

Accidental Cosmopolitanism: Connectivity, Insistence and Cultural Experience

Gavan Titley BA (TCD), MA (DCU)

Thesis presented for the qualification of PhD

Dublin City University, School of Applied Languages and Intercultural Studies

Supervisor: Professor Michael Cronin

Date of submission: 24 May 2005

Declaration of the Candidate

I hereby certify that this material, which I now submit for assessment on the programme of study leading to the award of PhD, is entirely my own work and has not been taken from the work of others save and to the extent that such work has been cited and acknowledged within the text of my work. Signed: Gaurav Singh (Candidate) ID No.: 98971069 Date: 25th May 2005

Table of contents

Abstract

Acknowledgements

Introduction	1
1. The Imaginative Geography of Global Interconnectedness	
1.1 Imagining globality and ‘the global’	19
1.2 Globality reconsidered	33
1.3 Limitlessness, limitedness and globality	41
1.4 Imaginative geographies and ‘writing the world’	72
1.5 Postscript: The dead letter office of globalisation	85
2. Accidental Cosmopolitanism and Connexity	
2.1 Imaginative geography and cosmopolitanism	94
2.2 The re-emergence of cosmopolitanism	100
2.3 Cosmopolitanism as discursive fluid and mobilising metaphor	111
2.4 Routes into cosmopolitan practice	118
2.5 Accidental Cosmopolitanism	142
3. Paradise, porousness and panopticism	
3.1 Introduction: Negotiating the contours of the Caribbean	165
3.2 All-inclusive resorts as cultural type and lived form	183
3.3 The lightning rod of the all-inclusive	195
3.4 Dwelling, imagining and researching in the Caribbean	199
3.5 The porousness of paradise	210
3.6 The creep of <i>all-inclusivisation</i>	219
3.7 Knowing me, knowing you, knowing me: negotiating St Lucia online	230
Conclusion	250
Bibliography	261

Doctoral thesis abstract

Accidental Cosmopolitanism: Connectivity, Insistence and Cultural Experience

Processes of globalisation are often associated with a burgeoning consciousness of interconnectedness and interdependence between people in the majority and minority worlds. Areas of everyday life, such as consumption and travel, are held to be increasingly informed by the realisation that micro-practices implicate the person in relation to global Others. It is argued that rhetorical ideas of global awareness – as well as the theoretical assumptions that underpin them – depend heavily on rationalist notions of an unfurling consciousness, and inadequately consider the ambivalences engendered by informational overload, non-linear processes and the unintended consequences of globally significant actions. Thus prevalent ideas of acting ethically in globalised societies are not based on considerations of how people may construct the ‘globe’ as a shifting, imagined and incoherent context.

The thesis proposes a new understanding of the idea of imaginative geography to conceptualise the ways in which living in interdependence involves a constant tension between implication and understanding. This is exemplified by the ways in which contemporary tourism – for political, cultural and environmental reasons – has become an experience of *accidental cosmopolitanism* for many; the experience of becoming unavoidably aware of one’s interconnections in a context where leisure normally guarantees insulation from them. As a case study the thesis analyses the construction of the Caribbean as a particular type of touristic space embedded in western images of the non-modern paradise. Field work in St Lucia reveals a fine-grained picture of the ambiguous ways in which touristic images are mediated, re-accented or contested, and how fantasy spaces can never be insulated from wider socio-political dynamics. It concludes by examining the import of these theoretical innovations and the fieldwork observation for discussions of globalisation and non-formal education.

Acknowledgements

This thesis examines interconnection and interdependence. It is also proof that without others embracing these conditions nothing would get done.

I am indebted to SALIS for its creative interdisciplinary environment, its financial support, and for the intangible benefit of a continued feeling of involvement while living in Helsinki. In Dublin City University I have received generous scholarly and personal support over many years, and I would like to thank Dr. Roddy Flynn, Debbie Ging, Prof. John Horgan, Dr. Dorothy Kenny, Brian Trench, Dr. Bill Richardson and Prof. Jenny Williams. I am particularly grateful to Dr. David Denby for initially supervising and supporting this project. In the University of Helsinki, I have been fortunate to end up in the Renvall Institute for Area and Cultural Studies. Thanks are due to the Director, Dr. Lars-Folke Landgren, and members past and present of the *pulla klubben*. In the Institute and University I would like to recognise the interest and support of Prof. Andrew Chesterman, Yonca Ermetlu, Dr. Maarit Forde, Prof. Arto Happala, Dr. Janne Makela, Dr. Jussi Pakasvirta, Dr. Mark Shackleton and Prof. Esa Valiverronen. From 2001-2 I received funding as a visiting researcher from CIMO, and from 2002-4 from the Finnish-Irish bilateral scholarship.

In the Council of Europe I would like to thank Peter Lauritzen and Antje Rothmund for support and involving me in stimulating projects. Yael Ohana and Goran Buldioski have been firm comrades and great friends. My project in St Lucia and interest in Caribbean issues has benefited enormously from the advice of Dr. Sandra Courtman, Dr. Amanda Sives, Dr. Stuart Murray and Dr. Mimi Sheller, and from the resources and advice available in the library of Institute for Commonwealth Studies. In St Lucia I am indebted to Jo Hanlon, Joe Du Bois, Louis Lewis, Berthia Parle and Dr. Tennyson Joseph for advice and participation, and to Jennifer Lutton, Herbert Signorent and Gene Maruaz for companionship and keen insight. Thanks to particular friends whose intelligence and example have made me think and think again; Colm O' Cinneide, Dr. Colin Coulter, Ditta Dolesjiova, Allan Gronbaek, Petr Lebeda, Natalie McDonnell, Peter Merry and Dr. Andrew Newby. My involvement in the British & Irish Studies programme at Renvall is due to the support and interest of Pirkko Hautamäki, and my intense enjoyment of my time there is largely thanks to her friendship, rigour, and commitment to the revitalising power of dark humour.

Prof. Michael Cronin has been a committed and challenging supervisor and a source of inspiration. His intellectual creativity and clarity resonate with political purpose and generosity, and the ideas that have ended up here would not have done so without his engagement.

'Tis not off the street ye licked it'; during the course of this thesis, and in education and life in general, my parents Alan and Mary Titley have always been loving and dedicated, providing a space and atmosphere in which we could find what interested and moved us. This is a small but important opportunity to thank them for that, and to hope that now I can be inspired to create the same conditions for somebody else. Convention dictates that I thank Päivi Lampinen-Titley last, however convention has little to say about how to describe her what she means in my life. Living with you is, as I have told you before, 'the growing good of the world'. Gööglahden Kuningatar, sä oot ihana ja mä rakastan sua. Jonas-Liam, the thesis is finished and it's time to go and play.

The world is a rock/ that's spinnin' so fast / it'll give you jim-jams.
Frank Black, "Sir Rockaby".

Introduction

In effect, both inside and outside the academy today, we are all asked to do more cultural work.

Mike Featherstone and Scott Lash, *Spaces of Culture* (1999:1)

We are all required to 'do more cultural work today'. The 'we' implies rather than identifies, and the demand echoes from the globalised rafters; the planetary world demands nothing less. Yet beyond the certainty of the requirement, the scope of this work and the capacities required to carry it out are far from clear. Featherstone and Lash, in grounding this assertion, acknowledge that the 'process of globalization' is integral to this new twist in the cultural turn, and that whereas culture – as interpretative framework or felt collectivity - may have been widely assumed to describe and prescribe fixity, coherence and a shared world of meaning, that which was always less than solid has now melted even further into air. In the words of Asian Dub Foundation, culture moves, and culture as a 'form of life' (Hannerz 1996: 69-77) is stretched into new shapes and frameworks.

The concept of cultural work is suggestive, and I wish to calibrate it in a slightly different way than its sense in its original context. For Featherstone and Lash, cultural work is increased in scope and complexity by the dilution of stable cultural frameworks in shared cultural worlds, even if this, as they admit, is a less than stable imaginary for basing an analysis of change. What is of more interest here is the by now commonplace assertion that 'cultural work' is increased and intensified by 'the sources of cultural production and dissemination' increasing (1999:1). To state it somewhat breathlessly, cultural forms, bodies, products and images are increasingly mobile and de-territorialised; migrating, dwelling, combining and re-combining, traversing life-worlds, and requiring new discourses, narratives and metaphors to make sense of them. Cultural work – which varies across overlapping formations of selves, groups, networks, regions, nations, globes - has increased through unevenly dispersed and experienced cultural flows, and increasing amounts of cultural environments are now commonly held to be shifting, diffuse and porous.

Thus at an initial level, this notion of work implies that symbolic habitats need to be worked on and in, as this expansion in scapes and flows involves constant complexity (Appadurai 1996). Cultural *complexity* signifies difficulty, ambiguity and density, and in these general terms, has become a central focus for discussion in relation to situated considerations of cultural movement in the everyday, among them examinations of 'multiculturalisms' (Watson 2000), environment and risk (Lash et al 1996), media reception (Gillespie 1996, Massey 1998, Moores 1993), and consumption and consumerism (Howes et al 1996, Lodziak 2002, Ritzer 2004). Moreover, a more discursively embedded sense has emerged as socio-cultural theory turns to the complexity sciences for compelling metaphors of an expanded job description. The 'mobility turn' in socio-cultural analysis (Urry, 2000, 2003) - building on non-linear and unstable notions of global flows, scapes (Appadurai 1996), networks (Castells 1997, Latour 1999) and rhizomes (Deleuze & Guattari 1980) - approaches the contingency and fluidity of cultural experience as potential chaos, with unpredictable impacts, forms and hybrids (Barker 2002).

Cultural work implies dwelling in and engaging with flows that are unpredictable, and that emanate from increased and disparate sources of cultural production and dissemination. Dwelling in and encountering through flow involves a sense that just about anything, in some form, can be encountered, and can become implicated in ongoing sense-making, including a sense of 'self-in-the-world' (Hart 2003:224). To quote another succinct summary from Featherstone:

The flows of information, knowledge, money, commodities, people and images have intensified to the extent that the sense of spatial difference which separated and insulated people from the need to take into account all the other people which make up what has become known as humanity has been eroded (1995: 87)

The compelling idea of, to paraphrase, *the end of insulation* generates a host of questions regarding the forms of insulation deemed to have been so categorically eroded – which is not of central interest here – the forms of insulation which may evolve in response to exposure, and how this is negotiated through forms of cultural work. However it also raises this argument to a level of abstraction that needs to be avoided if compelling metaphors are not to be reduced to empty vessels, or reified as trendy labels in particular forms of academic flows. Thomas Hylland Eriksen is undoubtedly right to

insist that discussions of global flow be anchored in considerations of how such flows are brought into being socially. As he writes, in reference to Arjun Appadurai's celebrated imaginary of global scapes, it is "[...] clear that they are only brought into being in so far as people invest them with content, that they are only activated through social processes" (2003: 5). Not only are flows enacted and imagined, they are also conduits of power and possibility; as Arif Dirlik observes, a discourse of fluidity must constantly remain alert to the "[...] inequalities disguised by assertions of flow, hybridity and so on" (2005: 39).

Cultural work - which so far could be regarded as having an unmanageably expansive remit and range – is made necessary through experiences of flows being invested with content and meaning, where there is a *relational sense of self and others in the world*. To cut into the specific aspects of this that will be analysed here, I wish to describe some brief moments of cultural work. These are moments where spatial, global metaphors of space and connection are inhabited through particular material, perceived and imagined relations; moments where everyday practices are seen to connect us in power-based relations of interdependence; moments where people may be de-insulated and in pursuit of modes of re-insulation. Like scenes from a movie trailer, the snapshots detailed below will appear in different forms at different points during this work. The swift editing and montage of a trailer compresses the core of the narrative while amplifying the gaps that invite association and speculation. These vignettes also invite speculation; on a 'condition' that has no core but stems from compression, and where the gaps are amplified by the unending unfolding of the story.

(i)

What is Global Education? Global Education is a process which enables people to understand the links between their own lives and those of people throughout the world. It aims to develop skills, attitudes and values to bring about a more just and sustainable world.¹

While working as a temporary supply teacher during *One World* week in a Dublin school in 2000, I ran a series of activities on global education for my pupils, aged from

¹ Sourced from an introduction 'What is Global Education?' from the Global Education Centre of the Development Resource Centre, Wellington, New Zealand. <http://www.globaled.org.nz/>

10-11 years, most of whom were by that stage of the year focused determinedly on Christmas. From a range of development education materials produced for this week, I choose an exercise on the production of labelled sports gear, the daily uniform of the majority of the class. The exercise draws parallels between the lives of Minority World children as privileged consumers and the lives of children labouring to produce cheap sports shoes and tracksuits in south-east Asian factories. A point for discussion is how the children in Dublin feel about the revelation of a material connection between them and the labouring children, members of their global cohort. For some the connection is shocking, and they express both focused and inchoate indignation. Others are outraged, but more by the discrepancy in the prices they begged their parents to pay and the cost of production. Yet others worry that their favoured gear might give them AIDS because some of 'those kids' had touched it before them.

(ii)

The twenty-first century has to be a biodiversity century: rules of competition must give way to the principle of compassion; the culture of greed and consumerism has to give way to the culture of conservation; the culture of domination needs to give way to the culture of protection; the culture of appropriation must give way to that of sharing and caring (Vandana Shiva 2000: 135).

Across Europe, consumer demand for Sport Utility Vehicles (SUVs) is growing. Concomitant with that growth is increased lobbying by environmental groups to have special taxes levied on these 'Chelsea tractors' because of their increased fuel consumption and carbon dioxide emission. In many European cities, including Paris, Rome and London, politicians have latched onto SUVs as 'handy symbols of ostentation and excessive consumption' and suggested a range of municipal measures to limit their access and stunt their ubiquity.² Given the popularity of SUVs with predominantly middle class families, analysts have sought to square this popularity with the growth of fears about climate change and the general presumption of a green class-consciousness.

² See Morgan, Oliver: "Car Makers still in love with their 4x4s". *The Observer*, October 3 2004.

For George Monbiot there is no contradiction. Discussing an advertisement for an SUV that appeared in the *Financial Times* – “This one will take you on the school run and up the Amazon” – Monbiot comments: “George Marshall, of the climate change network Rising Tide, suggests that the people who buy these cars in the face of both a developing global climate crisis and an impending global oil crisis are engaging in ‘reactive denial’. By showing that it’s possible to consume vast quantities of fossil fuel without an immediately discernable adverse effect, 4×4 drivers prove to themselves that there cannot be a problem”³.

(iii)

Integration of cultural difference is the state in which one’s experience of self is expanded to include the movement in and out of different cultural worldviews. People at Integration often are dealing with issues related to their own ‘cultural marginality’. This stage is not necessarily better than Adaptation in most situations demanding intercultural competence, but it is common among non-dominant minority groups, long-term expatriates, and ‘global nomads’ (Milton Bennett, 1993: 29).

A former colleague attended an international seminar on intercultural learning held, unaccountably, in an all-inclusive resort in Gambia. Between sessions, delegates would congregate by the pool for refreshments. Due to renovations, a simple chain fence had replaced one area of the wall demarcating the resort, and local vendors quickly learned to congregate there at particular times. Hotel security tolerated the presence of the vendors but forbade them from shouting or whistling at the delegates to gain their attention. So the vendors stood there silently, displaying their wares. As the week passed fewer and fewer delegates spent their breaks by the pool. According to my colleague, many of them found this silence tense.

o o o o o

These stories stand as nothing other than moments where people bring flows into being by connecting up through movement, consumption and encounter. As illustrative snapshots that represent the experiences that have propelled me to investigate ‘interconnectedness’, they shift from the sometimes intangible register of the academic discourse that follows to the everyday banality of that discourse’s purchase. The themes

³ Monbiot, George, “War X 4”. *The Guardian* 6 July 2004.

present in and across these vignettes can be linked in many ways, what is significant for now is the activation that occurs through interpretation and imagination; these are moments when people regard themselves as being connected to distant and unknown others, and act – in whatever way - in an awareness of that interconnection.

Across these vignettes, the featured actors differ in terms of volition, forms of capital and degrees of agency. Nevertheless, they all inhabit specific points of power in relations of what Doreen Massey has usefully termed the ‘power geometry of time-space compression’ (1991: 25). As inhabitants of the overdeveloped societies that principally populate the Minority World⁴, their experiences place them relationally, and mark the irruption of ethics into the supposedly predominant aesthetics of consumption (Bauman 1998, Featherstone 1991). What is experienced, as a basic commonality, is interpolation in “[...] already existing, and unequal, distribution of power and resources” (Massey 1995: 18). Neither is this power geometry static and fixed; central to its disjunctive effect is a commentary on imaginative and physical mobilities. Those sited at ubiquitous technological interfaces have never had so many images of those without the means to communicate (Mirzoeff 2005), mobile subjects continuously come in contact with immobilised subjects, and these different states support the continuing axis of dominant flows (Ray 2002).

Therefore subjects are all hailed, in some way, as connected, privileged, responsible and implicated. Metaphors of flow are momentarily realised in movement to and movement from, and in senses of connection that must be negotiated when they are recognised as such. Furthermore, this connexity is acknowledged in contexts where a discourse validates certain perspectives on connexity; conscious de-insulation leads to actors being required to display progress as a constituent feature of genuine awareness,

⁴ I have chosen to use the relation Majority/Minority World, while readily conceding that such concepts are increasingly undermined by the network logics of overlapping globalisations. As Philip McMichael has pointed out, “Division of the nations of the world is quite complex and extensive, and it depends on the purpose of the division” (1996:29). Not only does the idea of Majority/Minority transcend geopolitical categories based solely on the nation – thus ignoring the complexities of ‘fourth world’ poverty and migration – but it is not predicated on visions of development processes, stemming as it does from critiques such as Sousa Santos’, when he contends that “[...] perhaps rather than looking for models of alternative development the time has come to look for alternatives to development (1999: 35). The purpose of this strategic and contingent division, in my argument, is to foreground an ‘imaginative geography’ that is based on the distribution of resources and concomitant forms of power.

through fairly traded consumption, through environmentally aware choices, and through ‘intercultural’ encounters lived in the spirit of professed values. In each example noise and dissonance characterises these specific reactions; other myths and assumptions intrude and ‘distort’, self interprets Other in ways that leave the self as Other to oneself, and there are always polysemic possibilities for fashioning alternative routes to that received notion of progress that nevertheless remains insistently and unsettlingly in cognition.

The cultural work these vignettes imply is the ways in which contemporary socio-cultural life – overwhelmingly but not exclusively in over-consuming societies – implicates people in shifting patterns of interconnection, interdependence and power geometry, in bonds beyond the subjective and the preferred collective, and in relations that are characterised as increasingly mobile, fluid, and transgressive of borders and limits (Castells 1997; Hannerz 1996, 2003; Iwabuchi 2002; Urry 2000, 2003). Thus a central aspect of cultural work, and of this thesis, is the idea of *living in interconnectedness*. With apologies to EM Forster however, the brief snapshots of connexity strongly suggest that this does not require us to merely connect. As chapter one explores, discussions of interconnectedness in discourses of globalisation stress temporal-spatial diffusions and intensifications of physical, mediated, economic, political and ecological relations and connections, and also a *consciousness* of them. Finding ways to conceptualise and analyse this *consciousness* – as a discursive construct that both abstracts from and is a pastiche of interpretations of such consciousnesses in socio-cultural expression – is a key task of theory, and of theory’s relation to praxis.

To come into what Robertson terms globality (1992) is to become aware, and awareness of interconnectedness - though obviously always partial - involves becoming aware of the inescapability of interdependence, inescapable whether it is embraced or not. Most obviously this implies interdependence in a shared environment (Shiva 2000), interconnection in a volatile and mystifying global economy (Goringe 1999), increased vulnerability to global ‘bads’ and responsibility for seemingly remote global ‘goods’ (Kaul et al 2002), obvious and indelible involvements in the poverty and marginalisation of countless global others (Monbiot 2003), globally mediated debates on security, justice and civilisation (Mirzoeff 2005), and vastly increased connectedness

to cultural and political others and their places mediated in virtual and physical movement and imagination (Allen & Massey 1995). As Susan George contends, the imbricated nature of these contemporary problems demands attention to the ethical frameworks within which 'fast castes' – the beneficiaries of transnationalisation and hegemonic globalisation – understand the question 'what do we owe to others?' (George 2003: 24)

Interconnectedness, shifting and changing in a 'light economy' and a 'mobile world', nevertheless implies connections that are weighty in their implications and responsibilities; the paradox of fluidity may be an increase in what can be experienced as ties and bonds. Interconnectedness is ambivalent; dimensions and flows flit partially in and out of consciousness and understanding, it is both celebrated as value and disavowed as burden, it supposes emergent solidarities while denying the solidities that solidarities used to be based on. I want to suggest that it involves both the lightness and heaviness of being; whether it is unbearable or not is a key problematic of this work. The young west Dublin consumers, the unknown car owners stereotyped by their SUVs, the practitioners of intercultural learning staring at the gap between seminar room and outside world; what unites my hugely limited representation of their experiences is a tension between imagined connections and felt bonds, between dwelling and acting in interconnectedness.

Given the range of areas and issues that this area of discussion can conceivably encompass, this thesis seeks to make some modest cuts into questions of living in interconnectedness, and to discuss them with increasing specificity as the chapters develop. Chapter one sets out to review and engage with a range of discussions that cluster around the cultural hermeneutics of contemporary cultural work, which I will contend involves the recognised tension between comprehension and ethics, or what could be termed understandings of and standing in interconnectedness. By necessity this will involve a somewhat abstracted theoretical discussion, conducted at the interstices between situated analyses and the tentative extraction of meta-discursive possibilities. Centrally, this chapter will argue that ideas of living in interconnectedness tend towards the deployment of linear notions of consciousness as something that unfurls and encompasses, and that comes into global awareness when confronted with the non-negotiability of interdependence.

To return briefly to the snapshots, each is preceded by a quotation that exhorts and prescribes, and they are taken from widely available discussions of global education, ecological citizenship and intercultural education. Their textual position situates them as implicit commentary, yet they are not intended as either a judgement on the paucity of practice or the utopianism of theory. Instead, they illustrate the important dissonances that emerge between rhetorical and pedagogical ideas of awareness of interconnectedness, and the diffuseness, unpredictability, affective ‘irrationalities’ and complex imaginations of people dwelling in and negotiating connections and their consequences. While this thesis does not engage with discussions of consciousness that lie beyond its scope and disciplinary competence, I will argue that a central weakness of these concepts is their rational assertiveness in the face of widely available discussions of socio-cultural subjects interpreting their habitats (Campbell & Rew 1999, Hannerz 1996, Melucci 1996).

In other words, theories, campaigns, policies and actions that exhort us into global consciousness need to engage with the complexity of interpretation and visions of ‘the global’ that we inhabit. For those that fetishize and reify ‘action’, this may be construed as a semi-apologetic rehearsal of the inadequate mobilisation of the privileged. However it is my contention that involved considerations of ‘cultural work’ are required in order to devise and calibrate strategies that harness individual agency to the collective transformation of global injustices and inequalities. Global awareness is a slogan, as an ontological claim it must take account of the ways in which interconnectedness is imagined and the world of worlds is mapped.

To address this, in chapter one I propose to significantly re-accent the idea of *imaginative geography* to put into play the imbricated aspects of *ge and grapho*; ‘I write the earth’ (Hourihane 2003: 1). This thesis is concerned with dual senses of writing the earth, and the interplay between them attempts to describe the key problematics of ‘living in interconnectedness’. Writing the earth simultaneously involves narration – in the sense of positionality, representation and perspective that has been developed in human geography (see Allen & Massey 1995) – and inscription; leaving marks, traces and scars. Living, consuming, deciding, travelling, in short acting, involves a constant and inseparable relationship between senses and interpretations of

self, impact and action, and the known, unknown and unknowable implications of those actions. As Keith Hart puts it:

“[...] there are as many worlds as there are individuals and their journeys; and even if there were only one out there, each of us changes it whenever we make a move” (2003: 218).

In other words, this sense of imaginative geography implies not only an obvious and unknowable multiplicity of constructions, but that the imaginative construction cannot be separated from some notion of actual and real effects in the physical world. This interplay between narration and inscription is crucial to arriving at understandings and practices of living in interconnection. It does not juxtapose a simplistic sense of imagined perspective and real world effect, fundamentally it is a phenomenological idea designed to explore the relationship between standing in and understanding interconnectedness. We can never stand outside of interconnection, and hence interdependence, however the ways in which people narrate, conceptualise and understand their constant inscribing is the key tension embodied in the idea of imaginative geography.

As John Urry argues in suggesting the ways in which complexity thinking may illuminate the fluidity and unpredictability of global flows: “The observer changes that which is observed, apparent hard-and-fast entities are always comprised of rapid movement, and there is no structure that is separate from process” (2003: 7). Yet while senses and visions of self in an interconnected globe may diverge, and are always already –as Lefebvre argues in critiquing the dualistic separation of ‘ideal’ (imagined) space and ‘physical’ space (1991) - immanent in social relationships increasingly stretched over time and space, in an important and obvious sense there is only one world out there, and it is affected by the ways in which interpretations of it inform action and engagement. The tension between these ways of writing the earth is, I propose, the key nexus of the ‘cultural work’ discussed in this introduction. Depending on the issue, the moment, the agent and the context, this tension can result in embrace or denial, and predominantly in situated engagements that fall between such extremes. The aspirational quotations that preceded the introductory snapshots imagine a particular symmetry and balance between narration and inscription. In opposition to that, a central

theme in thinking through interpretations of interconnectedness is well expressed by Meyer and Geschiere:

There is much empirical evidence that people's awareness of being involved in open-ended global flows seems to trigger a search for fixed orientation points and action frames, as well as determined efforts to affirm old and construct new boundaries. For students of globalization it is therefore important to develop an understanding of globalization that not only takes into account the rapid increase in mobility of people, goods and images, but also the fact that, in many places, flow goes hand in hand with a closure of identities which often used to be much more fuzzy and permeable (1999: 7)

The closure they describe makes reference to the contraction of territorial identities (Delanty 2001) and ethnic and religious identities (Hylland Eriksen 1993, Castells 1997: 1-65) pithily referred to by Castells as the "[...] cross-cultural refusal of the picture of globalization" (1997: 109). However the general thrust of their point can also be seen as alluding to a wider variety of ways in which 'world overload' comes into play, and is managed, reduced and circumvented. As will be discussed, there is an almost overwhelming range of areas of life where appeals to the global and senses of interconnectedness manifest themselves in everyday life. Discussions of this inhabit both high theory and high street. While Zygmunt Bauman eloquently laments the embedding of individualism in conditions that require involvement in webs of mutual implication and responsibility (Bauman, 2000, 2002), a leaflet advertisement for Peace of Mind aromatherapy products frenziedly stuffed in my hand in a crowded Dublin department store advises us that if we are 'feeling overwhelmed', and if the "[...] world closes in on you and your head feels a size too small", key tactics should include not listening to the news and reconnecting with "[...] the peace, connectedness, sense of balance and justice we get through nature".

This chapter proceeds towards a fuller discussion of imaginative geography by attempting to sketch out dimensions of living in interconnectedness. By examining such aspects as the velocity of informational flow and comprehension; 'global figuration' (Bauman 2001) and unintended consequences; mediated witnessing and the negotiation of implication; reflexivity and complexity, I attempt to map out issues that normative notions of awareness and consciousness subsume but must become attuned to. I then develop my analysis of imaginative geography through a consideration of areas where it

has a crucial impact on the potential success of policy formulation and other forms of advocacy and awareness-raising. I cannot approach doing justice in this thesis to the depth and range of work and controversy concerning the imagination in humanist, social-scientific, social-psychological and phenomenological literature (see Robinson & Rundell 1994). I employ it here as a composite notion for the processes of interpretation and evaluation whereby our realities are extended and meaning is attributed.

Chapter one concludes with a postscript discussing the relations between this analysis and a broad discourse of globalisation theory. While theories and discussions central to recent explorations of globalisation are both overt and latent at all times, wading through a consideration of the extensive and complex literature it has accrued at this point in the develop of the argument would owe more to convention than logic. Instead, I propose to link discussions of ‘the global’ and ‘globality’ to the theme of living in interconnectedness. In this postscript I hope to make this choice clear by arguing that globalisation – as an over-burdened signifier and nexus of very disparate controversies and analyses – is itself an imaginative geography that encourages inadequate narration, while inscribing significant consequences.

If chapter one explores a variety of ways in which the globe is proposed as a realm of meaning and implication, chapter two examines discussions of conscious agency and ethical reflexivity in a planetary habitat. Despite its durable accents of detachment, irony and dilettantism, *cosmopolitanism* has (re)emerged as the discourse around which diffuse, complementary and conflicting visions of living ethically in globalised relations of connexity and dependence have congregated. As Walter Mignolo notes, this resurgent convergence is a product of the different issues and registers of agency and power that globalisation puts in play, and the concomitant need to find a space where the relationships between different responses to these issues can be examined: “[...] globalization is a set of designs to manage the world while cosmopolitanism is a set of projects toward planetary conviviality” (2000: 721).

A basic tenet of chapter one is that invocations of global consciousness also invoke disparate imaginative mappings of the globe and the relationships that traverse and produce it. Mignolo’s deceptively clear formulation hints at how the trajectory of analysis in chapter two approaches the questions raised by imaginative geography. There

are evidently a wide variety of images of conviviality that underpin cosmopolitan projects, and cosmopolitanism is at its most reductive and redundant when it attempts to prescribe cosmopolitan sensibilities, values, competences or practices in generalised or universalised terms. It is my contention that cosmopolitanism's re-emergent value lies in its possibilities as a *mobilising metaphor* and as a *discursive fluid*. To take the latter notion first, a limited historical review of cosmopolitanism in this chapter examines how cosmopolitanism has always been understood as some form of transversal commitment and praxis in relation to boundaries and horizons of coercive particularity. Historically, this transcendent practice has been related to collectivities such as the nation-state and/or ethnic identity, and indeed, it continues – particularly in debates surrounding the 'crisis of multiculturalism' (see Gilroy 2001, Hall 2002, Hollinger 2002) – to shape relations to these affective and ascribed identities.

Nevertheless, deterritorialisation and transnationalisation entail that relationships between collectivity, place, identity and allegiance are far more overlapping and subjective than the classic confrontations of previous cosmopolitan engagements with nationality, ethnicity and class. Discussions of cosmopolitanism now tend to encompass wider and more involved discussions of identity, belonging, solidarity and engagement under conditions of cultural and political globalisation (Hall 2002, Hannerz 1996, Tomlinson 1999) and within a pervasive consciousness of shared environmental stewardship (Bindé 2003, Smith 1998). A further dimension of this is that not only are senses of implication and allegiances comparatively more diffuse, but that the political frameworks within which action can be taken have equally grown more complex. Thus cosmopolitanism, with its irreducible plurality of conceptualisations, can be productively understood as a discursive fluid because the multiplicity of debates and approaches gathered under the rubric of cosmopolitanism inevitably inform and inhabit each other.

As a mobilising metaphor, cosmopolitanism's core value lies in the ways in which different interventions may sustain and unsettle each other. Cosmopolitanism is generally situated as a critical discourse, a space that is marshalled in order to imagine transformative responses and positions. As different interventions congregate around the sign of cosmopolitanism, they engage in a consistent settling and unsettling of how cosmopolitanism and cosmopolitanisms should be understood. Therefore a significant part of chapter two involves not only examining what cosmopolitanisms are proposed,

but how these cosmopolitanisms are imagined, argued for, and located. It puts into play aspirational discussions of ideal type cosmopolitans (Hannerz 1996); critiques that approach it as a discourse that sanctions the elite imposition of discrepant privileges, perspectives and mobilities (Brennan 1997, Clifford 1998,); ethical frameworks and institutional projects for cosmopolitan governance that centrally imagine a responsive cosmopolitan citizen (see Delanty 2000); continuing deployments that situate it as a commitment and disposition that tempers and transcends coercive boundaries of belonging and legitimacy (Beck 2002, Nussbaum 1994); tentative explorations of cosmopolitan emergence in multicultural consumer societies (Tomlinson 1999, Urry 2002, 2003); and critical re-workings that address 'ordinary', 'rooted' and subaltern cosmopolitanisms excluded by a conceptual history of elitism and cosmopolitanism's inscription in Western Modernity.

It is in this context that I develop the idea of *accidental cosmopolitanism* as an approach to cosmopolitanism that examines crisis and process, as opposed to aspiration and delineation. Accidental cosmopolitanism is a minimal, speculative approach to everyday cosmopolitanisms without reference to empirical evidence, it seeks to examine the moments, contexts and experiences in which a dialogic imagination is intensely activated, and where the insistence of connexity requires cultural work – be that work denial, embrace, or anything in between. The moments of disjuncture reprised by the vignettes of global education, intercultural education and environmental stewardship can be read as moments of dissonance between narratives of self-in-the-world and the implications of inscription, and what I seek to do with this notion is to examine the repercussions and possibilities of these tensions.

To elaborate on this idea, I concentrate on tourism as a modality of interconnection that is often profoundly neglected in these terms. I examine public discussions of tourism, atrocities against tourists and the political backdrop of tourism post September 11th 2001, and argue that a discourse is emerging in which the normative exoneration of tourism from political and cultural complexity is being challenged. I attempt to map out a series of processes that have unsettled residually powerful senses of tourism as a modern practice of 'away'; stepping out from webs of obligation, restriction and responsibility. The re-territorialisation of tourist spaces, the re-inscription of political identities into affective practices of escape, and the imbrication of touristic images of

place in wider geo-political discourses are creating situations in which perhaps dissonant binds of interconnection cannot be disavowed. Touristic experiences may be becoming increasingly marked by competing visions of presence and legitimacy, and these visions are insistent. Accidental cosmopolitanism can be understood as the question marks that surface in these moments.

Chapter three focuses on developing and questioning these theoretical constructs through situated cultural analysis of tourism in the Caribbean. In a global mediascape, the Caribbean is perhaps the ultimate fantasyscape; a region shaped by historical practices and discourses of colonial exoticisation, and locked firmly into the continuous reproduction and mediation of lingering and evolving visions of tropical paradise. For many tourists in the UK and North America, Caribbean islands have become increasingly accessible in recent years, facilitated by a massive increase in forms and sites of tourism, faster and more frequent air connections, an expanding cruise ship industry, and a greater overall economic impetus in the region to replace diminishing economic opportunities with tourism and related service industries. It is in this context that I examine the imagined Caribbean as a multi-sited, multi-vocal and multi-faceted negotiation, a fantasyscape that is produced and sustained in very real terms.

It is a form of globalised common sense to relate the Caribbean to *paradise*, a mythic production sanctioning forms of exotic experience and consumption that are embedded in histories of colonial appropriation and disavowal (Sheller 2003). The Caribbean – as an imaginative space that maps in shared and divergent ways across and within the ‘region’ – is a space of liminality and play, curiously sundered in its connotative congruency from the multiple and hybridised imports of its people, labour, material presences and cultural products stitched fast in the everyday fabrics of European and North American places. If dominant images and practices of Caribbean place are to be believed, it seems as if travel to *the* Caribbean is also travel away from fuller, more complex senses and experiences. It is here that the relationship between narrating and inscribing in the Caribbean begins to emerge.

This chapter takes various approaches to examining how tourists are implicated in this fantasyscape. How does the performance of ‘the Caribbean’ engage senses of interconnectedness? If tourist presences can never ‘escape’ the insistence of wider

implication in questions of political, economic and environmental interdependence, how might questions of narration, inscription and accidental cosmopolitanism play out? Tourism in the Caribbean involves stark yet nevertheless intricate questions of economic, political and cultural power. Before, during and after travel, tourists are implicated in these questions and imbricated in their dynamics. The networks of power and interdependence that connect primarily Western tourists, when related to the homogenising and exoticising narratives and images that hegemonise a particular framework for approaching the Caribbean, suggest that the themes of imaginative geography and accidental cosmopolitanism warrant serious examination in this context. Indeed, it is possible to argue that the implications of tourism in the Caribbean can only be understood with serious reference to the imaginative geographies of tourism and tourists, and the ways in which they relate to the inequalities enshrined in paradise, exotic and tropical tourism.

The research that is discussed in this chapter emerges – like the theoretical concerns of this thesis – from a concern with relationships of inequality and the subjective understandings of them that must be engaged for any form of transformation to take place. Central to this is a critique not only of the dominant mythologies of the Caribbean that elide historical and lived interdependences, but also a critique of the politically-invested research interventions that have tended to simplify the cultural dynamics of tourism to questions of whether exotic touristic spaces are impositions and artificialities, or both. This chapter argues that the contours of an imagined Caribbean may look broadly congruent, but that this elides the different investments Caribbean residents, transnational citizens and tourists have in images and narratives of place. Paradise may be ubiquitous, but it is not settled and static, as I discuss by combining forms of analysis that focus on St Lucia, the ‘world’s number one destination for weddings and honeymoons’. Paradise is an established paradigm of domination in an Othered relationship with Western modernity, and an over-bearing grammar for theming and disciplining social life in a touristic economy. Yet it is also a metaphor and discourse invested with affective, localised and inter-subjective cultural and political accents. It is important to understand that paradise as a lived metaphor may be both and disabling and enabling at the same time, but to different degrees and in different dimensions.

