

CHAPTER 1

TOURISM, POLITICS AND THE FORGOTTEN ENTANGLEMENTS OF POWER

Tim Coles and Andrew Church

TOURISM AND THE PREDICAMENTS OF POWER

Kenya, 28 November 2002: an Arkia airlines charter jet was narrowly missed by two surface-to-air missiles as it started its ascent from Mombassa airport. On board were 261 passengers, the majority of whom were Israeli citizens on their way home after their vacations. Just as it was attacked 15 people died in a bomb attack on the Paradise Hotel on the Indian Ocean coast. Nine Kenyans and three Israelis, two of whom were children, were killed along with the three suicide bombers. Eighty people were injured, many badly (BBC 2002). Al-Qaeda operatives in Kenya claimed responsibility in the aftermath of the attack (CNN 2002).

The Kenya atrocity is a distant memory now but at the time it acted as a chilling reminder of what had happened in New York and Washington in the previous year and in Bali the month before. Shortly afterwards, Steve Bell, a political cartoonist published an image of George W. Bush standing at the Presidential lectern in *The Guardian* newspaper. Behind Bell's signature portrayal of Bush, flies what appears to be a B52 bomber and an airliner which a missile has just missed. For a bemused-

looking Bush, apparently 'only an all-out war on tourism can bring to an end this war on terrorism!' (Bell 2002).

The joke hinges on Bush's Texan drawl, his particular pronunciation of 'tourism', its closeness to his verbalisation of 'terrorism', and a seeming inability on the part of the US authorities to differentiate between the two. Published relatively early into the President's 'Global War on Terrorism', the cartoon is all the more poignant for its early connection of the two concepts. Foreshadowing the findings of the 9/11 Commission (2004), Bell was one of the first commentators to connect the practice of tourism and recent acts of terrorism. Tourists are not only the subjects of acts of terrorism as recent attacks in Bali and Sharm el Sheik are a reminder; tourism has become a central component in the mediation of terrorism. The 9/11 attacks were facilitated by temporary mobilities as the attackers travelled around the world training and preparing themselves, garnering knowledge and collecting intelligence, meeting contacts and probing the weaknesses in the security apparatus of the United States. Masquerading as business travellers, on 09/11 the four sets of hijackers set off on routine commuter flights from Boston and New York with such devastating effects. Other forms of transitory migrations have been, and indeed remain, a medium used by Al Qaeda for prosecuting its conflict (09/11 Commission 2004).

Bell's image is all the more striking because it articulates issues about the multiple and complex connectivities between tourism and power. It points to the sometimes hidden but also often highly visible presence of power relations in the production, governance and consumption of tourism, as well as the importance of tourism in political, cultural and social practices that empower individuals and organizations. Tourism has assumed a central position in the power politics of the unfolding world order as new alliances have been forged on both sides in the 'War on Terror'. The vulnerability of the seemingly powerful is exposed by a cartoon which simultaneously

points to the apparent capacity of a minority group to impose its agenda. Unfolding power relations are further evident in the desire to reassert authority and domination. From a position of appearing powerless in the face of attacks, the American government seeks, for a range of specified and unspecified motives, to empower itself by drawing on a range of technologies and measures to prevent attacks and enhance Homeland Security (09/11 Commission 2004). New border controls and immigration tools have indeed been progressively introduced to regulate visitor flows. Images and objects of revised security arrangements have the potential to build greater consumer confidence (Hall et al 2004), but narratives that portray these responses as draconian may also alienate overseas visitors and frustrate the rebuilding of the tourist economy in the United States (Cochrane 2005). Thus, while the authority of government is bought to bear on the tourist sector, as is so often the case in the contemporary world, the subtleties and complexities of the interactions between power and tourism remain elusive and for the most part hidden away behind political rhetoric.

CONNECTING TOURISM AND POWER

The purpose of this book is to strengthen the connection between tourism research and conceptualisations and theorisations of power. As we will show, linkages exist but they are very unevenly developed. We wish to place constructs of power more firmly at the centre of the agenda of critical tourism research. We would contend that tourism studies should be explicitly engaged with power, practically to be rewired more extensively into discourses and conceptualisations of power. Our choice of words is quite deliberate. Far from being total strangers, tourism and power are often mentioned in the same breath. Issues of power, empowerment and disempowerment permeate many aspects of tourism research. Sometimes these incursions are explicit and direct, at other times they are indirect and latent.

Whatever the mode of infiltration, the intricate connections and feedbacks between constructs of tourism and power have been recognised. Our challenge is to progress beyond often infrequent, partial and even plainly opportune treatments of power in tourism. Power is not a convenient conceptual 'port of call', a loosely-defined notion that handily serves to explain ambiguous asymmetries among different stakeholders in the development process, or which helps to describe vaguely the unequal allocation of resources. Power has for sometime been one of the major concepts in the social sciences (Clegg 1989: xviii), and as Prus (1999: 3) puts it 'few terms in the social sciences have engendered as much mystique (fascination, curiosity, fear) as "power"'. Yet tourism analysis has become only selectively linked with established and emergent discourses of power, usually those influenced by post-modern and post-structural social theory. Within this collection, we aim to map some of the diverse intersections between tourism and power. We explore how power manifests itself, how it is expressed, and the multiple ways in which it is articulated, circulated and (deliberately) not even used in tourism. In so doing, we intend to illustrate the potential and potency of the full range of theorisations of power towards developing deeper understanding in critical issues of tourism.

That said, the intention is not to present an exclusively uni-directional portrayal of the relationship between power and tourism. By this, we mean that we do not solely consider discourses of tourism to be informed and shaped by debates on power. Rather, the relationship between discourses of tourism and power is a more fluid and reflexive one. Scholarly analysis of tourism has much to contribute to the understanding of power in contemporary societies. As Britton (1991: 458) recognised, tourism has become a 'major internationalised component of Western capitalist economies.... one of quintessential features of mass consumer culture and modern life.' The study of tourism offers social scientists a greater insight into the nature of modern-day life. In this respect, it too provides an ideal empirical setting in

which to appraise the value of current thinking on power. One of the most remarkable features of accounts in tourism that do engage directly with power discourses is the degree to which constructs of power are accepted practically as given. Writings of Weber, Lukes or Foucault may be tactically deployed but they are largely just reported (cf. Reed 1997, Hollinshead 1999; Cheong and Miller 2000; Kayat 2002, Sofield 2003). There is often no comment from tourism scholars on the epistemological, ontological or methodological implications of conceptualisations of power although the writings of Urry (2002, 2003), Aitchison (2003) and Franklin (2004) are important instances where this challenge has been accepted. As we shall demonstrate below, major positions on power are far from unproblematic and they have been the subject of compelling critiques. Many of the prevailing ideas on power are a function of the time and context of their emergence; they may well be of enduring relevance yet their appropriateness to contemporary conditions is routinely left uncontested (cf. Thomas and Thomas 2005). For example, the nature of American local government which so influenced the writings of C. Wright Mills (1959), Robert Dahl (1961a, 1961b), Stephen Lukes (1974) or other power theorists in the 1960s and 1970s is not the same as that encountered by Judd and Simpson (2003) or Laslo (2003) nearly thirty years later in their respective inspections of the politics of the development process in urban tourism.

POWER IN TOURISM

As a basic construct, power has featured frequently and repeatedly in tourism discourses over the years. As far back as the mid-1970s, Doxey's (1976) oft-cited work, as well as Bjorklund and Philbrick's (1975), focused on the development of standardized views of resident reactions in the face of tourism (Shaw and Williams 2004: 178), and the hence the relative power of residents to devise effective strategies to deal with tourism. Other work has explored the nature of host-guest

encounters the through the lens of social exchange theory (Ap 1992, Kayat 2002) whereby asymmetries of power in the social relations of tourism are manifest in the underlying assumption that residents 'behave in a way that maximises the rewards and minimises the costs they experience' (Madrigal 1993: 338 in Shaw and Williams 2004: 178). Although heavily critiqued for a variety of reasons (cf. Butler 2006a, 2006b), Butler's (1980) tourist area life-cycle model postulated transitions in the power relations of tourism between local people and external actors as the development process unfolds. Power asymmetries are also evident in de Kadt's (1979) early exploration of the social and cultural effects of tourism in developing countries. Drawing on wider thinking on development at the time, de Kadt (1979: xii) stressed the importance of not focusing solely on growth for growth's sake but also the potential for growth to address wider social inequalities within developing countries. As part of this aspiration, the 'development community is searching for means that will enable the poor to provide for their basic needs through more productive work, more widely available social services, and increased participation in political decisionmaking' (de Kadt 1979: xii). Tourism may, he argued, contribute to these wider policy aspirations but lamentably 'a pro- or anti-tourism stance might be taken up without real evidence to support it' (de Kadt 1979: xiii).

A wide variety of disciplinary positions has been evident among those with an interest in the relationship between tourism and power. From a sociological grounding, Morgan and Pritchard's (1998: 7) examination of marketing, promotion and branding explores the way in which 'tourism processes *manifest power* as they mirror and reinforce the distribution of power in society' (italics original). Basch (2004) has explored power relations in the customer service encounter between the tourist and the accommodation provider from a perspective of social psychology. Thurlow and Jaworski (2003) have used applied linguistics to demonstrate the power of language in inflight magazines in mediating what they term a 'globalization of

nationality' and the promotion of 'global lifestyles'. Richter (1983) has exposed the tri-partite relationship between tourism, power and international relations, while Timothy's (1997) work identifies boundaries and the practice of border crossings by tourists as an expression of the current *status quo* in geopolitics. From a political science perspective, Judd and Simpson (2003) note how public-private partnerships involved in urban tourism projects function as independent centres of power outside traditional local government structures. Mayors forge alliances with such groups and bypass democratic processes leading to considerable potential for reconstructing the local state.

Accounts of the *de jure* practice of power in tourism have accompanied discussions of the *de facto* operation of power. For instance, Arino (2002) outlines how the state and its opponents exercised power in the introduction of the ecotax in the Balearic Islands. Historians have adopted longer-term perspectives on the connectivities between tourism and power in some cases to legitimate the role of the state (cf. Baranowski and Furlough 2000; Koshar 2002). Cocks (2000) has drawn our attention to the role of local chambers of commerce in the early promotion of urban tourism in America. Festivalisation at the turn of the previous century was accompanied by the propensity to empower local bourgeois elites further by restricting access to political power and cultural capital. In more extreme circumstances, Baranowski (2000) describes the role of tourism in the National Socialist agenda for Germany in the 1930s. Travel was used as a form of political coercion by the ruling elites and tourism became a medium through which to articulate dominant ideologies (cf. Keitz 1991). Increased travel opportunities for individuals were presented as a benefit of the consumerism induced by the Nazi regime and a phenomenon to be directly equated with the programme *Kraft durch Freude* (KdF – Strength through Joy) (cf. Semmens 2005).

Interest in the spatialities of power has been notable in writings as varied as those on political economy and tourism (Britton 1991), the cultural and performative geographies of tourism (Crouch 1999), and tourism, public sector policy and planning (Elliot 1997; Hall 1994, 2000). In the context of developing countries Bianchi (2002) exposes how power relations in tourism are central to the way in which the social practices of global patterns of production and consumption are constituted (cf. Britton 1991; Mowforth and Munt 1998). Inspections of global commodity chains in the tourism sector reinforce this perspective (Clancy 1998; Mosedale 2005). Tourism is viewed as a commodity fashioned in an articulated system of producers, suppliers and intermediaries. The allocation and distribution of benefits (often money and knowledge) inevitably result in winners, losers and rivalries among the individuals and/or groups involved. Ioannides (1998) has mapped the gatekeepers, the principal nodes in the chain, as power-brokers in the consumption of tourism (see also Klemm and Martin-Quiros 1999; Bastakis et al 2003), while Crase and Jackson (2000) have explored the idea of information asymmetry as a form of power in the economics of market operation.

The body is a key source of social difference and power. Recently, the importance of performative and embodied perspectives to the analysis of tourism has been stressed (Aitchison 2000; Crouch 2000; Franklin 2003; Crouch, this volume; Cater, this volume). Feminist writings and more recently studies concerned with sexualities have played a significant role in opening up power as an issue for tourism research. These have indicated how tourism and mobility both reflect and contribute to power relations linked to age, class, disability, gender, race and sexuality. A number of studies have revealed the role of tourism in maintaining patriarchal structures (Swain 1995). Indeed, Aitchison (2003: 83) has observed that,

‘both poststructural feminism and postcolonial feminism have placed emphasis on the textual, discursive and performative construction of the Other in the reinscription of gender-power relations. Together these post-positivist perspectives have laid bare tourism’s inherent paradox: although associated with a globalised melting pot where postmodern deconstruction and reconstruction have induced the breakdown of previous boundaries.... the global tourism industry simultaneously serves to inscribe the Otherness of culture and particularly, the Otherness of women and black people.’

Feminist writing has challenged power relations within the tourism academy.

Aitchison (2001) has identified the gendered features of academic tourism research publications. Pritchard (2004) argues that the ‘malestream’ of research and academic posts in the tourism field, along with the dominance of ‘masculinist’ epistemological and ontological perspectives, has resulted in the marginalisation of feminist research on tourism. Furthermore, Pritchard (2004) claims that the tourism academy has been remiss in its treatment of sexuality. While reviews in the 1990s identified a general lack of interest in the topic (Markwell 1996, Prichard et.al. 1998, Veijola and Jokinen 1994), there is now an emergent literature situated in a number of disciplines delivering insights into the interactions between power, tourism and sexualities (Browne 2006). The injustices, in the form of the discriminations and exclusions that gay men and lesbian tourists experience, have been increasingly documented. In some cases, such as gay cruises to the Bahamas, this involves governments using state powers to deliberately exclude non-heterosexual visitors (Puar 2002a).

