextuality of the events and encounters they come across or become engaged in, but the multiplicity of the difficult cultural, spiritual, cosmological worlds they live within, and thereby the gains of being sincerely and responsibly *relational* within them. For Walsh (in Mignolo and Walsh 2018:254) — writing on the praxis of decoloniality inherently in parallel to Deleuzoguttarian notions of relationality — such conceptions about 'decoloniality' must not remain merely platitudinous: they must not be "a new abstract universal, but a [committed and attainable] way of being, thinking, serving and doing, a [whole] conscious way of existence". The shift of eurocentric institutions and interest groups towards relationality must thus be an acknowledged and decided movement "away from Western ontological totalitarianism" (Mignolo and Walsh 2018:239) to faithfully recognize, address, and buttress new (i.e., previously suppressed or silenced) 'horizons of knowledge' — although, importantly, Deleuze would no doubt prefer that to be stated as *horizons of thinking.*

• Reflective Question(s) On The Nomadic Logic of Travel / Tourism / Related Mobilities

*For Grimwood, Caton, and Cooke (2018), those who work in Tourism Studies — especially on an international front — have a tall moral duty to think and work by relational values. For (Bertella 2018), the cultivation of **the relational gaze** in and across tourism is a pressing matter for the field: for instance, to her, if tourism projects, packages, and programmes are to introduce travelers cum visitors to populations like Yolngu in Arnhem Land in the Northern Territory of Australia, i.e., **to peoples who have traditionally already lived to relational ways of living,** then it would be ironic and debilitating if those eternal project managers, package developers, and programme researchers do not listen to and communicate about such populations 'relationally' themselves. Where tourism practitioners and researchers are engaged **in worldmaking activity** (i.e., everywhere and all of the time, **unavoidably** (Hollinshead and Suleman 2017)), it should beneficially be realized that it will never be just one single world that is being inscribed or projected. Those who **worldmake** through tourism (i.e., each practitioner and each researcher in every facet of their work (Hollinshead and Caton 2017: Hollinshead and Suleman 2018) can advance understanding by thinking relationally along pluriversal lines (see Mignolo and Walsh 2018:147) and acknowledge that the experienced world is actually constituted of a multiverse of ways of living, being, and becoming: see Maturana in Maturana and Varela (1991), here, on **the multiverse.***

Overview — The Call For Self-Reflexive Questioning:

Towards 'Generative Vitality' Through Tourism / Tourism Studies

Let us finish with some overall ruminative Deleuzian queries for researchers and practitioners in Tourism Studies on the conceptual craft of reflective and reflexive 'palpation'.

Do you (the researcher or practitioner) over-trust the foundational narratives and the peddled perspectives that the chain of distribution within and across the tourism industry or the channel of projection within and across Tourism Studies gives you? How institutionalized are you in your juridical place and space making? How open are your interpretations of matters of difference? How static is your own held or hailed knowledge about tourism and the peoples, the places, the pasts, and the presents which it judges? How open, fluid, and vital are your own projections of place and space,

generatively? Would it help your servicing of the cultures, the spiritualities, and the longstanding-traditions and the emergent-hybrid-transitions which 'live' there if you can learn more frequently, more regularly, and even axiomatically *to think otherwise* about the receiving populations and the resident cosmologies which you authorize and transmit? To what degree do you rely commonly, routinely, systematically upon heavily-institutionalized and overcoded **in-**terpretations of local being at the expense of more open **out-**terpretations of becoming?

In Deleuzian terms, how **striated** is the institutional imagination you are forced to work with (see Colebrook 2006 and Bonta and Protevi 2012 on the rigidities of 'striated' organizations versus relatively-open and **smooth** organizations); or otherwise, how accommodating are the historical accounts, the cultural narratives, and the interpretations of nature, the cognitions of spirituality that you embrace in quotidian fashion? Thus ... how effective is your own generative vitality? Are you *generatively vital* and notably refreshing in the worldmaking projections you deal in through your authorial role in Tourism Studies? How 'smooth' are the governing conceptualities of the bodies and organizations you work for and under; how spiral are the visions and the groupthink thoughtlines you have wittingly and unwittingly adopted yourself?

References

Adey, P., Bissell, D., and Urry, J. (2010). Mobilities, Meeting, and Futures: An Interview with John Urry. Environment and Planning D: Society and Space, 28, 101-116.

Ansell-Pearson, K. (1999). *Germinal Life: The Difference and Repetition of Deleuze*. London: Routledge.

Baggini, J. (2018). *How the World Thinks: A Global History of Philosophy*. London: Granta.

Bauman, Z. (2003). From Pilgrim to Tourist — or a Short-History of Identity. In S. Hall and P. du Gay (Ed.), *Questions of Cultural Identity* (pp.18-36) London: Sage.

Belhassen Y., & Caton, K. (2009). Advancing Understandings: A Linguistic Approach to Tourism Epistemology. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 36(2), 335-352.

Bergson, H. (1988). *Creative Evolution*. New York: Dover.