To explore this, I examine the all-inclusive resort as a potent symbol of control and curation, where spatialising and performative logics would appear to aim at minimising the dissonances and disjunctures I discussed in the previous chapter as being central to the implosion of inscription in narration. However, I delineate a picture of negotiation and sited interaction that is far more complex than normative and figuratively-driven readings of postcolonial cultural-economic imperialism⁵ that tend to be applied to the ‘third world’ in general and the Caribbean in particular. I attempt to outline a picture of paradise as a multiple (imagined) site in one (Hannerz 2003). Being a tourist in the

⁵ As accounts such as McLaren’s (1998) illustrate, a generalising paradigm of cultural imperialism in approaching ‘third world tourism’ (Lea 1988, Mowforth & Munt 1998) remains seductive to the extent that it often undermines insightful aspects of the work. In *Rethinking Tourism and Ecotravel*, McLaren outlines many aspects – the attitudes that may accompany an ‘economic right to travel’, the elisions of historical domination that are often central to re-framing a postcolonial tourist destination, the economic distortions that accompany uneven spatial and sectoral development along the lines dictated by the inward investment of capital – that are associated with cultural imperialism theses and that demand sustained engagement. However what is intended as a campaigning publication is rarely capable of examining the different kinds of local investments (and indeed the different kinds of ‘locals’) that accrue to situated tourist development. As Dennison Nash argued almost a decade previously – in an essay broadly sympathetic to the purchase of imperialism in tourism analysis – tourism studies needed to move away from general statements about ‘tourism and development’ and focus increasingly on the transactional nature of tourism, with power as an intrinsic organising principle of that analysis (1989). Furthermore, Gmelch contends that he found the language of neo-colonialism and imperialism to have little resonance with the Barbadian tourist workers that he interviewed (2003: 35-7). The lingering attraction of cultural imperialism approaches can be linked to a continuing acceptance of massified typologies of the tourist, and somewhat simplistic models of ‘cultural contact’. Take the following example from McLaren: “In the Amazon, renegade tour guides contract out to tourists to take them into the wilds of the rain forest to ‘go native’. Tourists follow these guides to Indigenous villages, demand to stay with local families, eat their food, expect the locals to entertain them, and make only a token payment before they leave for the next village” (1998: 30). In my personal experience of such tourism, every one of these assertions – perhaps generalised from an uncited testimony – is incorrect. This has less to do with a humanist faith in tourists than with a basic analysis of how this form of secondary rainforest tourism has evolved. I took a tour from Baños, Ecuador, that was organised by a small firm of Shuar men in their early twenties. Many of these young men became guides after their national military service, as the role of being between the nearest urban centre and their home suited the sense of ‘in-betweenness’ they themselves felt after a formative period away. As such it was a form of employment that did not necessitate a more demanding migration to Quito or Guayaquil. The close existence of different tour offers by broadly similar tour guide companies and cooperatives ensured that a very similar form of tourism developed, with little room (or tolerance) for ‘renegades’. Tours were organised in and around the ‘indigenous villages’, however access and contact was strictly regulated and organised performatively. In the tour I went on the guides had built a ‘tourist village’ on the opposite side of the river from their village, which acted as a natural barrier to spontaneous exploration, and which allowed them to ‘timetable’ access to the ‘authentic’ village. Such access was mainly limited to moments when other work did not need to be done, thus allowing residents to curate spaces and modes of performance. What is difficult to convey – though enormously tangible – is the degree of amusement they gained from watching tourists engage in ‘traditional’ pursuits; from an enjoyment of discomfiture to a complicit sense of performance. It seemed to me that they were hugely capable of pinning tourists within varieties of expectation, and could produce indigenous, ecological or ‘adventurous’ emphases transactionally. In other words, they attuned quickly to the expectations and modes of interaction that both seekers of authenticity and ‘post-tourists’ communicated. I have included this long reflection as it seems to me that the lingering purchase of generalising, culturally simplistic models of ‘encounter’ are not only socio-culturally inadequate, but do a grave injustice to the everyday operations such as the one I have described.

Caribbean involves implication in a matrix of issues of political-economic interdependence, and a cultural politics of landscape and place. In St Lucia in particular, this is bound up with significant changes in economy occasioned by recent WTO rulings affecting the banana industry, and ongoing debates about public space, tourism and identity. By looking at the spaces, moments and trajectories of connexity that tourism in this context engenders, I will discuss a situated example of imaginative geography and its tensions in play.

It is important, in introduction, to clarify the relationships between the suggestive metaphors of imaginative geography and accidental cosmopolitanism and the empirical work discussed in chapter three. As chapter two makes clear, the idea of accidental cosmopolitanism is one of momentary disjuncture, of the irruption of inscribed interdependences into the subjective mediations of narrated interconnection. As such, it is a speculative idea, aimed at capturing the potential dissonance released by what appear to be increasingly prevalent experience of 'away'. This speculative approach has a certain power, but it also involves a particular form of necessary limitation. 'Accidental cosmopolitanism' is not something that is easily researched in empirical terms. As Chapter three makes clear, there are practical impediments to such research, as the broad nature of being on holiday and the specific nature of all-inclusive resorts makes sustained access to and the committed participation of tourists in research difficult.

More fundamentally, such research would involve attempting to fit the articulated experiences of tourists into a pre-decided conceptual framework, and would amount to significant misrepresentation and shallow research practice. Thus while chapter three particularises the key problematics of this thesis in an analysis of Caribbean tourism, it does not analyse instances of perceived accidental cosmopolitanism nor draw firm conclusions on the imaginative geographies at play in mobilising and performing the Caribbean. Instead, it limits itself to delineating the parameters within which such processes may play out in tourism economically dependent on cultural performance, and on all-inclusive environments predicated on the management of expectations and cultural risk. It is more than likely the case that Minority World tourists regularly experience dissonance and discomfort as a consequence of the disparity between expectation and experience, but it is not the aim of this study to attempt to capture this.

Chapter 1

The Imaginative Geography of Global Interconnectedness

1.1 Imagining globality and ‘the global’

Figuring global figuration

The imagination and praxis of interconnectedness is not new, but has been codified as a particular kind of discussion in relation to the recent cosmology of globalisation. Prior to the strategic marginalisation of the term promised in the introduction, it needs to be acknowledged that discussions of interconnectedness have been primarily forged in considerations of globalisation as a multi-layered and multi-perspectival matrix of social, economic, cultural, political and environmental processes. Given the explosive ubiquity of the term, it has not only rapidly accrued a vast corpus of explanatory literature but also a concomitant and perhaps inevitable narrativisation of ideas of globalisation.⁶ Within this explicatory story, Roland Robertson’s formulation of globalisation as “[...] the compression of the world and an intensification of consciousness of the world as a whole” (1992: 8) has assumed an integral importance. As the section will argue, his idea of *globality* has attracted comparatively less attention, yet across the multiple controversies of the dense inter-disciplinary field of globalisation theory⁷, it is perhaps this insight that remains common through and across different accents and articulations.

If globalisation has anything approaching a shared resonance, it involves an awareness of being in the world, and a sense of axiomatically being connected with countless others. So while Robertson writes extensively of interconnectedness (1992, 1995), Jonathan Friedman - in stressing the binds of connection - writes of “[...] an increase in interdependence and an awareness of that interdependence (1995:70), and Malcolm Waters of globalisation as a “[...] social process in which the constraints of geography on social and cultural arrangements recede and in which people become increasingly

⁶ See Stuart Hall’s influential essay “Cultural Studies: Two Paradigms” for a discussion of the difficulties inherent in the narrativisation (and indeed commodification) of theoretical paradigms. *Media, Culture, Society* Vol 2. No.1 (1980).

⁷ I use the idea of ‘globalisation theory’ broadly and advisedly; Justin Rosenberg (2000) for one has trenchantly critiqued the lack of differentiation between ‘theories of globalisation’ – that is theories that contribute to understandings of globalisation as a contemporary “spatio-temporal phenomena” - and globalisation theory that explains social phenomena through reference to an already constituted globalisation. The result of slippage between these is, according to Rosenberg, an empty circularity verging on the tautological.

aware that they are receding” (2001: 5). Combinations of these formulations have become something of a requisite shorthand for contextualising different studies in relation to ‘globalisation’ (see for example Bairner’s pithy discussion 2001: 6-11), and their implications have also been fashioned into conditions. John Tomlinson, for example, frames this as the experience of ‘complex connectivity’ (1999: 1-12) while Geoff Mulgan, with a New Labour sense of brand potential, opts for the information age connotations – grounded in an appeal to old English certainties - of *connexity* as the basic understanding that the world is “[...] so much more joined together than ever before” (1998: 3).

Leaving aside, for the moment, involved debates about the scope and coherence of globalisation as theoretical resource (Dirlik 2003, Rosenberg 2000), it is clear that these formulations propose a global register as both the extent of action and the horizon of interpretation. Connection, interdependence, connectivity and *connexity* all attempt to suggest increased causality, relationality, imbrication, and also the constitutive importance of the imaginative dimension that is of central interest here. Zygmunt Bauman suggests that:

By far the most prominent and seminal feature of our times is the emergence of ‘global figuration’: of a network of dependencies which covers the entirety of the planet and so sets the stage for a human and historical equivalent of the ‘butterfly effect’ held responsible for eccentricity of unconventional weather fluctuations. As the network of dependencies spreads to absorb and embrace the furthest corners of the globe, nothing that happens anywhere on earth can be safely left out of account in calculations of causes and effects of actions: nothing is indifferent, or of no consequence, to the conditions of life anywhere else (2001: 11).

Bauman may have in mind state responses to issues – such as arms proliferation and atmospheric pollution – that challenge territorial logics, but the sense of nothing being indifferent or of no consequence has a resonance for the daily habitat of the interconnected individual as well. The idea of global figuration can be read as an agency-sensitive version of Giddens’ discussion of disembedding and action-at-distance, where social relations are recognised as being shaped through changing relations of time and space by the interplay of present and absent others (1990: 18). Giddens’ implicit formulation of awareness has been critiqued for an insufficient recognition of subjective pathways and cultural-hermeneutic interpretations (Stevenson 2003, Wynne 1999). What

Bauman's notion of global figuration suggests is a prevailing awareness that explanations, logics and connections can be or must be sought in 'the global'; awareness of compression and interdependence constructs a global realm as a realm of interpretation, and, at least theoretically, it becomes "[...] virtually impossible for the individual human being to engage in any piece of social interaction without consciously or subconsciously relating it to social interactions on a global scale" [Spybey 1996: 11]

Living in interconnectedness, therefore, implies that disembodied relations increasingly come into awareness through everyday practices, and that absent others become present at least partially through the kinds of momentary realisations discussed in the introduction. As with the language of flow, however, ideas of 'the global' – and its conceptual other, 'the local' – constantly require contextualisation if they are not to be lost to a vocabulary of unhelpful abstraction, or as Hylland Eriksen puts it, "[...] 'the global' as a kind of Hegelian world spirit looming above and beyond human lives" (2003: 5). In this theoretical interrogation of imagination and interconnectedness, I would argue that there are more and less useful ways of constructing 'the global' as a framework for thinking through the ways people are implicated in shifting and partially knowable relations of dependence and implication. This is true both of theoretical engagements, and the global as a mobilising metaphor in wider social and political discourses.

Discussions of the global often invoke both a sense of scope and aspiration, or to put it another way, global figuration is an imperative of interpretation and responsibility. As Avtar Brah contends; "The question of the global...becomes one about how we imagine and realise our relationship to one another as individuals and collectivities, and to 'non-humans' including the living earth and the various known and unknown universe(s)" (2002:44). The global is the end realm of global figuration, but it also, in this form of summons, the kind of performative enactment that John Urry discusses when he argues "The global is seen as coming to constitute its own domains" (2003: 6). Yet while Brah does not quite develop the tension, her conjoining of imagination and realisation points to the ways in which 'the global' in this performative sense can be either empowering in its suggestions of trans-particular solidarities, or disempowering in its diffuse abstraction of agency and locus.

While it is obvious that there are very many interpretations of something called ‘the global’, a lot less attention is paid to the ways in which articulations of the concept and the processes it seeks to describe invite people to imagine and particularise it. To return to Spybey’s claim of the “[...] virtual constancy of daily conscious or subconscious” relation to a global scale, an obvious question is the way in which a global scale is configured. This can be illustrated by examining two theoretical discussions of the imagination in globalising contexts, and by further relating these constructions to notions of *the global* in international campaigns.

The global as vice and prism

Gerard Delanty, in *Citizenship in a Global Age* (2001) takes issue with the idea that globalisation gives rise to a *condition* of globality, which he implicitly equates with discussions of a global order, global society and global culture. Delanty argues against simplistic ideas of globalisation as a condition to be attained – with its implicit re-coding of modernisation – and against ideas of it as a condition that ambiguously supplants a modern or postmodern state. If, he argues, we can speak of a ‘global age’, it is as “[...] a process of social change arising out of the diminishing importance of space in defining cultural, political, social and economic ties...” (2001: 85). Delanty continues by making a useful distinction between what he terms strong and weak theses of globalisation, where strength and weakness refers not to a normative judgement on validity but to the degree of holism proposed by an argument. To summarise:

Most theories of globalization fall into two groups, theories of political economic transformation and theories of socio-cultural transformation...I shall identify a strong and weak argument in each position...The strong thesis is one that emphasises globalization as leading to integration, homogeneity, standardization, or simply put, to a global order; the weak thesis is that globalization leads to fragmentation, plurality, even chaos (2001: 86)

There is a strong case for suggesting that Delanty over-simplifies with this categorisation, as it is increasingly the case that cultural accounts of globalisation locate themselves as interpretations of the interplay of strong and weak theses (Barker 1999). However the issue of substance is the way in which he points to significantly different visions of how ‘the global’ can be understood. What I wish to argue here is that strong and weak theses of globalisation diverge sharply in the role they ascribe to the imagination in the production of ‘the global’, and that a recognition of the implications

of this are crucial to the ways in which interconnectedness is understood. As we shall see, totalising, integrative analyses of globalisation are more attuned to questions of power geometry, but in their claims to meta-narrativity they marginalise and often expunge subjective understandings, investments and their consequences. On the other hand, while soft theses of globalisation that emphasis non-linearity and particularity often stand accused of diminishing the import of hegemonic political-economic globalisation, for the purposes of this argument I am interested in the ways in which the imagination is seen in these arguments as a constituent feature of 'the global'. I will develop this with reference to what might be described as exemplary rehearsals of strong and weak theses by Fredric Jameson (1991, 1998) and Arjun Appadurai (1996). In Jameson, it can be argued that traces of the global as a totality that consciousness must unfurl towards is present, whereas for Appadurai the global is continually negotiated as an everyday construct.

While a residual reliance on what is often over-simplified as 'Frankfurt School critique' has been detected in Fredric Jameson's analysis of postmodern cultural forms and practices, his wider argument in *Postmodernism, or the Cultural Logic of Late Capitalism* (1991) is precisely captured in the title. Postmodernism is a 'periodizing concept' characterised by the production of culture as a core economic activity, a final insidious move that is both spatial and formal, and that explicates the logic of expansionist multinational capitalism. This corrosive colonisation of culture – a theme well-established in both radical and conservative critiques since at least the beginning of the twentieth century (see for example Adorno & Horkheimer 1972, Garnham 1986, Hoggart 1957, Leavis 1930, MacDonald 1957, Schiller 1991) – amidst the diverse trajectories of postmodernism poses pressing problems of conceptualisation, problems that in turn have serious implications for political mobilisation. Writing in 1991 about the "[...] as yet untheorized original space of some new 'world system' of multinational or late capitalism", he contends that the fragmentation of postmodernity reflects the 'incapacity of our minds' to map personal experiences in a systemic totality that evades the imagination (1991: 50). Thus fragmentation is an aspect of an emerging totality – the 'world space of multinational capital' - that requires an

[...] as yet unimaginable new mode of representing...in which we may again begin to grasp our positioning as individual and collective subjects and regain a capacity to act

and struggle which is at present neutralized by our spatial as well as our social confusion (1991: 54).

Jameson's comments are restricted here to critiquing political art and its inchoateness in the face of a world system that denies representation, or at the very least the atrophied features that sharpened modernism's dissonant critiques. The pressing task of such representation is to provide a 'cognitive mapping' in the face of individual and collective disorientation. It is, in a sense, implicit that if navigating the contours of a world system is beyond the scope of a radical avant-garde, individual subjects are concomitantly rudderless. This raises questions about the relationship between 'the global' and 'world space', and between different kinds of imagination in positional contexts.

In his later essay "Notes on Globalization as a Philosophical Issue" (1998) he reframes cornerstones of his influential argument to compose a new variant on this thesis within a related discourse of global cultural homogenisation. Discussions of the global intensified enormously in daily discourse between these seminal publications, yet it could be argued that his analysis of the speed and density of global flows and networks evading imaginative mapping was prescient. However the crisis of imagination that remains coherent in his work is in itself an effect of a particular construction of the global. Jameson, arriving at a theory of cultural fragmentation and representational crisis distilled from a model of centre-periphery globalisation, suggests that the global is what he terms an "untotalisable totality" (1998: xii), and it is precisely this simultaneous claim and disavowal that in turn constructs imagination as generally inadequate.

I will argue in the postscript to this chapter that this construct is intimately bound up with the will-to-imagine systemic coherence that still haunts certain discussions of globalisation - a will I contend is related to the politics of different conceptualisations - for now it is enough to take the point that invocations of the global as a teleological externality in which we are interpolated frame subjectivity and imagination in a particularly limited way. Contrary to Delanty, there is a globalised condition that Jameson seeks to describe - with some of the periodising characteristics of postmodernism - yet this is a meta-narrative that perversely proclaims its existence through the inability of 'little narratives' to articulate adequate representations, or to approach it with any insight or congruence.

If Jameson's analysis stands in a tradition that sees globalisation as a centripetal force building on and transforming modernity, Arjun Appadurai's equally fabled discussion of disjuncture and difference in the global economy suggests radically different implications both for a conceptual mapping of 'the global' and the social significance of the imagination (1996). That Appadurai feels compelled to write, in his introduction to *Modernity at Large*, that globalisation is not 'the story of cultural homogenization' and that this "[...] argument is the very least that I would want the reader to take away from this book" (1996:11) suggests a deep awareness that it is the Jamesonian imaginary which is often in the ascendant when globalisation – in this sense a postmodern concept that paradoxically licences meta-narrativity – is invoked.

Both Jameson and Appadurai come at their constructions of a meta-space through discussions of mass mediation, yet Appadurai builds his influential 'weak thesis' (see Delanty 2000: 87) of globalisation as the disjunctive and situated interplay of cultural homogenization and heterogenization on two interlocking discursive trajectories. He works both from a principled anthropological commitment to the fine-grain of micro-process, and from an awareness of the substantial body of soft-ethnographic qualitative research on media reception and interpretation that developed, at least in part, as a reaction to the mass cultural imagination that lingers in some of Jameson's work and in the core of his intellectual lineage (on lineage see Adorno & Horkheimer 1979; 1944, Bloch et al 1980; on reception Kellner 1997, Morley 1992 & 1997, Rajagopal 2000).

Jameson and Appadurai's work line up not only on opposite sides of the weak and strong divide divined by Delanty, but in opposite trenches in a range of debates that attempt to frame modes of agency in globalising environments. Without getting sidetracked into thoroughly critiqued discourses of, for example, cultural imperialism and constructions of the global (Tomlinson 1992, 1999), it is possible to trace different ways in which the importance and scope of imagination is framed by travelling briefly along this well-worn route. If, for Jameson, late capitalism is "the supreme unifying force of contemporary history" (Jameson 1998: 147), then it is possible to see how he can arrive at the unreflexive staticity and counter-ethnographic claims made in the quotation below:

[...] Each national culture and daily life is a seamless web of habits and habitual practices, which form a totality or a system. It is very easy to break up such traditional cultural systems...Once destroyed, those fabrics can never be recreated. Some third world nations are still in a situation in which that fabric is preserved. The point is therefore that, alongside the free market as an ideology, the consumption of Hollywood film form is the apprenticeship to a specific culture, to an everyday life as cultural practice: a practice of which commodified narratives are the aesthetic expression, so that the populations in question learn both at the same time. Hollywood is not merely a name for a business that makes money but also for a fundamental late capitalist cultural revolution, in which old ways of life are broken up and new ones set in place (Jameson 1998: 63).

Thus imagined, bounded totalities are eroded and integrated into an untotalisable totality where disjuncture is a question of scale, rather than difference and diffusion. There is only apprenticeship where there is a master, and the master narrative that collapses representation into globalisation as Americanisation only works by positing a crisis of imagination within a crisis of unspecified cultural loss. Subjective and situated imaginations are impermissible not only because of the classic binding of meaning at the point of production that is symptomatic of such pronouncements, but because Jameson's teleological construction of the global can permit no other. Appadurai, while in basic agreement with Nestor Canclini's minimalist assertion that "[...] the steady predictable tempo of homogenising development is upset by the counter tempo of profound differences and cultural discontinuities" (Durham & Kellner ed. 2001:506) is interested in moving towards a mapping of the global that does not rest on the banal yet easily romanticised hybridity of everyday life (see Friedman 1999). Instead, the unilateral scenario depicted in crippling abstraction by Jameson is seen as a particular perspective on flows that evade such definitive prescriptions, where "The United States is no longer the puppeteer of a world system of images but is only one node of a complex transnational construction of imaginary landscapes" (1996: 31).

This shift from linear coherence to incoherent multiplicity does not elide the power geometry of relations, instead it emphasises the very different trajectories that organise relations of attempted assimilation and domination (1996: 32). More to the point, it is this shift to theorising the diffuseness of global cultural flows and connections that somewhat paradoxically rehabilitates imagination in the global. Appadurai's framework for an initial discursive organisation of cultural flows into ethnoscaples, mediascaples, technoscaples, financescaples and ideoscaples has been enormously influential in shifting

academic imaginations away from a residual reliance on centre-periphery models (Barker 1999), however it is worth revisiting the fact that these overlapping scapes are offered primarily as entry points into what he terms ‘imagined worlds’, and cannot be read as analytical categories without acknowledging their foregrounding of positionality - “[...] these are not objectively given relations that look the same from every angle of vision but, rather, that they are deeply perspectival constructs, inflected by the historical, linguistic and political situatedness of different sorts of actors” (1996: 33).

Theorising from discussions not only of media spectatorship but also from an integrated discussion of migration and transnationalisation, Appadurai argues that the diffuse availability of resources for considering self-in-the-world re-establishes the imagination as central to social practice and globalised subjectivities. This argument is inherently ambivalent, as he argues “[...] the work of the imagination, viewed in this context, is neither purely emancipatory nor entirely disciplined but is a space of contestation in which individuals and groups seek to annex the global into their own practices of the modern” (1996: 4). ‘The global’, then, is neither an iron cage that cannot be grasped from the inside, and nor is it an emerging, aspirational horizon. Instead it is a constantly shifting construct that is made sense of relationally, and that requires all social actors to engage with placing themselves relationally to physically and virtually encountered others. To quote:

The image, the imagined, the imaginary – these are all terms that direct us to something critical and new in global cultural processes: *the imagination as social practice*. No longer mere fantasy (opium for the masses whose real work is elsewhere), no longer simple escape (from a world defined principally by more concrete purposes and structures), no longer elite pastime (thus not relevant to the lives of ordinary people), and no longer mere contemplation (irrelevant for new forms of desire and subjectivity), the imagination has become an organized field of social practices, a form of work (in the sense of both labor and culturally organized practice), and a form of negotiation between sites of agency (individuals) and globally defined fields of possibility. (1996: 31)

I will return to Appadurai’s discussion of imagination and collective agency later in the chapter. For now some interim conclusions can be drawn. There is an enormous body of multi-disciplinary research examining relationships between mediated and circulated images and practices of identification and imagination (see Buckingham 2000, Gripsrud (ed.) 1999, Lewis 1991, Morley 1992), and much of it compounds Appadurai’s dismissal

of rationalist, universalist and massified constructions of subjectivities and understandings. Given the ubiquity of global figuration in everyday life referred to by the theorists discussed thus far in this chapter, then what would seem to matter significantly is the ways in which 'the global' or a 'global scale' are constructed. The following comparison, in considering two different approaches to the global in international campaigns, argues that similar differences to constructing the global can be discerned in the more broadly public realm. And if imagination has been under-theorised in the discourses engaged above and in wider social analysis (Stevenson 2003: 5) then it is surely the case that this failing haunts the logics of unfurling global awareness that I discussed in introduction and that will be re-visited now.

The bigness of worlds

The tensions traced between broadly strong and weak theses can be noted in contrasting the emphases of metaphors deployed by international organisations in awareness-raising activities addressing the apparently unprecedented growth in issues that require a global consciousness. Discussing the United Nations report *Our Global Neighbourhood* (1995), John Tomlinson notes that the idea of neighbourhood involves an important shift from the overtones of planetary pastoral inherent in McLuhan's global village. Placing the emphasis on 'enforced proximity' rather than emergent unities, he argues, captures something of the crucial ambivalence of globalisations:

On the one hand, there is the promise of a world of expanded horizons, of the possibility of increasing political understanding and cooperation and of enriched and diversified cosmopolitan cultural experience. Proximity might mean that global inequalities are rendered more visible, that common global risks and threats – most obviously to our shared environment – become more focused, and that an agenda of global responsibility and common interests is established. But on the other hand it is characteristic of neighbours that we don't choose them, but have to live alongside them...So the all-too-obvious potential dangers of a global neighbourhood are those of an increasingly 'crowded' social and cultural space. (1999: 181-2)

A metaphor of the world as localised habitat hints at several dimensions of the time-space compression held to be central to contemporary globalisation (Harvey 1989, Robertson 1992, Urry 2001), and the idea of neighbourhood seems initially rich both as a global imaginary and as a commentary on changes in the lived existence of actual neighbourhoods. While the neighbourhoods of global cities become increasingly characterised as 'dense fields' of mobilities, networks and flows of people, goods,

images, finance, technologies and wastes (Hiebert, 2002: 211), the world as a neighbourhood is made denser by the imports of enforced proximity. The idea of neighbourhood suggests to any putative inhabitant that there is much out there that impacts on us, as we simultaneously impact on other subjects and objects. Thus in terms of 'awareness', the metaphor of neighbourhood strives to interpellate its residents within dialectics of interdependence and the lived hybridity of global-local relations; everyone is always on the roster of neighbourhood watch.

This sense of common habitation and shared responsibility is, almost paradoxically, reinforced by a spatial metaphor of a different magnitude that is nevertheless immanent in the construction of neighbourhood. The ubiquitous image of the earth from space, most famously sourced from the Apollo 17 mission of 1972, is an image that began to assume powerful global iconicity within broadly the same period as McLuhan's "global village". As John Urry notes in a discussion of the globe as metaphor, the image of the earth from space has been deployed by a range of global corporations to suggest global reach and connectedness and by environmental movements to suggest the inescapability of shared 'planetary stewardship' (1999: 45-6). Central to these accents is the shift in cultural imagination described by James Lovelock; "[...] new understanding has come from going forth and looking back to the Earth from space. The vision of that splendid white flecked blue sphere stirred us all" (quoted in Slattery, 1995: 612). Our interconnectedness is signified by the interplay of metaphors; adopting the vision of the astronaut, we are de-territorialised and gazing on the earth as the human world, aware both of its magnitude and uniqueness, but also of the shrinkage that makes such a perspective possible. We are part of one world.

In the neighbourhood, we are grounded but never entirely territorialised, aware that we are increasingly connected to others through the movements, flows and impacts that constitute the globe as neighbourhood. This awareness of the global – constructed from 'above' and 'below' – is seen as the pre-condition of action, where action is concerted and continuous engagement with the responsibilities that unfurl as the domain shifts and expands. As the *Our Global Neighbourhood* report contends, 'The most important change that people can make is to change their way of looking at the world', a change in perspective which is both premised on and sustaining of a 'global civic ethic' (1995: 47, in Tomlinson 1999: 183).

Tomlinson critiques this shift from metaphorical suggestion to universalist discourse by highlighting the absence of any theory of cultural mediation; not only are debates surrounding cultural particularism and moral knowledge sidestepped (see Paul et al 1994), but the overwhelming ontological task of imagining oneself as part of a global neighbourhood is subsumed. Enforced proximity is no guarantee of empathy or imagined intimacy, never mind the bedrock of a normative shift to participative global citizenship. Thus once again, 'awareness of' meekly becomes a normative plea for 'attitude and behaviour towards' without an acknowledgement of the massively complex 'gap-filling' that cultural-hermeneutics in situated contexts suggests.

I will return to this absence of cultural hermeneutics more explicitly. For now it could be added to this critique that proximity itself is a concept that has to be understood in these conditions as an imaginary negotiation. As a spatial concept, proximity describes degrees of closeness, and suggests in this context that new kinds of closeness are forged and foisted by the compression of temporal-spatial relations, and specifically by the accelerations that subsume space to time (Harvey 1989). In the interlocking images of the world and neighbourhood as global, this shift in proximity is presented as an infinite series of linear trajectories where individuals shuttle between local and global. More importantly, this linearity is mirrored in the normative sense of awareness that it suggests.

The externalised earth - the outer limits of proximity that 'stirred us all' - and the neighbourhood as the intimate space of compressed proximities allow no sense of what Urry terms 'the timed and spaced quality of relations stretching across societal borders' (2000: 15). In other words, interconnections flow in overlapping spatial relationships and temporal regimes. As Urry points out in quoting Keil, both advocates and critics of certain discourses of globalisation "[...] assume a too linear trajectory of globalization" (2003: 40). In other words, the planetary utopianism of the UN's ethical aspirations and Jameson's dystopian discourse of ur-synchronisation are both branches of the same tree struggling to encompass rhizomatic, de-centred multiplicities of understanding and engagement (Deleuze & Guattari 1985).

These metaphors suggest uniformity of compression and an attendant *unfurling* of awareness; yet as I have begun to suggest, if interconnectedness is to be a useful and suggestive spatial conceptualisation it must allow for uneven processes and uneven understandings. At the very least, the idea of chaos involves negotiating uncertainty, confusion and disequilibrium, and conceptualising living in interconnectedness must find adequate ways of including the implications of ambiguity. Moreover, as later sections will discuss, it fails to take account of the obvious ways in which new forms of proximity often witness new dynamics of distancing and dissociation.

This requirement is perhaps grasped in another campaigning metaphor, ‘How Big is Your World?’ Or at least the idea of spatial relativity presented here can be marshalled in two ways. In one guise it appears as a re-run of the idea of unfurling awareness; as Jeannie Marshall, an ‘Empowerment Consultant and Coach specializing in deep transformation through energetic awareness and clearing’ states in an article ‘How Big is Your World?’ in the *Marshall House Journal*; “Each morning you awaken to a new day, a new world. How big do you want today's world to be? One of the remarkable things about this world is that you get to choose how big you want it to be. The size and shape of your world are dependent on your focus”⁸. Even allowing for the individualised self-help discourse from which this is drawn (see Bauman 2001), it should be obvious that the fetish of ‘choice’ and the rationality of ‘focus’ cannot be extended to the contours of a known world, a point I will develop in relation to Ulf Hannerz’s concept of ‘habitats of meaning’ (1996).

The second way in which this phrase can be interpreted comes far closer to capturing something of the role of cultural mediation and imagination in shaping scapes of global interconnection. As an emerging initiative of the Council of Europe, ‘How Big is Your World?’ was an event aimed at encouraging youth civil society to integrate ‘globalisation issues’ beyond the realm of development education, and involves an

⁸ This example is used quite flippantly, however it is also an interesting commentary on the discussions of everyday imaginative geographies, particularly in relation to mediatised experience, that are discussed in the following section. <http://www.mhmail.com/articles/HowBigWorld.html>

interesting switch in perspective.⁹ Rather than presenting the global world as an exegetic totality that is accessed through awareness, this idea of bigness acknowledges the perspectival and shifting nature of multiple constructions of the global. This phrasing aims to work across the divergent and overlapping modernities of the forty-three member states of the Council of Europe, but it also suggests that activism and education need to move from inviting the individual to come into awareness and take up their role, to facilitating the subject in positioning themselves in an increasing complex and cacophonous sphere of possibilities.

If the neighbourhood suggests awareness borne of new senses of compressed proximity, 'how big is your world' hints that these senses can produce new types of distance. In reconfiguring the 'spatial turn', it acknowledges the complexity inherent in imagining oneself as interconnected and responsible beyond the knowable, ambiguities not always obvious in borrowed, meta-territorial notions such as world or global citizen. Posing this question acknowledges that the world can - in a host of ways - be simultaneously smaller and bigger, compressed and extended. Awareness partially constructs 'the global', but it does not map it. A more ambivalent reading of awareness that recognises ambiguity and complexity is a pre-condition of discussing the 'responsibilities' of living in interconnectedness.

In concluding the analysis that links these subsections thus far, it is worth reiterating Hylland Eriksen's point that "[...] the global only exists to the extent that it is being created through ongoing social life" (2003: 5). Before examining these processes of creation more substantially, and in relation to the ways in which they engage the narrative and inscriptive properties of imaginative geographies, it should be clear that ideas of 'the global' are also ongoing creations. As these sections have maintained, contemporary theorisations of the global have propagated divergent notions, developed within often conflicting analytical matrixes, that in blunt terms are more or less adequate when it comes to merely approaching the ways in which global figuration may be played out in 'everyday life'. As the postscript will argue, a variety of converging factors ensure that discussions of globalisation will always sanction a totalising impulse, and notions of

⁹ The conference event Europe, Youth and Globalisation, under the slogan 'How Big is Your World?' took place in Strasbourg 6-8 May 2004. The final report is available at http://www.coe.int/T/E/Cultural_Co-operation/Youth/1_News/globalisation.asp

‘the global’ that are produced by this tend to consider imagination as absent or as overwhelmed by scale, disembedding, and complexity. Approaches where diffuseness is a product and a condition of the constitutive importance of imaginative engagement may, in foregrounding the ways in which people produce the global through tracing trajectories, filling gaps and making connections, provide a basis for returning to the discussions of awareness that are the central focus of this chapter.

It is important to note that the approaches I have discussed here are not always at odds with one another. Roland Robertson’s discussions of *globality* (1992, 1995, 1997) have constituted a notable attempt to provide an analytical mapping of “[...] moves in the direction of global interdependence and global consciousness” (1990:22). More importantly for the purposes of this argument, the neglected notion of globality contains important elements for a discussion of awareness, ‘global consciousness’ and the inherence of ambivalence and ambiguity.

1.2 Globality reconsidered

Writing in 1992, Roland Robertson’s qualifying remarks on the expansive ubiquity of ‘globalization’ and the ‘global’ in academic and wider public discourse signal a circumspection that has become increasingly de rigueur in direct proportion to the density of globalisation discussions; “[...] even though the term is often used very loosely and, indeed, in contradictory ways, it has *itself* become part of ‘global consciousness,’ an aspect of the remarkable proliferation of terms centred upon ‘global’ (1992: 8). Given this proliferation, what is also remarkable is the comparative lack of attention that his discussion of globality has received - in comparison, for example, to the over-exposure and rapid decontextualisation of globalization (Robertson 1992, 1995) - given that it to a large extent avoids the tendency of global-talk to descend into what the *New Internationalist* magazine sometimes characterises as ‘globaloney’.

What follows is not an attempt to sift and sort from the inevitable flurry of accents that accrue to mobile concepts and triumphantly re-present a correct calibration. What I wish to contend in this section is that particular aspects of globality – where the world as a whole is set as a horizon of ambivalence and source of self-consciousness and relativisation – have important implications for subsequent discussions of awareness.

Robertson is indeed correct to observe the over-burdening that attends suggestive formulations; *globalism*, for example, has been deployed to signify both ‘one-worldism’ and what we can contingently call ‘cosmopolitanism’ (Robertson 1992: 10, see also Chapter 2) and the almost polar sense of hegemonic neo-liberalism (Ralston Saul 2004). Equally, globality has been taken up both as a general synonym for ‘global’ and worked through in theorisations that may or may not engage with Robertson’s discussions (Albrow 1996, Scholte 2000, Shaw 1999, Therborn 2003).

Identifying the overlaps between some of these conceptualisations provides an introductory point of departure for a fuller discussion of Robertson. At a minimal level, these theorists are interested not only in what Martin Shaw refers to as “[...] a strongly emerging *practical consciousness* of worldwide human commonality” emerging from common (and often traumatic) world experiences (1999, 2001) but also in developing a concept of globality that is de-coupled from limiting discussions of globalisation. For Shaw, following Albrow, globalisation is a concept that is crippled by hegemonic senses of neo-liberal market expansion, but more importantly, in its inability to provide for discussions of “conscious global-oriented action”. To quote:

While this (globality) could be taken as implying that there is a ‘finished’ global world, it is more helpfully understood as referring to the *emergent and contradictory condition of global-ness*. The point is not the degree of completeness but the distinct quality of a global world. Globality depends on the more mechanical interconnectedness indicated by globalisation analysis, but it is far more than this. The relation between the two can be specified thus: *globalisation is a necessary but not a sufficient condition for globality*.¹⁰

Thus globality, if it is to be tentatively described as a ‘condition’, is not the untotalisable totality that eludes Jameson, and it compounds the constitutive approach of Appadurai by acknowledging the conditions created by time-space compression and interconnectedness while suggesting that such relations do not stand outside of globality as a consciousness of world space. Similarly, Robertson arrives at a discussion of globality by arguing – throughout his relevant publications – for the energies of the humanities and the social sciences to be re-trained less on globalisation than on “ ‘the

¹⁰ Quotation from “Globality as a revolutionary transformation” in Shaw, Martin (ed.) (1999) *Politics and Globalisation*. Sourced from <http://www.sussex.ac.uk/Users/hafa3/politicsch.htm>

world' as a central hermeneutic" (1990: 19). Globality, as he discusses it, is both a way of capturing subjective and highly divergent senses of consciousness of the world as a whole and the kinds of ambivalent global figuration this may encompass, and a construct that allows - somewhat problematically - an analytical space for sociology to examine various and often divergent ways of 'conceiving of the world' in a comparative framework. These senses, however, require a degree of unpacking.

I will deal initially with the deployment of globality as something other than a product of globalisation, and as a concept that undermines normative notions of globalisation as an extension of modernity. To argue that Robertson's formulations have been under-valued in ongoing debates is not to deny that his discursive field betrays signs of age in a theoretical milieu marked by a notable speed and volume of theoretical production. Much of his initial work in *Globalization: Social Theory and Global Culture* (1992) is aimed at carving out a sense of globality that diverges significantly from globalisation for similar if more foundational reasons than Shaw. In these discussions, globality is offered as a world hermeneutic that disavows the absolute purchase of a range of contemporary meta-theories. Engaging with Giddens' then prominent discussion of globalisation as a consequence of modernity (1990), Robertson argues that an alternative juxtaposition of modernity and globality instead emphasises discontinuity and the overlap of divergent and 'differently paced modernities' (Huysen 2003: 58). For Giddens, modernity is inherently globalising, and time-space compression and the lifting out of social relations can be understood as an inevitable effect of global capitalism, the global information system and the international order of nation-states (1990).