Empirical studies have also highlighted the role of gay tourism marketing and discourses in the propagation of western-centric post-colonial discourses (Alexander 1998). Puar (2002b) argues that an embodied and performative understanding of tourism, sexuality and power will be most fruitfully developed through an increased

engagement with post-colonial and queer theories. Travel and tourism can empower some individuals through opportunities for fulfilment, embodied performance, transgression and escape. Gay and lesbian tourist destinations can enable practices, performances and identity building not possible in 'home' locations. Simultaneously, gay and lesbian tourists may also be subjected to constraints that arise not only from the capitalist commodification of tourism spaces but also from a series of disciplining hetero-normative gazes that can limit the opportunity to develop sexual citizenship and identity (Brown 1999, Browne 2006, Cantu 2002, Johnston 2005, Pritchard et al 2000, Puar 2002b). In tourism studies, as in other disciplines (Hubbard 2002), research into sexuality has tended to focus on the 'other' and considered only homosexualities whilst ignoring heterosexualities in the production of tourism spaces. Moreover, in nominally homosexual leisure and tourism spaces excluding processes function further where the homo-patriarchy of gay male practices can exclude lesbians (Pritchard et al 2002) and other males with marginalised sexual identities (Binnie 2004).

THE PARADOX OF TOURISM AND POWER

Despite this growing engagement with power there remains an important paradox in that power and power relations are frequently invoked as pivotal features in the production of tourism, the negotiation of tourist experiences, and the administration and governance of tourism; however, they are routinely under-conceptualised in tourism discourses. With notable exceptions among some of the studies mentioned above, established discourses of power by major theoreticians have by and large failed to feature prominently in contemporary studies of tourism. In many instances, tourism commentators are prepared to deploy the explanatory virtues of power (often as a capacity or authority) but seldom do they progress beyond elementary, and

hence apparently uncontentious, conceptual simplifications (cf. Haugaard 2002; Morriss 2002). More worrying still, power is being taken for granted; that is, as an implicit or implied feature, lurking as it does in the background of many studies, invoked at convenient moments in the narrative but not the subject of rigorous identification, evaluation or analysis. Rather, it serves as an enforcement measure to add immediate and seemingly extra conceptual substance to the argument. Few tourism scholars recognise the rich intellectual genealogies of power discourses, the highly contested and nuanced approaches to understanding power, and the significance (as well as potential) of debates on key theorists' ideas. Instead, power is often perceived as an obvious and self-justifying concern. It is conceptualised in a vague and generalised manner, and there exist in this approach several real dangers (see Morriss 2002). As a single salutary example, the apparently mutually-implicated nature of power and resources is routinely invoked, such that power is equated simply as access to and control over resources including images and representations (cf. Kayat 2002; Murphy and Murphy 2004: 350; Fyall and Garrod 2005: 145, Henderson 2003; Hunter 2001; Trist 1999; Williams 2002). This may well characterise the attributes of the powerful and manifest changes in the 'balance' of power between identifiable groups; however, it may grossly simplify the full complexities and potentialities of the practices and performances of power leading to potentially misleading conclusions. In a stark warning, Allen (2003) observes that the relationship between power and resources is not always an obvious or simple one. It is crucial to distinguish between the exercise of power and the control of resources because the two do not always go hand-in-hand in a causal manner as, for instance, power may not be utilised. Perceptions of power and its significance may also differ markedly among stakeholders as may their strategies and tactics for employing it (Buchanan and Badham 1999).

Nowhere perhaps is this perceptible paucity of theoretical and conceptual engagement with power discourses more emphatically exposed than in studies of so-called 'sustainable tourism'; that is, in arguably the most high profile topic within cross-disciplinary studies of tourism. Interest in more responsible and inclusive modes of tourism development and management have been accompanied by a commitment to comprehensive approaches to development which are flexible and dynamic, integrative and inclusive, and oriented towards the community and the goals of all stakeholders (Simpson 2001). In turn, this has raised questions about how to build enduring and viable partnerships of, and collaborations among, diverse stakeholders which will enhance the effectiveness, efficiency, harmony and equity of tourism development (Teo 2002; Timothy 1998; Selin and Chavez 1995; Selin 1999; de Araujo and Bramwell 1999; Bramwell and Lane 2000; Bramwell and Sharman 1999; Burns 1999, 2004).

Ultimately, as both Scheyvens (1999, 2000) and Sofield (2003) have demonstrated, tourism may lead to the empowerment of local communities in multiple (i.e. economic, social, psychological and political) ways (see also Timothy, this volume). While more equitable, fair and locally-empowering forms of tourism production, governance and consumption remain the aspiration, inevitably they require interaction among human beings; in other words, they are political processes and they are the subject of power relations among constituencies. Contestation, consensus and dissonance among competing participatory interests are inevitable features of development in this manner (Simmons 1994, Fallon 2001). Almost by definition, such issues necessitate an interest in how power is exercised, by whom, in what manner of political arrangement, and to what end. Furthermore, as Ryan (2002) points out, if there is to be equity related to tourism development, there must be an element of power sharing. This requires individuals (or groups) to take responsibility for (i.e. power over) the delivery of equity. Jamal and Getz (1995: 190)

have introduced the idea that adjustments in the relative access to, and exercise of, power may be required in community-based tourism planning to achieve a more equitable, fairer sets of outcomes (cf. Ashley 1998; Forstner 2002). However, Thomas and Thomas (2005) argue that the redistributive aspects of power relations in stakeholder coalitions are notably absent from such discussions. Similarly, Bramwell and Lane's (2000: 8-9) wide-ranging review emphasizes that the nature of power, its dispersal among stakeholders, and its ability to contribute to, or frustrate, the operation and outcomes of collaborations is only generally conceptualised and at that by largely instrumental means.

Regrettably, such generality leads to limited conclusions. As Reed (1997: 657) has observed, these may be a function of initially imprecise and limiting premises (see Hall this volume). For instance, she contends that 'while power relations are included with collaborative theory, it is frequently assumed that collaboration can overcome power imbalances by involving all stakeholders in a process that meets their needs.' Her work draws our attention to the disappointing situation whereby different theoretical approaches to power (beyond partial, simplified and implied Weberian readings) are all too infrequently invoked in accounts of empowerment when there is clear evidence of their potential validity as interpretative frameworks (Sofield 2003). Rather, as Timothy (this volume) demonstrates, research towards unravelling how power features in empowerment through tourism appears to be driven by a largely inductive approach. A rich collection of case-studies of the relationship between tourism and empowerment now provides a strong empirical basis from which to deepen the understanding of empowerment by contemplating the mutual implications of power theory and tourism in the contemporary world.

Thus, only recently, according to Hannam (2002: 229), has 'research into tourism development begun to focus more explicitly upon the concept of power' as

opposed to more general articulations in which power features as a much vaguer and even implied notion. To accompany interest in power as a concept, Hannam identifies a relative shift away from the political and economic as dominant arenas of power towards investigation of the social and cultural relations of power. This shift has been accompanied by the introduction into tourism studies of the ideas of Michel Foucault and other post-structural social theorists (Urry 2002; Veijola and Jokinen 1994; Wearing 1995; Morgan and Pritchard 1998; Aitchison 1999; Cheong and Miller 2000; Franklin and Crang 2001; Edensor 2000, 2001; Franklin 2004, Winter, this volume). Hollinshead (1994, 1999) has, in particular, been an enthusiastic advocate of Foucault's thinking. For him, Foucault's contribution might,

‘not always be a completely fresh approach to matters of discursive power and disjunctive effect in tourism, [but] the very depth, range and ubiquity of its investigative assault on matters of dominance, subjugation and normalisation could conceivably be of multiplicative value and differentiative potency in and across tourism studies’.

(Hollinshead 1999: 10)

In order to understand the advances resulting from this increased engagement with theories of power, the next section sets out the key conceptual debates and theoretical traditions within the study of power, and it considers the insights provided by tourism researchers who have drawn on the different theoretical perspectives.

CONCEPTUALISING POWER

The question ‘what is power?’ is immensely problematic. It is a conundrum that many scholars of power have struggled to solve, and it is one that we cannot hope to answer fully or definitively here. There appears to be almost as many definitions of

power as scholars writing on the subject. As other power theorists have pointed out (Haugaard 2002; Morriss 2002; Lukes 2005), it is an almost impossible (and largely unrewarding) task to attempt to review fully the extensive bodies of writings on power (see Mann 1986, 1993; Hindess 1996; Prus 1999). An historiographical overview does, however, point to four broad features that are vital to the further introduction and effective development of power discourses in tourism. The first is the plurality of approaches to understanding power, and a second allied feature is the essential contestability of power as a concept. The third feature concerns disagreements over the language used to discuss power. The relevance of, but highly overlooked nature of, debate over the use of the power discourse and why concepts of power are analytically valuable is the final feature.

The plurality of approaches is indicated by the many established and contrasting theoretical statements on the nature of power from, among others, Max Weber, Hannah Arendt, C. Wright Mills, Talcott Parsons, Stephen Lukes, Anthony Giddens, Barry Barnes, Stewart Clegg, Michel Foucault and Pierre Bourdieu to list but a few (see Clegg 1989, Hindess 1996, Prus 1999; Haugaard 2002, Allen 2003). From these widely varying theorisations, Haugaard (2002: 4) attempts to identify 'certain generalized perceptions of power'. These include, what he terms, 'power over' and 'power to' (associated with the analytic tradition); 'conflictual power' and 'consensual power' (social theory of the modern variety); and 'power as constitutive of reality' (postmodern social theory). These general perceptions of power are explicitly and implicitly presented in discussions of tourism. For example, a variety of studies of the political economy of tourism in developing countries have identified the power of interest groups 'over' local and regional governments (Elliott 1997, Mowforth and Munt 1998). By contrast, studies from a performative perspective have highlighted the empowering, 'power to' aspects of tourism activities (Coleman and Crang 2002, Crouch 2004). Fallon (2001) argues that the uneven patterns of tourism

development in Lombok (Indonesia) reflect local differences in power relations between developers, tour operators and local communities with some locations developing consensual relations between these interest groups whereas in other locations conflict has occurred. A variety of the studies from a Foucauldian perspective consider the constitutive and productive nature of power (e.g. Morgan and Pritchard 1999).

[Insert table 1.1 near here]

Haugaard (2003: 89) proposes a seven-fold typology of theorisations on the production of power. Power is created from social order (Parsons, Luhmann, Barnes, Haugaard, Clegg, Giddens); bias (Bachrach and Baratz); systems of thought (Foucault); 'false consciousness' (Lukes); power/knowledge, obligatory passage points (Foucault, Clegg); discipline (Foucault); and coercion (Weber, Dahl, Bachrach and Baratz, Mann, Poggi). There are, therefore, notable and sometimes extensive differences in substance among contested interpretations of power. Begg (2000: 14-15) easily identifies 19 definitions of power from different sources without claiming to be exhaustive (table 1.1). All grand statements of this type are though problematic. They contain limitations to one degree or another based on their intellectual framing. Each position reflects its author's biases and sympathies. Lukes has, for example, critiqued his original (1974) thesis and decried its now widely-cited definition of power as a 'mistake' in his subsequent (2005: 12) writings. Such differences are far from trivial. As he (2005: 12) observes:

'Disagreements matter because how much power you see in the social world and where you locate it depends on how you conceive of it, and these disagreements are in part moral and political, and inescapably so.'

Each major theorist's work has potential application for the production of insights into power relations in tourism. Reminiscent of Orwell's *Animal Farm*, it seems that to date some theorists have had more potential than others. As argued below, the ideas of both Foucault and Lukes have been more commonly used to unravel critical issues in tourism. However, the application of their thinking does not necessarily imply an exclusivity or ease of potential application, nor does it suggest that they are any the less problematic than other conceptualisations (Clegg 1989, Stewart 2001). In the case of Foucault, the emergence of his thoughts on power in tourism partly reflects recent trends within the social sciences.

Not only do distinctive theoretical and conceptual positions have particular methodological and empirical consequences, but they have also been accompanied by the emergence of distinctive vocabularies of power. Herein lies the third feature of the discourse relating to power: namely, that a more precise use of language is crucial to the application of power discourses to research problems in tourism. Sloppy usage has the potential to induce misleading conclusions. Although there may be some slippage or overlap, to conflate terms and their distinctive meanings may provoke misunderstandings over the diverse ways in which power achieves its effects (Allen 2003: 30).

To achieve precision is no easy task and especially not in a book with contributions from several authors with different theoretical positions! We are not so much advocating here a strict terminological policing, but rather we are trying to promote a greater awareness of the dangers of the casual use of language in discussions surrounding power in tourism. Lukes (2005: 61) comments that the word 'power' is polysemic -like the words 'social' and 'cultural'- and its precise meaning depends on the context of application. Morriss (2002) points out that there is an extensive Anglo-phone literature on power but many of the constructs of power stem from the

discussion of terms originally from other languages. As such, views of power may be coloured by the subjectivities of translation (see also Poggi 2001, Clegg 1989, Lukes 2005). Stewart (2001: 6) has noticed a propensity among research workers to use words interchangeably when they are not in fact synonymous. 'Power' is all too often conflated with 'domination' such that the concepts of 'power over' and 'power to' (see below) are implicated logically and empirically, and the pursuit of power becomes the search for strategic success through resource mobilisation.