Bertella, G. (2018). Emerging Practices by Institutional Entrepreneurs. In B.Grimwood, K.Caton, and L.Cooke (Eds.), *New Moral Natures in Tourism*. London: Routledge.

Bogue, R. (1990). *Deleuze and Guattari*. London: Routledge.

Bogue, R. (2012). Deleuze and Literature. In D.W.Smith and H.Somers-Hall (eds). *The Cambridge Companion to Deleuze* (pp.286-306). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bonta, M., & Protevi, J. (2012), *Deleuze and Geophilosophy: A Guide and Glossary*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh Univ. Press.

Braidotti, R. (2011). *Nomadic Theory: The Portable Rosi Braidotti*. New York: Columbia Univ. Press.

Braidotti, R. (2013). *The Posthuman*. Cambridge: Polity.

Braidotti, R. (2019). *Posthuman Knowledge*. Cambridge: Polity.

Britton, S. (1991). Tourism, Capital, and Place: Towards a Critical Geography of Tourism. *Environment and Planning: Society and Space* 9(4), 451-478.

Buchanan, I. (2000). *Deleuzism: A Metacommentary*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh Univ. Press.

Buck, E. (1993). *Paradise Remade: The Politics of Culture and History in Hawai'i.* Philadelphia, Pa.: Temple Univ. Press.

Caton, K. (2018). Conclusion: In the Forest. In B.Grimwood, K.Caton, and L.Cooke (Eds.), *New Moral Natures in Tourism*. London: Routledge.

Clifford, J. (1997). *Routes*. Cambridge. Ma.: Harvard University Press.

Cole, D.R. (2013). *Traffic Jams: Analysing Everyday Life*. Brooklyn, N.Y.: Punctum Books.

Colebrook, C. (2002). *Understanding Deleuze.* Crows Nest, N.S.W., Australia: Allen and Unwin.

Colebrook, C. (2003). *Gilles Deleuze (Routledge Critical Thinkers).* London: Routledge.

Colebrook, C. (2006). *Deleuze: A Guide for the Perplexed*. London: Continuum.

Coleman, R., & Ringrose, J. (2013), *Deleuze and Research Methodologies*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh Univ. Press.

De Landa, M. (2012). Deleuze, Mathematics and Realist Ontology. In D.W. Smith and H. Somers-Hall (Eds.), *The Cambridge Companion to Deleuze* (pp.220-238). Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press.

Deleuze, G. (1988). *Spinoza: Practical Philosophy.* San Francisco: City Lights Books.

Deleuze, G. (1990). *The Logic of Sense* (Trans. M. Lester; ed.C.V. Boundas). New York: Columbia Univ. Press.

Deleuze, G. (1993). *The Fold: Liebniz and the Baroque*. (Trans. T.Colney). London: Athlone Press.

Deleuze, G. (2007). *Two Regimes of Madness: Texts and Interviews1975-1995*. [Trans.: A.Hodges and M.Taormina; Ed.: D.Lapoujade]. N.York: Semiotext(e).

Deleuze, G., & Guattari, F. (1987). *A Thousand Plateaus* (Trans. B.Massumi). Minneapolis: Univ. of Minnesota Press.

Deleuze, G., & Guattari, F. (1994). *What is Philosophy?* (Trans. H.Tomlinson and G.Burchell) New York: Columbia Univ. Press.

Deleuze, G. and Parnett, C. (2007), *Dialogues II*. New York: Columbia.

Flanagan, T. (2010). Free and Indeterminate Accord of 'the New Harmony'. In S. van Tuinen and N.McDonnell (Eds.), *Deleuze and the Fold: A Critical Reader.* London: Palgrave-Macmillan.

Franklin, A. (2009). The Sociology of Tourism. In T.Jamal and M.Robinson (Eds.), *The Sage Handbook of Tourism Studies*. London: Sage.

Garoian, C. R. (2015), Performing the Refrain of Arts Prosthetic Pedagogy. *Qualitative Inquiry*. 21, 487-493.

Gilroy, P. (2010), *Darker than Blue: On the Moral Economies of Black Atlantic Culture*. Cambridge, Ma.: Harvard Univ. Press.

Grimwood, B., Caton, K., & Cooke, L. (Eds.). (2018). *New Moral Natures in Tourism*. London: Routledge.

Hollinshead, K. (1999/A), Surveillance of the Worlds of Tourism: Foucault and the Eye-of-Power. *Tourism Management*. 20,7-23.

Hollinshead, K. (1999/B). Tourism as Public Culture: Horne's Ideological Commentary on the Legerdemain of Tourism. *International Journal of Tourism Research.* 1, 267-292.

Hollinshead, K., & Caton, K. (2017). Worldmaking and the Representation of Peoples and Places in/through Tourism. In L.Lowry (Ed.), *The Sage Encyclopedia of Travel and Tourism* (pp.1486-1490). Thousand Oaks, Ca.: Sage.

Hollinshead, K., & Ivanova M. (2013). The Multilogical Imagination: Tourism Studies and the Imperative for Postdisciplinary Knowing. In M.Smith and G.Richards (Eds.), *The Routledge Handbook of Cultural Tourism* (pp. 53-62). London: Routledge.