Giddens' analysis has attracted a range of criticism, most centrally for its failure to appreciate divergent and entangled modernities (Therborn 1995), which is in turn a product of seeing modernity-to-globalisation as an epochal shift rather than as a spatially diffuse set of interrelations (Barker 2002, Featherstone 1995). Robertson posits a similar argument, where globality can begin to be understood as an interstitial sense of 'being part of something bigger' that cannot be productively captured merely with reference to modernity: "...globality is the general condition which has *facilitated* the diffusion of 'general modernity', globality at this point being viewed in terms of the interpenetration of geographically distinct 'civilizations'" (1995: 27). Similarly, in arguing in an earlier essay "Mapping the Global Condition" (1990) against a distorting foregrounding of

certain globalizing forces in world history over others, he recognises both the diffuseness and invitation to systemic-induction that an idea such as globality suggests:

There may have been periods in world history when one such possibility was more of a 'globalizing force' than others – and that must certainly be a crucial aspect of the discussion of globalization in the long-historical mode – but we have not as a world-people moved into the present global-human circumstance along one or even a small cluster of these particular trajectories. And yet in the present climate of 'globality' there is a strong temptation for some to insist that the single world of our day can be accounted for in terms of one particular process or factor – such as 'westernisation', 'imperialism' or in the dynamic sense, 'civilisation'. Indeed as I argue elsewhere (Robertson 1990b) the problem of globality is very likely to become a basis for major ideological and analytical cleavages of the twenty-first century (1990: 22)

Both the dated and prescient nature of this argument is illustrated here. On the one hand, in influential analytical terms, globalisation is now rarely discussed with any great authority in totalising terms. Robertson and Appadurai's work – among others - shifted key debates to a basic acceptance of the interplay of processes of homogenisation and heterogenisation, and many key debates associated with this period of debate are now taken as frameworks for the exploration of more ethnographically based particularity and subsequent conceptual innovation (Inda & Rosaldo 2001), or as the dissolute basis for theorisations that transcend discussions of structuration with analyses of flow (Urry 2003). Equally, it is for the most part widely accepted that the deterritorialising processes associated with globalisation make it an act of prescriptive will to attempt a mapping of the global field that depends on strong coherent national centres, in geographical terms (Pickering 2001) and in terms of economic and cultural flows (Appadurai 1996, 2002; Castells 1997; Hannerz 1996; Sassen 2000, Urry 2000, 2003). That said, his idea that globality – in terms of images of the world as a whole that inform action or analysis – will prove to be a touchstone of global controversy has been borne about by ongoing and mutating controversies surrounding various attempts to map a post cold war 'global order' (Fukuyama 1993, Huntington et al 1997).

Moreover, the space prised open by Robertson's differentiation of globality from controversies over the form and properties of 'globalizing forces' has continued to be of use to theorists concerned with the epistemological – as opposed to merely analytical – collapse of globalisation into notions of modernity. Arif Dirlik, in his essay 'Global Modernity? Modernity in an Age of Capitalism', argues that globality emerges at the

moment when the teleology of modernity refuses transfer to notions of globalisation, and when claims to universal knowledge are undermined by uneven yet polyphonic discussions of global commonalities as well as differences. To quote:

[...] the awareness of globalization is at once the product of a making of a Eurocentric order of the world, and of its breakdown, which now calls upon our consciousness to abandon the claims of Eurocentrism while retaining consciousness of globality, which would have been inconceivable without that same order. It was necessary, before globalization in this contemporary sense could emerge to the forefront of consciousness, for a EuroAmerican globality to lose its claims to universality as the end of history – which is evident in our day most conspicuously not in the economic sphere where those claims may still be sustained, but in the realms of culture and knowledge, which display a proliferation of challenges to Eurocentrism (2003:283).

As Göran Therborn argues in 'Entangled Modernities' (2003) – an analytical framework immanent in Nicholas Mirzoeff's recent discussion of 'Babylonian modernity' (2005) – discourses of modernity that work through 'ideals, blueprints and stereotypes' and with latent Eurocentrism lurking un-deconstructed are prone to ignoring the discursive and geo-historical plurality of modernity that informs ideas of the global. Globality, for Therborn and Dirlik, poses the challenge of 'world-thinking' that is robust enough to navigate between the polar debilitations of universalism and relativism. This, Therborn contends, has consequences both for the practice of research and fundamental questions of self-conception:

Globality has two basic meanings: finitude and connectivity, both planetary. Universality, by contrast, denotes unlimited extension. Because of its modes of historical generation, modernity has to be seen to be a global phenomenon, rather than a universal one. As such, it should be the study object of a global history and a global social science. A global approach to social phenomena means focusing on global variability, global connectivity, and global inter-communication. It also implies a global look at processes of change, of continuity and discontinuity. (2003: 295)

Where Robertson's work mostly clearly feeds entanglement and its implications is in his mapping of 'the global field' as a set of mutually interpenetrating trajectories of relativisation between four major reference points; selves, Humankind, national societies and the 'world system of societies'.¹¹ Relativisation occurs as "[...] challenges are

¹¹ In his model of the 'global field', Robertson differentiates between "[...] imposing a model of the global field on all present and potential actors in that field and setting out a model which facilitates comprehension of variation in that field" (1992: 26). As he argues - and as I argue in postscript with

increasingly presented to the stability of particular perspectives on and collective and individual participation in, the overall globalization process” (1992: 29). A wide variety of attempts at sense-making, at different interpenetrating levels, cannot avoid traces of the world, or the need to place oneself in relation to conceptions of the world and the implications of unicity. Thus globality involves a high-degree of self-consciousness; the world becomes at once an immanent horizon of meaning, and a source of ambiguity and ambivalence.

Beyond its strategic utility in the debates discussed above, globality is a concept that continues to be of import precisely because its disjunctive challenges register in what I have been figuratively discussing as ‘the everyday imagination’. Here it is important once again to note that I revisit these discussions because these unsettling senses have been diluted in the deployment of ideas of globality as an axiom for positive global consciousness. Contrary to this, globality suggests that interconnectedness is something that we are *constrained* to think about, and to make sense of on a continuing basis in conditions which deny the possibility of secure sense-making. Globality captures a sense of the world as a horizon of meaning and agency, which intimately involves ambiguity about that world and ambivalence towards interconnections and their implications. It involves a temptation to explain and resort to that horizon – most obviously in Universalist or universalising terms - yet globality is a product of intersecting processes of relativisation and increased self-consciousness which simultaneously undermines the epistemological and ontological basis of such claims. The tension of globality is that it hints at the teleology implicit in concepts of globalization as a process (Dirlik 2003: 275) while destabilising holism in the very act of inviting it.

regard to the crippling tendencies of ‘globalisation’ – discussions of the ‘world as a whole’ inevitably involve shades of “what is sometimes pejoratively called totalistic analysis” (ibid) Thus Robertson’s defence of his modular approach is based on an appeal to its flexibility in considerations of totality, and its rather obvious status as a basis for further adaptation. While there is no doubt that his mapping of the global field identifies key nodes of relativising relationships, in terms of other approaches discussed here its attempt to ‘stand outside’ of such processes is undoubtedly a source of controversy. For Niezen (2004), this may well represent the apotheosis of meta-theoretical social pronouncements that he argues have been re-validated precisely by the totalising energies of discussions of globalisation. Similarly, such a modular approach would appear to conflict with Appadurai’s discussion of constitutive positionality in constructions of the ‘global’ of globalisation (2003).

For the central argument of this chapter, globality not only attests to the constant imaginative negotiation of ambivalence and ambiguity, but also to the need propounded by Robertson for the ‘moral acceptance of global complexity’. Principally Robertson is concerned here with pre-empting critiques of his attempts to map and modularise the global diffusion he theorises, and also in arguing that the overemphasis of any one component in his map at the expense of the interplay between all elements can easily constitute a form of analytical fundamentalism. Yet the idea of complexity as an ethical prerogative – while easily dismissed as the non-committal dilettantism of the ‘cosmopolitan’, see chapter two – suggestively recalls the problematic of agency sited in the idea of imaginative geography. Action is not paralysed by complexity as action – *inscription* – is always already taking place. The constant incompleteness and limitedness of *narration* is a product of complexity - understanding of - yet can also become the basis for an ethics of standing in, of an acceptance of limitation as the basis of enablement. This argument will be developed in the following sections.

Prior to that it is worth delineating some further aspects of globality by dismissing some of the criticism aimed at the idea in subsequent debate. For some, globality has been taken up as the product of a particularly ubiquitous equation - ‘the compression of the world and an intensification of consciousness of the world as a whole’ (1992: 8). This ‘consciousness’ has not only been misinterpreted as a variation on ‘global consciousness’, but has also become exemplified by obviously dissonant ‘reactions’ - such as the globally conscious refusals and fundamentalisms discussed by Barber (1997), Bauman (1999) and Castells (1997). To my mind, critically less attention has been paid to the cognitive dissonance in the everyday between the constant imbrication in globality – which “Recrystalises...ancient concerns with structure and the cosmic significance of the world” (Robertson 1997: 78) – and how interconnection and interdependence demand constant de/re crystallisation. There has also been a tendency to regard ideas such as globality with suspicion – as soft culturalised products of insufficiently rigorous enquiry. As Fredric Jameson contends, globality as a ‘new global ethic and consciousness in the world today’ is of little critical import to a “[...] structural account of the forms globalization takes in the various realms of the political, the economic and the cultural (1998: xii). Similarly, Jonathan Friedman supposes that an engagement with engagements axiomatically diminishes the need for the constant critical interplay of forms and modes of analysis:

For Robertson, however, the fact of global interdependence is the exclusive aspect of the global system relevant to his argument, and it enables him to relegate all other system properties, not least the economic, political and social structural, to the sidelines of his more restricted interest in globalization as an awareness of the fact” (Friedman 1995: 72)

These critiques may have import in relation to Robertson’s engagement with debates about the provenance of ‘globalisation’, and Jameson rails legitimately against the prescriptive and ‘unfurling’ simplifications that I have also been discussing in this chapter. However in terms of globality as a form of ‘global consciousness’ their competitive juxtaposition of systemic/structural accounts with the cultural-hermeneutic not only pre-supposes the possibility of these accounts, but also the possibility of producing such accounts outside of globality. In other words, they assume a limited subject-object epistemology that misses the phenomenological sense of globality – where the subject of ‘awareness’ is already in the world and of the world with the ‘object’ of knowledge – and where, to reiterate Urry’s discussion of positionality and mobility, “The observer changes that which is observed ...and there is no structure that is separate from process” (2003: 7). What Friedman and Jameson ignore is the import of globality as a way of framing understandings that are operative in the systems and structures they seek to elucidate.

Moreover, while this is not to question the sustainability of and sustained need for these forms of research, aspects of the complexity of globality question the position that such research is assumed to unproblematically inhabit. As Scott Lash argues in *Critique of Information*, the ‘out there’ status of critical theory is diminished by the general disappearance of a ‘constitutive outside’ from which critical theory speaks and is engaged with under constructive conditions. As the next section discusses, the speed and density of competing images and streams of information about ‘the world’ in part produce the complexity of orientation and globality. Lash describes this as general informationalisation, as a part of which the “[...] critical theory text becomes just another object, just another cultural object, consumed less reflectively than in the past” (2002: 10). While this obviously depends on many subjective and contextual factors, it suggests that the question is not how particular accounts relate the superstructure of

globalisation to the consciousness of globality, but how particular accounts operate *within* globality.

1.3 Limitlessness, limitedness and globality

Habitats of meaning and the problem of information

Göran Therborn links the challenge of ‘knowing’ globality to shifting conditions of knowledge and interpretation, and it is these challenges that are the subject of this section:

Globality entails... there is no longer any legitimate centre point, from which to look out and communicate with the rest of the world. Vistas, experiences, conceptualisations from all parts of the globe will be brought into networks of global inter-communication. (2000: 51)

These networks of global inter-communication have, since the optimistic and blinkered hey-day of modernisation theory through the critiques of informational and cultural imperialism and the subsequent focus on globally converging, merging and deregulated media, been the subject of transnational inquiry on the significance of media organisation, practice and interpretation in and between different societies (Mohammadi 1997). It is not my intention to summarise these debates here, but instead to isolate an aspect of global inter-communication that cuts to the quick of the complexity of globality. Global communications, and the mangrove density of flows of images and information that it engenders, makes ‘planetary identification’ possible (Stevenson 2003: 111) while rendering the knowledge base of that identification radically indeterminate, contingent and insecure.

That citizens of the Minority World live in a media-saturated environment is both a cliché and an area of intense enquiry. It is also premised on a dubious distinction: as Frank Webster argues, easy notions of the ‘information rich’ and the ‘information poor’ lack sociological sophistication and more nuanced senses of cultural as opposed to purely economic capital (1995: 97-8). Furthermore, as I shall argue, the degree of benefit implied by information *richness* needs to be carefully unpacked. Nevertheless, a minimum assertion may be that people are continuously exposed – and I use this term in a neutral as opposed to disempowering, passive sense – to rapid flows of information from an increasing array of sources that may be channelled through an increased variety

of distinct and converged media. Thus living in mediatised and information-saturated environments means that not only do people need media for constitutive information about themselves and the world, but that it is extremely difficult if not impossible to be 'outside' of such flows. As Hanno Hardt argues, media's significance in the 'creation of the contemporary lifeworld itself' is that 'knowledge about' is increasingly a product of only knowing through media, a process that has profound implications for the nature of private experience and collective action:

[...] the dualism of experience and learning – the first product of understanding and the process of coming to know, according to Emmanuel Kant and John Dewey, respectively – has been seriously challenged. While mass communication as a determinate of social and political realities has multiplied experiences of the world – or increased empirical knowledge – it has failed to equip individuals with an intellectual disposition – or rational knowledge – to competently approach the complexity of the world with confidence (2004: 2).

Hardt's formulation suggests an implicit dismissal of the cultural studies research that critiques the gendered and historicised association of interpretation, rational knowledge and the public sphere, and that proffers more multi-faceted descriptions of learning from media (Buckingham 2000, Morley 1997, Ross & Nightingale 2003). Neither does it immediately consider the social networks and 'interpretative communities' in which mediatised experience is discussed and evaluated (Gillespie 1995, Gripsrud 1999, Moores 1993, Morley 1992, 1997). Nevertheless, he does identify the key question immanent in the ambiguity and ambivalence of globality, which is how does one 'know' about the world under conditions where, as Scott Lash phrases it, 'knowledge itself is *of* uncertainty'? (2003: 52). It goes without saying that notions of 'ever-incomplete knowledge' (Beck 1992) are not predicated on the erosion of previously higher degrees of omniscience, but rather on the ways in which competing sources and discourses combine at even greater speeds to render 'knowing about' self-consciously indeterminate. Lash links this to what he terms the 'non-linear reflexivity' of 'second modernity', but his description is equally applicable to the kinds of reflexivity – the reflexivity of interconnectedness – that will be discussed in this section;

What happens now is not non-knowledge or anti-reason. Indeed...we are better educated, more knowledgeable than ever. Instead the type of knowledge at stake changes. It is itself precarious as distinct from certain, and what that knowledge is about is also uncertain – probabilistic at best; more likely 'possibilistic' (2003: 52).

Thus interconnection entails – in terms of the tender ecology of narration and inscription – a basic increase in objects of knowledge constructed between and across disparate and perhaps mutually subversive flows of information. These objects of knowledge – where the knowing individual, already in and of the world of that object, knowingly only comprehends an aspect of the ‘object’ – are also potentially what we could term objects of implication; in other words, the bond of interconnection is no less real because the ‘reality’ of the bond cannot be determined. Narration is contingent, inscription permanent. The complexity of globality involves a constantly expanding horizon of implication, with a possibly decreased ability to negotiate what those implications mean and entail. This section attempts to sketch the contours of this complexity.

What Ulf Hannerz describes as ‘habitats of meaning’ - a metaphor that attempts to bypass tired dualities of agency and structure in understandings of socio-cultural perception and action – depends on a relationship between physical exposure and ‘the capabilities we have built up for coping with it knowledgeably’ (1996: 23). As Hannerz illustrates, the ecology of individual and shared habitats is potentially altered by mundane acts such as flicking between channels with a remote control (1996: 24). In what is contentiously referred to as information society (see Webster 2002), it is possible to speculate that much like a natural habitat, the cultural one may fray and be thrown out of balance by an expansion of stimulus that strains understanding, as attempting to continually locate and understand oneself as a node of connexity struggles with the constancy of inconstancy. However this may be to strain the metaphor, and developing the dimensions of this tension analytically is complex, not least because it runs the risk of dusting off the zombie analysis and categories of mass society theories for a networked revival (Hine 2000).

The diffuseness and radical unknowability of experiences of learning from media presents specific problematics. On the one hand, the tendency both to generalise and to assert from more accessible analyses of the techno-economy, or from robustly inter-subjective analyses of textual discourses, has been subject to a sustained critique from qualitative and quasi-ethnographic analyses of media reception and interpretation (Morley 1997). This is further intensified by the technological-social fragmentation and differentiation of audiences and audiencehood. As Nightingale and Ross argue;

The frequency, range and immediacy of media engagements that link people to the information flows that are the life blood of the information society have obviously been precipitated by the proliferation of new technologies, the convergence of 'old' and 'new' media technologies and the globalization of communication environments. Separately and together, new technologies, globalization and convergence create new opportunities for people to access information – and they pose significant challenges for contemporary understandings of media audiences and the significance of their activities (2003: 2).

One of the significant challenges posed by this plethora of opportunities is approaching mediated knowledge (Livingstone 1999). As Sonia Livingstone has detailed, mediated knowledge – what is conveyed by media texts to audience members and how – has received far less attention than questions of audience competence; the pre-existing capital brought to the process of viewing, capital often neglected or invisible in linear models of communication. The 'very notion of knowledge' Livingstone argues, has become a troubled and obscured concept for media scholars as "[...] to ask about knowledge may appear to suggest a return...to models which are taken vastly to underestimate the institutional/epistemological basis of media production, the polysemic/multilayered complexities of message meanings and the interpretative and contextualised activities of the (plural) audiences" (1999: 95). Indeed, given that this chapter critiques the assumption of linear, unfurling awareness, it would be a fundamental flaw to depend on discussions which depend on any form of implicit transmission.

Nevertheless, a degree of abstractive theorisation must remain possible without constant reference to empirical evidence, if written with a reflexive sense of the constraints empirical evidence does and should place on assertion, and the ways in which empirical evidence is transposed into broader analysis. Therefore what I will concentrate on is an attempt to map the import of complexity for a figurative idea of global awareness similar to the unproblematic senses discussed in opening. This does no more than set out to describe a realm of generalisable challenges which I hope can be posited without traversing the constraints that a careful reading of audience research renders essential. The idea of awareness that underpins a positivistic shift from globality as consciousness to sphere of action needs to be critiqued in terms of the inherent tensions between habitat and meaning that Hannerz's notion identifies.

To return to the introductory discussion of interconnection, in an interconnected world - where connection inevitably implies forms of interdependence - issues of global justice, health and ecology have come during the last decades not only to depend on the development and advocacy of forms of global governance (Held 1995, 2000; Kaul et al 2003), but also to a large extent on the ways in which perceptions, knowledges and evaluations of issues become embedded in people's life-politics (Bauman 2000). Thus the question 'how are we to live?' (Goringe 1999, Singer 1993) is immanent in the everyday and the mundane, and implies both the reflexivity of constant, conscious surveillance and the stabilising momentum of routine. Such life-politics, or consumer politics (Stevenson 2003) inhabits the public and private and overlapping areas between, and often involves but is routinely independent and perhaps removed from collective action.

Burgeoning globality, as we have seen, can in this context be framed as a process of awareness, where buying, eating, giving, taking, investing, dumping, recycling, activity, inactivity, travelling, dwelling and many other micro-processes appear as moments in fluid and expansive relations with the world at large. Urging, sustaining and channelling this process and state of awareness are civil society actors including environmental organisations, consumer groups, ethical living networks, single issue lobbies, industry public relations, public representatives and watchdogs, and varieties of expert systems integrated differentially into this landscape of awareness-raising. And this is but a surface attempt to list types of organisations; missing are the enormous varieties of forms of networks and shifting collectivities that can be increasingly encountered, and more significantly, the ways, forms and discourses through which different media channels and actors reflect, engage and critique these issues, debates, and controversies. The question, then, is that if awareness as a basis for action demands being informed, what does 'being informed' mean under changing conditions of information and knowledge?

What I am interested in here is not only the difficulty of knowing about, but also the ways in which the concept of 'knowing about' changes in these generalised conditions. As Trinh T. Minh-Ha wrote in "Outside In Inside Out", "*knowledge about often gives the illusion of knowledge*" (1989: 133 italics in original). At stake in the original context

are the ideological implications of positionality and constructions of the Other, and shades of this remain germane to this argument. Her argument suggests that knowledge is always also a product of limitedness – a reflexive recognition of position, authority and possibility – and what I wish to pursue here is the implications of limitedness as a form of enablement in a context of limitlessness. Perhaps inevitably, framing this question thus involves engaging with the multi-accented and contested notion of the ‘information society’. It is commonplace in a range of discourses to describe information and its exchange as the defining feature of globalised life in many societies, however the range of enquiry and disagreement with regard to the development of this proposition is both beyond and marginal to the scope of this thesis. I will concentrate here on two recent accounts that attempt to describe challenging conditions of learning and knowing about, by examining the speed, non-linearity, limitlessness and disembeddedness of informational flow.

Scott Lash, in *Critique of Information* (2002), presents a picture of informational engorgement that could be read as a corollary rather than mirror of informational poverty in an overall picture of information inequality. This corollary also attests to disempowerment, but of a radically different kind. The ‘information society’, in this critique, is characterised by the unintended consequences of disembedded information that both eludes and elides ‘systematic conceptual frameworks’ and the organising gravity of discourse. For Lash, the information society is a *disinformed information society*: “First and foremost perhaps is to look at the paradox of the information society. This is, how can such highly rational production result in the incredible *irrationality* of information overloads, misinformation, disinformation and out-of-control information” (2002: 2).

Lash’s analysis is wide-ranging, and is primarily concerned with the future of critical enquiry under conditions of rampant informationalisation; where both the ‘outside’ foundations and conditions of critical reflection are incorporated by the information order, and where the ‘levelling out’ that characterises it erodes the difference between theory and general informationalisation. Broad brush strokes on the canvas of information society runs the obvious risks of disinterring atomised typologies and a debilitating reliance on metaphors of extremity. However many of the processes he discusses can be framed to develop the problematic of awareness under discussion. Most

obviously, in discussing the future of critical theory where "...the very speed and ephemerality of information leaves almost no time for reflection" (2002: 4), he touches on both the potential tension of habitats of meaning to 'cope knowledgeably' and the strained dualism of experience and learning noted by Hardt.

Thus the first issue to be considered in terms of connectivity, awareness and responsibility, is the implications of speed, diffusion and the supposed compression of reflection for orientation midst an expanding series of claims to connection and dependence. Here it is useful to integrate the work of Thomas Hylland Eriksen on 'slow and fast time' in the information age to Lash's frame of analysis. Eriksen works equally from the supposition of the irrationality of rational over-production. As he points out, weathering a blizzard of information is potentially as disabling of concerted awareness as forms of informational drought; "Ideas spread faster and faster. On the whole, people all over the world know more about each other than ever before, and the information on offer is changed daily" (2001: 26).

According to Eriksen, this rapidity of change and plurality of sources fragments ideas as to what constitutes knowledge, and how it is to be sourced, evaluated and integrated. For some, information constitutes new forms of exclusion and alienation, a pressure to constantly engage where the 'next moment kills the present'. Unprecedented amounts of information and modes of access demand new skills of filtering and evaluation, and they also demand increased discursive intelligence, as types and snatches of information are combined and re-combined in forms, narratives and link-ways that place the onus of coherence, cumulative logic and 'organising principles for knowledge' on the subject:

It is sometimes said that our generation runs out of things our grandparents had never heard of. What we now seem to run out of, is lack of information. In this situation, an acute need for a sorting mechanism appears. What are the criteria for distinguishing between good and bad, knowledge and noise, when the supply of everything is limitless? How can I sleep at night knowing that I have filtered away 99.99 per cent of the information I have been offered; how can I be certain that the 0.01 per cent that I actually use is the most relevant bit for me, in so far as I haven't even sniffed at the rest. (2001: 19-20)

The sense of access to a world of 'knowledge' with finite temporal and cognitive capacities for engagement makes the idea of being informed, and aware, a relatively

difficult notion to ground. As Eriksen further explains, in an apt example continuing directly from the question he poses in the previous quotation:

In the old days the answer to this kind of question was either a sound education (*Bildung*), a secure personal identity or distinct interests. Today, the jungle has become so dense that one needs to be both stubborn and single-minded in order to be well-informed about anything at all. Even someone paid by the state to do research on, say, chaos theory, cannot possibly read everything that is being written within the field, even if one restricts the scope to the English-language literature. (ibid: 20)

Obviously, the kind of rigorous comprehensiveness that he discusses here is not exactly relevant to the subject of interconnectedness. The speed of informational expansion and change – in foci, orthodoxies, interpretations – is, as are the anxieties that potentially accompany it. The health of habitats of meaning is threatened on the one hand by the stress of elusive coherence, and on the other by the drift of decontextualised and decontextualising images, impressions, nuggets and fragments.

Where this is daily apparent is precisely in the ways in which rhetorics and politics of interdependence have become central to understandings and practices of consumption, leisure and lifestyle, particularly but far from exclusively among the global middle classes (Tomic & Thurlow, 2002). Ethical consumption, ecological holism, responsible travel, fair trade; all urge the consumer-citizen towards a dialectic of the global and local, to an acknowledgement of our footprints and the need to tread lightly, towards an inescapable responsibility towards countless others that is intimate and dependent despite its almost total anonymity. Given the immediate tension here between endless ramification and lives filled with habits, commitments, routines, crises, partial understandings and self-narratives, the idea of ethical living involves strategies of ethical engagement based on contingency.

This is illustrated by a 2004 series in *The Guardian*, where the journalist Leo Hickman conducted an experiment in ethical living which involved an initial ethical auditing of his household and lifestyle, and sustained online engagements with specific specialists

and the reading and emailing public.¹² As Hickman made clear, the issue for him was not one of blissful ignorance of issues and impacts, but a ‘convenient fog of inertia and apathy’ that becomes denser as more and more life practices are implicated in ‘destroying the planet’. His arguments are familiar; even a cursory glance at the daily newspapers reveals stories where the ‘western lifestyle’ is implicated in degradation, poverty, waste, risk and hypocrisy, but there is also a world of other information to get lost in, which amplifies the sense of “what can little me do about it all?” As the experts audit his life, different daily practices become connected to a balance sheet of connexity; “Reams of notes are taken about how we wash our baby’s bottom, what make our television set is, what we do with our plastic bags, how we commute to work, whether we eat takeaway food, what bank accounts we have, and whether we know our neighbours”. Yet, as he realises, the only way to navigate such a ‘never-ending journey’ is to develop a particular kind of commonsensical perspective:

But I have found the trick to avoiding the feeling that your life is one drawn-out exercise in self-flagellation is to make sure that you retain a sense of perspective and humour throughout. No, you can’t save the world, but you have made more of an effort than you did yesterday.

Within the context of the article, this is sound advice, and projects the kind of ‘strong personal identity’ advocated by Eriksen in the face of limitless information. The article also indicates the kinds of negotiations and self-narratives (and in this form, a public, self-conscious one) that often accompany engagement in the politics of consumption and its complexities. Yet this article does not illustrate key aspects of this complexity, as the article describes the research and tenacity that goes into the development of *routine*. In other words, it is more about the grounding of pragmatism than developing enabling modes of limitedness in a context of limitlessness. The speed of informational change, inherent ambiguity of knowing and unintended consequences of interconnection and dependence question the possibility of routine, while the constraints of connexity demand continuity despite contingency.

¹² Hickman, Leo “How Green is Your House?” *The Guardian* Thursday January 29, 2004. The documentation of Hickman’s experiment and online discussions can be accessed from <http://money.guardian.co.uk/ethicalliving>.

As Lash perceptively notes, “[...] sense-making or knowledge is the glossing, the account-giving of everyday activities that is inseparable from those activities” (2002: 17). Informational speed and diffusion at least theoretically resists the glossing of pragmatism and the account-ordering of routine, and this can be linked to what Lash theorises as the increased *non-linearity* of informationalised existence. The following sections link aspects of this analysis to other established perspectives, and relate them to concrete questions of globality, interconnectedness and acting in informed awareness.

Speed up and scarcity of attention

An obvious area where the speed of informational change can be seen to inject complexity and non-linearity into consumption is in questions of environment, health and scientific expert systems. Following broadly from Giddens’ (1991, 1994) and Beck’s (1992) theorising of reflexive subjects monitoring their biography in the context of risk societies, Nick Stevenson argues that ‘the paradox of reflexivity’ is that as people increasingly monitor the involved choices of the lifestyles they lead, they become increasingly aware of risks and risk assessments (2003: 14). For Giddens, this suggests an increase in ‘clever people’, where in information societies people are better informed than ever before with regard to cultural lifestyles, health issues and in dealing with expert systems in their daily lives (1994: 94, in Stevenson 2003: 12). Stevenson’s reading of Giddens’ position here is purely a descriptive one, and what is of primary interest is once again the static and normative model of ‘being informed’ and aware that is supposed. Increased access to expert systems and cultures is almost assumed to fill the bucket of the clever mind, yet such a typology ignores several crucial factors.

As Stevenson indicates in identifying the paradox of reflexivity, reflexivity is a process rather than state of constant refinement; it involves the reflexivity of reflexiveness, in other words. According to Barbara Adams; “To impose a reflexive attitude on the self...requires that we overcome our powerful belief in an uncontaminated, objective reality and accept the constitutive power of our frames of meaning” (1996: 85). Thus ‘being reflexive’ may involve a constant reflection not just with regard to our sense of self and global implication in putatively unquestioned areas of lifestyle and impact, but also a reflection on types, discourses, sources and competitions in information. In particular, this involves engaging with diverse and overlapping expert cultures, which dispense mediated and differentially motivated readings of scientific research deemed of

relevance to questions of environment and health. Individual engagements with and trust in expert systems has been a central issue in critiques of modernity, however it is only with more recent interventions that theories of cultural mediation and ethnographies of interpretation and evaluation have been inserted into a previously deafening clash between trusting dupes and clever people (Lash 1994, Wynne 1996).

As Brian Wynne has argued in a critique of the work of Anthony Giddens and Ulrich Beck, typologies of the public in relation to expertise have been based on limited models of rational-choice, and lack such cultural-hermeneutic issues as alternative forms and discourses of knowledge, forms of protest and dissent that do not register as overt opposition, and how people “[...] informally but incessantly problematise their own relationships with expertise of all kinds, as part of their negotiation of their own identities” (1996: 50).

Therefore before further developing such ideas of cultural mediation, it is clear that the problem with the speed and flow of expertise pertaining to impacts and responsibilities in a whole variety of life-practices has little to do with normative notions of trust or lack thereof. To return to the critique proposed by Thomas Hylland Eriksen, it may have something to do not only with his idea that ‘freedom from information is a scarce resource’ – an irony that sits at the heart of the reflexive paradox – but that “[...] in information society, the scarcest resource for people on the supply side of the economy... (is the) *attention of others*” (2001: 20, emphasis in the original). Eriksen’s discussion of attention scarcity can be seen as a symptom of what Lash describes as ‘speed up’; technological forms of life outpace reflection and linearity, and contribute to what he describes as an increase in cultural ephemerality.

As the areas of life that imply connexity and impact increase in scope and complexity - pace Leo Hickman’s experience - so too do the expert cultures, sources of interpretation and advice. And, as is often noted, the orthodoxies of what is good for us and what is bad, what is dangerous and what is not, and so forth, shift and change as more and more sources compete for attention and fleeting hegemony. It is my contention that this has less to do with a state of ephemerality – which after all depends on individual and collective process – as a general expectation of ephemerality and assumption of obsolescence; an informational climate where information is ‘stacked’ (Eriksen 2001:

103-120) and makes little claim beyond the moment. For Lash, this is immanent in a wider condition, where “Technological time outpaces the determinacy of causality; it leads to radical indeterminacy, to radical contingency, to chronic insecurity” (2002. 19).

Aside from attempts to delineate, however problematically, a non-reductive condition, what should also be noted in this situation is the rise of instrumental critiques that attempt to create deliberate dissonance and (to use a term from classical communications theory) noise in a realm of increased competition for attention. This can be seen in the recent controversy where US scientific submissions to a WHO commission on obesity and diet were claimed to have been influenced by the needs of important domestic donors and clients¹³ and ongoing attempts - fuelled by a reflexive sense of the ‘levelling out’ of sources in informationalisation - to destabilise the appearance of any consensus on the scientific incontrovertibility of climate change (Monbiot 2004)

This awareness of increased claims on attention and the power of deliberate dissonance can be seen in wider consumer politics as well. Oxfam, for example, has recently argued that there is once again a widening gap between the rhetorics of global corporate responsibility and the reality of labour and production practices (2004). In others words, additional confusion is created by corporations – whom consumers ideally monitor as part of their ethical lifestyle – working within discourses of responsibility that have become recognised and routinised, while acting in ways that calls for increased knowledge and awareness, informed by constantly adapting modes of surveillance. This point is further developed in the next section. More recently, what was notable during the global response to the Asian Tsunami was the reflexive sense of accelerated time and its uses in the statements of many INGOs. In some instances, highly public contributions of aid from some governments were greeted with equally public pleas for vigilance; as the disaster retreats from a critical threshold of global public attention, the assumption was that initial pledges of aid would be quietly scaled back.

¹³ See Boseley, Sarah “US accused of sabotaging obesity strategy”. *The Guardian*, Friday January 16 2004.

Connectedness and unintended consequences

Given this broad sketch of informational instability, competition and perhaps opportunistic distortion, it is important to emphasise that embracing 'living in interconnectedness' involves a constant awareness of the *paradox of fluid bonds*; we are always implicated, but what we may be implicated in and how may shift and change. In that ethics are relational they are also intentional; there is always another whom we would do/not do unto, and even the unknown other is a subject of intentionality through interconnection. Yet this other is also a product of shifting conditions of construction, and a further paradox of connectivity may be that unintended consequences result from relations of consequence stretched over space and contingent in time. In Lash's critique, unintended consequence is not only a source of and factor in 'risk society'. It is also a product of what we saw previously described as the radical indeterminacy and insecurity of knowledge through information:

That is, the more we monitor or self-monitor, the more we subsume cognitively, the more gets out of control, the more risk, uncertainty we bring about. The more we monitor the object the more the object escapes our grasp. The more we strive calculatingly to minimise risks, the more we produce a whole other set of uncertainties (Lash 2002: 50)

Once again this is germane to understanding and standing in interconnection and interdependence with global others. An important example - and one that has received a wide degree of global public attention - is the question of consumer power through fair trade and boycotts. Consumer boycotts have a long and involved political history, for example during the civil rights era in the US (Greenberg 2002), but have become prominent again because of the politics of interdependence that they recognise and instrumentalise, as well as the ways in which they have become imbricated in lifestyle politics (Klein 2000). Since at least the 1970s it has been recognised that transnational corporations that are involved in environmental degradation and a wide variety of human rights abuse can be held to account in the 'daily election' of shopping (Miller 1997). Thus a boycott of goods is aimed not just as material impact, but at 'naming and shaming' corporations (Urry, 2000: 181) and tarnishing their global brand image.

Consumer power is held to connect the local shelf to global semiosis; potentially affecting both the bottom line and brand value. However the politics of consumption is a

debate that is often subsumed into wider debates on the politics of consumerism. I wish to steer clear here of polarizing perspectives on the relationship of consumerism and citizenship/activism; perspectives which examine the individualization of choice and freedom and the ramifications for a social imagination of the common good (e.g. Bauman 1998, 2000, 2001), and approaches that build on the oft-critiqued 'radical romanticism' of late British cultural studies, where the meaningful nature of consumption is taken to suggest a political foundation (for an overview and critique see Lodziak 2002). As Stevenson summarises, "(the former)...views have a persuasive logic, but remain blind to the ways in which the practice of citizenship may have changed within contemporary societies" whereas the potential of the latter category of approaches is tempered by being "[...] insufficiently appreciative of the ways in which consumer societies undermine the quest for justice" (2003: 127). Aspects of these debates will surface in this analysis, however I wish to keep in focus the question of everyday action in interconnection, the information on which this is based, and the question of unintended consequence.

As a concerted response to a particular abuse, a boycott aims at ameliorating or even radically improving the state of affairs that has motivated the action. Yet what happens when such a concerted act, mobilised through monitoring, produces new uncertainties and unintended consequences? As Naomi Klein documents in a discussion of the ramifications of boycotts in *No Logo*, many boycotts have achieved significant victories, particularly when accompanied by effective campaigning, and have forced companies to change practices and legal regulatory frameworks to be modified (2000: 345-65). As Klein argues, interconnection can never be concealed, and in an information age linkages between producers and consumers can bypass the connexity of partiality preferred by the corporation:

Severing brands so decisively from their sites of production and shuttling factories away into industrial hellholes of the EPZs has created a potentially explosive situation. It's as if the global production chain is based on the belief that workers in the South and consumers in the North will never figure out a way to communicate with each other – that despite the info-tech hype, only corporations are capable of genuine global mobility. It is this supreme arrogance that has made brands like Nike and Disney so vulnerable to the two principal tactics employed by anticorporate campaigners: exposing the riches of the branded world to the tucked-away sites of production and bringing back the squalor of production to the doorstep of the blinkered consumer (2000: 347).

In Klein's analysis, boycotts work through 'de-blinkering' as a particular form of imaginative propulsion, interconnection is 'revealed' and implication stark. This is a powerful logic, however as it is dependent on the politicisation of information and mobility, it suggests that such a politics must be vulnerable to mobility and informationalisation. Put in another way, the linear logic of a boycott in non-linear globality inevitably entails unintended consequence. There are many aspects to this. A primary one is what Klein describes as the focus on 'designer injustice' (2000: 432), where the targeting of high-profile corporations has provided a smokescreen for other errant corporations to modify their practices or to cover their tracks. In an information age reflexivity cuts every which way and monitoring gives rise to responsive and evasive monitoring. In other instances, unintended consequence is a product of particular forms of mobility. As a 2003 report of the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions documents, the continued spread of export processing zones – where labour rights have been kept off the agenda of multilateral agreements – in a global 'race to the bottom' in industries such as textiles means that out-sourced production chains can shift out of the spotlight, and may in fact encourage competing governments to conspire in the creation of such 'favourable' investment conditions. The 2005 accession of China to the WTO is expected to exacerbate these dynamics.