The last and by no means least important feature in the theorisations of power pertains to the use of power discourse. Simply put, why do we have concepts of power and why are they useful? As Morriss (2002) reminds us, there has been a willingness to discuss what power is or should be. All too often, though, there has been a failure to recognise that we use the concepts of power for several different purposes. Morriss (2002) identifies three contexts in which we talk of power and in which concepts of power function (see also Hall, this volume). The first is the practical context, the second moral and the third evaluative. By the practical context, Morriss (2002: 37) is referring to the desire to evaluate the extent of an agent's powers; in other words, what can be brought about, or what can't. Behaviour and its practicalities will be conditioned by the assessment of power. Estimation is not limited to the agent's own powers. Comparisons are made with competitors' powers which provide benchmarks in the process of self-evaluation, as well as clues as to what they may do for the agent, or what they may require of the agent. With the moral context, the pivotal idea is the ascription of responsibility (Morriss 2002). Power is used to bring about certain outcomes, and to say that somebody or something is powerful is to assign responsibility for particular outcomes, or 'the powerful are those whom we judge or hold to be responsible for significant outcomes' (Lukes 2005: 66). As Morriss (2002: 39) notes, the connection between power and responsibility is

essentially negative because responsibility can be denied by demonstrating a lack of power.

The third, evaluative context refers to the use of the concept of power to appraise social systems. It refers to the distribution of power within society and the degree to which the population's interests and expectations are met (Morriss 2002: 40). Of the three contexts, this is held to be the most complicated because the range of interests and things citizens value is so great. Evaluation depends on the identification of the extent to which citizens have the power to satisfy their own needs, and to which they are subject to the power of others. Thus, evaluation of social systems depends on the resolution of freedom to act against the limitations of domination. This context is important because it uncovers significant contradictions. Morriss (2002) identifies the hypothetical instance of a group of otherwise powerless individuals who voluntarily co-operate with one another to achieve their goals. They come to assume greater control over their own lives and their power is increased by collective action. Simultaneously, each individual has power over, but is subject to the power of, others. As Lukes (2005: 68) points out, issues of powerlessness and domination are not necessarily so separate. Among the powerful are those who are able to contribute to a reduction in others' powerlessness.

The contents of the book are designed to reflect the diversity of theorisations of power and the concluding chapter revisits the three contexts identified by Morriss (2003) and the challenges that arise for tourism research. What follows considers the plurality of power theories in more detail and identifies which conceptualisations of power have been most influential in tourism studies.

GENEALOGIES AND BLOODLINES OF POWER DISCOURSE

A number of commentators have argued that two conceptions of power have dominated Western political thought since the time of Thomas Hobbes and John Locke (Hindess 1996: 1). In the first, power is viewed as a simple quantitative phenomenon. In effect, it is treated as a tangible entity which is open to empirical observation and measurement. Power is conceptualised as a capacity; it has a currency, a valency which determines the extent of any resulting action. The great allure of this conceptualisation for social scientists is that it appears to offer an easy means of identifying who has power and who is powerless (Hindess 1996: 27). In the second, more complex conceptualisation, power involves not only a capacity to act, but simultaneously a right to act. Within this position, capacity and right function alongside one another because they rely on the consent of those over whom power is being exercised.

Dowding (1996: 4) suggests that power discourse may be reduced to two apparently even simpler prevailing concepts: 'power to' and 'power over'. Power is a capacity but, as he points out, in practical terms there seems little sense in saying that actor A 'has power' in an abstract, isolated (purely dispositional) sense. Rather, power is used in some basic way ('power to') to obtain a particular outcome. Power is never really power in general but it has specific application. 'Power over' implies 'power to' but it has specific connotations in so far as A has 'power over' B to secure an outcome from B. Dowding (1996: 2-3) further describes 'power to' as 'outcome power', or 'the ability of an actor to bring about or help bring about outcomes'. 'Power over' is given the coda 'social power' because it implies a social relation between at least two actors. Social power is, therefore, 'the ability of an actor deliberately to change the incentive structure of another actor or actors to bring about or help bring about outcomes' (Dowding 1996: 3). Allen (2003: 5) suggests that 'power over' is essentially the outcome of instrumental ties between actors, whereas 'power to' is manifested in associational ties. The former refer to a form of leverage

in order to induce outcomes and it is based on will and the potential for conflict, whereas the latter refer to a collectivity of action to facilitate a common aim through mutual action, and in so doing raises the prospects for or of mutual empowerment.

For Stewart (2001: 31) one of the problems of theorisations of power has been a concentration on power over rather than power to resulting in a discourse that sees power and domination 'as integrally related concepts'. The view of social power as causal power, however, is endorsed by Scott (1991: 4-5) and he notes (after Dahl 1968), the importance of differentiating between those exercising and holding power (see also Latour below). Since power is a disposition, the anticipation of its use may mean that power can have significant social consequences even where there is no explicit and overt intervention on the part of the principal (Scott 1991: 5). Scott (1991: 6) notes that this differentiation is evident in two streams of power research: his so-called 'mainstream tradition' that focuses on the episodic exercise of power by one actor over another; and the 'second stream' which concentrates on the capacity to do something.

A number of writers have drawn on these different streams in attempts to produce synthesised theorisations of power. In one of the more high profile accounts of power, Clegg (1989) attempted to encapsulate the fluidity, diversity and 'outflanking' nature of power. His conceptualisation was based on the observation of 'three circuits of power': episodic, dispositional and facilitative. The last is linked to the systemic features of capitalism and involves domination. Episodic power is based on agency and actors seeking to achieve their goals which Clegg (1989: 208) referred to as 'the 'normal power of social science' considered in the writing of Dahl and others. Dispositional power provides the context to episodic power and concerns the 'rules of the game' which are based on a variety of changing social and political practices. Clegg (1989) drew on conceptualisations of translation and obligatory passage points

developed by Callon and Latour to describe the processes which come to fix the 'rules of the game'. For Clegg (1989: 210),

'dispositional and facilitative power respectively, constitute the field of force in which episodic agency conceptions of power are articulated. Fixing these fields of force is achieved through enrolling agencies' obligatory passage points. Power involves not only securing outcomes, which is achieved in the episodic circuit of power, but also securing and reproducing the 'substantively rational' conditions within which the strategies espoused in the circuit of episodic power make contextual sense.'

Haugaard (2002) notes the value of Clegg's circuits but argues that, like Lukes (1977) earlier work, the circuits tend to present structural inequalities as unaffected by agency when in fact they are continually contested and evolving. Clegg's (1989) circuits of power do, however, suggest that, although seemingly straightforward, even the concepts of 'power to' and 'power over' mask several further complexities. In the case of 'power over', the resulting relationship between A and B is asymmetric in A's favour. However, it does not suggest that the relationship between A and B resolves only in a single direction. The result is a function of the resolution of both A's ability to dominate B and B's ability to resist A. Max Weber (1978: 53) recognised this in his extensive treatise on the nature of society and operation of organizations at the beginning of the last century. He viewed power (Macht) as,

'the probability that one actor within a social relationship will be in a position to carry out his own will despite resistance, regardless of the basis on which the probability rests.'

According to Galbraith (1983: 20), Weber's views on power represent the 'common perception' of power: namely, that 'someone or some group is imposing its will and purpose or purposes on others, including those who are reluctant or adverse.' As Galbraith (1983) goes on to note, it is precisely because power has such an apparently 'common sense' meaning that so often it is used in all aspects of life (not just in the social sciences) with little regard for the need for definition nor its complexities. Weber's comments are, though, instructive because they point to the different modes by which one may secure compliance over another. Weber (1978: 53) further distinguished power from domination (Herrschaft), or 'the probability that a command with a specific given content will be obeyed by a given group of persons'. Power was also differentiated from discipline, or 'the probability that by virtue of habituation a command will receive prompt and automatic obedience in stereotyped forms, on the part of a given group of persons.'

[Insert table 1.2 near here]

A number of writers have endeavoured to build the lexicon of power by clarifying terms and establishing their meanings with greater accuracy and certainty. Bachrach and Baratz (1970) presented one of the earliest attempts to widen the vocabulary of power (table 1.2). This was no easy task because, as Lukes (1974: 17) maintains, there was some confusion in their conceptual map. With this misunderstanding eliminated, Lukes (1974) argues that their original typology of 'power', in fact, identified five forms of control, or ways in which power manifests itself, each with subtle but highly important differences (cf. Lukes 1974: 17-18). Allen (2003) has since attempted to inject a further degree of precision. He makes the very particular point that authority and domination should not be confused. Domination is one among several 'modalities' of power in addition to authority, coercion, manipulation or seduction. Based on his readings of Weber, domination is 'a more tightly

orchestrated means of influencing the conduct of others'. If constraint and imposition are central to exercise of domination, then in fact '*close discipline, continuous control and supervision* represent the organizational means by which domination may be achieved' (Allen 2003: 28, italics original). He adds further lexical clarity by the identification of seduction as offering the prospect that an action is in fact optional and that the subject is not in fact compelled to participate. It introduces the possibility of choices. As a result, it involves a 'renunciation of total domination, not its propagation; it is a modest form of power which is intended to act upon those who have ability to opt out' (Allen 2003: 31).

Galbraith (1983) mentions the threat of physical punishment or the possibility of pecuniary reward as an organizational means of power. This is somewhat simplistic and Hannah Arendt has extensively explored the relationship between power and violence. Violence may not be regarded as a modality of power. She does note that 'power and violence, though they are distinct phenomena, usually appear together. Wherever they are combined, power, we have found, is the primary and predominant factor' (Arendt 1970: 52). She maintains, though, clearly 'power and violence are opposites; where one rules absolutely, the other is absent. Violence appears where power is in jeopardy but left to its own course it ends in power's disappearance.... Violence can destroy power; it is utterly incapable of creating it' (Arendt 1970: 56).

Arendt's work was rooted in her experience of politics from the 1940s to 1970s and, in particular, she explored the distinction between, what Haugaard (2002: 132) elegantly describes as, the 'politics which prevent human flourishing' and 'a form of virtue politics which contributes to human freedom and emancipation'. Power is vital to this latter form of politics but violence is characteristic of the former (Haugaard 2002). Violence may be used as a coercive measure but actually it signifies the diminution or erosion of power, not its reinforcement, because, for those in power,

the referral to violence signifies the dissipation of their capacity to carry out their will over others. The socialisation of power which an analysis of violence implies is evident in Arendt's (1970: 44) view that,

'Power corresponds to the human ability not just to act but to act in concert. Power is never the property of an individual; it belongs to a group and remains in existence only so long as the group keeps together. When we say of somebody that he [sic] is 'in power' we actually refer to his being empowered by a certain number of people to act in their name. The moment the group, from which the power originated to begin with, disappears, 'his power' also vanishes.'

For Arendt (1970: 44-46), power is different from strength, force, authority and violence. It is also a collective capacity and it is based on consensus. Power is as, Allen (2003: 53) succinctly puts it, rooted in mutual action. In this respect, there are some immediate similarities with Talcott Parson's views. Parsons studied in Heidelberg in the 1920s where he was influenced by the writings of Simmel and, more so, Weber (Levine 2000) whose work he later translated (see Weber 1978). Parsons (1963, 1967) is credited with developing a more positive, utilitarian view of power as a capacity to achieve collective goals (Clegg 1989) through collective action via institutionalized political leadership based on binding obligations and sanctions (Allen 2003: 53). Power is tied to authority and consensus, but it is distanced from conflicts of interest, coercion and force (Lukes 1974). This simple clarity is not, though, perhaps immediately apparent from Parsons (1967: 308) unwieldy definition of power as a,

'generalized capacity to secure the performance of binding obligations by units in a system of collective organization when the obligations are

legitimized with reference to their bearing on collective goals and where in the case of recalcitrance there is a presumption of enforcement by negative situational sanctions – whatever the actual agency of that enforcement.’

For Haugaard (2002), one of the defining features of Parsons’ earlier (1963) contribution was that he challenged the dominant view at the time that power as a zero-sum game (cf. Giddens 1968 critique). Weberian views of power contain a tacit assumption that there is a given and fixed ‘quantity’ (Parsons 1963: 233) of power. The gains made by the winners were therefore apparently at the direct expense of the losers. However, the question arises as to why power has to involve a zero-sum game? Power does not just exist. Even as a disposition it has to be created and its creation is a function of the relativities between agents; that is, there is a social production of power. If power is not constant, then the possibility exists that the gains made by the powerful need not be at the expense of the less powerful. In this respect, the existence of powerful individuals or organizations need not necessarily be invidious (Haugaard 2002: 67), but power could contribute positively to the general accomplishment of order and civility (Clegg 1989: 131).

Parsons (1963, 1967) advanced his views on power by drawing an analogy with money as a generalised symbolic medium. Money circulates within an economy but the value of money is based on consensus. A similar system of belief establishes the legitimacy of power. Symbolic legitimacy enables the holders of power (and money) to call forth obligations from others (Clegg 1989: 130). According to Haugaard (2002: 68), consensual power as self-reinforcing and self-perpetuating is based on the belief in legitimacy as a key element in the conceptualisation of power more generally. Furthermore, as social systems become more complex, consensual power becomes more vital to multiple goal attainment. Over time, the social system in which power functions becomes more effective in its operation and in the

attainment of goals. As a result, members of the social system become more willing to comply with those in authority. Coercion may be involved in the process of power formation but, as the system begins to operate ever more effectively, it becomes divorced from power. Just how effective the system operates to deliver the attainment of goals is essentially a determinant of the production and hence amount of power in the system (Haugaard 2002).

Bruno Latour (1986) revisited the argument that power is a relational effect, and in so doing he suggested that there are limits to viewing power purely as disposition. For him, power cannot be realised without connectivities and networks among actors who transact with one another to one degree or another. He describes a paradox such that,

‘when you simply *have* power – *in potentia* – nothing happens and you are powerless; when you *exert* power – in actu – *others* are performing the action and not you.... Power is not something you may possess and hoard. Either you have it in practice and *you* do not have it –others have- or you simply have it in theory and you do not have it.’

(Latour 1986: 264-265, emphasis original)

Latour (1986: 265) invoked the example of Amin Gemayel, the former President of the Lebanon. Elected Head of State in 1982 (cf. Moubayed 2001), he had power over the country, but because very few people acted when he ordered things, he was powerless in practice.