Hollinshead, K., & Kuon, V. (2013). The Scopic Drive of Tourism: Foucault and Eye Dialectics. In O.Moufakkir and Y.Reisinger (Eds.). *The Host Gaze in Global Tourism* (pp.1-18). Wallingford, Oxon: Cabi.

Hollinshead, K. and Suleman, R. (2017), Time for Fluid Acumen: A Call for Improved Tourism Studies Dialogue with the Decolonizing World. *Tourism, Culture, and Communication.* 17, 61-74.

Hollinshead, K. and Suleman, R. (2018). The Everyday Installations of Worldmaking: New Vistas of Understanding on the Declarative Reach of Tourism. *Tourism Analysis*. 23, 201-213.

Horne, D. (1992). *The Intelligent Tourist*. McMahon's Point, Sydney: Margaret Gee Holdings.

Huggan, G. (2001). *The Postcolonial Exotic: Marketing the Margins*. Abingdon, England: Routledge.

Jackson, A. C., &Mazzei, L. A. (2018). Thinking with Theory: A New Analytic for Qualitative Inquiry. In Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. S. (Eds.), *The Sage Handbook of Qualitative Research* (pp.717-737). Los Angeles: Sage.

Kirschenblatt-Gimblett, B. (1998). *Destination Culture*. Berkeley, Ca.: Univ. of California Press.

Lather, P. (2007). *Getting Lost*. Albany, NY: SUNY Press.

Law, J. (2004). *After Method*. Abingdon, England: Routledge.

Levinas, H. (1996). *Entre Nous*. [Trans. M.B.Smith and B.Harshav]. New York: Columbia.

Maiolo, F. (2012). *Foucault e la Souranità*. Roma. Arcana Editrice.

Manning, E. (2013). *Always More Than One*. Durham, NC: Duke Univ. Press.

Massumi, B. (2002). *Parables for the Virtual*. Durham, NC: Duke Univ. Press.

Maturana, H.R. and Varela, F. J. (1991). *Autopoiesis and Cognition*. Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Reidel.

Mavrič, M. and Urry, J. (2009). Tourism Studies and the New Mobilities Paradigm (NMP). In T.Jamal and M.Robinson (Eds.). *The Sage Handbook of Tourism Studies* (pp. 645-657). Los Angeles: Sage.

May, T. (2008). *Gilles Deleuze: An Introduction*. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press.

Mazzei, L. A. (2013). Materialist Mappings of Knowing in Being. *Gender and Education* 25(6), 776-785.

McKay, I. (2009). *Quest of the Folk*. Montreal: McGill and Queens Univ. Press.

Mignolo, W. D., & Walsh, C. E. (2018). *On Decoloniality*. Durham: Duke Univ. Press.

Mol, A. (2003). *The Body Multiple: Ontology in Medical Practice*. Durham, N.C.: Duke Univ. Press.

Noys, B. (2014). *Malign Velocities: Accelerationism and Capitalism*. Alresford, England: Zero Books.

Parr, A. (2013). *The Deleuze Dictionary*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh Univ. Press.

Richter, L. K. (1995). Gender and Race: Neglected Variables in Tourism Research. In R.Butler and D.Pearce (Eds.), *Change in Tourism: People, Places, and Processes* (pp.71-91). London: Routledge.

Robinson, M., & Jamal, T. B. (2009). Conclusions: Tourism Studies --- Past Omissions, Emergent Challenges. In T.Jamal & M. Robinson (Eds.), *The Sage Handbook of Tourism Studies* (pp.693-702). Los Angeles: Sage.

Rothman, H. (1998). *Devil's Bargains*. Lawrence, Ks.: Univ. Press of Kansas.

Saxena, G. (2015). Imagined Relational Capital: An Analytical Tool in Considering Small Tourism Firms' Sociality. *Tourism Management*, 49, 109-118.

Stewart, K. (2007). *Ordinary Effects*. Durham, NC: Duke Univ. Press.

Telfer, D. (2009). Development Studies and Tourism. In T.Jamal and M.Robinson (Eds.), *The Sage Handbook of Tourism Studies* (pp.146-165). London: Sage.

Thomas, N. (1994). *Colonialism's Culture: Anthropology, Travel and Government.* Princeton, N.J.: Princeton Univ. Press.

Tonkonoff, S. (2017). *From Tarde to Deleuze and Foucault: The Infinitesimal Revolution.* New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Urry, J. (1990). *The Tourist Gaze*. London: Sage.

Wearing, S., McDonald, M., and Ponting, J. (2005), Building a Decommodified Research Agenda in Tourism. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism* 13(5), 425-455.

Wyatt, J., Gale, K., Gannon,S., & Davies,B. (2011). *An Immanent Plane of Composition*. N.York: Peter Lang.

Young, E. B., Genesko, G., & Watson, J. (2013). *The Deleuze and Guattari Dictionary*. London: Bloomsbury.