Other aspects of this can be mentioned; as Klein documents, the focus on branded goods as a tactic of the information age may be both hindered and diluted by conditions of informationalisation. Corporations that offer services touching on everyday aspects of life while not depending on the primary purchases of consumers (e.g. wood and metals) are to an extent not only relatively invulnerable, but relatively out of awareness. Conversely, a corporate reaction to consumer activism and boycotts has been to develop sophisticated public relations mechanisms to make production and sourcing processes 'transparent', to relate the 'mission' of the company to wider social goals, and to produce and disseminate voluntary codes of conduct.

Klein posits a number of ramifications of these responses. The first could be described as the proliferation of weapons of mass distraction; voluntary codes are not legally binding, and are therefore produced as statements for public consumption and brand sustainability. Therefore, as Klein argues, the quantity and models of corporate codes produced during the late 1990s became almost impossible to monitor, and in fact could

be regarded as informational noise and chaos designed “[...] to obscure the fact that multinationals and citizens do not actually share the same goals when it comes to deciding how to regulate against labor and environmental abuses” (2000: 434). The development of codes, conspicuously designed to facilitate the informed, intentionally and unintentionally results in added layers of informational diffusion.

The second aspect could be described as the illusion of more light than darkness. Klein quotes a Harvard business professor Debora L. Spar and her notion of the ‘spotlight phenomenon’, an idea that suggests a panoptical logic operating incongruously in relations of fluidity and mobility. Spar suggests that the assumption of unwelcome attention has a critical impact on corporate behaviour regardless of whether they are monitored or not, thus rendering actual regulation unnecessary. As opposed to this, the idea and practice of spotlight politics may actually obscure more than it illuminates: “The spotlight being shined on these companies is both roving and random: it is able to shine down on a few corners of the global production line but darkness still shrouds the rest...reforms seem to be implemented solely on the basis of where the spotlight’s beam was last directed” (2000: 434).

At stake in this discussion is not the efficacy or strategies deployed, but the ways in which these conditions of constant contingency and over-determining indeterminacy strain the assumed relationship between ‘being informed’ and ‘being active’. As I have argued, interconnection is a shifting and imagined relationship that has to be conceptualised in terms of the heaviness and lightness of bonds. In such an imagined relationship we may connect to the contexts illuminated by the spotlight, yet we are no less inscribed in contexts ‘shrouded by darkness’, and with dynamics of unintended consequence, possibly even more so. Narration, to a large extent, depends on what is known, while inscription may be influenced by the amplified indeterminacy of that knowledge base.

In *The Age of Consent*, George Monbiot presents similar problematics of intentionality and impact in his discussion of David Korten’s notion of ‘voluntary simplicity’ (see also Lodziak 2002: 153-55). For Korten, ‘mindful living’ is a strategy both of reclaiming areas of life from reification and commodification, and of practising ‘consumer democracy’ by ‘nurturing the mindful market’ through ethical consumption (2003: 55).

In his sympathetic critique, Monbiot presents two problems with sustaining informed, ethical consumption, problems once again amplified by the very conditions that appear to present opportunities for de-commodification and re-politicisation. For Monbiot fair trade choices are a daily moral imperative, yet as a strategy for global justice and wealth redistribution it may in fact serve to obscure the need for radical change. Fair trade, as I will discuss in a subsequent section, depends on cultivating the imaginative bond of interconnection through shared implication in a physical good, and in the discrepancy between the life conditions of production and consumption. Thus the ethical purchase of a consumer is imagined to send a message back along the chain, which eventually alters the nature of the chain. For Monbiot, a problem with this relational logic may be that the 'message' does not travel back along a linear connection between consumer and producer:

Those who do seek to make ethical purchasing decision will often discover, moreover, that the signal they are trying to send becomes lost in the general market noise. I might reject one brand of biscuits and buy another, on the grounds that the second one was less wastefully packaged, but unless I go to the trouble of explaining that decision to the biscuit manufacturer I chose not to patronize, the company will have no means of discovering why I made it, or even that I made a decision at all. Even if I do, my choice is likely to be ineffective unless it is coordinated with the choices of hundreds...of other consumers. But consumer boycotts are notoriously hard to sustain. Shoppers are, more often than not, tired, distracted and drowning in information and conflicting claims. Campaigning organizations report that a maximum of one or two commercial boycotts per nation per year is likely to be effective, beyond that, customer power becomes too diffuse (2003: 56-7).

Scepticism towards the efficacy of ethical purchasing routines is not designed to undermine them, merely to undermine the attractive rhetoric of 'consumer democracy' that is used to gloss them. In this context, it serves to illustrate the indeterminate and contingent nature of interconnection, as Monbiot documents – although it is likely that he underplays the strategies of consumer analysts for ascertaining the degree of impact of fairly traded products – people may imagine themselves in a relationship of feedback that is actually a monologue. He makes a similar point in discussing our daily implication in unfairly traded products that are purchased indirectly. It is likely that many products contain raw materials – such as copper – that have been mined and refined at the profound expense of 'distant others', yet they are purchased in packages that the consumer is unaware of or has little leverage over. It is worth quoting Monbiot's description of a chain of responsibility in this instance:

My leverage over the copper market then depends on the transmission of my will through a number of intermediaries. If I am prepared to embarrass myself, I might be able to persuade the electrician to go back to his company and ask it to question the suppliers, who in turn might be persuaded to approach the manufacturers who in turn might be persuaded to petition the mining company...even if this request is somehow transmitted all the way there and back...all I am likely to receive is an unverifiable assurance that of course it was mined sustainably. I will be left feeling like a busybody and a supplicant, which is hardly a politically empowering position to be in (2003: 58).

At a very basic level, a chain of interconnection needs to be imagined as being comprised of a range of actors that impact on the possibility of aware action. In Monbiot's summary, deeply ingrained practices of everyday life mitigate against being able to pursue the causality of interdependence. Similarly, his recognition of the intersubjective emotions invested in such processes further complicates the rational-choice overtones of 'consumer democracy'.

The important point here is not only the actual impacts of motivated, aware action, but also the potential impacts on 'awareness' of such unexpected consequences. Acting within interconnectedness must be conceived of as being always already limited and partial, shot through with ambiguity, contingency and unintended consequences. Chris Barker, in arguing for the metaphors of complexity science and chaos in cultural analysis, contends that "this argument indicates limits to any cultural analysis, and in particular to modes of intervention, given increased levels of the unintended consequences of action" (2002:82). If this is the case for professional cultural analysts working in overlapping and competing communities of knowledge, it must be at least equally the case for the motivated consumer, sporadically made aware that attempts to develop routines around ethical engagement are unsettled by competing flows of information and analysis, discursive shifts in expert cultures, the constancy of the unintended, and the indeterminacy of agency.

Perception, knowing, and ethical implication

The two previous sections have attempted to indicate some of the issues raised by informational diffuseness and indeterminacy for theories of global interconnectedness and active interdependence. However there are obvious limitations – beyond the lack of empirical research – to general discussions that easily creep into determinist visions of

people locked in flows and baulking at conditions of overload. One such limitation, which this section seeks to address, is nuanced considerations of interpretation. While previous sections have examined general characteristics of contingency and insecurity, they have not made mention of specific experiences - encounters and interfaces between the implicated and the other of implication, the everyday exposures that expand and mould habitats of meaning. The metaphor of flow should not obscure the micro-complexities of moments of flow, as in turn that may obscure the divergent forms, images and experiences that the idea of flow attempts to encompass.

Since at least the work of Raymond Williams (1974) the idea of flow has been associated with television, particularly with the metaphysics of liveness, and with the aspects of cultural imagination engaged by the problematic co-presence immanent in the television image, at once separate in space and united in time (Ellis 2000: 32). This section examines the question of co-presence under conditions of time-space compression, and reviews contemporary discussions of seeing and witnessing the conditions, worlds, lives and suffering of others. An exploration of interconnectedness must engage with the ongoing centrality of television and the instantaneity of images and information about elsewhere, particularly in a context where, as Birgitta Höijer contends, a discourse of connection and compassion has increasingly developed "...at the point of intersection between politics, humanitarian organizations, the media and audience/citizens" (2004: 513). How can we discursively approach the significances of ubiquitous images, visions, and fragments of others and the senses of interconnection they may be framed within, while avoiding the shallow grave of assertion that tends to haunt such ventures in non-empirical media analysis?

This section proceeds by navigating between the by now familiar reductionisms of socio-technological determinism in its negative and positive guises. As Höijer sensibly notes, there are "...different forms of compassion as well as different forms of indifference" (2004: 528), and these fundamentally unknowable and contextual differences present as the degree zero of any discursive approach. The section considers both generalised discussions of viewing, knowing and the inferences for agency, and empirical research in circumscribed frameworks that serve to complicate and open further questions. In general, there is a dearth of work that considers these questions in terms of affective notions of global belonging and implication. Most of the work under

discussion engages, from a broad 'media events' perspective (Dayan & Katz 1992), with the analysis of representing, circulating and 'witnessing' images of trauma, pain and suffering in conflicts and humanitarian disasters. However the limited scope of this work does not undermine its relevance to wider discussions of imaginative geography, as such 'spectacular' events and the mediated experience of them are undoubtedly inscribed in wider impressions of global interdependence.

As I previously noted, a central ambiguity of the ambiguous information age is that globalised media makes planetary identification possible in radically new ways, while not necessarily offering resources for meaningful forms of perceiving, understanding and enabling identification. In other words, globalised media facilitates the possibility to 'see', it mediates explicit and implicit appeals within an expanded life-world, yet implication is as diffuse as it is persistent. Barbara Adam, in her discussion of the emergence of a global 'we' in shifting paradigms of time, notes how a global network of communications brings a *global present* into being. This collapse of space into the time of global co-presence opens up irreducible gaps between the instantaneity of simultaneity and the physical modalities of travel through space, "[...] a discrepancy ranging from the speed of light to the pace of walking" (1996: 87). While these discrepancies open up important questions of control and the nature of risk, what Adam is also interested in is the ways in which the global present makes a *global perspective* possible. Such a perspective entails the potential of powerful interpolation, the imaginative induction into a *global we*:

Such a global perspective becomes a potential reality once the whole world came into reach, in principle at least, at the everyday level. When people can hear on the radio and watch on their TV screens events and tragedies occurring on the other side of the globe, when it takes no more than two days to reach any destination, when, at the press of a button, a personal donation can affect the livelihood or survival of people in another part of the world, then a global perspective becomes part of everyday reality...all (global problems) are inescapable, global events, subjects for all to see, pass judgement on and exert pressure. A globalised present inescapably extends responsibility beyond representatives of local and national governments to the individual: it connects the global with the local and personal...the perspective of the objective observer is no longer appropriate when 'the other' is absorbed into a global *we* (1996: 89).

This extension of responsibility from representative roles to those who *perceive* is at the kernel of discussions of witnessing (Durham Peters 2001, Rentschler 2004, Zelizer

2002) and what has been described as ‘spectatorial citizenship’ (Rentschler 2004). Discussions of citizenship increasingly encompass affective relationships and ethical binds across aspects of socio-cultural life (Delanty 2000, Stevenson 2003) therefore it seems appropriate that being a spectator – of issues that demand commitment, solidarity and action – should be considered as a crucial, interpenetrative modality of citizenship. Yet while this formulation is seductive and richly suggestive, it does little to bridge the gap between *is* and *ought*, indeed it could be argued that it brings the argument back to the foundational problematic of this chapter.

Adam is careful to circumscribe her argument with a tone of possibility and potentiality, and it is in this spirit that I wish to explore it. The idea of a global perspective is meaningless without a perceiver, and the move from adopting a global perspective to accommodating a global we – which concomitantly absorbs ‘the other’ – is the core area of contention. A global perspective can be framed as the restless product of an adaptive habitat of meaning, and the evidence of the rhetorical examples on offer here suggests that it is action – in this case a donation – that indexically signifies far more than itself in relation to this perspective. The act of donation is understood within a connexity of solidarity, it provides sorely needed evidence of the fabric of the global *we*. Yet as Eoin Devereux argues in an empirical study of telethon giving in the Republic of Ireland, giving can be interpreted in terms of a connexity of distanciation, or indeed as a multi-perspectival reflection of the givers’ sense of self (1996). The interconnection of the donation, in Devereux’s terms, may actually serve to increase the substantive and imaginative differences in power geometry if understood as an act of charity in a publicly depoliticised relationship of caring and sharing. Giving may be interpreted as an act of cleansing – the periodic severance of connexity – that cements the undeclared hierarchies of a putative global we.

The key issue in this juxtaposition is not a theory of giving, but the introduction of context and discourse in approaching the significance and ambivalence of action. A globalised present ‘inescapably extends responsibility’, but the question remains as to how this responsibility is understood, mediated, enacted and interpreted. An interesting variation on Adam’s themes is provided by *Guardian* journalist Madeleine Bunting in an article on television and images of horror written two weeks after the Asian Tsunami of late 2004. Her argument - which refers to the cumulative effects of ongoing and

instantaneous coverage of the hostage crisis in Beslan, the atrocities committed at Falluja and the multi-sited coverage of the Tsunami's desolation – is generally concerned with what she sees as the disjuncture between grief and its manipulative commoditisation in a twenty-four news environment. Other aspects of her argument engage more centrally with the formative conditions of the global present.

Bunting argues “[...] we have an asymmetrical relationship between the vast quantities of information now available and our ability to respond to it” (2005). This lag – the two days to get anywhere noted by Adam - is a lag that provokes utter confusion in the perceiver, particularly in the case of the Tsunami where the conditions and daily struggle of people could be gazed upon while aid was in transit. This global perspective, in Bunting's argument, creates conditions of paralysis, particularly as in her view globalised media creates globalised impressions of ‘television's mean and dangerous world’ (Signorelli & Morgan 1990) where “[...] the scale of suffering and frequency of crisis becomes such that it only induces disengagement”. The key question at stake, for Bunting, is how Michael Ignatieff's idea of television as the medium that compels us to ‘shoulder each other's fate’ translates to current conditions of informational ubiquity. In Adam's logic perceiving extends responsibility, in this argument the suggestion is that it eventually dissipates it.

A complementary perspective is given by Nicholas Mirzoeff in his discussion of the war in Iraq and its global visual representation. Mirzoeff is uninterested in both the political redundancy of Baudrillard's analysis of the 1991 Gulf War (1991), and equally so in what he describes as the tendency to “[...] unmask these images for their deceitful intent” (2005: 13). Instead, he argues that a constant inchoate flow of images has become part of the weaponry of the ‘military-visual complex’ which operates to construct war as a network of events perceived from a multiplicity of positions that immediately defies intelligibility (2005: 10-14). Central to this elliptical limitlessness is a reflexive media sense of a fragmented audience, an audience that has come to expect the technical manipulation of image and is comfortable with the polysemy of imagery. This results in:

[...] banality of images...in which the very awareness of the input of the viewer in creating meanings has paradoxically weakened that response. For if all meanings are personal response, the argument goes, then no one meaning has higher priority. It is

however important to stress that this banality of images is no accident, but the result of a deliberate effort by those fighting the war to reduce its visual impact by saturating the senses with non-stop indistinguishable and undistinguished images (2005: 14)

In these discussions the metaphor of flow begins to take on more coherent contours and implications. Mirzoeff, far from tending towards the notion of a global perspective, argues that both prevailing conditions and conscious strategies work to negate any such coherent and potentially empowering notion. Similarly Bunting suggests that given the limited ability of the perceiver to shoulder, once they have done what they can possibly do, it is “a gesture of respect to switch off”. This approach recalls the relationship between limitedness and enablement under conditions of limitlessness, and both Mirzoeff and Bunting’s argument implicitly suggest the need for a constitutive space for the imagination – in other words they suggest an ability to connect more by perceiving less. Switching off is also to act, and it may serve as the catalyst for re-engagement through opening new hermeneutic spaces.

While these arguments serve to tease out the ambiguities of flow, they do little to answer some of the questions posed by Keith Tester in work that represents a central reference point in an as yet under-developed area of media analysis. Tester poses a clear question regarding the consequentiality of television for “moral relationships between viewers and distant suffering others” (1999: 469). While Mirzoeff posits an audience that adopts a critical stance towards the truth-claim of images, Tester is inclined to follow and extend Susan Sontag’s assertion that “everyone is a literalist when it comes to photographs” (2003: 42). Swapping visions of imagined audiences is of limited value (Hartley 1987), however Tester is undoubtedly accurate when he contends “...it is primarily through television that the moral demands that might be made by distant others are represented” (1999: 470). Moreover, while the discussions prior to this have established vistas of implication and disengagement, Tester disarmingly shifts the focus of discussion by maintaining “Sometimes television is consequential. The question thus becomes: when and how?” (1999: 471).

Tester’s argument proceeds through a detailed critique of Michael Ignatieff’s essay on the ethics of television contained in *The Warrior’s Honour* (1998). Ignatieff suggests that television images can be taken to ‘instantiate’ a moral obligation to those perceived by those who perceive, while simultaneously placing viewers as “[...] voyeurs of the

suffering of others, tourists amid their landscapes of anguish. It brings us face to face with their fate, while obscuring the distances – social, economic, moral – that lie between us” (Ignatieff 1998: 11 in Tester 1999: 472). This claim is grounded within a historical heritage of moral Universalism. However the force of the claim is undermined by the depoliticising dynamics of representations of suffering - as opposed to covering situations in need of pre-emptive engagement – and the dangers of disengagement provoked by the cumulative effect of representations of a world of chaos and unpredictability.

Tester’s central critique of this argument is a familiar one; Ignatieff assumes a direct flow model of communication between television and its viewers, and an overly rational assumption that moral consequentiality is heightened by programmes that deepen the viewer’s knowledge and awareness of a given situation (1999: 474-75). Thus Ignatieff sees a problem with form and genre, and much like Adam’s putative donor, does not allow for the intervention of discourse and the specificities of context and positionality. In these positions - as a central metaphor of Tester’s article describes - television can be conceived of as a bridge, in that it “...does indeed connect that which is separate. It creates a unity of humanity and, in so doing, it can be taken to provide a representational legitimacy for any conception of moral universalism” (1999: 480). The bridge in this understanding represents both the hopefulness of such arguments, and perhaps also their static naivety.

The partner metaphor to the bridge is - according to Tester following Simmel (1997) – the door, and it is the ambiguous implications of television as a door that the article is keen to explore. A bridge suggests the connection of banks, and if no tariff is imposed, it is open and can be crossed from either side (at this point the metaphor takes its leave of technological veracity). A door, on the other hand, also allows for ‘the possibility of permanent interchange’, but the interchange differs according to whether one is exiting or entering, closing or opening the door:

If this metaphor is applied to the case of television, a very complex picture of moral consequentialism begins to emerge. On the one hand, television can be interpreted as a door through which the particular and individual viewer enters into a much broader space of moral responsibilities and solidarity...if television is interpreted as a door on to a world from which the viewer has exited (by the spatial and imaginative movement

into the private and domestic sphere of television consumption and out of the spatial and imaginative spaces of public life) then it can be interpreted as a literal and metaphorical screen between the viewer and all that is outside. In this case the relationship between the viewer and the suffering other is likely to be interpreted in terms of boundaries and limits: I am here, they are out there (1999: 481).

This self-conscious turn to and reliance on metaphor is at once a strength and limitation for Tester's argument; the image of the door sets off questions of how open is open and how closed is closed, and whether the door was slammed or inched shut as the viewer tentatively exited. At the same time however, the bridge and the door begin to take on Tardis-like qualities, materialising in unknown contexts, bridging different gaps, and facilitating very different acts of exit and entrance. In other words, this turn to infinitely extendable metaphors of ambiguity signifies also the over-extension of theory, and the realisation that the door can only be hinged in contexts of meaningful interpretation.

It is precisely this empirical gap that informs Birgitta Höijer's research on discourses of global compassion (2004). Compassion, for Höijer, is understood as an emotional response connecting perception and the intimation of action; it "has to do with perceiving the suffering and needs of distant others through media images and reports. Global compassion is then a moral sensibility or concern for remote strangers from different continents, cultures and societies" (2004: 514). Compassion – which unsurprisingly turns out to be enormously subjective and complex – is not a product of linear causality, however Höijer is prepared to posit that the instantaneous power of media images makes people *unavoidably* aware of distant suffering, and that this poses a challenge to "include strangers in their moral conscience" (2004: 515). The empirical nature of her analysis, however, allows Höijer to develop far more fine-grained pictures of how such processes of inclusion may work (and it is interesting to juxtapose this processual sense with Adam's implicit sense of a state of inclusion).

The development of media analysis away from linear, prescriptive and often heavily behaviourist models of media impact to approaches that integrate socio-contextual analysis and discursive inquiry has increased the onus of specificity in descriptions of media relationships (Morley 1997, Livingstone 1999). Thus one of the first categories - latent in the discussions to date – to be problematised in this analysis is the idea of the

‘distant other’, the perceived victim unknowingly drawn into relations of tense implication. While – to return to Susan Sontag’s premise in *Regarding the Pain of Others* (2003) – images of suffering are expected to meet and are held to higher standards of authenticity and veracity (2003: 42-52), the inevitability of discourse entails that victimhood is a cultural construction. Höijer analyses this within what could be described as the emotional economy of humanitarian organisations and their media strategies, however her broader point is of core interest here. As critical development discourse has outlined in discussions of ‘third world’ victimhood and images of dependence and passivity (Grießhaber 1997, Tucker 1999) “[...] cognitions of victims... vary. As a cultural-cognitive construction, the discourse of global compassion designates some victims as ‘better’ victims than others” (2004: 516).

Höijer’s empirical work in Norway and Sweden focuses on interpretations of the Kosovo war and the refugee crisis that was central to coverage of the war for most of its duration. Her examples are obviously not generalisable, however they hint at interesting factors in the framing of ‘compassion-worthiness’. The ideal victim for many of her respondents were children, women and elderly people and Höijer detected in reactions to ‘crying middle-aged men’ a gendered discourse of compassion¹⁴ in relation to perceived proximity to the prolongation of violence and the capacity for self-help: “A condition for being moved is that we as audience can regard the victim as helpless and innocent” (2004: 521). Nevertheless, such discourses also hint at the absence of other perspectives, and another fruitful avenue of inquiry in this research is the relationship between compassion and the duration of the war (seventy-eight days). As Höijer observes, compassion not only decreased over a period of prolonged coverage, but this decrease

¹⁴ Höijer’s treatment of gendered victimhood is more extensive than this, and the citation here of a discussion of male victims in war needs also to be placed in the wider context of ‘historical and cultural variations in the victim status of women’ (2004: 517). Following Galtung, violence is often approached as ‘anything avoidable that hinders human self-realisation’. This emphasis on the social construction and perspectival nature of violence allows a wider consideration of violence beyond legally defined activities, and it also stresses that ‘victimhood’ is a product of different practices of socio-cultural and ultimately legal recognition. As Alsop, Fitzsimons and Lennon describe, a key task of critiques of patriarchy has been to unsettle the ways in which victimhood is gendered, and the (lack) of recognition of often privatised forms of gender-based violence perpetrated against women (2002: 70-75). Thus as Höijer notes, while ‘mothers and children make ideal victims’ in contemporary wars, there is little evidence of widespread outcry in relation to mass rape in various campaigns of the Second World War (2004: 517).

can be linked to the nature of the coverage (a point which to an extent revalidates Ignatieff's emphasis on complex and deeply penetrative programming¹⁵):

The powerlessness over the situation, the never ending number of victims, the difficulty of understanding the Balkan situation and ethnic conflicts, and the inability of the media to give a background, made the audience less interested, numb and even immune to the human suffering (2004: 525).

While this study departs from many others by not discussing in any great detail the positioning of the audience, Höijer provides interesting examples of how the 'truth-claim' of images – the basis for the implicit instantiation of a moral claim – is subverted when viewers mobilise contrary discourses. These included familiar discourses of conflict, ethnicity and atavism (see also McLoone 2000: 60-84), a critical scepticism of the commercial motivations of media, and situated claims to other sources of truth (in this instance the disputation of the refugee situation by Serbian immigrant respondents, 2004: 524). The Other is absorbed – indeed they are always somehow absorbed as othering is an ongoing relationship - but not necessarily into any form of meaningful, imagined collectivity, as this depends on a complex interplay of experience, cultural capital and discursive framing.

¹⁵ That varied, complex and dissonant programming does not 'result' in more powerful – not to mention knowable – modes of audience identification and moral consequentialism should not be taken to suggest that such programming is unimportant. Not only does this recall John Fiske's quasi-infamous discussion, in *Television Culture* (1987), of the ways in which resistant and imaginative media spectatorship may increasingly be a product of the numbing homogeneity of commercial programming, but it also denies the importance of responsive practices of public service broadcasting in globalised contexts. Graham Murdock has been one of the most consistent advocates of responsive programming, based on what he constructs as emerging cultural rights. Murdock has argued for the development of rights to a broad spectrum of personal and social experience, accompanied by reflexive media practice in providing access to relevant frameworks of knowledge. This argument does not depend on either pessimistic or optimistic constructions of the audience, and nor does it posit 'better results' as a consequence of diversified programming. Instead, Murdock argues that public media has a duty to provide 'relevant symbolic resources'; resources that are widening in some form of tandem to the transnational networking of national polities. Public communication must "[...] demolish the accepted divisions and develop forms of representation and participation and scheduling that promote encounters and debates between the widest possible range of identities and positions. It must...bring dialogic, contesting voices into the centre of the common domain (1999: 16). However such increased, random encounter could also describe the conditions critiqued by Ignatieff and others, and the kernel of Murdock's argument lies in the contention that media must pay attention to what could be termed discursive literacy – competences inherently suggested by the arguments in this section that examine the construction of Otherness. To quote: "It must balance the promotion of diversity of information and experience against citizens' rights of access to frameworks of knowledge, and to the principles that allow them to be evaluated and challenged" (ibid).

In conclusion, Høijer's categorisation of her audience's responses to the moral challenge of perception fleshes out the suggestiveness of Tester's metaphors: there are many ways, speeds and routes for exiting and entering the door. Her discussion moves towards the contours of 'forms of compassion' – tender-hearted, blame-filled, shame-filled and powerlessness-filled – which are given to be understood as partial and often interlocking, limited, circumscribed and categorised articulations that cannot be used to create wider conditions of audiencehood:

We should not idealize the audience, believing that all we need to do in order to awaken compassion and engagement is to expose people to pictures of humanitarian disasters. Neither should we believe the opposite, that the audience mainly turns away in cynicism and compassion fatigue, fed up with reports of expulsions, massacres, genocide, and terrorist and bomb attacks (2004: 529).

This kind of analysis needs to inform not only discussions of the 'audience' that make radically empowering or disempowering claims, but also the strategies through which different intermediaries invite compassion as an invocation to action. That said, there are dangers in appearing to describe a series of 'stages' from confrontation to awareness to action, as not only does this replicate the linear, *unfurling* notions under discussion, but it is to mistake the very nature of action itself. Seeing is an active process, and as Bunting contends, switching off is an active decision. Recent explorations of mediated witnessing – in part suggested in the US by the traumatic media spectacle of the attacks of September 11th 2001 (Zelizer 2002) – argue that the act of perception, which involves perceiving the pain and conditions of others, is always already participation. It is this immediate, phenomenological immanence of the perceiver that has informed ideas of the *witness*, and it is the power and ambivalent potential of this status that in turn informs discussions of *spectorial citizenship*.

In John Durham Peters' eloquent discussion of witnessing, to witness is understood as the inextricable combination of seeing and saying, the passive and the active (2001: 709). To witness is to come into contact, for something to come into cognition, thus a witness is immediately complicit; "To witness an event is to be responsible in some way to it" (2001: 708). Whereas a legal witness is held to have been physically present at an event, and thus implicated in a resultant process, the 'presence-at-distance' of a witness to mediated events is complicated by what Scott Lash (2002) terms 'culture-at-distance'.

Ethical implication is complicated by the stretching out of relations of agency, particularised understanding, and by what Peters calls the ‘hermeneutics of suspicion’ in relation to *media as witness*. In situations where, for example, globalised twenty-four hour news services make it possible to be an ongoing witness to ‘unfolding’ events, witnessing involves increased implication and often decreasing senses of how one is to respond. ‘Live’ television implies a form of co-presence that potentially inspires unicity while underlining separation. As Peters argues:

We have to keep up with the world because we are, in some complicated way, responsible to act in it, and we can only act in the present... ‘Live’ coverage of global sorrow is ethically recalcitrant: because it is fact, we are not protected by the theater’s ‘teleological suspension of the ethical’...because it is spatially remote our duty to action is unclear. We find ourselves in the position of spectators at a drama without the relief of knowing that the suffering is unreal. Hence the ‘unfeigned uneasiness’ (Hume) we face in watching the news (2001: 722)

Understood like this, the reactions previously discussed – switching off, distancing, querying the truth claim of representation or the political economy of conveyance – are less reactions than responses, the response of witnesses both too close and too near to what has been witnessed. Such responses are central to speculating on the non-linearity of imaginations of interconnection, and the concomitant negotiation of interdependence. If as Carrie Rentschler argues, the relationship of seeing is a form of participation, these divergent and dissonant reactions can be understood not as the disavowal of ‘global awareness’ or ‘global citizenship’, but as the ongoing negotiation of globality. It is possible that in some form spectators have an implicit understanding of Rentschler’s argument that proximity to events does not impact on the state of participation, merely its condition. Furthermore, vicarious pleasure and ironic distanciation are modes of participation, “[...] affective and political forms of participation in others’ suffering” (2004: 298). The active nature of participation in shifting perspectives of events can never become routine, but routine can become a form of participation.

In many of the treatments discussed here, the writers come back to the relationship between what is witnessed and the discursive frameworks within which the ‘world out there’ is mediated. Sontag, for example, sums up this critique by arguing that while harrowing images will always shock, and demand feeling, they are of little use in developing understanding (2003: 88-92). Rentschler provides a particularly telling

illustration of this in contending “[...] people may simply not know how to act or what to do with their vicarious experience of others’ suffering, because they have not been taught how to transform feeling into action” (2004: 300). She discusses what she sees as a politically disabling practice of victim identification, where the pain of witnessing is mediated with reference to one’s own personal pain or trauma. This may have the effect of obscuring the accountability of the witness in the pain of the other, or of foreclosing on the differences in power and context that infuse very different experiences of suffering. As Margery Fee argues, representations of Otherness must always be approached in terms of the discourses that place and absorb Otherness: “[...] how do we distinguish biased and oppressive tracts, exploitative popularisations, stereotyping romanticisations, sympathetic identifications and resistant, transformative visions?” (1989: 242).

It is no wonder that Susan Sontag – in answering her own rhetorical question “What does it mean to protest suffering, as distinct from acknowledging it” (2003: 36) – argues provocatively (and with an admirable disdain for any worldly practicalities) that “Perhaps the only people with the right to look at images of suffering of this extreme order are those who could do something to alleviate it...or those who could learn from it. The rest of us are voyeurs, whether or not we mean to be” (2003: 38). It is more than probable that Sontag’s strategic exaggeration takes account of the many and constant ways in which the witness of representation has been crucial in mobilising critical forms of public response. Yet what her proposal of a modest moratorium suggests is the need not only to constantly question the discursive frameworks of mediation alluded to by Fee and Ignatieff but the need to constantly query simplistic assumptions of how people perceive, know and move towards engagement with the others of the ‘global we’ in the ‘global present’.

Given the complexity of the issues and challenges that form the backdrop to this section, it is perhaps understandable that merely acknowledging interconnectedness is often presented as an end in itself, and that developing awareness and taking responsibility are the constant entreaties of the global age. Yet it is starting to become clear that this is only part of the cultural work required. Sense-making in globality can be seen to involve steering a reflexive course through shifting labyrinths rather than proceeding through corridors of awareness. It also involves a realisation that imagining and acting within

discourses, images and practices of interconnectedness involves grasping and orienting the self within *conditions* of complexity and ambiguity. Centrally, it involves reconciling the shifting mobilities of the cultural with the action-oriented ethics suggested by the phrase 'cultural work'.

Zygmunt Bauman, writing in the afterthought to *Liquid Modernity* (2000), notes that there is a 'high psychological price' attached to living 'among a multitude of competing values, norms and lifestyles, without a firm and reliable guide of being in the right.' With perhaps deliberate ambiguity, rightness in this phrase evokes both ethical probity and a degree of intellectual surety, the key tensions of connexity and cultural work. Bauman continues - citing Julia Kristeva and Alexis de Tocqueville - that faced with a choice between assuming or hiding from the requisites of responsible choice, there are few who do not long for a 'great simplification', or 'primal shelter' in the face of 'personal disarray' (2000:213). Bauman has often been criticised for painting an overly pessimistic picture of consumer society (see Stevenson 2003: 129-31) and the starkness of this description does recall the gravitational pull of the polarities this section has been attempting to steer clear of. However the tension that he describes, and which this section has attempted to elucidate in such everyday practices as watching, is the fabric of the globality under discussion.

As we increasingly experience the disjunctures of complex connectivity (Tomlinson, 1999), serious engagement with the issues we are implicated in is beset by risks; of critical overload and corrosive contingency, of false dichotomy, of comforting routinisation, of a constant haunting disparity between ethical self-narrative and the actualities of action (Gray 2002), or by what Bauman slates as the complicitous incantation of inevitability. Therefore a meaningful and sustainable sense of interconnectedness depends not only on acknowledging and valuing that connexity, but also on being able to imagine and act in an awareness of the constant partiality of our imagining. If connexity is to be more than a cycle of brisk forays from and depressed retreats to the primal shelter, we must learn to exist within its ambiguities and cognitive dissonances while accepting the non-negotiability of responsibility. As Alberto Melucci argues:

Uncertainty grows on a par with the increasing complexity of the systems in which we inextricably live, and decisions are responses through which we seek to reduce the degree of uncertainty present in our fields of action. Decision-making – the process which enables us to take action – is however, also an attempted evasion, a denial and a concealment of the dilemmas that lie beneath the decision itself. (1996: 126).

Living in interconnectedness involves recognition of the inextricable, a recognition that can be wholly, partially or sporadically disavowed (in itself a decision, in Melucci's sense) but one that must be suffused with a tolerance of the ambiguity inherent in complexity. Responsibility, then, becomes an ethical project where conviction must always negotiate with complexity, and where decisions wait to be deconstructed by the evasions that uncertainty makes inevitable. Globality implies existential conditions of limitless interconnection, and epistemological conditions of limitless information and contingent, incomplete knowledge. Orienting in globality involves exploring ways of living with limitedness, which is altogether different from accepting one's limitations. It involves the constancy of action in conditions where the context, actors and trajectories of action are never entirely sure, but always entirely required. A critical awareness of limitedness is proposed as an enabling notion in discourses and conditions of limitlessness.

1.4 Imaginative geographies and 'writing the world'

At this point, I want to return to and develop the mobilising metaphor of *imaginative geography* as a way of exploring the shifting relationships between a known world of connexity and the responsibility that appears immanent in awareness. The idea of an imaginative geography suggests a subjective, cognitive-spatial construction, where experience, knowledge, literacies, encountered flows of imagery and information, discursive communities and networks of influence, chance encounters and a variety of individuated factors produce a sense of globality and of being connected in the world. Based on the theoretical premises presented thus far, such a construction is constantly negotiating between information about the world at large and the modes, frameworks and discourses deployed to understand and evaluate 'it'. Suggesting the idea of geography, however, goes beyond the paradigmatic vogue for spatial metaphor as well as current theoretical approaches that will be discussed shortly.

The immanence of narration and inscription

As Jim Hourihane notes, etymologically the word geography is derived from two Greek words, *ge* and *grapho*; ‘I write the earth’ (2003: 1). Writing the earth can be taken to mean narrative and commentary – in the imaginative sense discussed – but it can also connote the idea of inscribing, of leaving marks, traces, footprints, scars. Handwriting moves across paper, inscribing words of unstable meaning and polysemic interpretation, yet these are signs whose physical imprint remains for as long as the paper exists. Writ large, the idea of imaginative geography as one that combines the ongoing project of sense-making with the inevitabilities of inscription offers an innovative approach to the dilemmas of interconnection and interdependence sketched thus far. The metaphor seeks to centrally address the tensions between knowing and doing, as the relationship between the dual senses of geography is inherently ambiguous. As the example of consumer boycotts intimates, informed actions, based on cognitive and emotional involvement in bonds of interconnectedness, can end up inscribing consequences and impacts in conflict with the senses of globality that motivated them. The discussions of tourism that follow in chapters two and three will further develop the concept along these lines.

To explore this ongoing negotiation between ethical commitments and shifting constructions of the world, the idea of *imaginative geography* offers both theoretical and educational possibilities. It is an idea that has begun to be interpreted and deployed in a range of overlapping ways in theorising understandings of positionality, taste, knowledge and commitment within sites and networks of consumption. Beyond spatial and metaphorical turns, it emphasises that the imbrication of the individual within scapes and fluids is influenced by knowledges, understandings and constructions of the global, and in an important sense, it marks a recognition that interrogating imagination in contexts of unprecedented informational flow is of pressing importance. Nick Stevenson, in an important study that begins to unpack cultural route-ways in forms of cosmopolitanism, argues that the imagination is a neglected concept in social science, despite the foundational dependence of the idea of society on the diffusion and shared negotiation of symbolic forms (2003).

The dimensions of this neglect are amplified in a context where not only is ‘society’ held to have lost its cohesive, self-evident, explanatory power (Urry, 2000, 2003) through the

multiple transgression and multi-directional mobility of people, objects, information, goods and bads, but where people's senses of 'the social' are increasingly (but far from overwhelmingly) mediated and articulated through memberships, solidarities, threats, risks, practices and desires that traverse, network and shift beyond clear and significant borders. Thus the idea of flow – despite its potentially obscuring accents – manages to capture both networks and relations of disjuncture and a hermeneutic sense of perspectives, as Appadurai describes it; “The various flows we see – of objects, persons, images, and discourses – are not coeval, convergent, isomorphic, or spatially consistent” (2003: 5).