There are counters to this view that power is meaningless without performance or practice. For instance, Lukes (2005) notes that it is possible to be powerful by the non-exercise of power. He draws attention to the almost adversarial nature of many

conceptualisations of power. One party may indeed exert power over another by acting against its interests. Instead, he notes, the (non-)exercise of power in the interests of others 'may, but also may not, be among the most effective and sometimes the most insidious forms of power' (Lukes 2005: 110).

Latour's emphasis on the relational and the practices of power draws our attention to tensions between the application of constructs of power to understanding real world and the philosophical assumptions of power. Morriss (2002) maintains strongly that power is a disposition and that, while it may be a tempting contingency to connect power with its manifestation, it is false just to reduce potentialities to actualities. As he puts it, 'episodic concepts report happenings or events, whilst dispositionals refer to relatively enduring capacities of objects' (Morriss 2002: 14). He identifies two fallacies in discourses of power –exercise fallacy and vehicle fallacy- and in so doing stresses that it is the disposition that we should ultimately seek to assess, not just the events or vehicles of power.

Exercise fallacy refers to 'the claim that the power to do something is nothing more than the doing of it' (Morriss 2002: 15); simply put, the exercise fallacy reduces the identification and assessment of power to the observation of its exercise, not the observation or measurement of the disposition, power itself. Dispositions can, after all, remain forever unmanifested. Exercise fallacy is evident in the work of those interested in decision-making (Lukes 2005: 109), but such behaviourists (see below) tend to avoid the so-called 'vehicle fallacy'. This refers to the association of power with a thing (its vehicle), a tangible entity; that is, power is identified with the resource/s that give rise to it (Morriss 2002: 19). As Allen (2003: 5) argues, resources are the technologies through which power is exercised and sustained. Resources are an obvious starting point from which to study power, but there is a subtle distinction in operation: the appraisal of a catalogue of resources provides

only useful evidence in the assessment of power (Morriss 2002: 19); assessment of resources is *not* the assessment of power. As Morriss (2002: 18-19) neatly puts it, 'wealth is not political power... whilst some people use their wealth to collect politicians, others can only collect paintings.'

TOWARDS A RADICAL VIEW OF POWER: LUKES AND TOURISM

Weber's thinking formed a major starting point from which American political theorists and sociologists in the post-war years started to think about power and of how to study it empirically (Lukes 1974: 1). This body of work concentrated on mapping the location and relative capacity of power as part of a wider project on the nature of democracy in the United States. The central concerns were who ran the community and who made the big decisions. The ensuing debates over power were also initially heavily influenced neo-Marxist considerations of the role of the state in capitalist societies (Haugaard 2002).

Questions of powerlessness and domination were evident in two of the earliest contributions in this genre. According to Lukes (1974, 2005), C. Wright Mills' (1956) *The Power Elite* and Floyd Hunter's (1953) *Community Power Structure* drew attention to the power vested in elites in American society. For Mills (1959: 3-4), the power elite is, 'composed of men [sic] whose positions enable them to transcend the ordinary environments of ordinary men and women; they are in positions to make decisions having major consequences.' They are in 'command of the major hierarchies and organizations of modern society' and they are 'not solitary rulers (Mills 1956: 4). Hunter's book explored the leadership patterns in a city of a half a million people, a 'regional city'. Hunter concluded how 'the men of real power controlled the expenditure for both the public and private agencies devoted to health and welfare programs in the community' (Hunter 1953, in Lukes 2005: 3-4).

Such an approach was attacked by Dahl (1958) as the 'ruling elite model' (Lukes 1974, 2005), with an undue willingness to concede that the local community had lost its social solidarity, and as behaviourist with an accent on decision-making (Dahl 1961a, 1961b). For Lukes (1974, 2005: 5), Dahl's ideas assumed a central position in the emergence of 'pluralist' views of power. Unlike the elitists, the pluralists maintained that power was distributed more widely through society and not vested exclusively in a single overall ruling power elite. Pluralist views noted that power relations were played out over multiple and often inter-locking issues (Lukes 2005: 5). They also rejected the view that power structures were stable over time (Bachrach and Baratz 1962: 947). Since different actors assumed different positions of power relative to the issues, there could be no singular ruling group. The idea of a single, stable group was undermined by oscillations in the importance of issues. As Lukes (2005: 5) notes, as straightforward as these ideas may nowadays seem, at the time they precipitated complex –and it might be added, enduring- methodological dilemmas regarding how to operationalise power in social sciences research. In particular, they raised the tantalising issues of how is power defined (by different groups), how should it be investigated (by which techniques?), and how and where is it distributed (i.e. how plural or democratic is it?).

Counter-criticisms suggested that the 'pluralists' had limited methodological horizons of their own. Bachrach and Baratz (1962: 948) noted that pluralists were not only interested in the sources of power, but also in one specific nature of its exercise. Their accent was on decision-making and their method was the analysis of concrete (i.e. observable) decisions, or 'a choice among alternative modes of action' (Bachrach and Baratz 1970: 39; Lukes 1974: 18). In Bachrach and Baratz's view however, the pluralists missed the 'Second Face of Power'; that is, the dimension of non-decision-making or,

‘the extent to which and the manner in which the *status quo* oriented persons and groups influence those community values and those political institutions.... which tend to limit the scope of actual decision-making to “safe” issues’.

(Bachrach and Baratz 1962: 952)

Simply put, what is kept off the agenda is as much an expression of power as what is included. The ability to limit decision-making to reasonably uncontroversial, uncontentious subjects is an expression of power. Non-decisions offer the,

‘means by which demands for change in the existing allocation of benefits and privileges in the community can be suffocated before they are even voiced; or kept covert; or killed before they gain access to the relevant decision-making arena; or, failing all these things, maimed or destroyed in the decision-implementing stage of the policy process.’

(Bachrach and Baratz 1970: 44)

Power was not solely evident in tangible decisions (Lukes 2005: 6) but,

‘the extent that a person or group –consciously or unconsciously- creates or reinforces barriers to the public airing of policy conflicts, that person or group has power’.

(Bachrach and Baratz 1970: 8).

In his seminal text *Power: A Radical View*, Steven Lukes (1974: 11-20) describes these as One- and Two-Dimensional Views of Power respectively (table 1.3). The Two-Dimensional View is notable, in Lukes’ (1974: 17) view, because Bachrach and

Baratz's (1970) work introduced the 'mobilization of bias' into discussions of power and the 'Second Face of Power' is, hence, an expression of a prevailing set of subjectivities (i.e. values, beliefs, procedures etc.) that function to the advantage of one group (in power) at the expense of another (the powerless). This raised the possibility for the first time that power is mutually implicated with ideology because non-decisions were decisions that result 'in suppression or thwarting of a latent or manifest challenge to the values or interests of the decision-maker' (Bachrach and Baratz 1970: 44).

[Insert table 1.3 near here]

As helpful as it may be, though, in advancing the power agenda, Lukes (1974: 21) argued that the 'Second Face' was still limited by virtue of its focus on observable conflict. It may be important to identify potential issues which non-decision-making had been prevented from becoming actual (Lukes 1974: 19) but, methodologically, the emphasis was still on observable conflict –whether overt or covert- as the articulation of power. This Two Dimensional View discounted the possibility that conflict may be latent, it may not be necessary at all to have conflict in order to observe the operation of power (Lukes 1974: 23), and non-decisions presuppose the existence of grievances which are denied their airing in the political process (Lukes 1974: 24). Instead, Lukes (1974: 23) argued that 'the most effective and insidious use of power is to prevent such conflict from arising in the first place.' Power is exercised not just to restrict what enters the agenda for political discussion. Rather, power can be used to prevent people from having grievances,

'by shaping their perceptions cognitions and preferences in such a way that they accept their role in the existing order of things, either because they can

see or imagine no alternative to it, or because they see it as natural and unchangeable, or because they value it as divinely ordained and beneficial’.

(Lukes 1974: 24)

Instead, Lukes (1974: 21ff) postulated a Three-Dimensional View of Power which ‘allows for a consideration of the many ways in which *potential issues* are kept out of politics whether through the operation of social forces and institutional practices or through individuals’ decisions’ (Lukes 1974: 24, emphasis original). In the Three-Dimensional View inaction, unconscious and collective (not individual, as in previous theorisation) operation may feature (Lukes 1974: 50) and there need not necessarily be observable conflict (table 1.3). In contrast, there may be ‘a *latent conflict*, which consists in a contradiction between the interests of those exercising power and the *real interests* of those they exclude.’ On this basis, Lukes (2005: 30, 37) concluded that ‘A exercises power over B when A affects B in a manner contrary to B’s interests.’ Latent power operates ideologically to shape people’s thoughts and wishes so that (otherwise apparent) differences of interest are obviated (Vogler 1998: 699). Such orchestration of their needs in this manner is practically contrary to their ‘real’ interests, and hence the freedom to choose may yield different sets of choices of action.

As compelling as this radical approach may at first sight seem, *Power: A Radical View* has been the subject of criticism. As Lukes (2005: 12) has recently recalled, his original thesis concentrated solely on power as domination (power over), and domination is, as he puts it, ‘only one species’ or, as Allen (2003) might term it, ‘modality’ of power. It also reduced power to an analysis of binary relations between two actors when actors’ interests and hence power relations concern multiple issues (Lukes 2005: 12-13). He has also noted that it is a good example of Morriss’ (2002) ‘exercise fallacy’ because it concentrates on the application rather than the

dispositionality of power (Lukes 2005: 109). Benton (1981: 180) has argued that the thesis has more fundamental shortcomings; the concept of 'interests' should be abandoned from a position of realist epistemology because they prove unworkable. What are the real interests of the powerless, how are these determined, and how are these to be uncovered by research workers? Under Lukes, power implies what Haugaard (2002: 38) terms 'could-have-done-otherwise agency' but it is difficult to know what they may or may not have done were the individuals not to have been constrained by the operation of the Third Dimension. As Clegg (1989: 3) points out, this exposes a potential methodological weakness because 'when people say what their consciousness of something is, these accounts cannot be taken at face value nor can they function as explanations.' Any reference that is made to the actor's account will be necessarily flawed in his view. Finally, according to Haugaard (2002: 39), there is a troubling propensity in Lukes' work to distinguish knowledge as free from power in contrast to Foucauldian perspectives. In its treatment of 'false consciousness', his work assumes that power distorts knowledge without acknowledging the complex nature of the power-knowledge relationship (see below).

For Haugaard (2002: 38), one of the most notable features of Lukes' thesis is that his critique of Bachrach and Baratz precipitated a view that 'biases are not necessarily reducible to individuals' actions or deliberate non-actions but are inherited from the past in the form of structured and culturally patterned behaviour of groups.' In this respect, there are resonances between Lukes' work and the views of power contained in emergent theories of structuration (Giddens 1976). The process of structuration involves the reproduction of continually-changing structures through the time-space specific acts of agents. This was presented by Giddens (1984) as a response to the apparent determinism of structuralism and the limited account of the power of agency in Foucault's work (see below). Agents can utilise causal powers which, according to Giddens (1984), can both challenge as well as maintain

structures. Thus, power is emancipatory and not simply constraining. Two types of resources to structures of domination: namely, 'allocative resources' that include produced goods; and 'authoritative resources' that include self-expression and the body (Giddens 1984). For Haugaard (2002), Giddens' approach represents an early attempt to synthesise the consensual and conflictual views of power but one that overemphasises the consensual aspects of power in contemporary society and underplays the contestation that is linked to structures. As an alternative approach, Haugaard (1997) seeks to build on the insights on power as constitutive provided by Foucault and the conflictual approach of Bourdieu; he argues that an understanding of power can be progressed by analysing the interactions between the goals of agents, structures, conflict and consensus.

The impact on tourism studies of theorisations rooted in Weberian, elitist, pluralist or Lukesian thinking is relatively limited. All too frequently, writings on tourism policy and development implicitly adopt some of these perspectives. For example, Reed (1997) critiques pluralist assumptions in discussion of partnership and collaboration in tourism planning (cf. Jamal and Getz 1995). Only a few writers explicitly acknowledge the influence of these power theories on their work (e.g. Hall 1994). Drawing on both pluralist and radical readings of power in her discussion of community involvement in the tourism development process in Squamish (British Columbia), Reed (1997) has identified several instances where the content of the agenda driving development forward was manipulated by the inclusion or exclusion of topics depending on the interests of those in power. Not only are power relations to be widely observed, but they also permeate through all strata of the tourism system, sometimes in manners that are either entirely unpredictable or obscure, unobserved to all but the skilled observer. A similar conclusion was drawn in Strange's (1999) case studies of tourism policy in historic towns in the United Kingdom. Despite the supposedly high profile of sustainability and conservation on

the policy agenda, business and economic development goals were often far more influential in shaping tourism policy decisions. As Doorne (1998: 133) has succinctly observed in the contested transformation of the Wellington (New Zealand) waterfront, 'the latencies of power cannot be ignored'. In the chronology of the project, there are several instances where particular issues are overtly omitted from the agenda; particular stakeholder groups are excluded from decision-making or the opportunity to make decisions; and, what he terms, 'localised latencies' reveal themselves whereby 'the differences between the visions of oppositional groups are less distinct' (Doorne 1998: 151). This latter point is significant because it points to the exercise of power in the (apparent) absence of conflict.

Notions of power linked to Weberian and Lukesian theories have been utilised in studies of tourism policy that have drawn on conceptual developments in the study of urban politics. The urban growth machine (Molotch 1976) and the urban regime (Stone 1989) were initially developed to examine how private business groupings shaped urban planning policies and how coalitions between politicians, bureaucrats and business representatives could coalesce into a consensual regime (see Gill this volume). An examination of Christchurch (New Zealand) by Schöllman et al (2001) claims that local place promotion strategies exhibit the characteristics of the urban growth machine model although the major developer interests central to the urban growth machine (Logan and Molotch 1987) play less of a role in the development of place marketing. Long (2000) argues that regime theory helps explain the long standing features of a public-private partnership in the London borough of Islington. Elements of regime theory are also utilised by Thomas and Thomas (2005) to examine the role of small tourism businesses in the development of tourism policy. There are some superficial similarities with elitism and pluralism, and Thomas and Thomas (2005: 132) find that, while in some locations stable coalitions may develop into regimes, in others 'a quasi-pluralist landscape of shifting coalitions relating to

specific issues may take hold'. They also draw on regime theory as part of an argument for a more systematic approach to understanding power relations in local tourism policy.

TOURISM AND FOUCAULT: THE CRITIQUE, ORDERINGS AND BEYOND

By contrast, far more explicit use has been made in tourism studies of the theorisations of power developed by post-structural writers, in particular the extensive writings of Michel Foucault. Foucault's consideration of power marked a significant departure from previous thinking that has been highly contested but has already had a significant influence on tourism studies. His numerous thoughts on power were in part aimed at challenging existing radical and liberal conceptions of power. Marxist theories that presented knowledge and ideology as repressive were critiqued for viewing knowledges, human subjects and practices as subject to the priorities of a capitalist system and the relations of production (Foucault 2002). Writings, often influenced by Weber, that emphasised the importance of authority, the state and politico-judicial systems were contested for their focus on how power was held by a group or institutions without an appreciation of the degree to which power penetrated deep into human existence, and because 'power relations are rooted in the whole network of the social' (Foucault 1982: 345).

At the heart of Foucault's early writing was a desire to understand the inseparable connections between power, knowledge and truth, and how the latter was not something simply sought but which played a central role in regulating human existence often through discourse (Foucault 1978). Miller (2003) argues this led to valuable insights into 'the various knowledges and practices which seek to transform human beings into subjects, and to generate true knowledges of them'. For Foucault, power is both productive, contributing to the collective dimensions of society, and

also constitutive of subjectivity as power plays a role in developing individual identities and practices (Gordon 2002).

Foucault's later writing on governmentality also provided new ways of thinking about the state, political power and the dangers of power. The state was presented as having 'both an individualising and totalising form of power' but the study of power could not simply involve the study of institutions (sovereign power). Rather, it must also incorporate a study of all 'micro' governmental practices to reveal the connections between the 'political' and all the other types of power relation, practice, and technologies (Foucault 1982: 332). Foucault (1982: 338) did acknowledge, however, the existence of 'power blocks' in which power relations, objective capacities and communication relations formed 'regulated and concerted systems'. Miller (2003: 205) ambitiously attempts to summarise the conceptual legacy of Foucault's changing writings on power as:

'power should not be understood according to the model of a generalised domination exerted by one group over another. Power must be understood as a multiplicity of force relations which are immanent to the domain in which they operate and are constitutive of their own organisation. Power does not derive from a single point of origin but is to be found where it operates, at the mobile and unstable interrelation of force relations at local levels. Power is neither an institution nor a structure; it is not a force that can be located. It is 'everywhere''

Clearly, the location of power is a significant concern. However, power is not an entity solely of itself, but it is imbued in all forms of human endeavour. It is,

'the name that one attributes to a complex strategical situation in a particular society. Power relations are not external to and causally related to other types of relations such as economic processes or knowledges, but are immanent to them. Power comes from below, from the multiple force relations operating in the apparatuses of production, families and institutions which cut across the social body. Power relations are intentional, yet they are non subjective, that is to say they are marked by a calculation of aims and objectives, but do not result from the choice or decision of an individual subject. And finally, where there is power there is resistance. Power is a relational phenomenon which exists through a multiplicity of points of resistance which are present throughout the networks of power'.

(Miller 2003: 205)

Indeed for Miller (2003; 17), the core of Foucault's work is to understand 'the regulatory practices of the self', and he suggests that power is an inadequate term to encapsulate such a task.

Given the mobilities and multiplicities associated with tourism along with the sometimes elusive role of state tourism policy and planning (Hall and Jenkins 1995, Church 2004), it is perhaps not surprising that Foucault's considerations of power should have been influential in tourism. Urry's (2002) 'tourist gaze' was directly influenced by Foucault's examination of the regulating gaze in medicine and penal systems. The tourist gaze establishes regulating norms for doing tourism while marking the object of the gaze with meanings linked to a range of power relations and sources of authority. Urry (2002) recognised that his earlier discussions of the gaze had not been sufficiently 'embodied' to consider the way bodily enactments contribute to power relations. Undoubtedly significant are other critiques of Urry (2002) concerning the prioritisation of the visual, the static nature of the gaze and an

overemphasis on the sites and governance of the gaze rather than the broader cultural processes with which tourism was intertwined (Franklin 2004). The tourist gaze, however, was key to moving forward the exploration of power in tourism so as to emphasise the centrality of the tourist rather than the state, other institutions or systemic power relations.

Beyond the gaze, Foucault's (1978) concern with the power of knowledges and discourses has also influenced studies of the 'micro' dimensions of power relations in tourism. Morgan and Pritchard (1998) directly acknowledge the influence of Foucault in their study of the semiotics and discourses (involving tone and status) that they argue are central to explaining the geographical differences in the development trajectories of resorts in south west England. A range of other studies has indicated how the symbols, signs and sites of tourism contribute to influential discourses that can have contrasting effects on power relations by both empowering tourists while underpinning material and symbolic otherings of certain social groups, especially in post-colonial settings (see Aitchison 2001; Craik 1997; Winter this volume). Indeed, a concern with the semiotics of tourism has provided some initial insights of the penetration of power relations deep into mundane materialities of tourism (Dann 1996; Echtner 1999; Selby 2004). However, as Franklin argues (2004), this was often by prioritising the objects and sites of tourism rather than the broader social processes involved.

If research into power relations in tourism is to be further informed by Foucauldian thinking, it will have to acknowledge, and be shaped by, the growing and forceful critique of his views on power. This has been developed from a number of theoretical, philosophical and psychological perspectives (Newman 2004). Lukes (2005: 98) argues that Foucault's later writings on governmentality and the many empirical studies by others that have followed expose tensions within his earlier

work. In particular, they reveal that the notion of power as being productive in constituting governable subjects is an over simplified 'ideal-typical' depiction which does not reveal how modern forms of power both succeed and fail. Other critiques of Foucault have focussed on moral and ethical issues whereby the all embracing, immanent conception of power leads to a view of the subject as dominated and leaves no room for human autonomy or responsibility (Hartstock 1990; Stewart 2001). Schnapp (2000: 134) claims that the 'sense of human beings as creative agents both of the self and of the world they share that is missing in Foucault'. Not surprisingly, this has been strongly refuted by advocates of Foucault. Gordon (2002: xvii) suggests that, despite the evidence of Foucault's writings,

'one section of academia is content to this day to assert that Foucault considered truth to be no more than an effect of power, that his thought is a wholesale and nihilistic rejection of the values of the Enlightenment, that he and his work are incapable of contributing to any form of rational and morally responsible action'.

Critiques and reactions to Foucault's writings of power of this nature have almost inevitably encouraged the development of more nuanced explorations of the creative and embodied 'power' of the tourist. Crouch (this volume) has drawn on theorists such as de Certeau (1984) to examine the enactments and negotiations in the fleeting practices, embodiments and spaces that enable tourism to be empowering. Similarly, Selby (2004) argues that the phenomenological writings of Schutz can be used to understand the relations between tourist in (co-)constructing a creative tourist experience. In other tourism writings the influence of post-Foucauldian arguments and critiques are more explicit. For example, Hartsock's (1990) feminist critique of Foucault, along with the conclusions of a range of post-structural writings, lead Aitchison (2003: 33) to argue that, for understanding gender and power relations

in the context of leisure, capitalism and patriarchy must remain the key focus of examination. She maintains that it is necessary 'to provide a broad analysis of the cultural 'fragments and differences' in the inter-relationships between gender and leisure while simultaneously attending to the broader structural relations of power'. For instance, Johnston's (2005) examination of gay and lesbian Pride festivals illustrates the role played by bodies and performance in both challenging and reaffirming the heteronormative power relations that structure tourism and leisure spaces. Such studies are also trying to avoid the pitfalls of so-called 'resistance studies'. Influenced by Foucault's argument that resistance to power relations was endemic, these have been critiqued from a performative perspective for encouraging a domination-resistance binary, and for not appreciating 'how power is continually and creatively constructed in fleeting contextual encounters' (Rose 2002: 395).

Actor Network Theory (ANT) represents a further significant post-Foucauldian perspective by which to understand power and its connectivities with tourism. While acknowledging an affinity to Foucault, proponents of ANT claim to adopt a distinctive and more empirically-oriented approach to understanding agency, organisation and power (Law 1994, 2003). The emphasis in ANT is on relations and process, and how time- and space-specific translations of heterogeneous networks, agents and non-human devices produce orderings that act in and shape the social world. Law (2003: 5) argues that the perspective on power in ANT must not be associated with pluralism. Rather,

'the effects of power are generated in a relational and distributed manner and nothing is ever sown up.... ordering (and its effects including power) is contestable and often contested.... human beings and machines have their own preferences'.

There have been strong critiques of ANT by theorists (Latour 1999). However, its emphasis on relational materialism and the role of non-human agents and devices in shaping power relations has appeal to tourist researchers seeking to understand the significance of objects involved in tourism. For example, Hetherington (2000) examines the interaction of the agency of humans and museum artefacts in constructing the tourism experience. Taking a broader perspective, Franklin (2004) argues that sociological notions of ordering influenced by ANT, Deleuzian writings on rhizomic networks, Foucauldian thought and post-humanism have the potential for creating nothing less than a new ontology of tourism. By viewing tourism as an ordering of central importance to the current social world, Franklin (2004) outlines the possibilities to understand tourism as not other to the everyday world, as Urry (2003) has suggested. Instead, it is central to the everyday and is a key connectivity network mutually-contributing to the globalising tendencies of contemporary capitalism and the associated processes such as consumerism and cosmopolitanism. The adherents of ordering theories suggest it has considerable potential for revealing the detail of how power 'works' in tourism through agents, objects, bodies and performances. Thus, it provides insights beyond more structurally-oriented accounts that seek to reveal the connections between tourism and wider power relations. Franklin (2004: 297) draws on the empirical example of the growth of Thomas Cook's tourism business which he claims played a role in nationalism and nation-building. He contends that, by viewing tourism as an ordering involving work, projects, devices and governance, it is possible to show that tourism was 'something that was made to happen' rather than just a structurally-linked outcome of changing technologies and demand.

Urry (2003) seeks to develop an ordering perspective of mobility in general which, compared to Franklin (2004), is more explicit in its consideration of power and draws

on network metaphors and complexity theory. For Urry (2003: 112), a complexity approach involves seeing power not,

‘as a thing or a possession. It is something that follows or runs..... It is non-contiguous.... Travelling light is the new asset of power. Power is all about speed, lightness, distance, the weightless, the global, and this is true both of elites and of those resisting elites.’

The key transformational elements of power are mediated and informational power and their increasing ‘structural power’ loosens other structural elements of society and means that political and personal attempts at ordering are always challenged and disrupted (Urry 2003: 139). Such claims are not readily reconciled with increasingly draconian attempts by governments to control human movement and would no doubt be theoretically critiqued by those mentioned earlier who argue for the need to recognise autonomy and identify responsibility in the analysis of power (Schnapp 2000, Lukes 2005). Importantly, however, Urry (2003) is seeking to highlight how mobilities are central to power relations in contemporary society and the influence of mobilities extends well beyond the governance and control linked to the gaze.

Collectively, these writings would suggest the engagement of tourist studies with theories of power is more advanced than might otherwise be thought. Claims that tourist researchers are not engaged with social science theory (Selby 2004) seem less valid and the examination of power relations in tourism is certainly playing a role in correcting some of the alleged theoretical limitations of past studies of tourism (Franklin and Crang 2001). Indeed, examinations of power and tourism influenced by Foucault and other post-structural theories seem to be more developed than those that draw on radical or liberal conceptions of power. Furthermore, Foucault has

had a significant methodological legacy in the social sciences by advancing the case for ethno-methodologies and it is no surprise that research influenced by post-structural theory has been central to developing qualitative methods which until recently had been marginalised in tourism studies (Jamal and Hollinshead 2001; Phillimore and Goodson 2004). However, notions of space and spatiality, despite their apparently obvious centrality to studies of tourism and power in this respect, have developed an elusive status to which we now turn our attention.

SPATIALITIES OF POWER AND TOURISM

Foucault (1982: 361) argued that 'space is fundamental in any exercise of power' and unsurprisingly a number of the studies of tourism from a post-structural perspective have made space their focus of study. Edensor (2000) draws on Foucault's ideas about surveillance to explore what are permissible and prohibited practices in enclavic tourist spaces, as well as the manner in which they are practically regulated. Similarly, in addition to finding power relations at the level of the individual and the institution that constrain and manage tourist behaviour, Cheong and Miller (2000: 372) discover power relations in locations which at first inspection might apparently be unpromisingly non-political to untrained eyes: interpersonal transactions between tourists and guides; ethical codes; and the design, content and publication of guidebooks. With an almost evangelical zeal, they (2000: 371) concluded from their Foucauldian reading that power is 'omnipresent in a tripartite system of tourists, locals and [information] brokers'.

To some degree, however, the notion of the tourism gaze reified the study of the spaces of tourism and this has been critiqued by Franklin (2004). Urry (2003: 113), draws on concepts of complexity to argue for a fluid and dispersed view of the relations between power and space. He claims that, from a complexity perspective,

power 'may be increasingly detached from a specific territory or space'. Despite this detachment he recognises that time-space configurations are entwined in the moorings and mobilities based around globally integrated networks and attractors which play a key role in transforming the social world.