While this articulation of imaginative geography is occasioned by the ways in which a broad spectrum of globalisation theory invites detailed considerations of mundane experiences of 'global issues', it is worth pointing out that a focus on the imagination – or on what could be called imaginative geographies in any era – is not bound up in any claims of epochal exceptionalism (see Bauman 1998). It is important to acknowledge that world-views and views of the world have been perpetually interlocked; the persistence of 'flat earth' advocacy is nothing if not a historically derived imaginative geography. Calibrating concepts such as this for an analysis of globalisations (Nederveen Pieterse 1995) does not imply the kinds of radical break critiqued in many narratives of globalisation (see Rosenberg 2000). Indeed, as the postscript will insist, discourses of globalisation are clearly operative and almost tautological in the ways in which they shape ideas of 'the global'.

As the postscript will also discuss, the teleological impetus of 'globalisation' is in and of itself a latent exercise in imaginative geography (see also Niezen 2004). John Tomlinson, for example, argues in relation to theories of homogenised 'global culture' that such contemporary concepts need to be placed “in a long historical context of the imagination of a unified world...as a form of cultural universalism” (2004:24). He illustrates this by contrasting Benjamin Barber's all-encompassing McWorld narrative (1995) with the 'theological globalism' of the 13th century Ebstorf Mappa Mundi and the Eurocentric cosmopolitanism of *The Communist Manifesto* (1848). The idea of imaginative geography is one that has rich potential in a context where visions of globalism are diffuse and controversial, but it is not intended as an instrument of relativisation. By critiquing the contours of inclusion and exclusion that imaginative

geographies produce, it is possible to critique the political projects they may attempt to promote. Thus for example Edward Said critiqued Samuel Huntington's self-serving and arbitrary (not to mention resolutely influential) division of the world into fractitious civilisational segments as a "belligerent, constructed and situational" (2001: 579) mapping that, as Francis Wheen has recently pointed out, was a product more of "the yearning for binary simplicity" than any serious description of analytically sustainable fault-lines (2004: 71-76). Through a similar analysis, Arjun Appadurai argues that the dormant political geographies formative in the map of 'area studies' require multi-positional re-workings if they are to be more than "...our own, first-order, necessarily parochial, world pictures" (2003: 9).

It can be contended that the idea of imaginative geography has assumed particular contemporary potency in 'over-developed' consumer societies, where consumption is (controversially) theorised as being increasingly central to identity constructions and mobilisations (Bauman 2001, Lodziak 2002, Ritzer 2003) and where the symbolic scope of multicultural possibility is constantly on the increase (Watson 2001). My development of this concept in this regard builds on Doreen Massey's explorations of 'geographical imagination' and her emphasis on positionality, power, discourse and resources in the shaping of 'worlds'. As she writes with John Allen in the introduction to *Geographical Worlds* (1995), the idea of globalisation as an 'ever-tightening' network of connections inexorably drawing more aspects of the world into a single globe is a vision that skirts around the complexity of how different networks interrelate, and how these networks must be understood as perspectival constructs (without an outside, as Scott Lash may contend) where "Each 'globalization' is constructing a different world" (1995: 3). This is illustrated with a discussion of the 'local and the global', where the idea of 'thinking globally' is critiqued as homogenising, and where different constructions, priorities and relationships within 'the global' remain unarticulated and hence unpacked. What is crucial in Massey's argument is not the forgotten heterogeneity of such ideas, so much as the relationships between such geographies and "[...] the already existing, and unequal, distribution of power and resources" (1995: 18).

An application of this thinking can be found increasingly in work that engages with the myths and fetishes of consumption. Philip Crang and Peter Jackson, in charting what they describe as 'multiple geographies of consumption', argue that understanding

putative global-local relations of consumption involves a constant interweaving between three geographies of consumption. Emphasising the enduring if shifting importance of personal sites and shared networks and practices of consumption – in at least partial contradistinction to arguments that connect consumption to rampant individualisation – they suggest the idea of local sites, where understanding consumption involves a consideration of location, co-presence and interaction.

This situatedness of consumption must be understood in relation to ‘absence and distance’, where “local sites of consumption can only exist through *global networks* of commodity production and provision...so, for example... particular consuming bodies inhabiting a particular domestic context...also depend on increasingly globalised systems”(2001: 328). Finally, these geographies are fused in the idea of ‘the imaginative geographies of consumer culture’ where knowledge and fantasies of ‘elsewhere and otherness’ inform practices in local sites (2001: 329-30). The point of this argument is that consumption not only involves the increasing penetration of something called ‘the local’ and something called ‘the global’, but that consumer practices must be understood as producing senses of the world and interconnectedness. It is these senses, Crang and Jackson argue, that constitute the basis for the work of ethical consumption campaigns and initiatives, as real and imagined cannot be separated.

A similar set of overlapping geographies are proposed by Mimi Sheller in an analysis of a ‘general imaginary of Caribbean totality’ that will be discussed at length in chapter three. As Sheller argues, an entity termed the Caribbean must be *produced*, and is produced through discourses as seemingly opposite as those of Northern academic practices and the historically derived grammars of the exotic that permeate consumer culture (2003: 8). As she compellingly argues, these imaginative geographies are made possible by the evasions and ellipses of the over-arching narrative of modernity itself:

Although the Caribbean lies at the heart of the western hemisphere and was historically pivotal in the rise of Europe to world predominance, it has nevertheless been spatially and temporally eviscerated from the imaginary geographies of ‘Western modernity’. The imagined community of the West has no space for the islands that were its origin, the horizon of self-perception, the source of its wealth...Displaced from the main narratives of modernity, the shores that Columbus first stumbled upon now appear only in tourist brochures, or in occasional disaster tales involving hurricanes, boat-people, drug barons, dictators, or revolutions.

Despite its indisputable narrative position at the origin of the plot of Western modernity, history has been edited and the Caribbean left on the cutting room floor. (2003:1)

Similarly to Crang and Jackson, Sheller argues that contextualising and problematising the imagined geographies of consumers is integral to understanding direct and indirect implication in 'perpetuating asymmetrical relations with distant others', and from that moving towards assuming ethical responsibilities. These innovative analyses capture much of what I am suggesting in approaching globality and living in interconnectedness as imaginative geographies, yet once again the way in which awareness is conceptualised poses many questions. In my general analysis of Caribbean tourism and micro-analysis of St Lucia and the cultural spatialisation of all-inclusive resorts, I will argue that tourism works hard to prevent the kinds of didactic dissonance that Mimi Sheller advocates. To return to the idea of connections and ties, a critical imaginative geography involves recognising the ways in which fluid connections also become ties, whereas the logic of these forms of tourism is to work in the opposite direction. Interconnectedness understood in terms of paradigms of fluidity and mobility is both light and heavy, tourism disavows the latter into the former precisely because of the weight of dependence involved.

For now, the problematic of awareness can be flagged by returning to the overlapping geographies proposed by Crang and Jackson. To illustrate the myriad relationships between local sites of consumption and global networks of production and distribution, they look at the multiple forms of connection that a fairly typical (yet quite continental) British breakfast might involve. The daily routine and the mundane occurrence implies a matrix of connections (and indeed one where the breakfasting consumer becomes irrevocably, if less dramatically, aware) and they quote David Harvey to spell out the implications of

[...] the obligation and material connection that exists between [consumers] ...and the millions of other people who had...a direct and indirect role in putting breakfast on the table this morning. (1993: 15, in 2001: 329).

It is the shift from an awareness of material connection to sense of obligation that is problematic here; in other words, imaginative geography acts as a synonym for awareness, and suggests that such a geography settles once its linkages and connexities

are *revealed*. Such a normative model cannot integrate the kinds of disjuncture and ambiguity that I have argued are central to theories of interconnectedness that allow for confusion, dissonance, unexpected consequences and contradictory images and flows of information. Forms of development education and the logic of ethical consumer organisations work from revealed connection to obligation, yet as Graham Murdock pithily puts it, 'Ideas don't walk in straight lines' (1999). To return to the personal example of development education offered as a vignette in the introduction to the chapter, the ambivalence of awareness and the normative expectations that surround it struck me while facilitating a workshop on global development education with a group of 12-13 year olds in a west Dublin school during 'One World Week'.

The exercise in question built on the popularity of sportswear in general and Nike in particular, and aimed to cultivate empathetic links between minority world consumers and the majority world producers, who quite possibly could have been a similar age. Having traced the production process with the group through a mixture of exercises and educational videos, the exercise 'debriefing' explores how children in this context felt to be connected through such asymmetry with children somewhere else. For some, the connection was shocking in its exploitativeness, for others the discrepancy between the costs of production and the retail price involved the main shock, but for one small group, the main 'didactic dissonance' stemmed from wondering if they could get Aids because one of 'those' kids had touched it. Many expressed reactions that involved overlapping versions of these.

Clearly this experience is representative only of my recollection of it in retrospect, but it does illustrate more generally the ways in which different discourses of otherness and the world combine, mediate and compete with each other. In this one instance, for example, a discourse of darkness and disease 'out there' (Grießhaber 1997) was a more compelling association with 'developing countries' than the appeal of shared childhood and divergent life conditions. As long as there are powerful zones 'out there' in our imaginative topographies (and perhaps the safest speculation in this chapter is that there will always be), claims that a 'global we' now absorbs a multiplicity of others are destined to recur as no more than aspirational rhetorics and increasingly ossified orthodoxies. The realisation of connectivity, as I argued earlier, can produce new senses of distance even as it works to secure new proximities and intimacies.

In summary, imaginative geography does not unfurl and calibrate objective or even stable relationships, in my conceptualisation its value lies precisely in capturing the partial, subjective and perhaps often contradictory ways in which we imagine the world. By emphasising the sense of inscription as well as narration, it suggests that responsibility lies in trying to act ethically while acknowledging the uncertainty and ambiguity of globality and the modalities through which the global is conceived of.

The vague inevitabilities of cultural mediation

A lingering question at this point might be what makes this important? The liberal guilt perhaps inherent in theoretical exploration of the world's issues – we could call it Bob Geldof on the shoulder - provokes the constant nagging doubts of relevance. If the argument were to be unplugged, and stripped of sound effects and drum machines, doesn't it boil down to three chords chiming that the world is complex, our ways of knowing about it are complex, and this entails complex decisions? What's more, despite the ultimate complexities, aren't we discussing people whose status as relative beneficiaries of consumer society should make the incorporation of some standards of ethical living 'the least we can do?' Surely the day to day pragmatics advocated by Leo Hickman are the most that can be aspired to, and in fact don't such positions cohere with the position of a critical commentator such as Bjorn Lomborg, who argues that instead of the paralysis of tackling everything we need a global conversation to determine priorities that we can act on? (Lomborg 2000).

Posing these critical if self-serving questions is important for a number of reasons. Primarily, it emphasises the point that elaborating an idea of imaginative geography is not proposed as bedrock for cultivating the ideal ethical consumer, it in fact emphasises the impossibility of this. Increased awareness of how we are connected and implicated, combined with the ways in which that awareness is developed in a situation of intensely competing sources, interpretations and images, challenges the possibility of living (ethically) in interconnectedness without integrating the constancy of ambiguity and uncertainty. The dual sense of *geography* emphasises the subjectivity and reflexivity of the known and imagined world, while underlining the fact that we always inscribe. Thus emphasising the foundational nature of limitedness in conditions of limitlessness is

designed to counter-act the profoundly *limiting* aspects of easy, rationalising global rhetoric and romanticism.

Secondly, as I have tried to illustrate in briefly critiquing some normative approaches to awareness, imagined geographies lie subsumed in a whole variety of theoretical, political and educational conceptualisations of and interventions in globalisations. The last five years in particular has seen the growth of ethical globalisation initiatives that aim to facilitate dialogue between governments, corporations, academia, 'traditional and non-traditionally organised' civil society associations and networks, and aim to influence both public policy and public opinion. Within the typologies of address activated by these agencies and their campaigns are assumptions about what people will react to, why, and how. An example of this is the move to radically reframe questions of global resources, competition and need in terms of global public goods, a project led by the Office of Development Studies of the UNDP.

Global Public Goods (GPG) is an emerging and disputed concept. It is generally conceptualised as goods central to the well-being of everybody that cannot be efficiently provided for by market processes and national policies alone (see Kaul et al 2003). Public goods are traditionally approached as goods that are consumed without rivalry between and exclusion of their consumers. The increased deterritorialisation and interconnectedness characteristic of contemporary globalisation has made it clear that public goods and public *bad*s must be conceptualised and acted upon globally. The analysis that grounds the advocacy of this radical shift in policy philosophy and making is familiar; under current conditions, people and finance are mobile, spreading volatility and the recognition that problems transcend the boundaries and collectivities of nation-states. The SARS crisis, for example, is held up as an indicator of why well-being must be protected and enhanced globally.

Public goods, global or otherwise, are constructed and defined as *public* through policy choices rather than intrinsic values and properties. Therefore the idea of GPGs involves a constant working ambiguity. Water, for example, has traditionally been defined as a private good – delivered by both private and public means – but is increasingly recast as a GPG because it is an issue in the global domain; it is part of the global commons, necessary for survival, access to clean water is a priority issue in swathes of the world,

access to water has been identified as a potential source of future conflict, and responsibility for water is ultimately global in scope.

The depressing paradox of such an initiative, of course, is that while national policies are insufficient for tackling, for example, financial crises or infectious diseases, there is a disjuncture between the apparently abstract and extra-territorial nature of GPGs, and the demands and introspection of nationally-based politics. As an organisation like the Simultaneous Policy Initiative has identified, not only are 'global issues' abstract and difficult to communicate beyond immediate exigencies (such as disasters) in the domestic political sphere, they also involve a version of the prisoner's dilemma, where negotiating partners rarely agree to 'jump together'¹⁶. A widely noted product of the tension between national policy and self-interest and the international policies needed to enhance and establish GPGs is 'free-riding', where certain governments can benefit from overall improvements without committing to or arguing for the commitment of national resources (and this is where financing can even be agreed and maintained). More broadly, this disjuncture relates to the temporal disjuncture noted not just between national electoral cycles and the 'glacial time' of certain global and ecological processes (Urry, 2000), but between the temporal regimes of modernity and those that 'govern the earth' (Sachs 1999 in Stevenson 2003), as well as between the supra-regulatory behaviour of techno-capital's 'dog years' and the responsive pace of authorities' 'institutional years' (Rischarde 2002).

Therefore the idea of GPGs, in proposing an innovative, highly nuanced and ethical framework for globalisation, depends to a large extent on a series of overlapping imaginative shifts, and most obviously on the kind of personal and polity-based shift to 'global civic ethics' critiqued by John Tomlinson in the UN's *Our Global Neighbourhood* report. Once again, we are in a position where a shift to some form of global cosmopolitan consciousness is advocated and desired, but there is little sense not only of how this might be achieved, but also of the kinds of cultural hermeneutics and relational identity-based issues possibly involved. Once again, the practice of absorbing us and them into a global 'we' falters on the neglect of even basic complexities of

¹⁶ See <http://www.simpol.org/> for an ongoing discussion of strategies aimed at eliminating advantageous asynchronicity from global governance decisions.

identification, and by assuming that a global 'we' can (and should) look the same and command the same allegiances from different sites of perspective and agency. The idea of Global Public Goods presents a powerful intellectual rationale, but its political rationale falters through an impoverished consideration of the cultural and affective factors that mediate the global 'ought' and particularised 'is'. As Ronald Niezen argues:

No clear conceptualization of a world culture can be separated from a corresponding negation of distinct societies – societies that protect or aspire toward self-definition, self-actualization, and political self-determination. Those with the most ambitious agendas of global identity look for ways to make distinct societies inconsequential (2004: 169).

Further aspects of the imagination immanent in appeals that neglect the dimensions of imaginative geography can be teased out through a brief discussion of two recent studies. In an essay "Automotive Emotions: Feeling the Car" (2003), Mimi Sheller argues that normative approaches to the 'problem of cars' and their impact on such public goods as the environment, health and safety have tended to ignore the ways in which car use is embedded in modalities, affinities and understandings that are not open to the persuasion of rational-choice approaches:

Car consumption is never simply about rational economic choices, but is as much about aesthetic, emotional and sensory responses to driving, as well as patterns of kinship, sociability, habitation and work...I suggest that an emotional sociology of automobility can contribute an invaluable theorisation of the connections between the micro-level preferences of individual drivers, the meso-level aggregation of specifically located car cultures, and the macro-level patterns of regional, national and transnational emotional /cultural/ material geographies...This work shifts our attention away from the rational actor making carefully reasoned practical economic choices and towards the lived experience of dwelling in cars in all of its complexity, ambiguity and contradiction. (2003: 2-3).

In reviewing and interpreting a range of work on automobility, Sheller illustrates that the car is cognitively, emotionally, kinaesthetically and symbolically integrated into work routines, negotiations of status and identity, family practices and rituals, and even senses of nationality. These deep and overlapping investments, then, suggest that moving towards a 'new (more ethical) culture of automobility across entire societies' cannot rely on rational discourse, or to return to the issue of GPGs, calls for the rapid and instrumental evolution of a coherent sense of global ethics. Dwelling, being, travelling, feeling and interacting in the moving car suggests imaginative geographies that do not

map a world relieved of the effects of cars in the ways that awareness advocates would like. Yet the car inscribes, constantly and often irrevocably.

As Sheller contends, in stressing the policy implications of her analysis, problematising the ways in which awareness and its prerogatives are often framed and assumed is designed to enhance these articulations. A consideration of the implications of modalities of consumption for the politics of consumption is suggested by Ian Cook, Philip Crang and Mark Thorpe in examining ruptures in imagined geographies of tropical fruit. The development of an 'exotic' fruit market in the UK since the mid-1980s is argued to have involved a re-articulation of colonial discourses of paradise, discovery and purity, and the ways in which these discourses have been situated by corporate practice as a fetish that "[...] incorporates the 'people of the tropics' with which imagined consumers interact with either on holiday or in Britain's 'multicultural communities', whose culture is the 'other' which consumers can supposedly 'get a bit of' through buying tropical fruits" (2004: 177).

Thus while fair trade logic draws attention to the connected implication of producer and consumer, Cook et al's analysis recalls the recurrent implications of historical discourses and imagined geographies of interconnection for the situated consumer. The commodity fetish of tropical fruit is sustained by a framework of colonial representation, yet what is interesting about this account is that it argues against the idea that such a fetish can be approached as "neatly woven veils which simply mask the origins of consumer goods". Fair trade and advocacy, for example, aims to recount a cycle of socio-economic production that uncovers the truth behind mythic veils. According to Cook et al, however, it is a mistake to assume that 'strategically rupturing commodity fetishism' can work primarily through replacing "[...] this (false) geographical imagination with that (real) one" (2004: 190). Instead, they argue, fruits represent and embody 'material-semiotic' connections that can be re-worked and used as the basis for critical explorations of the imbrications of power, past and present. What this argument represents is an awareness that progressive campaigns are required also to work with imaginative geographies, as Cook et al contend, "[...] to develop hybrid, multicultural geographical imaginations which might be (re-)attached to commodities sitting on supermarket shelves and might add extra dimensions to their consumption" (2004: 175).

The requirement to work with imaginative geographies in constructing the parameters of a campaign is not to suggest that the issues addressed by such campaigns exist only in the realms of the imagination. The issues addressed by these examples concern socio-economic marginalisation and oppression that can be measured and documented in objective terms. The point is merely that it should not be assumed that communicating this objective data results in the transmission of somewhat objective pictures of power relations and inequalities in the minds of consumers. The analysis in this chapter of current informational conditions calls into question, for a start, how such data is and can be received in a climate of claim, counter-claim and obfuscation. More importantly, the work of Sheller and Cook et al recognises that the variety of modes of understanding of connexity and consequence that people employ renders a hankering for instrumental-rationalist certainties less than useless. In daily life and experience, the 'objective' dimensions of inscription can no longer be addressed without recognising their immanence in modes, myths and frameworks of narration.

00000

Writing in his post September 11th essay series *Welcome to the Desert of the Real* (2002), Slavoj Žižek posits that existence is opposed not by nothingness, or non-existence, but by the insistence of that which does not yet or did not come into existence to exist. The trace of the insistent is ever-present, and pronounced in ethical decisions where knowledge of the spectrum of choice gives lingering substance to the insistence of what was not done, or chosen. As Žižek writes: "When I miss a crucial ethical opportunity, and fail to make a move that would 'change everything', the very non-existence of what I *should have done* will haunt me forever: although what I did not do does not exist, its spectre continues to insist" (2002: 22). What this chapter has attempted to explore is variations of this insistence, as well as the conditions whereby this insistence becomes intrinsic to negotiations of globality. An idea of imaginative geography suggests that there is no 'move' that would 'change everything', and that attempts to ignore the persistence of insistence are likely to become profoundly disabling.

The persistence of insistence is neither in and of itself disabling or enabling of action; it suggests the constancy of hermeneutic challenges and ethical claims in interconnected

relationships. Žižek goes on to quote Eric Santer's discussion of revolutionary moments and the felt impact of symptoms of past failure. His discussion produces a formulation of lyrical insight: "Symptoms register... (as) past *failures to respond* to calls for action or even for empathy on behalf of those whose suffering in some sense belongs to the form of life of which one is a part. They hold the place of something that is there, that insists in our life, though it has never achieved full ontological consistency" (ibid: 23). Globality presents ambivalent senses of a shared form of life, the insistence of Others that will never achieve 'full ontological consistency'. Understanding, and standing in these fluid bonds is at the core of contemporary cultural work. The next chapter explores ways in which taking up these tasks is conceptualised. Cosmopolitanism has historically provided a discourse of critique and mobilisation in its recognition of insistent others and other ways of life, and in a period of globalisations, it has been reinvigorated as a fluid and compelling discursive potentiality. Yet idealised clarion calls for cosmopolitan sensibilities and practices would seem to be at odds with the conditions of knowing and acting described here. That is why the subsequent section proffers an analysis of something called *accidental cosmopolitanism*.

1.5 Postscript: The dead letter office of globalisation

In opening, I begged for unavoidable references to globalisation to be interpreted as strategically in parenthesis, as a lengthy consideration of how I intended to contain its crushing, critical import would have disturbed the flow of this argument. Yet having derived the key foci of this chapter from discussing prevalent notions of interconnectedness - not to mention noting the ways in which discussions of interconnectedness have become intimately related to widely influential discussions of 'what is globalisation' - it would be unwise to leave this chapter without outlining the reasons for this strategic marginalisation. This can, to some extent, be expressed rather bluntly; given the inflation and concomitant critical deflation of 'globalisation', a detailed review of this literature would generate little of additional worth to the central thesis under consideration. More importantly, the discussion of globality I have attempted to elucidate suggests that 'globalisation' should be approached as a species of imaginative geography rather than a term that in any meaningful way unites the competing discourses and accents that lay claim to it. And finally, in a thesis concerned with the articulation and dissemination of ideas, it is also increasingly evident that

globalisation has become a term that encompasses or tinges far too many issues for it to be of public discursive value. In this brief postscript, I will substantiate these reasons.

The claim that globalisation - having been centrally important in propelling examinations of global interconnection and interdependence - is simply too overburdened to be of critical use is increasingly widespread. Justin Rosenberg, in launching a scathing and narrowly propelled attack on the ubiquity of globalisation, draws attention to the ways in which the term spiralled in apparent relevance and assumed cachet during the 1990s:

‘Globalisation’, wrote Anthony Giddens in 1990, is ‘a term which must have a key position in the lexicon of the social sciences. If so, then by the time he rose to deliver the first of his Reith Lectures on the subject in 1999 he would have had considerable grounds for satisfaction. For the progress of that term in the intervening decade has been little short of spectacular. In academic writings and government policy statements, in the journalistic media and in popular consciousness, the claim that the world is becoming unified as never before seems to have established a powerful hold (2000: 1).

Similarly, as Alan Bairner observes in an astute questioning of the seeming insurmountability of the term, analysts and readers have to come to the realisation that “[...] as has been suggested by Waters (1995: 1) ‘Globalization may be *the* concept of the 1990s’ and is likely to remain with us well into the next millennium” (2001: 7). As we creep further into this millennium, ‘globalisation’ as a nexus of debate and apparent cipher of explanation remains with us. However if the sweeping surveys alluded to in these quotations suggest literature at pains to stake a claim to globalisation’s epochal relevance, a more recent tendency has been to express the pain of the claims the concept has been staked with. During the time in which I have been monitoring and engaging with a burgeoning interdisciplinary literature that is compelled, enthusiastically or reluctantly, to engage with the unruly multi-accentuality of *globalisation*, gestures of knowing scepticism have not only become de rigueur, but have accelerated in their attempts to outdo each other. It is not beyond the bounds of possibility that a sublimated race to be the first to articulate a ‘post-globalisation’ paradigm has been taking shape for a decade or more. There are many good reasons for erecting a firewall or cordon sanitaire around the term, many of which have to do with what Hylland Eriksen

characterises as “[...] quests for symbolic power and professional identity” in accelerated and highly competitive research environments (2003: 5).

A more prevalent reason seems to be that while globalisation developed as a term for illustrating the extended scope and dynamic interrelation of technological, economic, political and socio-cultural processes, it has either become an apparently self-evident synonym for an unspoken cluster of these processes, or a term whose abstraction detracts from attempts to approach such processes through situated analysis. This is surely what Zygmunt Bauman – in a quotation that itself has quickly achieved the status of orthodox reference on this question – has in mind when he contends that “All vogue words tend to share a similar fate: the more experiences they pretend to make transparent, the more they themselves become opaque. The more numerous are the truths they elbow out and supplant, the faster they turn into no questions asked canons” (1998: 2). Given this basic condition of ubiquity, this opacity increasingly contaminates accounts that both circumscribe and assume the discourse of globalisation they work within.

Bauman is also hinting here at the tautological tendencies that globalisation encourages, a point developed by Justin Rosenberg in *The Follies of Globalisation Theory* when he points out that “Globalisation as an outcome cannot be explained simply by invoking globalisation as a process tending towards that outcome” (2000: 2). A decade previously, Roland Robertson had warned of this encroaching hollowing out through surfeit, by warning that the rapid ascendance of the term ran the risk of licensing “[...] the expression of residual social theoretical interests, interpretative indulgences or the display of world ideological preferences” (1990:16). Yet while there is agreement on the discursive engorgement of globalisation, there are significant differences in interpreting its consequences. While Robertson is concerned here with the loss to scholarship of a calibrated term of analysis, David Harvey takes precisely the opposite view, and laments the de-clawing of the political that globalisation is held to encourage:

It helped make it seem as if we were entering upon a new era, and thereby became part of the package of concepts that distinguished between then and now in terms of political possibilities. That so many of us took it onboard so uncritically in the 1980s and 1990s, allowing it to displace the far more politically charged concepts of imperialism and neo-colonialism, should give us pause (2001: 13)

While there is room for knowing sympathy with Harvey's point, both he and Robertson are united by incredulity; was it not inevitable that a term pretending towards some form of global meta-narrativity – in an intellectual context where meta-narratives had become increasingly subverted (Lyotard 1984) – would become bloated merely through the inevitable expansionism of trans-disciplinary critical engagement? This inevitability was already noted by Jan Nederveen Pieterse in his discussion of *globalizations* in 1995. As van Bisbergen et al summarise:

Globalization has come to mean all things to all people and in so doing has increasingly run the risk of losing its explanatory meaning. There are a number of fields in which globalization, as a process, is taken to mean something. Yet within and between each field, the meaning ascribed to globalization varies from author to author and from discipline to discipline. That is, the various meanings attributed to globalization within these fields are often not compatible, let alone between fields. (2004: 5)

Another way of reading the implications of this bloatedness is not only that globalisation loses explanatory meaning, but that it imposes teleological meaning. I have already noted this aspect in my discussion of Fredric Jameson's 'untotalisable totality', and there is undoubtedly a broader sense in which globalisation as a concept invites totalising analysis, particularly of the meta-theoretical persuasion that has so attracted the ire of anthropologists (Eriksen 2003, Niezen 2004). Niezen, in particular, detects in globalisation not only a tendency but also a will to envision on a grand scale. As he argues in *A World of Difference*, one of the impacts of globalisation discourses has been to provide a microcosmic haven for utopian imaginations, sustained by a fuzzy yet critical interplay between visions of world integration and visions of re-assertive insulation (2004).

To return to Harvey's critique of the diminution of the political, this sclerotic effect may also be a question of the reduction of globalisation to politics framed in overdeterministic ways. Globalisation was nothing if not politically charged, with precisely those bubbling accents that Harvey feels were displaced, when the contestation over neo-liberal hegemony for the second half of the 1990s took place comfortably within the parameters of a pro and anti globalisation dichotomy (Held and McGrew 2002). The proliferation of the term as a trendy label is one part of the problematic of stupefying multi-accentuality, another is the ways in which the term may both give notice of and

disguise hegemonic purposes (this despite the fact that the line of argument I am pursuing would seem to undermine the potential for any coherent sense of hegemony, and that processes broadly associated with the diffusiveness of globalisation are held to have undermined the possibility of hegemony per se, see Barker 2002: 57-62).

Many of these problems are surmountable through obvious practices of academic production - through contextualisation, the delineation of a referential habitat, and so forth. However the over-arching problem is that globalisation has been ubiquitously offered as a lens for viewing 'the world'. A casual glance at a range of polities might reveal that globalisation has gone from vogue professional term to contested public signifier, and even if it remains heavily accented in terms of a hegemonic neo-liberal economic agenda, its prismic significance in discussions of technology and communications, human movement and the future of multi-ethnic societies, the changing texture of lived environments, the realpolitik of labour and working rights and conditions, experiences of popular culture, articulations of cultural identity, shared environmental destiny, and so forth, suggests that a whole variety of overlapping and distinct processes are refracted through it. It is not just "[...] the obsfucatory role which the term plays in public debate" (Rosenberg 2000: 15) that is in question here, but the overwhelming explanatory power loosely accorded to it.

Yet despite the ways in which globalisation functions as a catchment notion, as a mobilising metaphor it tends to suggest a state often devoid of agency - it is something that is happening, 'running away' (Giddens 1999). As Bauman argues, "It is this novel and uncomfortable perception of things getting out of hand which has been articulated (with little benefit to intellectual clarity) in the currently fashionable concept of *globalization*. The deepest meaning conveyed by the idea of globalization is that of the indeterminate, unruly and self-propelled character of world affairs" (1998: 59). Intellectual clarity aside, it is hard to see how this inflation is of benefit either to general public discussion, or to the processes of understanding that I am discussing here. This is not, of course, to suggest that broadly agreed, precise and re-calibrated notions of 'globalisation' are possible or desirable, as such a desire runs contrary to the tenor of the analysis presented here.

Instead, it suggests that writing about globalisation involves a globalised dilemma; having migrated with such vigour across the Ideoscape, it is both too overloaded to be of descriptive or even prescriptive value, yet it is embedded as a banalised and mystifying term for understanding the world and world events. Thus strategies of critical dissociation face a special dilemma of their own; if theoretical research on globalisation has played a not insignificant role in promoting its now ubiquitous paucity, it is therefore implicated in working towards restoring its adequacy without binning it as the broken-backed beast of conceptual burden that succeeded the frailer ascendancy of postmodernism (see Hebdige 1986).

A parallel discussion to this may be observed in anthropological controversies concerning the centrality of culture, not only to that discipline's intellectual history and practice, but also to the framing of public discussions of belonging, legitimacy and entitlement. As Terry Eagleton has astutely observed, culture involves historically entangled senses of 'making' and 'being made' (2001), and while cultural analysis has engaged profoundly with processes of representation and the (systemic) circulation of meaning – culture as process – it has long been argued that centring culture as a collective noun produces an analytical problem and a political instrument. As James Clifford writes in his celebrated volume *Routes: Travel and Translation in the Late Twentieth Century*:

I worried about the concept's propensity to assert holism and aesthetic form, its tendency to privilege value, hierarchy and historical continuity in notions of common "life". I argued that these inclinations neglected, and at times actively repressed, many unpure, unruly processes of collective invention and survival (1997: 2).

While Clifford is centrally concerned with the ways in which culture as a bounded notion and imaginative geography of field-work has elided the significance of transgressive zones, contact and mobility, he also draws attention to the ways in which wider discourses of nation and culture tend towards strategic assertions of boundedness and homogeneity: "Nationalisms articulate their purportedly homogenous times and spaces selectively, in relation to new transnational flows and cultural forms, both dominant and subaltern" (1997: 10). Articulations of culture are political acts of distinction, and thus inherent commentaries on the myths and assumptions that sustain such distinctions (Appadurai 1996, Smith 2000). As Wolfgang Welsch argues, culture is

a prescriptive concept whose dominant accents intimately shape our lived understandings of culture, and therefore articulations of culture need to be aware of their propagandising potential (1999). Hence while academic writing on culture has increasingly tried to shift towards positional understandings and conceptual frameworks alive to the discontinuities and fluidity of (globalised) cultural environments, it has also had to take account of the ways in which, as Jane K. Cowan et al have noted, culture in political discourse is increasingly deployed as a commonsensical, essentialist rhetorical object (2001).

It is this political capital provided by culture that informed the suggestion of Lila Abu-Lughod that anthropology should marginalise the idea of culture as it is inevitably instrumentalised in the political articulation of difference, and instead focus on representations and stories that reflect connection, resonance and dissonance (1991). However, as Ulf Hannerz countered, having been so responsible for the intellectual centrality of culture, anthropology would forfeit public credibility, which is important if anthropologists wish to retain culture as an ‘important keyword’ while remaining actively vigilant to its abuses (1996: 42-3). Similarly, Rapport and Overing argue that anthropology’s competences lie in putting into play plural and destabilising narratives and senses, remembering that the problem is less with ‘culture’ as a word than with “[...] the modernist paradigms of knowledge within which it has been placed, which entail very specific relationships of domination and subordination” (2000: 102).

There are parallels here with globalisation, but also important differences. For one, globalisation involves a different kind of ubiquity; while culture – like nation – unites us in the universalisation of particularity, globalisation seems to offer unity in some quasi-universal form, without any obvious space for or treatment of particularity. Thus once again, the teleological impetus is problematic. Another key difference is the recuperative strategies made possible by the discourse of culture itself; as a variety of writers have argued, the key tension in culture involves foregrounding process over state, situated versions of ‘living culturally’ as against ‘living in cultures’ (Appiah 2003, Friedman 1994, 1994, Titley 2004a, 2004b). Yet, to return to Rosenberg’s argument, the problem with globalisation is precisely that ‘process and outcome’ involves a tautological relationship.

A further aspect of this requires integration. Arjun Appadurai has suggested that without constant, reflexive positionality in how discourses of globalisation are deployed, it is increasingly likely that globalisation functions as a wedge concept that is neither capable of communicating or comprehending perspectives from 'elsewhere'. In other words, and despite constant qualification, the invocation of globalisation implies that a view from somewhere is a view from everywhere, while disguising itself as a view from nowhere. For Appadurai, globalisation is increasingly a discourse resonant with the implications of power geometry, yet closed to the implications of the power geometry of its production:

The discourse of globalization is itself growing dangerously dispersed, with the language of epistemic communities, the discourse of states and interstate fora, and the everyday understanding of global forces by the poor growing steadily apart. There is thus a double apartheid evolving. The academy...has found in globalization an object around which to conduct its special internal quarrels...these debates, which still set the standard of value for the global professoriate, nevertheless have an increasingly parochial quality. Thus the first form of this apartheid is the growing divorce between these debates and those that characterize vernacular discourses about the global, worldwide...the second form of apartheid is that their poor and their advocates find themselves as far from the anxieties of their own national discourses about globalization as they do from the intricacies of the debates in global for a and policy discourses surrounding trade, labour, environment, disease and warfare (2003: 2-3)

Therefore globalisation carries added dimensions of responsibility, as a connector concept (Mignolo 2000) in debates conducted from positions of disparity and (gross) inequality. My approach, in thinking through this academic responsibility, is to partially follow Hannerz's position on implication and credibility, while actively seeking to recuperate spaces of clarity. In this context, this involves fixing the status of 'globalisation' as a product of globality. In many utterances it is a form of imaginative geography whose narrative purpose is diminished the more profoundly it inscribes. The teleological impetus previously discussed is an important aspect of this, but there are others. If globality involves the inescapability of the world as a horizon, and the constancy of ambivalence, globalisation is a concept that is often placed outside of globality, rather than as a paradigmatic containment of complexity. For my purposes, in seeking to find ways of framing and approaching interconnectedness, globalisation must be regarded as a species of narrative, that, when carefully contextualised – say, for example, in discussions of fair trade and free trade – provides orientation within globality. More generally, it could be argued that Freirian practice should apply;

globalisation should be named, unmasked and engaged. For academics, it may be useful to take PJ Harvey's advice on progressing while struggling with a song; leave out the bit you like most and try again.

Chapter 2

Accidental Cosmopolitanism and Connexity

2.1 Imaginative geography and cosmopolitanism

In the preceding chapter I sought to explore the challenges of globality through a recalibrated notion of imaginative geography, where our senses of the world – and how we know, move through and impact on ‘it’ and multiple others that share it – both narrate and inscribe. As Robertson has argued, globality is an ambivalent aspect of consciousness, as a general idea it does no more than speak to the contention that the world has become a constant frame of reference and horizon of meaning (1992: 1-28). This horizon increases practices of reflexivity based in dynamics of self-consciousness; an ambivalent recognition that the ‘the world out there’ is increasingly immanent and imminent in mundane aspects of everyday figuration. In the aspects of globality of concern here, this self-consciousness implies that orienting oneself within the interconnections and power geometry of connectivity is hugely complex, to use Robertson’s suggestive phrasing; “[...] ‘average citizens’ are increasingly *constrained* to think in terms, not necessarily favourable terms, of the world as a whole”. (1992: 26 *my italics*). Thus these constraints – of increased information, choice, contradiction and responsibility, to name but a few – are held to increasingly penetrate the fabric of everyday life.

A key trajectory of the previous chapter was to argue that prevalent rhetorical notions of global awareness, and subsequent extensions to consequent ideas of global responsibility, are often hamstrung by their inadequate hermeneutic sensitivities and implicit typologies of unfurling consciousness. It argued - by examining the ambivalence of interconnectedness and through emphasising a necessary dialectic between *limitlessness* and *limitedness* - that understanding and standing in bonds of interdependence needed to be seen as a profoundly imaginative engagement that is far from processual in any developmental sense. I concluded, in a discussion of Žižek’s notion of insistence, that imaginative geography is a concept that allows a discussion of the ethical implications of the everyday figuration of globalisations, while recognising the constant slippage between action and understanding. Running through this argument was the contention that the deflation of global rhetoric is a minimal basis for global enablement, as it opens up possibilities for recognising the forms of confusion engendered by linear logics in non-linear globalisation.