Foucault (1978: 94) also recognised the mobile nature of power noting that 'power is exercised from innumerable points, in the interplay of non-egalitarian and mobile relations'. For Westwood (2002: 2), such a view signifies that power should not be treated as a capacity outside or beyond social relations; rather, power is constitutive of social relations. In a classical Foucauldian reinterpretation, she notes that power is to be found everywhere and always present. Westwood sets out to document the terrains in which power is constitutive in the social. She argues that not only are there identifiable modalities of power but also distinctive sites of power. The former refer to the different forms of power and the manner in which power is enacted, while the latter are social spaces where power is exercised. Among the sites of power are: racialised power; class and power; engendered power; sexualised power; spatial power; and visual power. Modalities of power are: repression / co-ercion; power as constraint; hegemony and counter-hegemony; manipulation and strategy; power/knowledge; discipline and governance; and seduction and resistance (Westwood 2002: 3). For her, such a framework is useful because it moves analysis of power away from conceptualisations centred on capacity towards the specificity of strategies and tactics used in distinctive social settings (Westwood 2002: 135). Allen (2003: 2) in his study of place, space and power adopts a similar starting point of power as a relational effect of social interaction. For him,

'people are placed by power, but they experience it at first hand through the rhythms and relationships of particular places, not as some pre-packaged force from afar and not as a ubiquitous presence.'

Power is therefore not an arbitrary construct; instead, it is always of a particular kind. He notes that it is vital to differentiate because acts such as 'domination, authority, seduction, manipulation, coercion and the like to possess their own relational peculiarities' (Allen 2003: 2). This is a reasonably orthodox position to assume. Where his thesis differs is in his argument that, if power has a presence at all, it does so through the interplay of forces in place (Allen 2003: 11). This position is presented as an antidote to the increasingly accepted view that power is all around us. Among some of the more abstract theorisations of power, there is a simple propensity to assume that power is uniformly and evenly distributed across space. Indeed, Allen (2003: 3, emphasis original) argues that 'we have lost the sense in which power is *inherently* spatial, and conversely spatiality is *imbued* with power'. Power may require proximity or function through reach. For instance, how are domination, authority and seduction exercised? Are there differences in their exercise when the parties are closeby or far apart? And from a perspective of tourism, perhaps a more prescient question is one of how they come into contact with one another.

Again, these might seem like obvious questions, but as Allen (2003) argues there has been practically no attention among theorists to how geography impacts on the operation of power. As an initial effort to address this shortcoming, he identifies three genres of conceptualisation in which the spatiality of power is 'considered'. First, the writings of Weber -and others for whom power is an entity- are criticised because they take for granted how power is dispersed across space. Power is produced and reproduced across space largely unproblematically from place to place, and geography is viewed by and large as only a minor disruption to the distribution of power. The second genre is associated with Michael Mann and Manuel Castells and, once more, Allen decries this group for an equally

unproblematic treatment of power over space. On this occasion, such accounts portray power as navigated through complex and multiple networks in society. In terms of their pointing to the intricate organization and orchestration of power among actors, such views are highly relevant. They are, however, problematic in so far as they adopt a metaphor of power as a flow of electrical energy through a circuit without recourse to practicalities and limitations of flow throughout the system. Rather than a uniform or continuous transmission across tracts of space and time, as the second genre would imply, Allen (2003: 8) views power as always constituted in time-space. In this respect, he identifies the work of Foucault and Deleuze as emblematic of a third genre. Power is practiced, not possessed and that practice is imminent. Simply put, power is present, not a backcloth; moreover, it is not imposed from above or externally but it is seen as co-extensive with its field of operation (Allen 2003: 9).

In order to place power, Allen (2003) draws on a combination of the theoretical writings of Lefebvre (1991) and a series of case studies. Rather than trying to pursue Lefebvre's (1991) elusive representations of space, representational spaces and spatial practices, Allen (2003: 162) adopts a 'practiced view of power' in keeping with Lefebvre to examine 'how space is claimed exclusively and to focus on *what* exactly is exercised in the name of power'. One of the case studies is the tourism and retail spaces of the Potsdamer Platz in Berlin, including the Sony Plaza. Allen (2003: 182) claims here that space is dominated by a 'seductive presence' so that what seem like low key, intimate consumer invitations involve effective power from a distance for the Sony Corporation. The role of distance and presence is one of the key spatial paradoxes for understanding power in relation to tourism and mobilities. As Allen (2003:183) notes,

'it is true that power has to have a presence to be effective, the nature of that presence and its effect will vary from mode to mode. Just as there is no everywhere to power, so there is no such thing as a universal blanket presence'.

Clearly for tourists and all those connected to tourism, a temporary co-presence will be central to the exercise of power in the spaces of tourism which also involves complex networks of distancing, especially as producers need to send out their seductive invitations not just into tourism spaces but into the home and human imaginations. Distance, 'absence' and co-presence are important issues in the consideration of tourism and power to which we return in the conclusion but by studying power in the context of tourism it is possible to both 'place' and 'mobilise' power, and hence to consider the range of implications of increasing mobilities for the contrasting theorisations of power.

STRUCTURE OF THE BOOK

In the preceding sections we have explored the various ways in which power has been theorised and investigated empirically, and we have introduced the ways in which power and tourism have been connected. Power is an essentially contested concept. No single or accepted hegemonic position exists among power theorists on what power is or what power ought to be. None of the theoretical or conceptual constructs or positions introduced thus far is unproblematic. There are more popular, even more fashionable views of how to conceptualise power but this does not necessarily mean they are any the more effective than the more unfashionable in their ability to interpret the social or political dimensions of tourism. In the collection of essays that follows there has been no intellectual policing; no single, major 'paradigmatic' strand of thinking prevails here. Almost inevitably, not every

theoretical perspective can be covered but a diversity of approaches to power is present as a means of commending the versatility and capacity of power theory for tourism analysis. Some of the authors champion or challenge particular theoretical positions of power such as Foucauldian (Winter) and Lukesian (Coles and Scherle, Hall) readings, whereas others set out to establish the potentialities of power discourse would add to our understanding of tourism and vice versa (Shaw, Timothy, Lew).

The collection comprises three main sections, with a synthesis of the main perspectives and prospects for the future development of power discourse in tourism in the concluding chapter. The first section (chapters 2-5) considers the relationships between power, performance and practice. It explores notions of the negotiation and experience of power, with a particular emphasis on the embodiment and performance of power in tourism. The individual tourist is the predominant unit of analysis. David Crouch (chapter 2) surveys recent arguments concerning the 'practical ontologies' of tourism and emphasises how lay geographies are used by tourists to negotiate and make sense of and tourism thereby producing complex and non-linear entanglements. Crouch uses these notions to explore the significance of the Mediterranean and America in relation to British tourism and culture. These ideas are also progressed in an empirical sense in Carl Cater's (chapter 3) case-study of embodiment in adventurous pursuits in Queenstown, the self-proclaimed 'adventure capital of the world'. There are overlaps between Cater's work and Gareth Shaw's (chapter 4) investigation of holidaymaking among disabled people. While Shaw does not make such an extensive use of power theory, his contribution warns of the need to reflect carefully on the nature of practical ontology in his study of holiday-making among disabled tourists. Rooted in recent literatures on the dominant 'Social Model of Disability' (Gabel and Peters 2004), Shaw argues that tourism for disabled persons is empowering not just in the sense that holidays represent the opportunity

to overcome immobility. Rather, through tourism there is a release from the shackles of everyday routine for the disabled person, their family and their carers. The final contribution in this section is Caroline Winter's (chapter 5) Foucauldian reading of the Ghan Train as tourist attraction and emblem of cultural politics of Australian nation-building. Winter seeks to reveal the connections between wider social processes and the signs and symbols of the Ghan train in Australia by working with Foucault's notions of technologies. She argues that through the train, visual representations and the landscape the contribution of Indigenous and Afghan people towards the Australian nation has been subjugated, but to create an outcome that favours the stories and efforts of white Australians. Collectively, these chapters emphasise the role individual tourists can play in shaping the power relations of tourism.

In the second section of the book (chapters 6-8), the connections between power, property and resources are surveyed. These essays focus on political arrangements between groups in society and focus more squarely on the technologies -or as Morriss (2002) might put it, the vehicles of power- and the role of state institutions in mediating power relations. Alison Gill (chapter 6) explores the politics of property development in the year-round resort of Whistler in Canada. Whistler has been a long-term research interest for Gill and her chapter presents a retrospective of how power relations have been mediated using urban regime theory (Stoker 1996). Although the nature of the regimes and the power relations among and between stakeholders have evolved over the years, one constant has been the discourse surrounding 'bed units'. Although originally nothing more than a planning tool to regulate the load of development in a sensitive environment, 'bed units' have assumed an almost mythical status in Whistler. They have become a currency in their own right, fought over and regulated in the contested process of development.

The idea of changing regimes is picked up in Alan Lew's contribution (chapter 7). New urban regeneration initiatives embody the cultural settings and mediations of power in post-socialist settings. Morriss (2002) has pointed out that the majority of debate on power seems to be transacted in the English language. Whether or not this is a misleading assertion is an altogether different issue, but his observation points to the predominance of Anglophone perspectives on power and hence raises questions of their ability to understand power relations in other cultures (see also Coles and Scherle, this volume). Lew's chapter reminds us of the distinctive networks of *guanxi* operating in and among Chinese communities around the world (Lew and Wong 2004), how power is articulated through these networks of affiliation, and how the 'informal' (as western commentators might consider) collides with the formal. His chapter considers notions of power in a command economy. Authority and domination are identified in power discourses which mainly pertain to western liberal democracies. China is becoming one of the main source countries for international tourism while there is considerable and rapid development of infrastructure for overseas visitors and domestic tourists, not least related to the Beijing Olympics in 2008 (Zhang et al 2005). Although the Chinese economy is becoming more liberal, urban regeneration is perceived as essentially a state-centred project (Wu 2003). The formal structures described by Lew are still quite rigid but his contribution highlights the emergence of new urban forms as a manifestation of the agencies of individuals and groups of entrepreneurs in an unfolding form of structuration (Giddens 1984); informal social and cultural systems of power resonate in and interact with formal political and economic structures.

The chapter by Church and Ravenscroft continues the consideration of neo-liberalism and state institutions but focuses on property rights and the legal system. An examination of the conflicts in England over access to inland water between landowners, anglers and canoeists reveals how the socio-spatial process of resource

mobilisation linked to legal rights interact with state institutions and the structural principles of a neo-liberal society to produce leisure and tourism outcomes that favour those with property rights. The chapter demonstrates, however, the dependent nature of power relations so that those with authority rely on the actions and discourses of those they seek to exclude from particular spaces to justify the maintenance of their property rights.

In the final section of the book (chapter 9-11), issues of power and governance are explored. Once again, the role of state institutions features prominently but here special reference is afforded to the idea of empowerment in two respects: in a more general, relative sense associated with restructuring of power relations over time (Timothy, Coles and Scherle); and second, it focuses on empowerment as a specific ideological aspiration associated with, and articulated through, tourism and in the best interests of the communities it is intended to benefit (Coles and Scherle, Hall). Not surprisingly, the potential of Lukesian thinking has great potential in tourism studies in this respect. Dallen Timothy's (chapter 9) surveys recent progress by the tourism academy and in wider inter-disciplinary studies of tourism. His chapter demonstrates that empowerment has become a key conceptual and practical concern for social scientists from a large variety of disciplinary backgrounds, including members of the tourism academy. Multiple, contested perspectives abound in a highly fragmented and un-co-ordinated corpus of studies on tourism and of relevance to tourism scholars. The great challenge is to draw together common strands from this plurality of perspectives. Timothy's review stresses that the time is right to introduce theoretically-informed readings into studies of tourism; to date, our understanding benefits from a large empirical base but lacks conceptual refinement. Where theoretical frameworks have been applied they have almost exclusively viewed power through a Weberian lens (Sofield 2003), whether explicitly or implied.

Tim Coles and Nicolai Scherle adopt a different tack to issues surrounding empowerment (chapter 10). Their paper looks at the struggles of Moroccan tour operators to achieve more equitable commercial outcomes in their dealings with their German counterparts. Tourism is viewed as a 'passport to development' and a means by which Morocco will achieve greater economic independence over time. They use perspectives from organizational studies on the power tactics within organizations (based on the work of Lukes) combined with perspectives on intercultural communications to consider how power relations are constructed and played out in extended spatial commodity chains between Germany and Morocco. These theoretical frameworks and conceptual toolboxes reveal certain contradictions and tensions in the unfolding commercial relationships between German businesses and their Moroccan counterparts, especially where conflict is involved. Power is understood and used in quite instrumental means by both the perceived powerful and powerless to secure preferred outcomes. Crude calculations of the exercise of power may not be consistent with philosophical pronouncements, (Morriss 2002) but importantly reveal that the powerless can act in subtle ways to enhance their power and that both parties can feel empowerment in commercial relationships. In chapter 11, Michael Hall adopts an explicitly Lukesian approach to the location of power in tourism. As a final contribution here, Hall considers the functioning of power in and through a discussion of heritage tourism, Olympic bids and multiscaled governance. This highlights the way in which key organisations, such as the World Tourism Organization (WTO) and the World Travel and Tourism Council (WTTC), use knowledge and influence to define the 'rules of the game' concerning tourism globally, while operating through Lukes' second and third dimensions of power to ensure certain issues receive little attention in the political discourses of tourism. Both dimensions serve to defend and further substantiate the positions of such supra-national organisations as 'global' leaders.