Given this emphasis, it may seem like wilful theoretical density to turn to cosmopolitanism to provide adequate resources for discussing working with the inescapability of global consequentialism. Such a charge could be made on three accounts; the entangled historical lineage of the idea, including debates which question its embeddedness in discourses of Western Modernity (Mignolo 2000, Pollock et al 2000); the tendency, according to some, for cosmopolitanism to reify situated utopian visions and projects (Brennan 1997, Niezen 2004); and the widely-noted semantic over-determination of the terms cosmopolitan and cosmopolitanism, potentially marking them out as yet more illegible postcards shuttling toward what the previous chapter termed the 'dead-letter office of globalisation'. Nevertheless, while all of these cautionary charges have merits that will be subsequently addressed, there are good reasons for engaging with cosmopolitanism's unruly accents and imports, and for suggesting that it is a rich and complex *discursive fluid* that is conducive to developing the questions raised by the notion of imaginative geography.

There is a general onus on any argument addressing aspects of globalised implication to engage with the main currents of thought that seek to describe the modes, conditions and trajectories of action motivated by such implications. As Walter Mignolo notes in a modest appraisal of this discursive relationship: "[...] globalization is a set of designs to manage the world while cosmopolitanism is a set of projects toward planetary conviviality" (2000: 721). What Mignolo's pithy formulation succeeds in expressing is not only the obvious imperatives of emerging forms of reflexive action necessitated by the issues discussed in chapter one, but the profound set of differences masked by the invitingly relaxed notion of 'planetary conviviality'. Such differences span a substantial gamut from shades of radicalism in the developmental economics underpinning the politics of fair trade previously discussed (see for example Hines 2000 in relation to Monbiot 2003) to the possibilities and contradictions inherent in commitment to global human rights architecture (Delanty 2001), to the forms of emerging global governance likely to be regarded as convivial from a probably irreconcilable multiplicity of positions (Turner 2002).

Thus cosmopolitanism, while often lazily invoked as an aspirational end in itself, currently provides a discursive crucible where the crystallising imperatives and endless complexities of theorising globality collide. In this chapter I will argue that the

profound relationship between writing and inscribing - the ongoing negotiation between ethical commitments and shifting constructions of the world – recurs within a broad spectrum of contemporary writing and thinking on cosmopolitanism. The constant emphasis on dialogic approaches to self and other that is at the heart of much of this writing provides a rich vein of material for thinking through the implications of living in interconnection and interdependence.

Cosmopolitanism, as I will explore it, cultivates dimensions of reflexivity, entailing a commitment to developing the “[...] capacity for constant scrutiny and revision of one’s own perspectives” (Featherstone 2002: 5). It requires a ‘dialogic view of the self’ (Stevenson 2002: 62), an ability to “[...] draw selectively on a variety of discursive meanings” (Hall 2002: 26), and it encourages a ‘dialogic imagination’ (Beck 2002: 35) capable of developing “[...] mode(s) of managing meaning” (Hannerz 1996:103). At the same time, cosmopolitanism is held to involve – despite a legacy of accents of detachment and disavowal – ethical commitments forged through this interpretative reflexivity, a determination to place “[...] globality at the heart of political imagination” (Beck 1998: 29 in Vertovec & Cohen 2002: 11).

While cosmopolitanism has inevitably become a rubric for an array of controversies, it is the ways in which it provides a realm of debate and theoretical resources on connexity and its consequences that are of interest in this chapter. By opening up questions of “[...] cultural perception, imagination and disposition” (Tomlinson 1999: 184) cosmopolitanism recognises that globality involves more than the intimations of expanding global consciousness critiqued previously. By examining the ways in which ‘distant others’ can be re-conceived as ‘significant others’ (1999: 207) discourses of cosmopolitanism acknowledge not only the ways in which interconnectedness poses a thicket of ethical challenges, but also that the types and scapes of this distance are subjective, shifting, context-specific and imagined. It recognises that “Issues of global concern are becoming part of the everyday local experiences and the ‘moral life-worlds’ of the people” (Beck 2002: 17), while concomitantly recognising that both interpretations of ‘the global’ and the moral frameworks of those life-worlds are divergent. Convergence, through dialogue and for action, is possible only through what could be described as a cosmopolitan commitment to inter-subjective negotiation, or what Tomlinson describes as ‘deep hermeneutic engagement’ (1999: 194).

Therefore discussions of cosmopolitanism provide what I will describe in the next section as a discursive fluid, a rubric through which tactics and strategies for engaging the *insistence* of (imagined) Others and their rights and needs can be developed. To return to Mignolo's formulation, cosmopolitanism as a set of projects toward planetary conviviality involves multiple challenges, not least of which – to follow the import of imaginative geography – is the contours of the shared planet that is to be subjected to competing projects of conviviality. As Pollock et al contend, with some restraint, “[...] cosmopolitanism is not some known entity existing in the world, with a clear genealogy from the Stoics to Immanuel Kant, that simply awaits more detailed description at the hands of scholarship. We are not exactly certain what it is, and figuring out why this is so and what cosmopolitanism may be raises difficult conceptual issues” (2000: 577).

Following on from this, it is not only a question of multiple, often highly contextual visions and descriptions of cosmopolitanism critically rasping against each other – without the desire or necessity to merge – but also the ways in which a contemporary discourse of cosmopolitanism is comprised of ethical projections, delineated competences, observed practices and speculative ‘moments’. Before imagining what cosmopolitanism may be – with the pre-awareness that ‘it’ is ultimately not a feasible construction – an important question is how cosmopolitanism is imagined to be. This is not merely a question of the polite rigour of literature review; there are good reasons for arguing that different visions of conviviality ultimately may not be able to live with each other.

My aim, in this chapter, is to use these sometimes stark and sometime subtle differences between invocations of cosmopolitanism to elucidate a limited, contextual – if necessarily travelling – theory of *accidental cosmopolitanism*. While there is considerable theoretical ground to be covered before this idea can be developed, accidental cosmopolitanism can be regarded as the potential of micro-moments of realisation; the realisation of interconnection, interdependence, and the heavy fluidity of bonds. The accidental is a product of disjuncture; moments where the implications of inscription rupture and unsettle the narratives of being in and being in relation to. If imaginative geographies constitute the ways in which connexity is negotiated, moments of accidental cosmopolitanism produce dis-connect, with the potential for a re-

connection that is adaptive, informed, and yet increasingly aware of the constancy of contingency. The accidental is cosmopolitan in that it implies the appearance of limits and gaps that must at least be acknowledged, and that become consequential for the relation of understanding and standing in connexity. Thus this cosmopolitanism is fundamentally not about the pursuit of prescription and aspiration. If anything, its fundamental power lies in the reflexivity of implication and partiality. As Mike Featherstone writes:

The cosmopolitan was meant to be someone who in principle could know everything, who would learn how best to act from the accumulation of knowledge. Yet this technological potential for the archiving and data-basing of cultures does not offer any easy recipes for how to make adequate practical judgements, especially when we globalize the scope of our actions beyond the site of our accustomed set of identifications (2002:3).

The scope of an accustomed set of identifications is upset by the scope of interconnection, and by the ways in which interconnection demands an engagement with ambiguities that do not allow for anything as straightforward as surrogate stabilities. This can be illustrated in introduction with reference to discussions of different modalities of implication in chapter one; for instance, the idea of witnessing in and through media contains important parallels and suggestions. As John Durham Peters argues, witnessing is a 'distinct mode of perception'; as it cannot be understood only as a moment of perception, it becomes, in a sense, the start of a sequence of consequentiality. Following John Ellis, Peters contends, "[...] 'we cannot say we do not know' is its motto. To witness an event is to be responsible in some way to it" (2001: 708). As previously discussed, the complexity of witnessing is instigated by this direct sense of imbrication, but also by the ambiguity of 'knowing' in Peters' formulation. The extended treatment of discourse and incomplete knowledge in relation to witnessing implies that it might be more apt to contend that we cannot say that we do not *see*, often accompanied by 'we cannot say that we know what to do'. Disjuncture is a product not only of the discrepancy between access and agency, but between knowledge about and knowledge. The witness may be cast back not only on their relative inefficacy, but on the positionality of their perspective. These intersecting disjunctures come together in moments of accidental cosmopolitanism.

Similarly, Cook, Crang and Thorpe's work on the exotic fetish of tropical fruit contains the hint of a similar sense of latent fissures in understandings and practice. In cautioning against the idea that colonial mythologies can be 'corrected' and replaced with real, transparent power relations of production and consumption, they argue to the contrary that the development of 'hybrid, multicultural geographical imaginations' involves 're-attaching' challenging and dissonant aspects that problematise unreflexive consumption:

We contend that commodity fetishes are by no means neatly woven 'veils' which simply mask the origin of consumer goods. Rather, veils are prone to mundane rupture and recombination in the everyday lives of consumers and business personnel...and to strategic rupture and recombination in the work of NGOs, activists, educationalists and other culture workers (2004: 174).

The – imagined – consumer is faced with a dissonance that hints at connections and associations that can never, following Žižek, achieve full ontological consistency; they will always be partial and partially obscured, but the re-workings of geographies of consumption involves this dissonance necessitating moments of re-evaluation. Accidental cosmopolitanism exists as potential in dissonance, as the cultural work that is necessary to move from unsettling senses of 'revealed' connexity to re-settling praxis in revised, contingent understandings of those bonds and implications.

To elaborate on this idea further, the relevant sections of this chapter will discuss accidental cosmopolitanism in relation to the politicisation and instrumentalisation of tourist spaces, presences and identities in the post-September 11th world. As I have suggested in this introduction, it is my conviction that discussions of cosmopolitanism are best served by modest, contextual and suggestive discussions. While, as the previous examples imply, an idea of this sort may be fruitfully adapted for an extended range of modalities of connectivity, I am content to currently limit it to the stark dissonances experienced by tourists in diverse globalised sites over the past three years, and through it to explore the ways in which imaginative geographies, like habitats of meaning, are currently strained by the tensions between consumer practices and wider realities of interconnection and interdependence.

Accidental cosmopolitanism occurs, or may occur, when a dialogic sense of self in place and in connection to the life-worlds of others is unavoidable. If, in very fundamental ways, knowledges of self and other interpenetrate, such moments of complexity entail a reflection on the (in)adequacy of that dialogic construction, whereby the imagined connection with the other is challenged by dissonant ways of experiencing connection. I will argue that tourists are increasingly unable to avoid the power geometry of their interconnectedness becoming transparent, and that this 'self-consciousness' introduces ambivalence, conflict and ambiguity into what may have previously been solidly normalised assumptions and myths underlying tourism. Tourists, in a sense, become witnesses to their own implication, yet it may also become an implication where it is both difficult to say we do not know and that we do know what to do. As such, this limited theory of cosmopolitanism locates creative energy in ambiguity and ambivalence, but does not attach itself to any project for increased conviviality. Instead, as I will explore in an in-depth analysis of tourism in the Caribbean in chapter three and in conclusion, such potential provides capital for cultural work; for forms of reflexivity and ultimately education that address the shifting consequences of consequentialism.

A sustainable sense of interconnectedness – which can become embedded in people's daily life in ways that facilitate action and commitment - depends not only on acknowledging and valuing connexity, but also on being able to imagine and act in an awareness of the constant partiality of our imagining. Theorising an idea of accidental cosmopolitanism provides ways of situating this analysis in an analysis of tourism. Prior to that, however, the notoriously problematic idea of cosmopolitanism requires some development. The following sections address the contemporary re-emergence of cosmopolitanism, and map out some of the aspects and approaches that circumscribe the development of the ideas presented in this introduction.

2.2 The re-emergence of cosmopolitanism

Cosmopolitanism has recently been framed as a re-emergent discourse, and its re-emergence is charged with urgency. Across a recent and rapidly burgeoning literature (see Vertovec & Cohen 2002), the discursive fluid of cosmopolitanism can be seen informing the development of transnational architectures, systems and institutions, and

the subjective critical engagements that should ideally fill these with meaning and meaningful participation. Cosmopolitanism as a mobilising metaphor can be seen in formulations that propose it as a bulwark against the “[...] razor-wired camps, national flags and walls of silence that separate us from our fellow human beings” (Vertovec & Cohen 2002: 22), and marked as a praxis that must “[...] become part of the soil of culture” (Stevenson 2003: 42). The urgency of cosmopolitanism is generated both by the gravity of the situations in which it is conceived of, and the complexity and range of the questions it raises.

In recent years, cosmopolitanism has been rejuvenated as a concept in relation to chaotic ethical and cultural challenges under globalisations, its disputed and complex import as disposition, world-view and praxis urgently related to all manner of phenomena that traverse the ragged and eroded horizon of the nation-state and other significant collectivities at will. The broad sweep of cosmopolitanism incorporates interdisciplinary and highly context-dependant inquiries, and somehow suggests intersections between such apparently macro concerns as innovative strategies for global governance and the micro-reflexivity of the conscious and conscientious consumer in post-scarcity late capitalist societies. As well as gathering diverse spheres of agency and loci of action under its shifting rubric, cosmopolitanism is imagined and configured in overlapping and often incommensurable ways as a response to the contemporary transformations of socio-cultural conditions.

Thus the ideal type cosmopolitan develops skills and attitudes for navigating difference and Otherness, whether while on the move in the global jet stream or while dwelling in hybrid places (Hannerz 1996); an ethical framework of cosmopolitan politics seeks to address the consequences of multiple exclusions for multiple global others (such as refugees and asylum-seekers) (Held & McGrew 2002); it may be argued for as a variously interpreted yet emergent characteristic of ‘multicultural’, deterritorialised consumer societies (Tomlinson 1999, Urry 2002, 2003); it may still be critiqued as a discourse that sanctions the elite imposition of discrepant privileges, perspectives and mobilities (Clifford 1998, Brennan 1997); it can be presented as a worldview(s) that comes into being through transcending coercive horizons of belonging and legitimacy (Nussbaum 1994, Beck 2002); and deconstructed for its latent alterities by reformulations of subaltern, postcolonial and differently excluded praxes of living

through and across assumed boundaries and limitations (Breckenridge et al 2002, Pollock et al 2000).

Given this resurgence of interest, a number of attempts have been made to map the senses and imaginations of cosmopolitanism that are currently circulating. In their introduction to *Conceiving Cosmopolitanism* (2002), Steven Vertovec and Robin Cohen suggest that cosmopolitanism currently provides distinctive possibilities across a matrix of issues and discursive levels:

At all positions along this (conceptual) spectrum, some notion of cosmopolitanism has acquired appeal because the term seems to represent a confluence of progressive ideas and new perspectives relevant to our culturally criss-crossed, media-bombarded, information-rich, capitalist dominated, politically plural times (2002: 4)

Uniting perspectives on this spectrum are a sense of multiple ways in which the nation-state is and must be transcended, an ongoing critical dialectic between the universal and the particular, a cultural politics of anti-essentialism, and a commitment to “[...] representing variously complex repertoires of allegiance, identity and interest” (ibid). Beyond these points of commonality, Vertovec and Cohen contend that a reinvigorated literature can be organised under at least six obvious rubrics. Cosmopolitanism may be viewed as a ‘socio-cultural condition’; a descriptive application to a ‘culturally interpenetrated’ planet, where the increased hybridity of everyday life is linked both to celebrations of creativity and anti-essentialism as well as criticisms of rootlessness and globalised consumerism (see also Friedman 1999, Howes et al 1996, Tomlinson 1999, Watson 2000). As a ‘philosophy or world-view’, latter-day cosmopolitanism is often concerned with reconciling communitarian notions of collective belonging and morality with an over-arching commitment to principles of rights and justice, as both moral code and potentially legal codification (Hollinger 2002).

This conceptual mapping continues by dividing the political implications of cosmopolitanism into two political projects. The first relates to the evolution of transnational institutions and governance that hold legal and/or moral power over sovereign states, particularly in relation to Universalist projects such as human rights, and increasingly in relation to environmental issues and bio-politics (Held 1995, Beck 2001). Also mentioned – and arguably underplayed – in this description are the

transnational networks of nongovernmental organisations and alliances that converge around globalised issues and globalising practices.¹⁷ The second political project, which can broadly be described as the reality of multiple identities and the legitimacy of multiple affiliations and allegiances, is viewed by the authors as having the clearest historical narrative.¹⁸ Its contemporary relevance is informed by an increasingly widespread social recognition of gender, sexuality, age, disability and a range of other individuated factors in affective identities and social practices, as well as by the ways in which simple or ‘hyphenated’ categories of national-ethnic identity have been problematised by the implosion of multicultural models and contextually-involved practices of diasporic identification (Brah 1996, Hesse 2000, Stevenson 2003, Titley et al 2004b). The final two categories – ‘attitude or disposition’, ‘practice or competence’ – can be seen as enormously overlapping, and are presented in this framing as another limiting re-working of the cosmopolitan as liminal or detached cultural agent. Equally limiting – and almost impossible to discuss beyond solid qualitative material¹⁹ – is the

¹⁷ There is widespread debate as to whether or not the public focus on non-governmental transnational networks since at least the mid-1990s can be construed as an emergent global civil society. From a sociological standpoint, Gerard Delanty is inclined to scepticism; in *Citizenship in a Global Age* (2001) he argues that a global public sphere is both a realistic and ongoing project, as well as a necessary one (in relation to this see also his argument concerning the international development of agreed concepts of violence (2001). As opposed to that, forms of analytical-activist writing that have emerged from alter-globalisation politics not only take the existence of a functioning global civil society as a given, but writers such as George Monbiot in *The Age of Consent* (2003) contend that global governance in any meaningful sense can only emerge from the increased globalisation of civil society in parallel with and ultimately superseding existing transnational institutions. For a journalistic anthropology of how global civil society is conceived from different sites and in different globally-oriented contextual politics, see Kingsnorth 2003.

¹⁸ Several authors draw on Stoic discussions of an ever-increasing circle of inclusion from self to family, ‘group’ and so on to a hoped-for identification with humanity in general. The most notable recent invocation of this has been Martha Nussbaum’s discussion of patriotism in the US and what she sees as a tendency to national exceptionalism. Nussbaum (1994) argues that a stoic sense of the self surrounded by circles of otherness and implication not only challenges uncritical patriotism, but also acts to relativise and encourage reflexivity vis a vis perceptions of US dominance. A pride in high living standards, she argues, needs to be radically tempered by recognition of finite resources and the impossibility (and undesirability) of that living standard being replicated across the globe. Nussbaum’s essay is published online with a series of high-profile engagements and critiques that it engendered:

<http://www.phil.uga.edu/faculty/wolf/nussbaum1.htm> However for the purposes of the main focus on interconnectedness, it is possible once again to argue that a vision of ‘concentric circles’ suffers from a sense of unfurling, and pays insufficient attention to the ways in which linkages and conflicts between such rings may be experienced. On this see John Tomlinson’s discussion of Zygmunt Bauman’s idea of a ‘morality with short hands’, (1999: 196-8).

¹⁹ See for example Anna Bagnoli’s discussion of performative national identities amongst young Italian and English students and short-stay workers in Italy and England (2004). In particular, Bagnoli draws attention to the discrepancies between programmatic rhetorics of exchange, awareness and tolerance and the ways in which oscillating senses of ‘outcast’ and ‘outsider’ were far more likely to provoke ‘nostalgic idealisations of home’ than creative reconstructions of privileged, hybrid identities.

question of whether ‘exposure’ to other cultures, “[...] from buying bits of them to learning to partake in their beliefs and practices...leads to a fundamental change in attitudes” (Vertovec & Cohen 2002: 14). The issues raised by these categories are of clear relevance to a notion of accidental cosmopolitanism, and will be analysed in subsequent sections.

If cosmopolitanism is so robustly re-emergent, in and across these discursive foci and levels, it begs the further question as to where it has re-emerged from. This is an involved and sprawling question, as the multiple senses of cosmopolitanism contained in even such a neat framework as Vertovec and Cohen’s defy clear antecedent narratives. As Pollock et al have argued (2000), there is no historical lineage that this re-emergence is solidly built upon, in fact if anything many of the ‘qualified cosmopolitanisms’ discussed in the next section emerge from a critical break with many of the ideas historically associated with cosmopolitan practices (Anderson 1998). One way that has emerged to avoid superficial narrativity while grounding the politics of cosmopolitanism in historical thought is the deployment of consciously limited compressions of historical complexity that are used to crystallise particular ethical and political issues.

As Fine and Cohen argue in a contemplative mapping of ‘Four Cosmopolitan Moments’ (2002), the recurring historical focus on cosmopolitan values and possibilities is far from arbitrary. Cosmopolitanism has always to some extent re-emerged as a discourse in relation to at best limitation and at worst atrocity and presented itself as - to re-nuance a suggestive phrase - a form of transcendental politics. They employ the idea of a ‘moment’ – “a convenient device to anchor some key debates and antinomies” (2002: 137) - to map out some of the possibilities and limits of (situated) conceptions of cosmopolitanism. For these authors, cosmopolitanism is neither the promise of ‘benign global ecumene’ nor the revival of an ‘old deception’; each moment suggests issues and considerations that can be, in some form, transposed to current invocations.

Zeno’s stoic cosmopolitan emerges from imagining an ‘expanding circle of inclusion’ that transcends the Athenian city-state, and is used in this context to link cosmopolitanism to questions of belonging and the legitimacy accorded to different kinds of collectivities. Their second moment, Kant’s cosmopolitanism in conscious

contra-distinction to the burgeoning nationalism of the late eighteenth century, introduces both a fundamental relationship between humanity and rights, and the necessity to develop a reasoned commitment to a cosmopolitan order serving the ideal of perpetual peace (2002: 142-3). As Fine and Cohen elaborate, Kant's elucidation of cosmopolitan rights and a sustaining cosmopolitan order – including putative ideas for a federation of nations capable of defending the rights of all regardless of the practices of individual states – is grounded in both a metaphysics of justice and a close reading of socio-political change. In relation to the former, cosmopolitan rights are deduced from the moral imperative of peace making:

In his metaphysics of morals, the idea of a cosmopolitan right is presented as an a priori deduction from the postulates of practical reason, in other words it is a pure idea, based not on experience but on reason, an absolute duty and binding regardless of inclination...Kant insists that we have a duty to act in accordance with the idea of perpetual peace, even if there is not the slightest possibility of its realization and even if the idea were to remain forever an 'empty piety'. (2002: 143)

In his social reasoning, Kant propounds ideas that in some aspects carry weighty contemporary resonances; that the financial burden of armed readiness is unsustainable, the institutionalisation of republican ideals meant that wider application was possible, the benefits for economic exchange, and a realization that:

The cosmopolitan idea was no more than a recognition of the fact that 'the peoples of the earth have entered in varying degrees into a universal community and it has developed to the point where a violation of rights in one part of the world is felt everywhere'. In this regard it constituted a kind of realism in the modern, globalized age (2002: 142).

It is this sense of being 'felt everywhere' that imbues the appeal to humanity with a logic of interdependence, and it is an interdependence of reciprocity rather than abstract altruism. The ideals of cosmopolitan justice espoused by Kant are taken up in the third moment; Hanna Arendt's critique of law, responsibility and crimes against humanity propelled by the 'explosion of the limits of the law' witnessed in the Shoah. For Arendt, the emergence of a category of 'crimes against humanity' was less evidence of 'a new humanist sensibility' than an attempt to grasp "[...] that an organized attempt was made to eradicate the concept of human being" (Arendt & Jaspers 1992: 69 in Vertovec & Cohen 2002: 150). As the authors point out, Arendt preferred the idea of crimes against

the 'human condition', as this spoke to the shadow of 'total moral collapse' present in the Shoah. The 'cosmopolitan dilemma', in a sense, is how to register the force of such crimes in universalistic terms – also as a precaution against political instrumentalisation – while retaining a resistance to the de-politicisation of such crimes when related to an abstract category of humanity. For Arendt, the specificities of German guilt required political exposition and also an awareness that understanding them only in such specific terms would be to 'exonerate humanity from the need for a more profound ethical and political response' (2002: 150). As seen in this moment, Arendt's recognition of the imperfectness of both cosmopolitan law and of the idea of 'crimes against humanity' contains an implicit repudiation of Kant's pursuit of 'perpetual peace' as 'an illusion waiting to be disillusioned'. Instead, a pursuit of the cosmopolitan must involve recognition of the difficulties (and impossibilities) of understanding as a part of action, rather than as an impediment to it.

The final moment, Martha Nussbaum's recent (1994) critique of the unquestioned pieties of US patriotism, remains unremittingly and perhaps even more intensively pertinent to the context in which she writes. Given that her work draws explicitly on Zeno, it is unsurprising that she critiques American notions of exceptionality (in both its senses) as failing to recognise forms of interdependence and experiences of identity that traverse narrow and naturalised inner circles of belonging and legitimacy. Nussbaum regards both patriotism and a narrow conceived pluralism as obscuring both primary planetary allegiances (a potential inversion of the concentric circles) and the increasing complexity of identities and identifications in the contemporary United States. As Fine and Cohen detail, an extensive amount of the criticism directed at Nussbaum centred on situating her as a privileged interloper, pronouncing from a helicopter on the lives and allegiances of those passing on foot below the rotors (2002: 156-7). Inherent in this is a projection of the author as a particular form of imagined cosmopolitan, rootless and perhaps ruthless in her inability to understand the affective power of 'natural ties' and the political naivety of abstract values. However - as multiple critiques of the limitations placed on people articulating difference or articulated as different in national multicultural models attest – it is in and of itself an elitist assumption that the identities of the 'people' spoken for are settled and one-dimensional. At best it is a claim that is open to keen empirical inquiry (see also Back 1996, Kundnani 2004, Malik 1996, Parekh 2000).

Fine and Cohen's moments are offered both as an exploration of the resources and pitfalls to be found in a discursive history of cosmopolitanism, and also as an instructive venture in foregrounding the necessity of what they see as socially and morally engaged scholarship. Yet it is necessary to put their moments into dialogue with a similar moment-based approach taken by Walter D. Mignolo, in arguing for a differentiation between global designs, cosmopolitan projects and critical cosmopolitanism (2000). As Mignolo argues, the prevalence of religious and secular cosmopolitan projects in the modern world inevitably suggests that cosmopolitanism must be conceived of in relation to modernity, and specifically in relation to colonialism: "My story begins...with the emergence of the modern/colonial world and of modernity/coloniality, as well as with the assumption that cosmopolitan narratives have been performed from the perspective of modernity" (2000: 723).

In this analysis, three moments of *religion* (sixteenth and seventeenth century Spanish and Portuguese colonialism), *nation* (eighteenth and nineteenth century English and French colonialism) and *ideology* (US inspired modernisation and 'transnational colonialism') are central to understanding not only the emergence of a fourth moment – post Cold War neo-liberal ascendancy – but also to understanding the need to engage what he calls 'critical cosmopolitanism' (2000: 722-5). Critical cosmopolitanism emerges from the recognition that both hegemonic global designs – Christianity, nineteenth-century imperialism, late twentieth century globalisation – and universally oriented, emancipatory cosmopolitanisms – in the very different designs of, for example, Kant and Marx - necessitate a critique of cosmopolitanism from positions of alterity, from what he terms the *exteriority* of modernity: "By *exteriority* I do not mean something lying untouched beyond capitalism and modernity, but that outside that is needed by the inside. Thus, exteriority is indeed the borderland seen from the perspective of those 'to be included', as they have no other option" (2000: 724).

With perhaps parallels of the strategically transcendent critique of humanism offered by Paul Gilroy in *Between Camps: Nations, Cultures and the Allure of Race* (2000), Mignolo argues that critical cosmopolitanism is moored by engaging with the failures of both hegemonic and emancipatory global designs to account for – perhaps even to think about – positionality and power. In a critique that recalls both criticisms of the

transplantation of Zeno's 'circles' and Appadurai's questioning of the situated mapping of global relationships (2003), he argues that:

A cosmopolitanism that only connects from the center of the large circle outward, and leaves the outer places disconnected from each other, would be a cosmopolitanism from above, like Vitoria's and Kant's cosmopolitanism in the past and Rawls's and Habermas's cosmopolitanism today, and like the implications of human rights discourse, according to which only one philosophy has it 'right' (2000: 745).

The difference between the ways in which these two sets of moments conceive of cosmopolitanism's contemporary currency is crucial. Fine and Cohen's moments, though sensitive to delicate issues of contextual interpretation, pay – apart from in a discussion of Kant's reductive emphasis on pure reason and his scarcely unusual raciological musings (2002: 145) - scant attention to the ways in which cosmopolitanism maps relationships of epistemic power. Thus 'moments' do not only present quandaries and imponderables requiring translation, but interpenetrating relationships in need of unpacking. It is the latency of 'design' detected in the work of Habermas and Rawls, and elsewhere in the article in the work of Taylor (1992), that prompts Mignolo to argue for a critical cosmopolitanism that unsettles designs for 'inclusion' and 'recognition'. He argues that the values and systems historically and contemporaneously associated with cosmopolitanism – human rights, democracy, universal rationality – be recast as “ [...] connectors for critical and dialogic cosmopolitan conversations, rather than as blueprints or master plans to be imposed worldwide” (2000: 744). In Mignolo's postcolonial analysis, cosmopolitanism must be brought back to the future before being brought back for the future, and his focus on exteriority is given dimension by the 'inside' implicit in Fine and Cohen's choice of four Western moments.

Thus the intellectual history of cosmopolitanism is both challenged and retained as a source of potential relevance and inspiration to the present, and perhaps what unites contemporary discussions of the concept is their responsiveness to the implications of limits and horizons of coercion. Thus, for example, while the demise of the nation-state may be wildly exaggerated, discussions of cosmopolitan politics in relation to aspects of contemporary globalisation emerge from a realisation that the centrality of nation-state sovereignty in multilateral cooperation is a clumsy fundament for sustainably tackling issues such as human trafficking, climate change, infectious diseases and biohazards

(see Held 1999). Simultaneously, however, the need for cosmopolitan politics is urgently enhanced in contexts of serious and sustained human rights violation during conflicts, internal repressions and ethnic cleansings, situations where when action is taken it often depends on the willingness, potential and coherence of individual nation-states within and beyond multilateral institutions (Delanty 2001, Linklater 2002).

Of key interest to this argument are the discussions that focus mainly on individuated manifestations, behaviours and practices of cosmopolitanism and that present them or advocate them in personal responses to the issues of interconnectedness under discussion. In complementary distinction to Vertovec and Cohen's mapping of cosmopolitan approaches, I will detail here the main issues that tend to be related to the need for cosmopolitanism or cosmopolitan practice. For the sake of brevity, these central issues and discussions of cosmopolitanism can be tendentially organised – adapting Wolfgang Welsch's relational terms of internal and external transculturality (1999: 201-5) – into discussions of 'internal' diversification and 'external' networking and connexity:

- There is an increased awareness of – but assuredly not concomitant acceptance of – multiple identities and allegiances to issues, people, places and collectivities beyond the boundaries of the nation-state, ascribed (group) identity and political and spiritual meta-narratives (Appadurai 1996, Featherstone [ed.] 1999, Hall 1992, Hollinger 1995, Melucci 1996). While certain discourses of cosmopolitanism may have previously advocated the disavowal of collectivities, group identities and communitarian politics (for a critique see Brennan 1997), contemporary ideas can be argued to share a realisation that cosmopolitanism is as likely to be 'rooted' as 'rootless', and negotiate between ascribed and felt allegiances as opposed to merely questioning and rejecting them (Anderson 1998, Hiebert 2002, Kirby et al [ed.] 2002, Zubaida 2002). Localities are recast as febrile and fertile spaces of historical hybridity and difference, where non-romantic engagements with the specificities and meanings of place can yield perspectives and solidarities on elsewhere (McIntosh 2001). Thus cosmopolitanism emerging from broad debates on alternatives to nationalism and multiculturalism (Gilroy 1998, Hall 2002) seeks to find approaches to tensions of solidarity and critique, privileged perspective and possible - as opposed to ideologically charged 'pragmatic' –

politics, universalised values²⁰ and the reflexivity borne of a matrix of sustained critiques of Enlightenment legacies (Brah 1996).

- There is increased awareness - although once more questionable commitment – that connexity involves a reckoning with global consequentialism for people, organisations, institutions and nation-states. Global *goods* (public goods reconfigured beyond the national polity as global properties and responsibilities) and global *bads* (problems – such as communicable diseases like malaria, and more spectacularly but less importantly, SARS – that confront the entire population of the planet while manifesting themselves more forcefully in some sites than others) require innovative and integrated local, regional, national and international collaboration. In a context of what might be called late representative democracy, this cooperation must be horizontally as well as vertically integrated and be founded on multi-stakeholder negotiation and cooperation (Held et al 1999, Kaul et al 1999). This may be summed up as thinking beyond boundaries, while acting within, without and across them synchronically. Thus everyday, routine and mundane cosmopolitanisms are sought in the ways in which people integrate ‘globally aware’ thinking into their consumption and social behaviour.

Even merely working from these introductory generalisations, there is no doubt that contemporary debates on cosmopolitanism identify and seek to respond to challenges that place real and complex demands on individuals, organisations, institutions and communities. Equally – if we bear in mind the overwhelming backdrop to this thesis of the global mobilisation and marginalisation of a cosmopolitan politics of protest over

²⁰ While many accounts tend to associate Universalism with elite manifestations of cosmopolitanism that transcend the boundedness of particularities, Michele Lamont and Sada Aksartova argue for a recognition of ‘particular universalisms’; “[...] the cultural repertoires of universalism that are differently available to individuals across race and national context” (2002: 2). In a study of ‘ordinary cosmopolitanism’ among non-college educated white and black workers in the USA and white and North African workers in France, they analyse how both sets of participants deploy universal notions of human worth embedded in questions of human nature, morality and shared physiology. However the appeals to these notions are embedded in divergent ‘cultural repertoires’. Workers in the USA, they argue, are more likely to code questions of worth and morality in relation to free market liberalism, whereas similar arguments proposed by French workers can be related to ideas of solidarity deriving from Catholicism, republicanism and socialism. This particularisation is further evidenced by divergent cultural backgrounds and power relations within the nationally sourced target groups: “North African references to ‘the straight path’ emerge directly out of Koranic teachings, just as African-American uses of biblical references are sustained by the cultural influence of the Black church. The location vis-à-vis the racial boundary shapes the breadth of evidence used: African-Americans and North Africans employ a more extensive toolkit of anti-racist strategies as compared to whites in both countries” (2002: 17).

the invasion of Iraq, by a military coalition whose public rhetoric was firmly grounded in what could be represented in other terms as a cosmopolitan moment of assertion – there is little doubt that idealised and positivistic visions of cosmopolitanism have little situated purchase. As Craig Calhoun expresses it, in the context of domestic US politics and international relations post September 11th 2001, “[...] the cosmopolitan ideals articulated during the 1990s seems all the more attractive but their realisation much less imminent” (2002: 87).

The question, then, is, what can ‘cosmopolitanism’ achieve? The next section suggests some ways of reading the utility of contemporary revaluations. These are ways of reading central to developing approaches that are not queuing up, like Calhoun’s ideals, to audition as illusions awaiting disillusionment.

2.3 Cosmopolitanism as discursive fluid and mobilising metaphor

Cosmopolitanism is often easily misconstrued, or at least constructed, as a form of ‘global awareness’ with the added value of ethical engagement already ensue. It is of course relatively easy – to amend Gayatri Spivak’s caution – to issue stirring ‘calls for cosmopolitanism’ from the seminar room or study, however it is an altogether different question to write about the possibilities of ‘cosmopolitan’ moments or practices as a broad form of political potential without imposing visions of detached, comforting cosmopolitanisms that may or may not have purchase in different contexts and realities. Following on from an overview of re-emergent interpretations, in this section I wish to argue that the core utility of cosmopolitanism is in the ways it foregrounds various problematics of complexity and value that nearly always involve some imagination of self and others negotiating shared dynamics of limitedness. While until recently this has almost overwhelmingly involved the relationship of the individual to national collectivity and nation-state (and continues to do so in profound ways, see Held 2002), discussions of cosmopolitanism now tend to encompass wider and more involved discussions of identity, belonging, solidarity and engagement under conditions of ‘cultural globalisation’ (Hall 2002, Hannerz 1996, Tomlinson 1999) as well as in relation to shared environmental stewardship (Bindé 2003). Given this overlapping plurality of debates and approaches, I suggest that cosmopolitanism can be discussed as

discursive fluid, as mobilising metaphor, and as an idea both burdened and redeemed by its multi-accentuality.

Cosmopolitanism currently provides a discursive fluid through which the implications of living and dwelling in interconnectedness can be explored. I refer to the notion of a discursive fluid primarily because the plurality of debates and approaches gathered under the roof of cosmopolitanism inevitably inform and inhabit each other. Debates on cosmopolitanism have been re-ignited by overlapping discussions of self and other under changing 'global conditions', and range under this same rubric from intimate discussions of the self to the development of cosmopolitan legal and political philosophies, structures and institutions (Delanty 2000). While these discussions are often highly context-specific and precise in their inter-disciplinary focus, the relationships they propose between, for example, new forms of governance and new, subjective processes of 'world thinking' (Nussbaum: 1994) imply that the trace of overlapping and competing senses of cosmopolitanism can never be excluded.

Debates on global citizenship and cosmopolitanism provide a brief illustration of this. As Delanty (2000) and Turner (2002) – make clear, global citizenship is a concept of limited efficacy without a *polis* that gives it meaningful expression. Therefore Delanty, in proposing what he terms limited 'civic cosmopolitanism' based on 'civic community and public discourse' suggests that the kind of cosmopolitanism emergent from debates on global citizenship promotes a "[...] politics of autonomy (that) entails the connectiveness of self and other" (2000: 6). Similarly, while Turner - in critiquing what he sees as an over-reliance on human rights discourses in discussions of global citizenship (2002) - argues that convincing theories of a global polity are unconvincingly approached through theorisations of global citizenship, such debates are nevertheless valuable as there is "[...] a need for some understanding of how identities, membership and loyalties can develop and function in a global context". In other words, while rights-based and participative dimensions of putative global citizenships are unlikely to be embedded in institutional frameworks that in any way map those of the nation-state, global citizenship has an affective value that underpins diffuse practices. It provides a space for mapping imaginative geographies of the global, and sustains and is sustained by the kind of global public sphere that Delanty finds feasible. Thus

arguments about the potential for formal and informal political participation conclude with the cultural hermeneutic value of a failing political project.