REFERENCES

- 09/11 Commission. (2004) *The 09/11 Commission Report. Final Report of the National Commission on Terrorist Attacks Upon the United States*. Authorized Edition. New York: W.W. Norton & Company.
- Aitchison, C. (1999) 'Heritage and nationalism: gender and the performance of power.' In, D. Crouch (ed.) *Leisure/Tourism Geographies: Practices and Geographical Knowledge*. London: Routledge.
- (2000) 'Young disabled people, leisure and everyday life: reviewing conventional definitions of leisure studies', *Annals of Leisure Research*, 3(1): 1-20.
- (2001) 'Theorising Other discourses of tourism, gender and culture: can the subaltern speak (in tourism)?', *Tourist Studies*, 1(2): 133-147.
- (2003) *Gender and Leisure. Social and Cultural Perspectives*. London: Routledge.
- Alexander, M.J. (1998) 'Imperial desire/sexual utopias: white gay capital and transformational tourism', in E. Shohat (ed.) *Talking Visions*. Cambridge, Mass: MIT Press.
- Allen, J. (2003) *The Lost Geographies of Power*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Arendt, H. (1970) *On Violence*. London: Penguin.
- Arino, O.B. (2002) 'Sustainable tourism and taxes: an insight into the Balearic Eco-tax Law', *European Environmental Law Review*, June 2002: 169-174.
- Ashley, C. (1998) 'Tourism, communities and national policy: Namibia's experience', *Development Policy Review*, 16: 323-352.
- Bacharach, P. and Baratz, M.S. (1962) 'Two faces of Power', *American Political Science Review*, 56: 941-952.
- (1963) 'Decisions and nondecisions: an analytical framework', *American Political Science Review*, 57: 641-651.

- (1970) *Power and Poverty: Theory and Practice*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Baranowski, S. (2000) 'Strength through Joy: tourism and national integration in the Third Reich', in, S. Baranowski and E. Furlough (eds.) *Being Elsewhere. Tourism, Consumer Culture, and Identity in Modern Europe and North America*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Baranowski, S. and Furlough, E. (2000) 'Introduction', in, S. Baranowski and E. Furlough (eds.) *Being Elsewhere. Tourism, Consumer Culture, and Identity in Modern Europe and North America*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Basch, H. (2004) 'Who's in control? Insights from the front line', in, School of Tourism and Leisure Management, University of Queensland (eds.) Proceedings of the 14th International Research Conference of the Council for Australian University Tourism and Hospitality Education (CAUTHE) 'Creating Tourism Knowledge'. Brisbane: University of Queensland.
- Bastakis, C., Buhalis, D. and Butler, R. (2003) 'The perception of small- and medium-sized tourism accommodation providers on the impacts of the tour operators' power in Eastern Mediterranean', *Tourism Management*, 25: 151-170.
- Begg, A. (2000) *Empowering the Earth. Strategies for Social Change*. Dartington: Green Books.
- Benton, T. (1981) ' "Objective" interests in the sociology of power', *Sociology*, 15: 161-184.
- Bell, S. (2002) 'Only an all out war on tourism can bring to an end this war on tourism!' *The Guardian*, 29 November 2002 (#1853).
- Bianchi, R. (2002) 'Towards a new political economy of global tourism', in R. Sharpley and D. Telfer (eds.) *Tourism and Development. Concepts and Issues*. Clevedon: Channel View Books.

- Binnie, J. (2004) *The Globalisation of Sexuality*. London: Sage.
- Bramwell, B. and Lane, B. (2000) 'Collaboration and partnerships in tourism planning', in B. Bramwell and B. Lane (eds.) *Tourism Collaboration and Partnerships. Politics, Practice and Sustainability*. Clevedon: Channel View Books.
- Bramwell, B. and Sharman, A. (1999) 'Collaboration in local tourism policymaking', *Annals of Tourism Research*, 26(2): 392-415.
- British Broadcasting Corporation (BBC) (2002) Kenya terror strikes target Israelis. On-line document. Available from:
<http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/africa/2522207.stm> [Last accessed: 29 July 2005]
- Britton, S. 1991. 'Tourism, capital, and place: towards a critical geography of tourism', *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*, 9: 451-478.
- Brown, M. (1999) 'Travelling through the closet', in J. Duncan and D. Gregory (eds.) *Writes of Passage: Reading Travel Writing*, London: Routledge
- Browne, K. (2006 forthcoming) 'A party with politics?: (Re)making LGBTQ Pride spaces in Dublin and Brighton', *Social and Cultural Geographies*.
- Buchanan, D. and Badham, R. (1999) *Power, Politics and Organizational Change. Winning the Turf Game*. London: Sage.
- Burns, P. (1999) 'Paradoxes in planning. Tourism elitism or brutalism?' *Annals of Tourism Research*, 26(2): 329-348.
- (2004) 'Tourism planning. A Third Way?' *Annals of Tourism Research*, 31(1): 24-43.
- Butler, R.W. (1980) 'The concept of a tourist area cycle of evolution: implications for the management of resources', *Canadian Geographer*, 24(1): 5-12.
- Butler, R.W. (2006a) *The Tourism Area Life Cycle. Volume 1: Applications and Modifications*. Clevedon: Channel View.
- Butler, R.W. (2006b) *The Tourism Area Life Cycle. Volume 2: Conceptual and Theoretical Issues*. Clevedon: Channel View.

- Cable News Network (CNN) (2002) Al Qaeda claims responsibility for Kenya attacks. Online Document. Available from:
<http://archives.cnn.com/2002/WORLD/africa/12/02/kenya.probe/> [Last accessed: 29 July 2005]
- Cantu, L. (2002) 'De Ambiente: queer tourism and the shifting boundaries of Mexican male sexualities', *GLQ A journal of gay and lesbian studies*, 8: 139-166.
- Cheong, S-M. and Miller, M.L. (2000) 'Power and tourism. A Foucauldian observation', *Annals of Tourism Research*, 27(2): 371-390.
- Church, A. (2004) 'Local and regional tourism policy and power', in A.A. Lew, C.M. Hall and A.M. Williams (eds.) *A Companion to Tourism*, Oxford: Blackwell.
- Clancy, M. 1998. 'Commodity chains, services and development: theory and preliminary evidence from the tourism industry', *Review of International Political Economy*, 5(1): 122-148.
- Clegg, S. (1989) *Frameworks of Power*. London: Sage.
- Cochrane, E. (2005) The United States Conference of Mayors. International Travel Challenges/Economic Impact (Washington, D.C. 22 April 2005). Online document. Available from:
http://www.usmayors.org/uscm/us_mayor_newspaper/documents/04_25_05/cochran.asp. [Last accessed: 29 July 2005]
- Cocks, C. (2000) 'The chamber of commerce's carnival: city festivals and urban tourism in the United States, 1890-1915.' In S. Baranowski and E. Furlough (eds.) *Being Elsewhere. Tourism, Consumer Culture, and Identity in Modern Europe and North America*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Coleman, S. and Crang, M. (eds) (2002) *Tourism: Between Place and Performance*. Oxford: Berghahn.
- Craik, J. (1997) 'The culture of tourism', in C. Rojek and J. Urry (eds.) *Touring Cultures: Transformations of Travel Theory*, London: Routledge.

- Crase, L. and Jackson, J. (2000) 'Assessing the effects of information asymmetry in tourism destinations', *Tourism Economics*, 6(4): 321-334.
- Crouch D. (1999) 'The intimacy and expansion of space', in D. Crouch (ed.) *Leisure/tourism geographies*, Routledge, London
- Crouch, D. (2000) 'Places around us: embodied lay geographies in leisure and tourism', *Leisure Studies*, 19(1): 63-76.
- Crouch, D. (2004) 'Tourist practices and performances', in A.A. Lew, C.M. Hall and A.M. Williams (eds.) *A Companion to Tourism*, Malden: Blackwell.
- Dahl, R.A. (1958) 'A critique of the Ruling Elite Model', *American Political Science Review*, 52: 463-69.
- (1961a) 'Equality and power in American society', in P.F. Drucker, D.C. Miller and R.A. Dahl (eds.) *Power and Democracy in America*. Westport, Co: Greenwood Press.
- (1961b) *Who Governs? Democracy and Power in an American City*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- (1968) 'Power', in D.L. Sills (ed.) *International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences*. New York: Free Press and Macmillan.
- Dann, G.M.S. (1996) 'Tourist images of a destination: an alternative analysis', *Journal of Travel and Tourism Marketing*, 5(1/2): 41-55
- de Araujo, L. and Bramwell, B. (1999) 'Stakeholder assessment and collaborative tourism planning: the case of Brazil's Costa Dourada Project.' *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 7(3&4): 356-378.
- de Certeau, M. (1984) *The Practice of Everyday Life*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- de Kadt, E. (1979) *Tourism: Passport to Development*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Dessewffy, T. (2002) 'Speculators and travellers: the political construction of the tourist in the Kadar regime', *Cultural Studies*, 16(1): 44-63.

- Doorne, S. (1998) 'Power, participation and perception: an insider's perspective on the politics of the Wellington Waterfront redevelopment', *Current Issues in Tourism*, 1(2): 129-166.
- Dowding, K. (1996) *Power*. Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Echtner, C.M (1999) 'The semiotic paradigm: implications of tourism research', *Tourism Management*, 20(1): 47-57.
- Edensor, T. (2000) 'Staging tourism: tourists as performers', *Annals of Tourism Research*, 27(2): 322-344.
- (2001) 'Performing tourism, staging tourism: (re)producing tourist space and practice', *Tourist Studies*, 1: 59-82.
- Elliot, J. (1997) *Tourism. Politics and Public Sector Management*. London: Routledge.
- Fallon, F. (2001) 'Conflict, power and tourism on Lombok', *Current Issues in Tourism*, 4(6): 481-502.
- Forstner, K. (2002) 'Community ventures and access to markets: the role of intermediaries in marketing rural tourism products.' *Development Policy Review*, 22(5): 497-514.
- Foucault, M. (1978) *The History of Sexuality. Volume 1. An Introduction*. (trans. Hurley, R.) New York: Pantheon.
- (1982) 'The subject and power', in L.D. Hubert and P. Rabinow (eds.) *Michel Foucault: Beyond Structuralism and Hermeneutics*, London: Harvester Wheatsheaf.
- (2002) 'Truth and Judicial Forms. Lectures delivered at the Pontifical University of Rio de Janeiro May 1973' in J.D. Faubion (ed.) *Michel Foucault. Power. Essential works of Foucault 1954-1984*. London: Penguin Books.
- Franklin, A. (2003) *Tourism: An Introduction*. London: Sage.
- (2004) 'Tourism as an ordering. Towards a new ontology of tourism', *Tourist Studies*, 4(3): 277-301.

- Franklin, A. and Crang, M. (2001) 'The trouble with tourism and travel theory?' *Tourist Studies*, 1(1): 5-22.
- Fyall, A. and Garrod, B. (2005) *Tourism Marketing. A Collaborative Approach*. Clevedon: Channel View Books.
- Gabel, S. and Peters, S. (2004) 'Presage of a paradigm shift? Beyond the social model of disability toward resistance theories of disability', *Disability and Society*, 19(6): 585-611.
- Galbreath, J.K. (1983) *The Anatomy of Power*. London: Corgi Books.
- Giddens, A. (1968) "'Power" in the recent writings of Talcott Parsons.' *Sociology*, 2: 257-72.
- (1984) *The Constitution of Society*. Cambridge: Polity.
- (1976) *New Rules of Sociological Method*. London: Hutchinson.
- Gordon, C (2002) 'Introduction', in J.D. Faubion (ed.) *Michel Foucault. Power. Essential works of Foucault 1954-1984*. London: Penguin Books.
- Hall, C.M. (1994) *Tourism and Politics. Policy, Power and Place*. Chichester: J.Wiley & Sons.
- (2000) *Tourism Planning. Policies, Processes and Relationships*. Harlow: Prentice Hall.
- (2003) 'Politics and place: an analysis of power in tourism communities', in S. Singh, Timothy, D. and R. Dowling (eds.) *Tourism in Destination Communities*. Wallingford: CAB International.
- Hall, C.M. and Jenkins, J. (1995) *Tourism and Public Policy*. London: Routledge.
- Hall, C.M., Timothy, D.J. and Duval, D.T. (2004) 'Security and tourism: towards a new understanding?', in C.M. Hall, D.J. Timothy and D.T. Duval (eds.) *Safety and Security in Tourism. Relationships, Management and Marketing*. Binghampton: Haworth Press.
- Hannam, K. (2002) 'Tourism and development I: globalization and power.' *Progress in Development Studies*, 2(3): 227-234.

- Hartstock, N. (1990) 'Foucault on power: a theory for women?', in L. Nicholson (ed.) *Feminism/Postmodernism*, London: Routledge.
- Haugaard, M. (2002) *Power: A Reader*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- (2003) 'Reflections on seven ways of creating power', *European Journal of Social Theory*, 6(1): 87-113.
- Henderson, J. (2003) 'Ethnic heritage as a tourist attraction: the Peranakans of Singapore', *International Journal of Heritage Studies*, 9(1): 27-44.
- Hetherington, K. (2000) 'Museums and the visually impaired: the spatial politics of access', *Sociological Review*, 48: 444-463
- Hindess, B. (1996) *Discourses of Power. From Hobbes to Foucault*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Hollinshead, K. (1994) 'The unconscious realm of tourism', *Annals of Tourism*, 21: 387-391.
- (1999) 'Surveillance of the worlds of tourism: Foucault and the eye-of-power', *Tourism Management*, 20: 7-23.
- Hubbard, P. (2002) 'Sexing the Self: geographies of engagement and encounter', *Social and Cultural Geography*, 3: 365-382.
- Hunter, F. (1953) *Community Power Structure: A Study of Decision Makers*. Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press.
- Hunter, W.C. (2001) 'Trust between culture: the tourist', *Current Issues in Tourism*, 4(1): 42-67.
- Ioannides, D. (1998) 'Tour operators: the gatekeepers of tourism.' In D. Ioannides and K. Debbage (eds.) *The Economic Geography of the Tourist Industry: a Supply-side Analysis*. London: Routledge.
- Jamal, T. and Getz, D. (1995) 'Collaboration theory and community tourism planning', *Annals of Tourism Research*, 22(1): 186-204.