However, as chapter one argued in an analysis of concepts of global public goods, many discussions of the reform and transformation of global governance implicitly depend on the pre-existence and active advocacy of such evolved cultural hermeneutic ‘dispositions’. As John Tomlinson perceptively notes in his discussion of the U.N.’s *Our Global Neighbourhood*:

Their approach is to move swiftly from the idea of cultural perception and imagination to the recommendation of a core set of universal values (deriving from the norm of reciprocity) to which all human beings could assent, and from this to the stipulation of a set of institutionalised global rights and responsibilities (1999: 183).

As Tomlinson observes, this is less the weakness of oversight than the condition of a particular type of institutional discourse, but it hints at the wider importance of cosmopolitanism as a discursive space. Speculative approaches to global governance and cosmopolitan systems always already involve a notion of a cosmopolitan disposition that reads, welcomes, sanctions and supports its proposals; an imagined cultural agent necessarily underpins it speculation. Similarly, approaches which specifically imagine the cultural hermeneutic nature of cosmopolitanism, in examining the ways in which cosmopolitan practices may emerge, often examine the frameworks, systems and invitations to cosmopolitanism that exist or that may come into being.

Cosmopolitanism therefore involves a concomitant reflection on the imbrication of the micro and macro, dissolves the rigidities of structure and agency, and ensures that citizenship involves a political discussion of cultural self-identity and a cultural discussion of political identification. Thus, to extend Urry’s notion of global fluids (2003: 59-61), cosmopolitanism provides a discursive fluid where themes and questions inexorably flow between and across contexts, disciplines and conceptual frameworks. Moreover, these discursive properties – and ensuing difficulties of theory, interpretation, method and praxis – can be seen as a meaningful response to the ‘multi-dimensionality’ of globalisation (Pieterse 1995, Tomlinson 1999), where issues and the prescriptive perspectives brought to bear on these issues traverse boundaries of many kinds.

A property of fluidity is viscosity, and it is also sometimes a consequence of the density of flow. Approaching cosmopolitanism in this way implies concentrating on certain streams and flows as opposed to others, and foregrounding those that carry these particular problematics forward. As I will explore in subsequent sections, there are flows of cosmopolitanism that are either somewhat irrelevant to these arguments, or that may in fact be in conflict with the specific understandings I wish to develop here. For example, attempts to reflect on living in interconnectedness through idealised and typological metaphors and constructions of ‘the Cosmopolitan’ have obvious limitations (Hannerz 1996), and in fact I would argue are only as useful as the transformative critiques that they generate. Equally, ideas of cosmopolitanism that attempt to frame notions of a disposition, outlook or world-view (Iyer 2000) are often weakened by their claims to supra-contextual relevance, assumption of the subject’s coherence, and the vestiges of what I have critiqued as the ‘unfurling’ model of global awareness and consciousness.

The richest veins of thinking for the purposes of this argument may be characterised as those approaches that acknowledge and describe the emergence of cosmopolitan possibilities, invitations and practices, often by ‘recovering’ cosmopolitan practices from the discursive margins of ethnocentric and logocentric constructions, readings and assumptions (Pollock et al 2000, Kirby, Gibbons & Cronin (ed.) 2002, Hiebert 2002, Zubaida 2002, McIntosh 2002). While it is this area of theory that provides the most substantial input into the key questions I am pursuing, I will contend that while strong versions of emergence theses stray into the now familiar territory of linear constructions of self and understanding, soft versions lack a more detailed consideration of how cosmopolitan practices may actually emerge and be ‘recognised’. Indeed a weakness of soft versions is that it is possible to argue that emphatically non-cosmopolitan practices may emerge from the very conditions held to be conducive to ‘emergence’.

Turning to the second aspect of contemporary cosmopolitanisms, this characteristic and inescapable bleed of reference and inference also gives rise to a degree of capital as a mobilising metaphor. Cosmopolitanism provides a flagpole on which very different flags may be hoisted, yet most of them are attempting to signal a commitment to relationships of solidarity and critique (Said 1991), collective existence and subjective

difference. As Vertovec and Cohen summarise in noting the return of multiple examinations of cosmopolitanism's purchase:

In most cases the re-emergence of cosmopolitanism arises by way of a proposed new politics of the left, embodying middle-path alternatives between ethnocentric nationalism and particularistic multiculturalism. For some contemporary writers on the topic, cosmopolitanism refers to a vision of global democracy and world citizenship; for others it points to the possibilities for shaping transnational frameworks for making links between social movements. Yet others invoke cosmopolitanism to advocate a non-communitarian, post-identity politics of overlapping interests and heterogeneous or hybrid publics in order to challenge conventional notions of belonging, identity and citizenship. And still others use cosmopolitanism descriptively to address certain socio-cultural processes or individual behaviours, values or dispositions manifesting a capacity to engage cultural multiplicity (2002: 1).

An important element of this mobilising import is that it anchors the political relevance of what are principally academic debates by framing cosmopolitanism as an individual-focused rather than individualised or individualising discourse. In other words, cosmopolitanism as I am discussing it here works hard to understand the interpretations and types of knowledge in which meaningful action – individual and collective – can be grounded. Indeed, if we take the idea of interdependence seriously, action is never individual, and we are always also constrained by others. Yet in the areas of life I am discussing, action is and can be channelled into both more or less individually oriented and collectively oriented goals and horizons. Cosmopolitanism is individual-focused in that it stresses the everyday decisions and implications that place the individual as a nexus of relationships, dependencies and consequences, yet does not and cannot make assumptions about the memberships, affective ties and solidarities of people to groups, places, collectivities and movements. This is both a political and a conceptual commitment, as Stuart Hall comments:

We witness the situation of communities that are not simply isolated, atomistic individuals, nor are they well-bounded, singular, separated communities. We are in that open-space that requires a kind of vernacular cosmopolitanism, that is to say a cosmopolitanism that is aware of the limitations of any one culture or any one identity and that is radically aware of its insufficiency in governing wider society, but which is nevertheless not prepared to rescind its claims to the traces of difference, which make life important. (Hall 2002: 30).

Thus this fluid addresses subjects as agents that particularise these debates to relevant, intersubjective horizons of meaning, not as individuals in a decontextualised, typologised, liberal sense of the word. To return to the ways in which discussions of political possibility are imbricated with cultural analysis and vice versa, this is also as a consequence of individual-focused approaches that recognise without prescribing the collectivities, communities and ties that people carry with them. Taken like this, cosmopolitanism can be argued for as a political discourse of communality in societies increasingly characterised by individualised ontologies and strategies (Bauman 2000, 2001b). What Hall is describing is a cosmopolitanism of collectivised complexity that does not depend on imagining and projecting implicit communities or constituencies, or on seeing them as impediments to cosmopolitan realisation. It is precisely these forms of detached and anti-vernacular cosmopolitanisms that have been critiqued for fetishizing mobility and dissociation in typologies of the Cosmopolitan, or in pronouncing forms of aspirational cosmopolitanism (Brennan 1997, Eagleton 2000, Featherstone 2002, Niezen 2004).

Cosmopolitanism as a mobilising metaphor may allow synergies of approach to emerge, and energise apparently discrete issues and praxes by bringing them into dialogue and collision with each other. Emphasising this aspect is important given the accents of discrepant and often ironic detachment that cosmopolitanism has become saddled with; discussions such as these can be seen as or become self-serving monologues of eternal qualification, distanced from the 'dirty outside world' (Hall 1990: 12) by instrumentalising the 'complex world out there'. Similarly, senses of 'the cosmopolitan' as a post-collective creature are often read as disavowals of solidarity and action, and cosmopolitan politics the rather obvious and anaemic response to the fetish of complexity.

Perhaps paradoxically – and in contra-distinction to the discussion of the opacity of globalisation – the fusion of fluidity and metaphor inherent in cosmopolitanism prevents it from reaching a point of critical saturation. It is difficult to sustain misleading assumptions of conceptual coherence when an interesting property of discussions of cosmopolitanism is the emergence of both 'cosmopolitan politics' and the 'politics of cosmopolitanism' from tensions between what might otherwise appear as overly sophisticated refinements. This is particularly pronounced in engagements that seek to

carve out spaces of recognition and suggestion for practices and life-practitioners that have historically been, if anything, the subject of a cosmopolitan gaze (Venn 2002). As Pnina Werbner (1999) and Daniel Hiebert (2002) illustrate in studies of transnational networks²¹, the ‘cosmopolitan’ carries traces of sublimated gendered, racialised and class-based historical constructions. In both cases, they argue that non-elite cosmopolitan ‘habitus’ is embedded in different facets of everyday life, necessitated by the cultural translation, outreach and openness to difference that marks the practices of the communities and individuals under discussion.²²

A consequence of critical differentiation and commitment to the enduring potential as fluid and metaphor is the circulation of amended and accented cosmopolitanisms.²³ As Vertovec and Cohen compile:

²¹ Werbner’s work examines the transnational practices of British Pakistani communities, Hiebert focuses on the ‘micro-geography’ of an area of Vancouver that has experienced distinctive patterns of migration from different migration sites during different historical periods (2002: 209-211).

²² It is important to note that such an assertion does not imply romanticised visions of resistant, lived multiculturalism, or developmental typologies of intercultural beings whose tolerance increases through exposure. This point will be discussed in relation to typologies of the Cosmopolitan in a later section. In Hiebert’s analysis, he is careful to examine the ways in which inter and intra-community antagonisms relate to the homogenising tendencies of the Canadian multicultural model (the assumption that immigrants are largely the same and can co-habit, 2002: 218-9) and to the processes of identification and legitimacy involved in practices of home. As he writes: “[...] (discrimination) is far more complex than simply the subordination of one undifferentiated group of ‘others’ by an equally homogenous dominant population. In particular, they challenge the idea that we can draw a sharp boundary between ‘hosts’ and ‘newcomers’ in a society that receives large numbers of immigrants. In total, one out of every three residents of greater Vancouver was born outside Canada; in some neighbourhoods, the ratio is much higher, in a few cases virtually 100 per cent. In these places, the ‘host society’ is made up of immigrants who have been in Canada a little longer than those who have just arrived. Therefore immigrants themselves are critical to the development of – or lack of – a culture of hospitality and cosmopolitan engagement” (2002: 219).

²³ Of course significant contributions to similar problematics eschew the accents and genealogies of cosmopolitanism for as many reasons as other contributors qualify it. Indeed, it is also a politics of cosmopolitanism to avoid working explicitly through it as a notion. A notable recent example of this is Paul Gilroy’s notion of ‘planetary humanism’ in *Between Camps: Nations, Cultures and the Allure of Race* (2000). Planetary humanism – which he discusses in terms of cosmopolitan possibility – is made possible by a critique of the relationship between humanism, colonialism and racism, and by building on a widely established critique of ‘raciology’ to engage in and shape questions of a shared planetary future: “Making raciology appear anachronistic – placing it squarely in the past – now requires careful judgement as to what histories of our heterocultural present and our cosmopolitan future should entail” (2000: 335). For Gilroy, a thoroughly critiqued humanism – where the ‘color line’ is remembered yet transcended – can be resituated in a politics of the future, providing a ‘strategic universalism’ born of the lessons of past suffering and future-oriented politics. It is worth noting that Kenan Malik, in a review of Gilroy’s book, questions not only if humanism can be thus recast but also whether it provides any possibilities in the context of ‘deeply anti-humanist times’, where the arrogance of humanism is linked by many critics to environmental degradation and the projects that have resulted in global inequalities. See http://www.kenanmalik.com/reviews/gilroy_camps.html It is worth – in the contours of this debate –

Such qualified notions include ‘discrepant cosmopolitanisms’ (Clifford, 1992, 1998), ‘exclusionary cosmopolitanism’ and ‘inclusionary cosmopolitanism’ (A. Anderson 1998), ‘rooted cosmopolitanism’ (Cohen 1992), ‘oppositional cosmopolitanism’ (Schein 1998), ‘eccentric or ex-orbitant cosmopolitanism’ (Radhakrishnan 1995) and the seemingly strange hybrid notion ‘cosmopolitan communitarianism’ (Bellamy and Castiglione 1998) (2002: 21).

Accidental cosmopolitanism can clearly be understood as an addition to this expanding collection, however what still remains to be unpacked in such a list is the different ways in which cosmopolitanism is imagined to *become*. This is dealt with in the next section.

2.4 Routes into cosmopolitan practice

A consequence of cosmopolitanism as a discursive fluid is that it can easily be shaped as a mobilising metaphor of a different sort. At least one of these common mutations is familiar: the cosmopolitan as the privileged and mobile agent dwelling in and across cosmopolitan spaces and places. It is an association of cosmopolitanism with forms of overt cultural capital and ultimately conspicuous consumption, and it is a stereotype often characterised as deeply attached to relativising irony. As Craig Calhoun points out, the historical privilege of metropolitan cosmopolitanism – in imperial and trading cities, for example – has involved a lack of responsibility for power (2002: 88-9), and it is this sense of mobility, and lack of implication and possibility, which continues to haunt the idea of cosmopolitanism today. Nevertheless, critiques of the development and encrusted connotations of this vision of cosmopolitanism are widespread (Brennan 1997, Calhoun 2002, Clifford 1997, Tomlinson 1999), and as I am not attempting to sand and varnish cosmopolitanism as a robust focus of public communication, I will deal with these accents only to the extent to which they impinge on the main question at hand.

And that is; how does ‘cosmopolitanism’, or cosmopolitan practice, come about? Or at least, how is it imagined at work in a given context (if indeed one is given)? This question is important not only because it further elaborates the discursive field within which I will develop the idea of accidental cosmopolitanism, but also because I am often

remembering the qualitatively based arguments advanced by Lamont and Asksartova, who noted the existence of ‘particular universalisms’ that stress human commonality as opposed to questions of identity (2002).

left with the impression that discussions of cosmopolitanism signal the limits of politically committed academic engagement. It is necessary cultural work to delineate and advocate, but as Calhoun points out, “Cosmopolitanism also reflects an elite perspective on the world. Certainly, few academic theories escape this charge, but it is especially problematic when the object of theory is the potential for democracy” (2002: 91). Indeed, if Calhoun’s focus were broader than a discussion of global governance – wide enough in itself – he may have added that this is problematic at a foundational level of the object of theory being the existing and potential practices of other people. Thus the routes into cosmopolitanism – the ways different theorists position themselves in relation to particular forms of advocacy – is as important as the substance of cosmopolitanism that is discussed and advocated.

Engaging in debates about the contours of cosmopolitanism implicitly engenders a weight of implication, a responsibility for the praxis of ideas. It cannot be writing about the world without, in Simone de Beauvoir’s epigraph, answering for everything to the world at large.²⁴ Indeed, if the accent of dilettantism is to be displaced, cosmopolitan theory must in a sense amount to cosmopolitan praxis, as Fine and Cohen maintain: “[...] those who advocate cosmopolitan solutions can no longer escape the burden of social responsibility for their ideas. Far from being a selfish, idiosyncratic or indulgent choice, to advocate, delimit and develop cosmopolitanism in the global age has become a moral necessity...” (2002: 162). It is precisely this necessity and obligation of advocacy that brings the academic discourse of cosmopolitanism sharply into contact with its own potentialities. What I have in mind here is not a spreadsheet of the actual influence particular constructions have on, for example, policy, but on what could be called the translatability of delineation and advocacy into extended forms of agency.²⁵ Vertovec and Cohen, in the overview of re-emergent cosmopolitanisms discussed previously, note the lack of a transformative fabric in many of the discussions they mention:²⁶

²⁴ As quoted by David Bellos in an essay on Albert Camus’ novel *The Fall*, (2004: xix).

²⁵ There has been a similar ongoing debate in cultural studies regarding socio-cultural policy and education, following roughly on from ‘end of romanticism’ debates in the mid-1990s. See Barker (2002: 1-21), Ferguson & Golding (ed.) (1997), McGuigan (1992, 1996, 2004).

²⁶ This, of course, is clearly a product of their spectrum of reference; the field of writing on global governance is driven by detailed proposals and supporting analyses for enhancing cosmopolitan structures

While this trend towards positively reappropriating notions of cosmopolitanism is to be welcomed for its socially and politically transformative potential, practically all the recent writings on the topic remain in the realm of rhetoric. There is little description or analysis of how contemporary cosmopolitan philosophies, political projects, outlooks or practices can be formed, instilled or bolstered. In short, there are few recipes for cosmopolitanism. One important exception has been Nussbaum's (1994: 4) call for 'cosmopolitan education'. (2002: 21)

This section examines different ways of 'calling' for cosmopolitanism, and argues that it is precisely the expectation of 'recipes' that deforms the practice of theoretical advocacy. Before different ideas can become instilled into praxis, the question of writing *into* cosmopolitanism must be addressed. By paying close attention to particular examples, I will outline here approaches that discuss cosmopolitanism and cosmopolitan practice as aspirational project, imperative value, discursive 'ideal type', and emergent possibility. In this section I will limit myself to discussions of cosmopolitanism that are of central significance for discussions of interconnectedness, while recognising that there are no such neat conceptual divisions in this discursive fluid. My first port of call illustrates this; the 'important exception' of Martha Nussbaum's plea for 'cosmopolitan education' in a context of national exceptionalism, nurtured and normalised through the narratives and emphases of the school educational curriculum.²⁷ Nussbaum's matrix of issues is of less importance to this argument than the ways in which she calls for cosmopolitanism and imagines cosmopolitan dispositions to be cultivated. In her essay 'Patriotism and Cosmopolitanism', Nussbaum locates the necessity of reformed educational thinking and practice not only in the hubristic potentiality of exceptional power, but in the broader necessity of developing an awareness of globality and a sense of wider responsibility, extending to the vague and remote edges of Zeno's furthest circle. As she writes:

and frameworks. See for example Patomäki & Teivainen (2004) for an overview and proposals on reform of existing global institutions and questions of global jurisdiction, taxation and civil society inclusion.

²⁷ What Nussbaum has to say about Lynne Cheney's (wife of the US Vice-President) venture into bedtime reading: *When Washington Crossed the Delaware: A Wintertime Story for Young Patriots* (2004) would undoubtedly be interesting. See the review of the National Review Book Service – "Designed to bring you the best conservative books available" – for a sense of how explicitly the ground has shifted since Nussbaum's intervention:

http://www.nrbookservice.com/BookPage.asp?prod_cd=c6593

To conduct this sort of global dialogue, we need not only knowledge of the geography and ecology of other nations -- something that would already entail much revision in our curricula -- but also a great deal about the people with whom we shall be talking, so that in talking with them we may be capable of respecting their traditions and commitments. Cosmopolitan education would supply the background necessary for this type of deliberation (1994: 3).

Nussbaum's call is hardly revolutionary in general terms; what she has in mind is merely a diversification of curricular foci and the inclusion of texts and perspectives beyond the parameters of discourse as usual. In elaborating and justifying the necessity of this shift, Nussbaum appeals not only to the aspirational status of Kantian morality, but is wise enough to pre-empt the criticism that what she idealistically requires is the *diminution* of real, thick structures of feeling (Williams 1961, see also Anderson 1983, Billig 1995) emanating from national belonging in favour of abstract commitment to a shapeless supra-collectivity that strains the idea, and practice of imagination. Nussbaum's counter-move is based on accepting that the imaginative other is always inside the (national) gate, and that imagining the idea of national collectivity in a multicultural United States is far more than the routine assumptions of banal nationalism (Billig 1995). Furthermore;

But why should these values, which instruct us to join hands across boundaries of ethnicity and class and gender and race, lose steam when they get to the borders of the nation? By conceding that a morally arbitrary boundary such as the boundary of the nation has a deep and formative role in our deliberations, we seem to be depriving ourselves of any principled way of arguing to citizens that they should in fact join hands across these other barriers (ibid).

Thus cosmopolitan education is not only about increased information and perspectives on issues and places, but about fundamentally attempting to redraw vectors of belonging and logics of inclusion and exclusion. It is an education that attempts to put "[...] right before country, and universal reason before the symbols of national belonging" (ibid). Nussbaum's is an aspirational document, and as such does not aspire to be a detailed policy proposal to a national board of education. However what is of interest, once again, is the educational – and thus communicative and interpretative – logic deployed. Nussbaum's case is based on reasoning that humanity is ultimately a more interesting and important affective bond than nation, and in doing so she falls back on the same linear transmission-based logic associated with theories of rational communication (Rosengren 2000), and critiqued by Tester in his discussion of Ignatieff. Beyond this set

of familiar assumptions, it is possible to argue that Nussbaum's call has something Arnoldian about it: education should appeal to the (cosmopolitan) best self, which will prevail over the graver (parochial) and relaxed (hedonistic) selves (Arnold 1869). Thus the work of a cosmopolitan curriculum, just like the work of culture, is the pursuit of sweetness and light and a common rational realisation of the universal prerogative. Ultimately, Nussbaum's is a theory of unfurling cultivation.

Therefore it is hard to see, in contradistinction to Vertovec and Cohen's claim, that such a 'call' advances far beyond the realms of rhetoric. This has to do with the critical distance such a strategy opens up between the mode of advocacy and the parameters of the possible. The problem with this form of 'call', if we return to the question of translatability, is that a reflexive cosmopolitan perspective involves an awareness of contextual limitedness, and can parlay that into strategy. This is the force of Timothy Brennan's criticism of what he calls 'new cosmopolitanisms', whose advocates are unable to appreciate the situated ways in which political questions are teased out, and unaware that abstract frameworks of progressive analysis and possibilities do not map onto exigencies that are apparently unknown to them.²⁸ In the following example, he argues that a reflexive shudder in the presence of an apparently essential binary is a failure to understand the nature of strategy (see also Spivak 1987):

Thus for the independence leader of Guinea-Bissau, Amilcar Cabral, the dialectic of colonizer and colonised was simply not supposed to represent either a sociological explanation or a nuanced cultural model. It was itself a focus – that is, a careful exclusion. He was not lumping difference together, nor was he unaware of multiple communities with their disparate interests. He did not emphasize the disparate because it would not then, in that project, have led to more than the impossibility of doing (Brennan 1997: 3).

It is worth recalling that Nussbaum is explicitly demanding a preparation for meaningful thinking on interconnectedness, however it is unlikely that a combination of increased knowledge about and a commitment to abstract universalism amounts to a 'recipe' for imagining connexity under the conditions discussed in chapter one. In her anxiety to

²⁸ It is also possible to link this general argument – rather than Nussbaum's work specifically – to Žižek's critique of liberal radicalism, where the radical utterance is predicated on the security of the system under critique (2002: 60-62), and radicalism is thus a product of and sustaining agent of systemic privilege. This clarifies a further aspect of the enabling limitedness of cosmopolitan practice; that it does not marginalise itself through a fetish of the impossible. On this see also Said (1994).

factor the global Other into the imaginative geographies of young Americans, what disappears is the otherness of Others. It is perhaps this (non-paralysing) acceptance of imaginative *differance* – that interconnectedness involves seeking to know while accepting the limits of knowing and the power involved in seeking – that is hardest to stitch into the tapestry of cosmopolitanisms called for in these ways. It is also absent in approaches that advocate values or competences that cosmopolitans should aspire to. As noted in the introduction to this chapter, the possibilities of cosmopolitanism for cutting into experiences of interconnectedness primarily rest on the emphasis placed on the ‘dialogic imagination’; modes and strategies for re-conceiving ‘distant others’ as ‘significant others’. However articulating the work of the dialogic imagination - when the subjects of dialogue are inserted into this abstract formulation - becomes knotted and complex.

This can be illustrated by examining the idea of empathy – putting oneself in the shoes of others – that is often associated with the imaginative solidarity of cosmopolitanism, and linked to the development of compassion. Terry Eagleton makes an explicit connection between imagination and empathy; “The imagination is the faculty by which one can empathize with others – by which, for example, you can feel your way into the unknown territory of another culture” (2000: 45). However, how does cosmopolitan practice involve ‘feeling your way’ into the experiences and contexts of Others? I will discuss this by examining different ways of understanding empathy in a particular case study. In *The Silent Takeover: Global Capitalism and the Death of Democracy* (2002), Noreena Hertz introduces a sustained critique of the distorting political economy of global capitalism through a bizarrely disjointed vignette of the global modernisation of Bhutan (2002: 17-20). The kingdom of Bhutan – ‘mythical Land of the Thunder Dragon’ – has become something of an icon in alter-globalist discourse, particularly in relation to the idea of ‘gross national happiness’. Having established its pristine symbolism, Hertz proceeds to produce a list of wildly determinist examples of the far-reaching ‘tentacles of global capitalism’:

Already the impact of the West is apparent. Basketball has replaced archery as the national sport, thanks to the videotapes of NBA games the king has shipped to him from New York. *Boogie Woogie*, a game shoe sponsored by Colgate, now rivals the panoramic Himalayan vista for viewers’ attention. *Friends*, *Teletubbies*, BBC and CNN entertain, inform and brief. Nightclubs intercut N’Sync and Britney Spears with

1980s Wham and Culture Club. A modern telecommunication systems (sic) has been put in place and e-mail is replacing letter-writing, despite the ten days of free mail service that Queen Tashi Dorji Wangmo Wangchuk, the eldest of the king's four wives, offered the Bhutanese to combat this very development. Children now make pilgrimages to monasteries offering prayers while clad in Spice Girls T-shirts...so even Bhutan, the last Shangri-La, is being infiltrated (2002: 18-19).

Hertz's perspective is not unusual, and reflects what Calhoun describes as "[...] the tendency to treat the West as the site of both capitalist globalization and cosmopolitanism, but to approach the non-West through the category of tradition" (2002: 91). Moreover, the appropriation of cosmopolitanism referred to here is implicitly displayed in the unreflexive cultural construction of the vulnerability of the traditional Other, a point definitively made by John Tomlinson in *Cultural Imperialism*: "Only if they (the analysts) can adopt the privileged role of the cultural tourist will the sense of the homogenisation of global culture have the same threatening aspect. The Kazakhstani tribesman who has no knowledge (and perhaps no interest in) America or Europe is unlikely to see his cassette player as emblematic of creeping capitalist domination. And we cannot, without irony, argue that the Western intellectual's (informed?) concern is more valid; again, much hangs on the question 'who speaks?'" (1991: 109).

To be fair, a nuanced account of aspects of change in Bhutan is not Hertz's main objective, and what is of interest here is primarily what this kind of writing says about empathy and cosmopolitan practice. There is a tension present between the appropriation of the complexity of Otherness and a concern for the shrinking sphere of agency of Others, and this makes reflexive engagement difficult. Consider the girl wearing the Spice Girls t-shirt; she is clearly a cipher of consumerisation, and a product of the last of Nestor Canclini's perspectives when he writes that "The anthropologist arrives in the city on foot, the sociologist by car via the main highway, the communications specialist by plane" (1995: 4).²⁹ In other words, her t-shirt reifies her; there is no room for speculation, for example, as to whether the t-shirt as material object (or general affective

²⁹ Canclini's reference could also be usefully related to communications specialists associated with linear modernisation paradigms who explicitly advocated empathy as a characteristic both required by modern urban settings and being situated in a mass audience, and as being cultivated by 'the spread of mediated experience'. For Daniel Lerner in *The Passing of Traditional Society* (1958) and Wilbur Schramm in *Mass Media and Development* (1964) empathy was central to negotiating membership of a modern public and the atomisation of urban modernity, and they attempted to prescribe the role of media in developing 'mobile empathetic personalities' (Lerner 1958: 54). The critique both of such modernisation paradigms and the lack of a structural theory of power inherent in the assumptions supporting the 'integrative work of communication' are widespread and familiar (Gunder Frank 1967, Wallerstein 1974).

sign of difference and novelty) is integrated into an existing ritual through a very mundane act of syncretism (see Howes et al 1996).

Thus what is produced is empathy through the symbolic resonance of discourse rather than with an experience, it is the product of ‘recognising’ domination through a transfer of ethnocentric precepts (Rapport & Overing 2000). Yet, in this relationship, how can empathy function at all? As I have argued so far, attempting to speak for this experience reproduces widely critiqued aspects of theses of cultural imperialism and global homogenisation, but ultimately does little else than rehearse these arguments (see Brennan 1997). What is often advocated as an alternative to the imaginative colonisation and displacement of empathy – or as Laçan put it, “If I put myself in the other person's place, where is the other person?” – is for introspection to replace projection. This position is delineated by Terry Eagleton, in his discussion of ‘empathetic errors’ where the empathiser, in order to empathise, makes the mistake of assuming the coherent subjectivity of the Other. As he expresses it; “Your understanding of me is not a matter of reduplicating in yourself what I am feeling, an assumption that might well raise thorny issues of how you come to leap the ontological barrier between us” (2000: 49).

Following Eagleton’s logic, it is possible to interpret Hertz’s construction as leaping such an ontological barrier and knocking over several discursive hurdles on the way. Yet the question still remains, how can she merge a cosmopolitan ethics of concern with a cosmopolitan reflexiveness of knowledge about? Eagleton’s proposition is *omphalopsychic*; “[...] you do not need to leap out of your skin to know what another is feeling; indeed there are times when you need rather to burrow more deeply into it” (2000: 48). In other words, the shoes of the other are to be found in one’s navel. In some ways, this is a powerful appeal; recent debates about migration and globalisation in Ireland, for example, have been characterised by arguments about the empathetic resources provided by the Irish emigrant past for the reception of global others in an immigrant present (for a critique see Garner 2004, Titley 2004a). While Eagleton proposes this at a safe level of generality, the replacement of internal with external identification poses some equally thorny questions, namely the difference between transfer and projection in an imagined relationship.

If, following Rapport and Overing's critique of anthropological transfer in the 'recognition' of domination, positions such as Hertz's can be critiqued for displacement, it is hard to see how burrowing into one's own experience results in more than replacement. To recall Carrie Rentschler's discussion of victim-identification and witnessing, Rentschler's empirically grounded worry involved the ways in which relating the situation of the other to one's own life events and suffering may result in foreclosing on the differences of power and context that infuse very different experiences of suffering. Respecting 'the ontological gap between us' and burrowing into the empathetic possibilities of one's own experience is therefore no more likely to satisfy the constant reflex of cosmopolitan practice. Of course, empathetic practices are never reducible to such formula, my point here is rather to demonstrate the ways in which listing values or competences such as 'empathy' as desirable cultivations of the cosmopolitan disposition is to mistake the unavoidably situated and relational nature of such ideas.³⁰ Furthermore, it demonstrates once again the irreducible tensions of imaginative geography; the ontologically incomplete Other of interconnection can never be known through either formula in practice. The incompleteness of identification follows on hard from the indeterminacy of knowledge. So what of the dialogic imagination? It would seem that 'Hertz' – in this symbolic rendering - breaches an ontological gap whichever way she might interpret such an entreaty. I will return to this in discussing the application of accidental cosmopolitanism in the next section.

³⁰ Once again Žižek provides an interesting and provocative example in his discussion of reading 'about Islam' post September 11th 2001, and as a wider remark on cultural politics, his example resonates with the critique of cultural diversity as understanding and respecting the difference of Others in multicultural societies as debilitating an depoliticising culturalisation: "In the days after September 11th the media reported that not only English translations of the Koran but also books about Islam and Arab culture in general became instant bestsellers: people wanted to understand what Islam is, and it is safe to surmise that the vast majority of those who wanted to understand Islam were not anti-Arab racists, but people eager to give Islam a chance, to get a feel for it, to experience it from the inside, and thus to redeem it – their desire was to convince themselves that Islam is a great spiritual force which cannot be blamed for the terrorist crimes. Sympathetic as this attitude may be (and what can be ethically more appealing than, in the midst of violent confrontation, trying to put oneself inside the opponent's mind, and thus to relativize one's own standpoint?), it remains a gesture of ideological mystification par excellence: probing into different cultural traditions is precisely not the way to grasp the political dynamics which led to the September 11th attacks" (2002: 34). While he could be accused of judging far more than the books from a quantity of covers, his point once again chimes with a sense of the disjunctures of non-linearity; it may be, from the vantage point of the political philosopher, precisely not the place to look for answers, but the question remains, where is? In terms of the general options of the teeming masses on Žižek's couch, this question remains unanswered.

A similar critique may be offered when cosmopolitanism is discussed as an ideal typology, or as an agent of aspirational praxis. This mode of calling unites the weaknesses detected in the advocacy of both principles and programmatic values. This is not only because of the implied habitus of the figure of the cosmopolitan, who tends to be moulded from very selective clay. It is because smuggling competences and values into an instructive typology may not recognise the inherent ambivalence of such instructions. This by now rather obvious contention can be illustrated with reference to Ulf Hannerz's well-known essay 'Cosmopolitans and Locals in World Culture' (1996), and John Tomlinson's subsequent discussion of it (1999). In Hannerz's delineation, the cosmopolitan is primarily a cross-cultural agent, sustained both by a general orientation – a 'willingness to become involved' – and the development of reflexive competences. While Hannerz stresses that his discussion should not be read as a 'definition of a true cosmopolitan', given the nature of his approach it is difficult to read it as anything but (1996: 102).

As Tomlinson sees it, Hannerz's cosmopolitans are 'rare birds of passage' (1999: 183). They are characterised by "[...] a willingness to engage with the Other. It entails an intellectual and esthetic openness toward divergent cultural experiences, a search for contrasts rather than uniformity...there is the aspect of a state of readiness, a personal ability to make one's way into other cultures, through listening, looking, intuiting, and reflecting" (1996: 103). Lest this description be read in terms of a mere delight in cultural contrasts, Hannerz is quick to differentiate it from the mobile habitus of transnational elites, and also – in what are surprisingly relaxed and empirically uninformed generalisations for such an eminent anthropologist – from the vast majority of tourists and migrants, themselves living within transnationalised networks. Yet in a summarising statement, Hannerz provides an incisive vision of the approaches to cultural knowledge as cultural work that I have been connecting with imaginative geography:

What they (cosmopolitans) carry, however, is not just special knowledge, but also that overall orientation towards structures of meaning to which the notion of the 'culture of critical discourse' refers. This orientation... is reflexive, problematising, concerned with meta-communication; I would also describe it as generally expansionist in its management of meaning. It pushes on and on in its analysis of the order of ideas, striving towards explicitness where common sense, as a contrasting mode of meaning

management, might come to rest comfortably with the tacit, the ambiguous and the contradictory. In the end, it strives toward mastery (1996: 109).

The idealised cosmopolitan - particularly those influenced by dwelling-in-between and a constant alienation from frameworks of situated commonsense – is constantly involved in a critical reflection on indeterminacy, an ongoing contemplation of narration. While Tomlinson critiques Hannerz's neglect of the ethical commitments of the cosmopolitan (inscription)³¹, what separates this picture from the senses I have been cultivating is the commitment to mastery – which could in turn be regarded as a teleological inevitability of typological and idealised explorations. It is not necessarily a retreat to the unconscious security of commonsense to rest with the ambiguous and the contradictory, and like the variety of musical rests, it does not imply an indefinite pause. Mastery signifies a disabling utopianism in a context of limitlessness, rather than a realisation that there may be no order of ideas and no vantage point from which to propose one. Once again, this is not a question of postmodern relativism, but of accepting the conditions in which understanding and standing in interconnectedness must be approached.

Other aspects of Hannerz's construction recall the point made previously; that ultimately typological constructions act as a form of provocation, as a nexus for the calibration of further questioning. This is the role his account plays in Tomlinson's discussion of cosmopolitanism; he proceeds to examine the ways in which the category of the cosmopolitan often depends on debasing the 'local', a dichotomy strengthened by traces of gendered and ethnocentric figurativeness (1999: 187-9). What Tomlinson also latches onto is the ways in which cosmopolitanism and mobility interlock reductively in Hannerz's account. There is clearly no suggestion that mobility engenders cosmopolitan outlooks or practices – Tourists desire 'home plus', migrants reconstruct 'home plus higher income', transnational elites encapsulate themselves in 'home plus safety' – however there is no exploration of mobility and cosmopolitanism that does not involve the capital of physical movement, indeed, it appears as something of a limp concluding

³¹ This is ultimately a question of reading; Hannerz does not specifically link the practice of cosmopolitanism to a wider engagement with any form of politics or issue, yet it is hard to read his discussion of a commitment to openness and *willingness to engage* as a formulation bereft of ethical consideration. Tomlinson reads this as indicative of a lack of a 'Sense of wider cultural commitment – of belonging to the world as a whole' (1999: 186), which is certainly plausible, yet hardly conclusive.

rumination: “And one may in the end ask whether it is now even possible to become a cosmopolitan without going away at all” (1996: 111).

There are two aspects of this absence that require a degree of analysis. With respect to Hannerz’s tourists and migrants – whose status as emptied signifiers is a consequence of idealised enquiry – a vast array of empirical studies document and ‘recognise’ varieties of cosmopolitan practice while undermining the status of the ideal cosmopolitan as a productive vehicle of enquiry. While Anderson (1998), Hiebert (2002) and Werbner (1999) explicitly examine the practices of ‘non-western’ transnational communities under the rubric of cosmopolitan practice, it would be possible to comfortably discuss an even wider spectrum within the anthropology of transnationalism in relation to it (Appadurai 1996, Fog Olwig 2001). Similarly, the impetus of postcolonial deconstructions of cosmopolitanism has been both to foreground its writing out of subaltern and exteriorised practices, and to reconstruct them as historiography or empirical study (Breckenridge et al 2002).

The other ellipse in Hannerz’s understanding of mobility is of course the multiple mobilities discussed in chapter one as central to the constitutive setting of ‘cultural work’. In my discussions of interconnectedness, the examples have for the most part addressed senses of interconnectedness that are partially revealed by the mobility of images, information and products, and the concomitant imaginative mobility of the interconnected subject. Seen in this way, the previous discussions of negotiation, orientation and witnessing can also be read as sustained engagements with the complexities of situated cosmopolitan practice. Moreover, some recent studies explicitly address aspects of situated cosmopolitanism, where the situatedness is understood both as a given and in contra-distinction to the real and metaphoric mobility of ‘free-floating’ cosmopolitans.