- Johnston, L. (2005) *Queering tourism: Paradoxical Performances at Gay Pride Parades*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Judd, D.R. and Simpson, D. (2003) 'Reconstructing the local state. The role of external constituencies in building urban tourism', *American Behavioural Scientist*, 46(8): 1056-1069.
- Kayat, K. (2002) 'Power, social exchanges and tourism in Langkawi: rethinking resident perceptions', *International Journal of Tourism Research*, 4: 171-191.
- Keitz, C. (1991) 'Reisen zwischen Kultur und Gegenkultur – 'Baedeker' und die ersten Arbeitertouristen in der Weimrer Republik' in H. Spode (Hg.) *Zur Sonne, zur Freiheit! Beiträge zur Tourismusgeschichte. Berichte und Materialien Nummer 11*. Berlin: Verlag für universitäre Kommunikation.
- Klemm, M.S. and Martín-Quirós, M.A. (1999) 'Changing the balance of power. Tour operators and tourism suppliers in the Spanish tourism industry.' In L.C. Harrison and W. Husbands (eds.) *Practising Responsible Tourism. International Case Studies in Tourism Planning, Policy and Development*. Chichester: J. Wiley & Sons.
- Koshar, R. (2002) *German Travel Cultures*. Oxford: Berg.
- Larson, M. (2002) 'A political approach to relationship marketing: case study of the Storsjöyran Festival.' *International Journal of Tourism Research*, 4: 119-143.
- Laslo, D. (2003) 'Policy communities and infrastructure of urban tourism.' *American Behavioural Scientist*, 46(8): 1070-1083.
- Latour, B. (1986) 'The powers of association', in J. Law (ed.) *Power, Action and Belief: A New Sociology of Knowledge*. London: Routledge.
- (1999) 'On recalling ANT', in J. Law and J. Hassard (eds.) *Actor Network Theory and After*, Oxford: Blackwell.
- Law, J. (1994) *Organising Modernity*. London: Sage.
- Law, J. (2003) 'Notes on the theory of the actor network: ordering, strategy and heterogeneity', Centre for Science Studies, Lancaster University, Lancaster

LA1 4YN. Available at www.comp.lancs.ac.uk/sociology/soc054jl.html [last accessed November 2005].

Lefebvre (1991) *The Production of Space*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Levine, D.N. (2000) 'On the critique of 'Utilitarian' theories of action. Newly identified convergences among Simmel, Weber and Parsons', *Theory, Culture and Society*, 17(1): 63-78.

Logan, J. and Molotch, H. (1987) *Urban fortunes. The political economy of space*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Long, P. (2000) 'Tourism Development Regimes in the Inner City Fringe: The Case of Discover Islington, London', in B. Bramwell and B. Lane (eds.) *Tourism Collaboration and Partnerships: Politics, Practice and Sustainability*, Clevedon: Channel View Publications.

Lukes, S. (1974) *Power: A Radical View*. London: Macmillan.

----- (1977) *Essays in Social Theory*. London: Macmillan.

----- (2005) *Power: A Radical View*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan (2nd edition, The Original Text with Two Major New Chapters).

Mann, M. (1986) *The Sources of Social Power. Volume 1. A History of Power from the Beginning to AD1760*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

----- (1993) *The Sources of Social Power. Volume 2. The Rise of Classes and Nation-states, 160-1914*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Markwell, K. (1996) 'Towards a gay and lesbian leisure research agenda', *Australian Leisure*, 7: 42-44.

Mills, C.W. (1956) *The Power Elite*. New York: Oxford University Press. (Second edition 1959).

Miller, P. (2003) *Domination and Power*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul

Molotch, H. (1976) 'The City as Growth Machine', *American Journal of Sociology*, 82: 483-99.

- Morgan, N. and Pritchard, A. (1998) *Tourism Promotion and Power. Creating Images, Creating Identities*. Chichester: J. Wiley and Sons.
- Morriss, P. (2002) *Power. A Philosophical Analysis*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Mosedale, J.T. (2005) *Capital Mobility in the Tourism Sector: An Analysis of Integrated Corporations*. Unpublished Paper presented at 'The End of Tourism? Mobility and Local-Global Connections', 23-24 June 2005, Centre for Tourism Policy Studies, University of Brighton, Eastbourne, UK.
- Moubayed, S. (2001) Amin Gemayel Says His Family's History "Runs Parallel To Lebanon's" Washington Report on Middle East Affairs. October 2001. Online document. Available from: <http://www.wrmea.com/archives/october01/0110029.html>. [Last accessed: 14 August 2005.]
- Mowforth, M. and Munt, I. (1998) *Tourism and Sustainability. New Tourism in the Third World*. London: Routledge.
- Murphy, P.E. and Murphy, A. (2005) *Strategic Management for Tourism Communities. Bridging the Gaps*. Clevedon: Channel View Books.
- Parsons, T. (1963) 'On the concept of political power', *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society*, 107(3): 232-262.
- (1967) *Sociological Theory and Modern Society*. New York: Free Press.
- Poggi, G. (2001) *Forms of Power*. Oxford: Polity
- Phillimore, J. and Goodson, L. (2004) *Qualitative Research in Tourism. Ontologies, Epistemologies and Methodologies*. London: Routledge.
- Pritchard, A., Morgan, N.J., Sedgely, D., Khan, E. and Jenkins, A. (1998) 'Reaching out to the gay tourist: opportunities and threats in an emerging market segment', *Tourism Management*, 19: 273-282.

- Pritchard, A., Morgan, N.J., Sedgely, D., Khan, E. and Jenkins, A. (2000) 'Sexuality and holiday choices: conversations with gay and lesbian tourists', *Leisure Studies*, 19: 267-283.
- Pritchard, A. (2004) 'Gender and sexuality in tourism research', in A. Lew, C.M. Hall, and A. Williams (eds.) *A Companion to Tourism*, Oxford: Blackwell.
- Prus, R. (1999) *Beyond the Power Mystique. Power as Intersubjective Accomplishment*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Puar, J. K. (2002a) 'A transnational feminist critique of queer tourism', *Antipode*, 34: 935-946.
- Puar, J. K. (2002b) 'Circuits of queer mobility: tourism, travel and globalization', *GLQ: Journal of Lesbian and Gay Studies*, 8: 101-137.
- Reed, M.G. (1997) 'Power relations and community-based tourism planning', *Annals of Tourism Research*, 24(3): 566-591.
- Richter, L. (1983) 'Tourism, politics and political science: a case of not so benign neglect', *Annals of Tourism Research*, 10(3): 313-335.
- Rose, M. (2002) 'The seductions of resistance: power, politics and a performative style of systems', *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*, 20: 383-400.
- Ryan, C. (2002) 'Equity, management, power sharing and sustainability – issues of the "new tourism".' *Tourism Management*, 23(1): 17-26.
- Scheyvens, R. (1999) 'Ecotourism and the empowerment of local communities', *Tourism Management*, 20: 245-249.
- Schollmann, A., Perkins, H.C. and Moore, K. (2001) 'Rhetoric, claims making and conflict in touristic place promotion: the case of central Christchurch, New Zealand', *Tourism Geographies*, 3: 300-325.
- Schnapp (2000) 'Power and responsibility: should we spare the king's head?', *Politics*, 20(3): 129-135.
- Scott, J. (1991) *Power*. Oxford: Polity.

- Selby, M. (2004) *Understanding Urban Tourism . Image, Culture and Experience*.
London: I.B. Tauris.
- Selin, S. (1999) 'Developing a typology of sustainable tourism partnerships',
Journal of Sustainable Tourism 7(3/4): 260-273.
- Selin, S. and Chavez, D. (1995) 'Developing an evolutionary tourism partnership
model', *Annals of Tourism Research*, 22(4): 844-856
- Semmens, K. (2005) *Seeing Hitler's Germany. Tourism in the Third Reich*.
Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Simmons, D.G. (1994) 'Community participation in tourism planning', *Tourism
Management*, 15(2): 98-108.
- Simpson, K. (2001) 'Strategic planning and community involvement as contributors
to sustainable tourism development', *Current Issues in Tourism*, 4(1): 3-41
- Sofield, T.H.B. (2003) *Empowerment for Sustainable Tourism Development*.
Oxford: Pergamon Press.
- Stewart, A. (2001) *Theories of Power and Domination*. London: Sage.
- Stange, I. (1999) 'Urban Sustainability, Globalisation and the Pursuit of the Heritage
Aesthetic', *Planning Practice and Research*, 14(3): 301-311.
- Stone, C. (1989) *Regime Politics: Governing Atlanta 1946-1988*. Lawrence:
University Press of Kansas.
- Swain, M.B. (1995) 'Gender in tourism', *Annals of Tourism Research*, 22(2): 274-
266.
- Teo, P. (2002) 'Striking a balance for sustainable tourism: implications of the
discourse on globalisation', *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 10(6): 459-474.
- Thomas, R. and Thomas, H. (2005) 'Understanding tourism policy-making in urban
areas, with particular reference to small firms', *Tourism Geographies*, 7(2):
121-137.

- Thurlow, C. and Jaworski, A. (2003) 'Communicating a global reach: inflight magazines as a globalizing genre in tourism', *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 7(4): 579-606.
- Timothy, D.J. (1997) *Tourism and Political Boundaries*. London: Routledge.
- (1998) 'Co-operative tourism planning in a developing destination', *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 6(1): 52-68
- Trist, C. (1999) 'Recreating ocean space: recreational consumption and representation of the Caribbean marine environment', *The Professional Geographer*, 51(3): 376-388
- Urry, J. (2002) *The Tourist Gaze*. London: Sage.
- Urry, J. (2003) *Global Complexity*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Veijola, S. and Jokinen, E. (1994) 'The body in tourism', *Theory, Culture and Society*, 11: 125-51.
- Vogler, C. (1998) 'Money in the household: some underlying issues of power', *The Sociological Review*, 46(4): 687-713.
- Wearing, B. (1995) 'Leisure and resistance in an aging society.' *Leisure Studies*, 14: 263-279.
- Weber, M. 1978. *Economy and Society : an Outline of Interpretive Sociology*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Westwood, S. (2002) *Power and the Social*. London: Routledge.
- Williams, D.R. (2002) 'Leisure identities, globalization, and the politics of place', *Journal of Leisure Research*, 34(4): 351-368.
- Wu, F. (2003) 'The (Post-) Socialist entrepreneurial city as a state project: Shanghai's reglobalisation in question', *Urban Studies*, 40(9): 1673-1698.
- Zhang, H.Q., Pine, R. and Lam, T. (2005) *Tourism and Hotel Development in China*. Binghamton, NY: The Hawrth Hospitality Press and International Business Press.

Table 1.1: A selection of definitions of power.

Author(s)	Year	Definition of power
Russell	1938	The production of intended effects
Weber	1947	Power is the probability that one actor within a social relationship will be in a position to carry out his own will, despite resistance and regardless of the basis on which this probability rests.
Bierstedt	1950	Power is latent force.... Power itself is the prior capacity which makes the application of force possible.
Parsons	1956	Power we may define as the realistic capacity of a system-unit to actualize its interests within the context of system-interaction and in this sense exert influence on processes in the system.
Dahl	1957	A has the power over B to the extent that he can get B to do something that he would not otherwise do.
Blau	1964	Power is the ability of persons as groups to impose their will on other despite resistance through deterrence either in the form of withholding regularly supplied rewards or in the form of punishment inasmuch as the former, as well as the latter, constitutes in effect negative sanction.
Kaplan	1964	The ability of one person or group of persons to influence the behaviour of others, that is, to change the probabilities that others will respond in certain ways to specified stimuli.
Lukes	1974	A exercises power over B when A affects B in a manner contrary to B's interests.
Foucault	1982	A way in which certain actions may structure the field of other possible actions
Carter	1992	There is a power relation when an individual or a group of individuals can ensure that another or others do not do something, want or do not want something, believe or do not believe something, irrespective of the latter's interests.

Sources: adapted from Bacharach and Lawler (1980: 16-17) and Begg (2000: 14-15)

Table 1.2: A typology of power and related concepts based on Lukes' (1974) reading of Bachrach and Baratz (1970)

Concept	Meaning
Power	All forms of successful control by A over B - that is, of A securing B's compliance. It embraces coercion, influence, authority, force and manipulation.
Coercion	Exists where A secures B's compliance by the threat of deprivation where there is a conflict over values or course of action between A and B.
Influence	Exists where A, without resorting to either a tacit or overt threat of severe deprivation, causes B to change B's course of action.
Authority	B complies because he recognises that A's command is reasonable in term of his own values. This is either because A's command has content which is legitimate and reasonable, or because it has been arrived at through a legitimate and reasonable procedure.
Force	A's objectives are achieved in the face of B's non-compliance by stripping B of the choice between compliance and non-compliance.
Manipulation	Is an 'aspect' or sub-concept of force (and distant from coercion, power, influence and authority) since here compliance is forthcoming in the absence of recognition on the complier's part either of the source or the exact nature of demand upon the complier.

Sources: abridged from Lukes (1974: 17-18) based on Bachrach and Baratz (1970: 24, 28, 30, 34, 37).

Table 1.3: The Three Dimensional Views of Power as originally outlined by Steven Lukes in *Power: A Radical View*.

View of Power	Nature of view:	Focus on:
One-Dimensional	Behaviouralist, Pluralist	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • behaviour • Decision-making • (Key) Issues • Observable (i.e. over) conflict • (Subjective) Interests, seen as policy preferences revealed by political participation.
Two-Dimensional	(Qualified) Critique of behavioural focus	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Decision-making and nondecision-making • Issues and potential issues • Observable (overt or covert) conflict • (Subjective) Interests, seen as policy preferences or grievances.
Three-Dimensional	Critique of behavioural focus	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Decision-making and control over the political agenda (not necessarily through decisions) • Issues and potential issues • Observable (overt or covert) conflict and latent conflict Subjective and real interests

Source: Lukes (1974: 13, 25)