Kirby, Gibbons and Cronin, in their concluding remarks to the edited collection *Reinventing Ireland: Culture, Society and the Global Economy* (2002), argue that the cultural and historical myopia engendered by dominant narratives of globalisation and unprecedented social change in Ireland during the ‘Celtic Tiger’ of the 1990s has given rise to a disjuncture between the supposed sovereignty of the ‘consumer’ and the meaningful political agency of the ‘citizen’ (see also Coulter ed. 2004). Following

Bauman (2000), they argue that individualised life-narratives and the insidious privatisation of personal experience paradoxically disable not only collective possibilities, but also the ways in which independence is sustained by intimate and public commitments to interdependence. This is problematic both in terms of the ‘ruthless narrow gauge functionalism’ of Irish political economy, and also with regard to thinking through coexistence in an increasingly (and overtly) multicultural society. In a repudiation of the schismic rhetoric of the Celtic Tiger’s ‘new culture’ – “[...] seen as marking a break with the past and the coming-of-age of an enlightened, tolerant and liberal Ireland” (2002: 2) – they advocate a focus on *dynamic rootedness*:

[...] political engagement with cultural possibility that looks to radical, transformative energies in the Irish past and present. In linking radical, dissenting, alternative traditions in the Irish past to individuals and groups and movements which contest the present neo-liberal orthodoxy in Ireland, a critical culture can emerge that allows people to situate themselves not only in place and time but in a shared community of liberation (2002: 206).

Beyond the specificities of cultural politics, what the idea of *dynamic rootedness* suggests is that cosmopolitan practice is intimately concerned with situatedness and positionality. It severs the assumptions made by Hannerz that resources for cultural translation are produced in cultural-spatial interstices; they may also lie in cultural-temporal ones. However, the key point of this kind of formulation is that cosmopolitan practice is not bound by an orthodoxy based in any one approach. *Dynamic rootedness* implies both reflexive positionality and commitment. The approach of Kirby et al is to suggest that the ‘cosmopolitan imagination’ must guard against exteriorising that which is interiorised through stereotyping the ‘local’ as the alterity of cosmopolitanism. This insight is given a different emphasis by Alastair McIntosh in his extended image of ‘digging where we stand’ in *Soil and Soul* (2001). The title of McIntosh’s book perhaps deliberately flirts with the mythological coordinates of romantic nationalism, and in doing so draws attention to his detailed repudiation of either exclusive ideologies of belonging centred on place, and both romanticised and dismissive accounts of modernity’s forge.

The book documents McIntosh’s involvement with The Isle of Eigg Trust campaign, which was dedicated to wresting the Hebridean island from feudal to communal ownership, and a subsequent battle to prevent a super-quarry being carved into a

mountain on the Isle of Harris. McIntosh's book is a profoundly complex reflection on activism and spirituality, place and community, and it does the intertwining aspects of his approach some disservice to isolate them here. One such aspect is the constant parallels that are evoked between not only the plight of the Hebrideans and Native Americans, but also the nature of the interconnections invoked between them. McIntosh's digging into the living history of the island's social ecology does not just result in ways of re-thinking community in the present – through 'near-forgotten fragments of history from long-overgrown pools of local knowledge' – but in ways of thinking through connexity. This interconnectedness is felt in ways commensurate with Eagleton's 'burrowing', for it is a sense and ethics of interconnectedness derived from a deep sense of place, or of inclusive introspection. In one passage, McIntosh recalls a conversation with a local bard Torcuil MacRath:

These *Red Indians*, if that is what you would call them', Torcuil continues, gazing directly into my eyes, monitoring every unconscious flicker as he tells me about the television programme that has made such an impact on him. 'They said their culture is dying. They said it's because the Circle, the Sacred Hoop has been broken. Long pauses punctuate every statement. This is not snappy soundbite culture; this is where meaning lies more between the words than in them. 'Well, I'll tell you this, Alastair...it's the same for us. It's the same for the Gael. At least that's what I think. Because when I heard them on the television, those Indians, I understood instantly what they meant (2001: 51).

MacRath then continues to sing a song in Gaelic written after watching the television programme, but which also carries resonances of the parallel losses he laments. This kind of picture gives another sense to dynamic rootedness, where the reflection on interconnection provokes thinking both about one's own situation, and that of the other. It illustrates what McIntosh has in mind when he writes; "I have focused on islands, because it is easier to tell a story around places with a fixed boundary. But it will have been clear, I hope, that this story is connected in with the whole world" (2001: 279).

These two discussions of rooted forms of 'cosmopolitan practice' make it possible to discuss cosmopolitanism in radically altered ways, yet there is a need to augment this with more specific considerations of such practices in relation to the central aspects of interconnectedness under discussion. Furthermore, there is a need to think through some of the implications of discussing such situated practices and how they relate to 'calling for cosmopolitanism'. Moving from an emphasis on typological or idealised

cosmopolitans to a potentially limitless exploration of situated cosmopolitan practices dilutes some of the more marginalising and exclusive senses that cosmopolitanism has accrued. Similarly, focusing on contextual practices and the ways in which they are recognised, played out and framed suggests that cosmopolitanism is no longer approached as a state to be attained, a coherent 'world-view' that is cultivated in accordance to generalised, prescriptive criteria.

If cosmopolitanism can be viewed as a diffuse register of commonplace practices, it means that practices that combine the ability to negotiate between forms of otherness and an ethical sense of that interaction are developing across a spectrum of everyday contexts. This turn to the contextual particularisation of cosmopolitanism suggests the final bankruptcy of the 'global-local' as either concept or slogan, recalling Ulrich Beck's assertion that "'Globalization' is a non-linear, dialectic process in which the global and the local do not exist as cultural polarities but as combined and mutually implicating principles" (2002: 17) indicating that the "[...] apparently local and the apparently cosmopolitan should not necessarily be counterposed" (Urry 2003: 137).

Nevertheless, excessive extrapolation from and theoretical riffing on studies of 'glocalised cosmopolitanism' would be to misjudge the nature of cosmopolitanism as a discursive fluid. A focus on ordinary cosmopolitanisms – recognised and valorised as such by research frameworks – does not result in a set of settled propositions, but rather in a plethora of theoretical questions that in turn cannot be allowed to settle as theory. There are a number of reasons for this. Most prosaically, such a focus can stray remarkably quickly into the realms of academic romanticism, and replace the typology of the exceptional with that of the 'everyday' (see Ferguson & Golding [ed.] 1997). In discussions of cosmopolitanism, the everyday is an ambivalent sign; in acknowledging the import of fine-grained ethnographic studies of everyday practice - particularly in situations that have been discursively marginalised by dominant conceptualisations of cosmopolitanism – it can simultaneously valorise and disavow their importance. In other words, once a body of such work circulates to a significant extent, there is a danger that the nuances and specificities of such research become subsumed in a general, compulsory acknowledgement of *the* local and ordinary.

Cosmopolitanism is a focus of increased academic publishing and teaching, and as such is currently subject to narrativisations intent on assembling core considerations and essential references. If the fluidity of cosmopolitanism derives at least in part from the ways in which situated research has diluted prescriptiveness, it would be ironic if such dissonance becomes a statutory trope in a fixed topography of 'the topic'. Relatedly – and in a continued parallel with Cultural Studies' construction of everyday resistance – there is a danger that resting on the empirical satisfaction of actually existing cosmopolitanisms weakens the implicit aspect of praxis in cosmopolitan theory. Furthermore, it may also replicate a gaze onto everyday practice that is exoticising, reifying and fundamentally unc cosmopolitan. It is potentially a similar dynamic to that noted by Terry Eagleton, in arguing that the consumption of everyday popular culture in Cultural Studies' paradigms came to play the "[...] expressive, spontaneous, quasi-utopian role which 'primitive' cultures had played previously" (2000: 12) (see also Barker 2002, Ferguson & Golding [ed.] 1997, Fiske 1987, McGuigan 1992, 1996).

These studies ultimately indicate the transient utility of cosmopolitanism as a discursive space. If cosmopolitanism involves a working recognition of the 'otherness of otherness', then a cosmopolitan discourse must recognise the limits and potential contradictions of recognising and framing practices as cosmopolitan in the first instance. More pertinently to this argument, the importance of studies of the everyday is precisely that they refuse categorisation and easy ascension into a theory of cosmopolitanism. The slew of modifying adjectives used to amend cosmopolitanism – as discussed by Vertovec and Cohen (2002: 21) – place the emphasis less on cosmopolitanism than on the context in which this discursive fluid is being carefully particularised. Thus a turn from typologies of idealism and coherence leads to a mosaic of inter-subjectivities and specificities, and the dialectical production of new questions.

Chief among these questions is the extent to which we can discuss ideas of emergent cosmopolitanism while safeguarding both the reflexive openness of the discourse and the contextuality of research. The introduction of subjectivity to cosmopolitanism yields a focus on practices in time and space, yet if there is an over-arching philosophical sense to cosmopolitanism, it is that it testifies to the necessity of 'deep hermeneutic engagement' and intersubjective negotiation (Tomlinson 1999: 194). In other words, while it is undoubtedly unsatisfactory to produce recipes for the cosmopolitan

disposition, it is equally deflating to simply conclude that situated practices exist and hope that when they are encountered, they are recognised and valorised. A further stage must be to examine if it is possible to speak of emergent cosmopolitanisms and cosmopolitan practices, whether and by whom they are recognised, and without being overly instrumental, what can and do they achieve? That in turn leads to the question of how research and theory of this kind relates to the practices and possibilities it, through research and commentary, to some extent takes ownership of (Fine and Cohen 2002, Foucault 1969).

Discussions of emergent cosmopolitanism are based on analyses of shifting experiential conditions that can be held to necessitate the development of new modes of interpretation and interaction. As such, emergent cosmopolitanism can be located almost anywhere. Helmuth Berking, for example, develops an idea of *solidary individualism* that can be read as a complementary attempt to suggest the potential of apparently contradictory social trends. Berking argues – in contra-distinction to Bauman and the reading of Bauman proposed by Kirby et al – that dominant cultural ‘self-definitions’ of utilitarianism and individualisation should not be regarded as overdetermining and necessarily resulting in the demise of collective responsibility. Instead, they may engender novel (in the sense that they are not the tenacious traces of lingering traditional practices) dynamics of “[...] solidary social relationships, norms of reciprocity and forms of mutual recognition” (1999: 193). What drives this mutuality is the ubiquity of ongoing self-realisation in late modernity, and in particular the reflexive monitoring of the image of self created for others. As Berking writes:

Regardless of whether they are accentuated as institutionalised behavioural expectations or biographical self-interpretation, as symbolic self-classification or intersubjective self-aspiration...what is demanded of the individuals in every case is cognitive, social and affective competences which...practically coerce them to form and expand reflexive self-relations (1999: 195)

What Berking suggests, then, is that the constant biographical and identity-negotiative reflexivity of the late modern subject (Beck 1992, Giddens 1991) *extends* awareness of others to a realisation of mutual interdependence:

[...] political practice on a reflexive self that, from the perspective of a self-constructed identity and in the intention of realising itself, acts towards changing the

social world; one of its particular symbolic features consists of realising the necessity of never ceasing to see individual problems in global contexts...the moral economy of our society, so it appears, is more and more migrating into the *subjective ecology* of highly individualised individuals (1999: 201).

The idea of subjective ecology is deeply suggestive; perhaps not of any form of dynamically rooted politics, but of the minimal speculative clay available to a micro-politics of interconnectedness. The *subjective ecological* web of the individual - spun from the bonds of interconnection and interdependence – seems to describe the ways in which connexity with others manifests itself unevenly and partially, yet nevertheless implies insistence. Berking leaves us to speculate further on the possible relationships between individualised and relational senses of self, and the practice of solidarity. This speculative question can be explored by turning to examine Ulrich Beck's notion of *cosmopolitanization* (2002) and John Urry's conceptualisation of an *emergent global fluid of cosmopolitanism* (2003). Like Berking, Beck and Urry provide new pathways for open, trans-contextual writing on 'the transformation of everyday life'. Beck's notion is predicated on the realisation that the 'profound ontological changes' that I discuss in chapter one necessitate a 'dialogic imagination', accepting "[...] living in terms of inclusive oppositions" (2002: 19). It requires the cultivation of perspectives that are based in a reflexive approach to self and other, and self as other.

For Urry, cosmopolitanism as a global fluid illustrates the "[...] irreversible, unpredictable and chaotic workings of global complexity" (2003: 138) as encounters and engagements with cosmopolitanising agents are diffuse and ultimately unknowable. Nevertheless, he offers a speculative, evolving set of characteristics that suggest ways in which cosmopolitan practices develop within this broadly sketched milieu, to an extent whereby they can be described as "[...] a new emergent fluid of global ordering" (2003: 138). To adapt Stuart Hall from a not unrelated context, these writings map out a *cosmopolitanism without guarantees*; as with Berking's speculative limits, the transformation of the everyday does not necessarily result in practices that can be argued for as cosmopolitan, and cosmopolitanism can only be argued for within analytical frameworks attuned to inconsistency, ambivalence and ambiguity. In doing so they link discourses of cosmopolitanism with the ambivalences of connexity that I outlined in relation to the idea of imaginative geography.

Urry's discussion asks; "Is a set of 'global' values and dispositions becoming an emergent and irreversible implication of global complexity?" (2003: 133). He cites a number of generalisable characteristics that point to the uncertain and contingent emergence of a 'cosmopolitan fluid': extensive corporeal, imaginative and virtual travel; a curiosity about places, peoples and cultures combined with a stance of openness; a willingness to risk in encounter underpinned by 'semiotic skill to interpret and evaluate' images of otherness, and emerging global standards by which places and actors can be judged (2003: 133-4). In partially developing aspects of these characteristics, Urry is careful to circumscribe them with the ambivalence of potential. In a less systemic way than Berking, he sketches the parameters of, for example, increased virtual mobility and spectatorship where "Such sensations of other places can create an awareness of cosmopolitan interdependence and a 'panhumanity' (2003: 136). It goes without saying that empirical evidence could be found to highlight the ambivalence of each of the generalised examples marshalled – gift-giving and witnessing, for example, are briefly invoked – however the wider importance of Urry's compressed discussion is the ways in which he argues for the recognition of unrecognised and emergent forms and practices of cosmopolitanism, where as social actors "[...] assemble, organize and mobilize differently, so new, unpredictable and emergent cosmopolitan identities, practices and cognitive praxes will emerge" (2003: 137).

This is perhaps the safe limits of extrapolation, therefore I turn to a far more developed discussion of emerging cosmopolitanism in globalised consumer societies to examine some of the possibilities and limitations of this form of tentative calling. Ulrich Beck's essay "The Cosmopolitan Society and its Enemies" (2002) discusses the relationship between a 'cosmopolitan sociology' and a 'cosmopolitan society', and in so doing it interrogates similar questions of new sociological conceptualisation and method as John Urry (2000, 2003). While the new conceptual vocabulary of such a sociology itself constructs the cosmopolitan society under discussion, my discussion here will concentrate on the ways in which a 'cosmopolitan society' can be known, revealed and predicted through interpretation.

Beck argues that many of what could now be termed the decontextualised grand narratives of globalisation – transnationalisation, deterritorialisation, the increase in

scope and density of trans-border informational, human, financial and hybrid networks - alter what Raymond Williams called 'the structure of feeling' of everyday life (1977). Globalisation, for Beck, is not a simplistic process that hails from above or below, but instead alters the texture of national societies internally. What was understood to be – in a descriptive and prescriptive sense (see Welsch 1999) – hermetic and coherent is now increasingly seen as a locus of interpenetration. This is the starting point for elucidating an idea of *cosmopolitanization*: “[...] cosmopolitanization means *internal* globalization, globalization *from within* national societies. This transforms everyday consciousness and identities significantly. Issues of global concern are becoming part of the everyday local experiences and the ‘moral life-worlds’ of the people” (2002: 17 original italics).

As an introductory pitch this is a reasonably standard description, and Beck's delineation of 'a cosmopolitan perspective' – a formulation that perhaps leans problematically towards typological coherence – gels with several of the key outlines discussed previously in this chapter:

The central defining characteristic of a cosmopolitan perspective is the 'dialogic imagination'. By this I mean the clash of cultures and rationalities within one's own life, the *internalised* other. The dialogic imagination corresponds to the coexistence of rival ways of life in the individual experience, which makes it a matter of fate to compare, reflect, criticise, understand, combine contradictory certainties...The cosmopolitan perspective is an alternative imagination, an imagination of alternative ways of life and rationalities, which include the otherness of the other (2002: 19)

Once again, there is little here that can be disputed in terms of the worthiness of cosmopolitan aspiration. Beck's formulation has the advantage of combining several senses of the dialogic self/imagination previously encountered; knowledge of the other begins with the acknowledgement that we are interpretative agents in the world of that knowledge, and can never stand outside of dynamics of identity and subjectivity in relations of Othering. Knowledge of self and of the Other interpenetrate. If the dialogic imagination constantly 'hails' us back to an awareness of how we invest in certain subject positions in relation to the Other (Hall and Du Gay 1996), the focus on the 'otherness of the other' cautions against the reductionism of empathy in failing to take seriously the "ontological barrier between us" (Eagleton 2000: 49). His description of 'rival ways of life in the individual experience' carries a sense not only of the significance of intersubjective encounters, but also of the overlapping ways in which the

subject is held to be multiple, shifting and socially performative over time and in context (see Hall 1992).

In describing the extent to which such reflexive tensions are foregrounded by the ‘transformation of the everyday’, Beck is careful to circumscribe his delineation of the cosmopolitan perspective with a series of warnings that are directed not only at weak utopian pronouncement but also at extrapolations that pursue linear and encompassing suggestions. Cosmopolitanization is as likely to result in new conflicts as new solidarities, and as a process, it is less a design for life than an inchoate feeling that the everyday produces “[...] issues people never faced before”. Thus while Beck – bravely or fancifully, depending on your reading – goes as far as to suggest that cosmopolitanism may be the ‘big idea’ that supersedes communism and neoliberalism in shaping political thinking on global interdependence, cosmopolitanization is not a process of inevitable reflexive and ethical cohesion that responds to experiential diffusion. In carving out a sense of this process, Beck bluntly differentiates it from readings of what he terms “[...] the hidden cosmopolitanization of nation-state societies and the rise of the ‘cosmopolitan subject’” (2002: 19). While he provides no orienting references for this trend, this strategic disavowal makes it clear that studies of local, rooted, and subaltern cosmopolitanism cannot be aggregated and marshalled as evidence of “cosmopolitanization”. If there is a vaguely progressive accent to this as a ‘process’, it is the familiar refrain that interconnectedness becomes a minimal horizon of meaning, even when such an awareness is instrumental in recidivist and reactionary attitudes and politics. As he writes:

Cosmopolitanization means that that the key questions of a way of life, such as nourishment, production, identity, fear, memory, pleasure, fate, can no longer be located nationally or locally, but only globally or glocally – whether in the shape of globally shared collective futures, capital flows, impending ecological or economic catastrophes, global foodstuff chains or the international ‘Esperanto’ of pop music (2002: 30)

Beck’s idea of *cosmopolitization* then, seems to be precisely the kind of fluid, open notion that legitimates a discourse of emergence; it recognises the ‘profound ontological changes’ in the “everyday local experiences and the ‘moral life-worlds’” of people, yet it is an increasing experience of interconnectedness that can only be regarded as

ambivalent. Cosmopolitanism may be cultivated in response to the dissonance, ambiguity and conflict of cosmopolitanization, but it requires overlapping and polyvalent forms of work, including the notion of 'cultural work'. In acknowledging that the mutual implication of what I have been discussing as imagination and ethics is far from assured, he warns against 'cosmopolitan fallacy':

The fundamental fact that the experiential space of the individual no longer coincides with national space, but is being subtly altered by the opening of cosmopolitanization should not deceive anyone into believing that we are all going to become cosmopolitans. Even the most positive development imaginable, an opening of cultural horizons and a growing sensitivity to other unfamiliar, legitimate geographies of living and coexistence, need not necessarily stimulate a feeling of cosmopolitan responsibility. The question of how this might at all be possible has hardly been properly put so far, never mind investigated (2002: 29)

This quotation opens up a number of latent questions, and Beck's final question is one I will be returning to in the more specific context of tourism and accidental cosmopolitanism. Beck is undoubtedly right to caution against the kind of linear developmental notions that I have been critiquing, in particular the assumption that chaotic cosmopolitanization – where unknowable experiences and forms of encounter and exposure and interaction are held to transform 'everyday consciousness' – may result in some kind of coherent, super-ordinate framework of cosmopolitan responsibility. Nevertheless, in so doing he implicitly accepts that responsibility is a result of a process of exposure, rather than, for example, the kind of amplification of ethical solidarity that Eagleton sketches in his discussion of empathy (2000), or that McIntosh discusses in looking at a connection to specific place as a fluid of broader attachments (2002).

It is when Beck attempts to substantiate minimal cosmopolitan orientations from the ambivalences of cosmopolitanization that central problems present in his analysis. This is most evident in his sketch of banal cosmopolitanism; which he argues is an increasingly prevalent and countervailing reflex to the naturalised assumptions of banal nationalism (Billig 1995). Before examining the ways in which banal cosmopolitanism has seeped into what Stevenson terms 'the soil of culture' (2003: 42), Beck re-establishes a point that is fast approaching the status of tautology: "What appears as and is proclaimed as national is, in essence, increasingly transnational or cosmopolitan. What

is at issue is the relation of our knowledge of the world and social structure. Social structure is becoming transnational or cosmopolitan; an epistemological shift is required in concurrence with this ontological trend” (2002: 29).

The power of banal nationalism stems precisely from the ways in which the foreign and the hybrid are rendered intrinsic; theorists of nationalism and culture have long observed that nationalism involves periodic re-affirmations of homogenisation, through the construction and maintenance of boundaries and strategic processes of articulation and performance, rather than the innocent demarcation of discrete entities and pre-existing ways of life (Anderson 1981, Clifford 1997, Pickering 2000). Thus, as Wolfgang Welsch observes – in an analysis which backs Beck’s call for a complementary ‘epistemological shift’ – the reality of (national) culture is always also a function of conceptions of culture; we know what we recognise and vice versa (1999). Beck discerns the proto-possibilities for this shift in what he terms banal cosmopolitanism, which he then attempts to secure through an impressively wayward example:

[...] banal cosmopolitanism appears to be displacing banal nationalism – involuntarily and visibly, and throughout the world. In Birmingham recently, there was a national demonstration against the ‘German’ company BMW because its plan to sell the ‘British’ Rover threatened to bring calamity to the whole region. On such an occasion, for sure, banal nationalism briefly flares up again, but afterwards, in the pub around the corner, tempers are cooled with so-called ‘Dutch’ or ‘German’ beer and ‘our’ football team is cheered on in competitions in which every player of every skin colour and culture play against each other (2002: 19)

One could contend that the zoological tone that pervades this description of the crudely behaviourist masses is far from cosmopolitanising, however this is not the main concern. What undermines this foray into substantiating cosmopolitanization is the radical ambivalence of this example, and the sense that it is intended to stand in for empirical investigation. If situated cosmopolitan practices are to be discussed, the abstracting discussion in turn must be aware of the situatedness of the practices. Beck seems to suggest that the regressive industrial nationalism of the world of work is calmed by the post-industrial, consumerist cosmopolitanism of consumption, while ignoring that

consumption cannot be read simply in this way.³² The apparent plurality and hybridity of football and beer is nothing of the sort; as Jonathan Friedman has pointed out, what is important is not the existence of hybridity as objectively discerned by the analyst, but the ways in which it is valued and understood in everyday practice and political discourse (1999: 249). Beck is clearly unfamiliar with such banal ‘everyday practices’ as buying the cheapest beer, associating ‘foreign’ beers with the sponsorship of domestic football teams, or cheering on ‘our’ black player while abusing ‘their’ one. As Les Back has similarly pointed out – echoing Brennan’s disdain for the rote rehearsal of critical paradigms (1997) – the point is not the clash of essentialism and anti-essentialism in some form of epic endgame, but the complexity of how they overlap and merge in situated incidents and understandings (1996: 6).

If cosmopolitanization is undermined by an instance of careless populism, more substantively problematic is the suggestion that cosmopolitanism can ever be banal. There is no symmetry between Billig’s notion and Beck’s adaptation; banal nationalism works through the continual flagging of coherence, it may not require constant conscious register, but it requires an accepted, normative framework, what Billig terms the ‘endemic condition’ of daily life (1995: 6). In contrast, there is no evidence to suggest that any of the ciphers of banal nationalism proffered by Beck signify dissonance, never mind alterity within this endemic condition. It remains a puzzling fallacy in discussions of multiculturalism that the consumption of a wide range of culturally differentiated goods is either presumed or hoped to increase tolerance for generalised, cultural others.

Beyond this misapplication of a suggestive parallel, if we regard cosmopolitanism not as a state of being, but as a reflexive practice, then it precludes any stage of banality – it always involves the conscious interpolation of the ‘dialogic imagination’. In other words, if a banal everyday sense of porousness and heterogeneity were to displace the flagging and categorising of banal nationalism’s discourse, any meaningful notion of cosmopolitanism would be located in the critical displacement and questioning of ‘cosmopolitanization’. While I have argued here that I am not in favour of attempting to

³² Beck’s use of ‘workers’ as ciphers of unreflexive, particularist passions does not sit easily with the little empirical work that exists on the subject; Lamont and Aksartova’s discussion of ‘ordinary cosmopolitanisms’, for example, not only questions the simplicity of this vision but also the projection of identity issues as the main focus of conflict (2002)

delineate cosmopolitanisms, it is worth recalling the ways in which the cosmopolitanisms I have discussed have been united in some form of ‘transcendentalism’. Cosmopolitan practice is always at some level critical practice, and ‘banal cosmopolitanism’ from this perspective resembles a category mistake.

At this point I will turn to an elaboration of accidental cosmopolitanism, as it emerges from an attempt to fuse a commitment to this transcendental property with a suspicion of the assertions and appropriations that other treatments of cosmopolitanism may be prone to.

2.5 Accidental Cosmopolitanism

The idea of accidental cosmopolitanism can be introduced with reference to an experience that is more common than this introductory example may suggest.

In a bizarre amalgam of tense geo-politics and enduring celebrity, Madonna was greeted with both controversy and acclaim on a recent ‘private’ visit to Israel, organised by her local Kabbalah centre in Los Angeles. No stranger to the myopia of cultural appropriation³³, Madonna attracted criticism from Orthodox Jews for wearing various religious symbols dominantly coded as masculine, and matters were not improved when her husband Guy Richie was snapped by a vigilant photographer dancing at a party with a copy of the Torah. However the Israeli Tourism Minister, Gidon Ezra, welcomed the singer, declaring “Madonna’s visit to Israel has great significance for promoting tourism in Israel”³⁴. Despite this her visit soured again, however, when Madonna visited Rachel’s tomb in Bethlehem. Protestors held a vigil during her visit to the tomb and gathered outside her hotel to sing “Don’t cry for me Palestina”. They contended that her visits – which were held to be of such significance to Israel’s tourist image - should be balanced by visits to Palestinian communities excluded (and thus invisible) from these areas by the newly erected security wall. Protestors, apparently, adapted Madonna’s

³³ The video for “Like A Prayer”, for example, attracted criticism from Christian groups for the overtly sexual nature of the black Christ featured, and the video for “Frozen” was criticised for appropriating Henna patterns normally reserved by Hindu women for specific celebrations.

³⁴ Chris McGreal, “Madonna in mystical mode dismays Orthodox Jews”, *The Guardian*, September 20 2004.

1984 hit “Holiday” to read "While you're on your holiday, take some time to educate," with *educate* replacing the original appeal to *celebrate*.

Beyond the specificities of this political situation and the dimensions of her celebrity, I want to argue in this section that what Madonna experienced during her visit is becomingly increasingly common, and I will sketch this out under the label of *accidental cosmopolitanism*. Accidental cosmopolitanism involves situations where a dialogic imagination is required to understand the material and symbolic significances of one's presence and impact – the reflected insistence of self - and to develop a sense of how to act within a reflexive reading of complex connectivity. Madonna's experience is emblematic of many aspects that will be discussed in the following sections. We are told that Madonna is a devout Kabbalah follower, and a friend confides that “Madonna told me that if she had known nine years ago what she knows today, she would have lived differently”. To some extent, her spiritual tourism recalls the savagely dismissive reading handed down by Christopher Lasch, who in *The Culture of Narcissism* sees such esoteric bricolage as a symptom of a collective lack of direction:

Having no hope...of improving their lives in any of the ways that matter, people have convinced themselves that what matters is psychic self-improvement; getting in touch with their feelings, eating health food, taking lessons in ballet and belly-dancing, immersing themselves in the wisdom of the East, jogging, learning how to ‘relate’, overcoming the ‘fear of pleasure’. (1979: 29 quoted in Bauman 2001:150).

If we extend to Madonna the basic sociological courtesy of reflexivity and agency – her friend has confided in us that she is indeed improving her life in a way that matters to her - Lasch's satire depends on positing a set of superordinate ‘ways that matter’ beyond the reach of incense-fogged false consciousnesses. Yet Madonna may not be undertaking a voyage that solely orbits her own navel; the newspaper reporting also informs us that Madonna responded to the politicisation of her visit by saying that she is united with the people that she met in ‘the Holy Land’ in wanting ‘peace on earth’. The problem appears to be, however, that there are many people she did not meet – in and of itself perceived as a political act - and they are neither prepared to share her notion of peace or to allow the ‘innocent and private’ aspects of her visit to go unchallenged. This experience begins to illustrate what I have in mind in adapting the title and image of

*The Accidental Tourist*³⁵ to incorporate cosmopolitanism, so often lazily presumed as the other of tourism.

Prior to developing it in the sections that follow, the argument can be summarised as follows. Cosmopolitan practices and perspectives do not evolve in clear and precise terms from different life experiences. As previous sections have made clear, the debate about cosmopolitanism is far less about distilling prescriptions than marshalling cosmopolitanism as a metaphor and fluid for examining how particular orientations, understandings and actions are developed in situated context. Touristic experiences are under-examined in this mode; in many general understandings of cosmopolitanism, being cosmopolitan is either a form of evolved tourism (Robbins 1995), or its evaluative other (Hannerz 1996). At the other pole of this tired binary, infrastructural investment in and the overall performance of tourism – not to mention the anticipated presence of outsiders through tourism – is often simplistically held to foster tolerance, mutual understanding and a shared stake in a peaceful environment.³⁶

³⁵ The novel *The Accidental Tourist* (1985) by Anne Tyler was turned into a film in 1988 by Lawrence Kasdan, and won a best supporting actress Oscar for Geena Davis. The idea of *The Accidental Tourist* has more recently become attached to a falsified photo that circulated in the weeks after the World Trade Centre attacks on September 11th 2001. The photo purported to show a tourist posing on the observation deck of one of the towers, unaware that the photo also captured a plane hurtling towards the building behind him. A website dedicated to tracking and analysing urban legends argues that the picture's power comes from the fact that "The photo ripped away the healing distance brought by the nearly two weeks between the attacks and the appearance of this digital manipulation, leaving the sheer horror of the moment once again raw and bared to the wind. Though the picture wasn't real, the emotions it stirred up were. It is because of these emotions the photo has sped from inbox to inbox with the speed that it has". <http://www.snopes2.com/rumors/crash.htm>. The way in which the tourist's supposed obliviousness is juxtaposed with oblivion resonates with the points about the targeting of tourists discussed later in this section. It is interesting to note, however, that there has been little discussion about the fact that the photo implies that somebody took the photo, and therefore gazed on both the tourist and the plane, thus interpolating the viewer of the photograph into another suggestive position of horror and discomfort.

³⁶ See for example current discussions of the role of tourism in cultivating peace in the Middle East, whereby the presence of tourists acts – almost like informal peace-keepers – to bind opposing forces together in a shared financial and cultural investment, and where once again the durable myth of understanding through interpersonal contact is held out as a driver of peace. As a report in *Travel Daily News* describes: "The dynamism of tourism can help bring peace to the Middle East, World Tourism Organization (WTO) Secretary-General Francesco Frangialli told the third Prime Minister's Conference for Tourism to Israel held in Jerusalem. *Tourism and peace are inseparable. The forces unleashed by tourism are so powerful that they can change apparently irreversible situations and bring about reconciliation where none was considered possible*, said Mr. Frangialli. Tourism is "a harbinger of peace" for destinations and tourism operators in a small region like the Holy Land, bound together by a common destiny and by a common interest in shared development projects. *Why confront each other when peace profits everyone and conflict no one?* he asked. It also promotes a direct contact between visitor and host, which is irreplaceable, prompting the question *how anyone can feel enmity for someone he has known or received personally, or has received him.* Friday, February 27 2004. http://www.traveldailynews.com/new.asp?newid=15665&subcategory_id=109

My argument here is not interested in scrabbling to sustain over-wrought extrapolations from situated analyses, but to develop a limited and contextual theory of cosmopolitan practice invited by the disjuncture of narration and inscription. I suggest that experiences of tourism, particularly those that at some level involve a consumption of exoticism and forms of cultural risk management, are increasingly likely to encounter moments and situations of dissonance, ambiguity and conflict. I theorise these as moments merely because I cannot be aware of the resources, capacities and subjectivities that are carried by situated tourists into such situations, but it is possible to suggest spaces and moments where connexities are unavoidably impressed upon situations. It follows from this – as shall become apparent in some of the examples discussed – that dissonance and ambiguity are amplified by situations where trajectories and relations of connexity have been sublimated and disavowed, and thus their often radical resurgence heightens both the intensity of the experience and the *cosmopolitan challenges* proffered.

The examples that follow can be characterised as contexts where a time to *celebrate* becomes a time to *educate*; where western consumer-citizens on holiday are placed in a situation where the significance of their presence and privilege is inescapable; where the interconnections they carry with them and step into make themselves at least partially visible; and where an experience associated with ‘escape’ is inescapably politically instrumentalised. In doing so, I hope that I avoid the tint of judgementalism that so often creeps into such discussions. Tourists are hailed into accidental cosmopolitanism when the forms that they have invested in and the imaginative geographies that guide them are ruptured, often in ways that profoundly cut to the assumptions and normatives that legitimise mobility, presence and contact. Accidentalism is deeply perspectival; what is accidental in these contexts is that which is unpredictable, chaotic and assumed to be under control. Cosmopolitanism is potentially invoked by what is then demanded of the tourist to interpret their presence, linkages and symbolism. Accidental cosmopolitanism involves over-layered senses of realisation; the comprehension of disjuncture, and the potential cultural work deployed to address what that realisation brings.

In situations of conflict, multiple inequalities, resource competition and political strife, a range of socio-political discourses increasingly problematise tourist activity, and demand of the tourist negotiations, reflections and actions that as I have outlined are now commonly discussed under the rubric of cosmopolitanism. In other words, the key issues that cosmopolitanism seeks to address – from the ramifications of the global pursuit of security to the ways in which we perceive, interpret and evaluate difference and otherness – are central concerns for contemporary tourists, from the moment they are interpolated as such by images and desire to the spaces and moments when they negotiate being such in lived and situated experience. As Madonna discovered, imaginative geographies always narrate and inscribe; her narration is one of peace, spirituality and healing, yet from a variety of vested perspectives her presence inscribes political inequality and continued marginalisation. Accidental cosmopolitanism may develop in such newly perceived vectors and interstices between knowing and doing, narrating and inscribing.

I have chosen to prioritise depth of analysis over breadth of application in developing this idea, and hence the following sub-sections extend this argument by looking at public debates on tourism post-September 11th 2001. This date is not proposed as a watershed for thinking on tourism, as the processes detailed below are not neatly divided by even such a profound temporal signifier. Nevertheless, that event and the geo-political ramifications that have followed have contributed significantly to a robust questioning of tourism - beyond academic research - as a globalising leisure practice, and contributed to thinking on what is demanded of and legitimate from accidental cosmopolitans. These examples are explicitly drawn from arguments and representations placed in the public domain over the last two years. They are mainly drawn from UK-based media; the UK's involvement in the invasions of Afghanistan and Iraq has led to debates about presence and legitimacy bleeding into many areas of life, and it is also fair to say the British public sphere provides a healthy spectrum of channels through which these debates can take place. While they are not presented as representative of anything other than the scope of these debates, I contend that they provide contextual evidence of shifts in the way tourism is increasingly evaluated and discussed. This in turn suggests ethical and epistemological problematics that cosmopolitanism – reflexively engaging in connexity it can neither disavow nor fully understand – at least partially emerges from.

Environmental bubbles and global risk society

It is possible to argue that a primary dimension of accidental cosmopolitan is called into being by the violent re-insertion of risk and indiscriminate occurrence to travel on and after September 11th 2001. While there is a danger that using this date as a watershed both overburdens and lends credence to its political instrumentalisation, it is nevertheless of significance for a thesis that engages with constructions and understandings of the global. The argument of this section is, in many ways, a simple one: the attacks of September 11th re-problematised mobility and its vulnerabilities in ways that *undermine the apparently routine nature of air travel.*

The fall-out from the attacks in Manhattan for travel are in many ways obviously visible; previously sacrosanct national airlines have disappeared, security precautions in airports are increasingly rigid, time-consuming and their rebate likely to be extended without warning, armed personnel are increasingly present in airports and sea terminals, personal information is increasingly sought and stored by travel authorities, and in many countries, new and expensive forms of biometric recognition technologies will be used to validate travel documents as a direct result of changes in US immigration policy.³⁷ Yet to focus on the chaotic coming into being of forms of cosmopolitan engagement, we need to consider the core physical and symbolic effect of the Manhattan attacks: the global iconography of hijacked passenger jets crashing into the World Trade Centre.

Daniel Boorstin's (1964) seminal notion of the 'environmental bubble' imagines tourists cosseted and segregated by the interpenetration of physical and cognitive strategies of risk management. While this sense of 'the tourist' remains latent in many stereotypes and typologies (see for example McLaren 1998), Boorstin's analysis retains limited veracity after forty years of qualitative inquiry into tourist experiences (Abram et al 1997, Sheller & Urry [ed.] 2004), deconstructions of the privileging of authenticity in interpretations of tourist motivations (Meethan 2002), a critique of the class-based assumptions which underpin the immanent idea of the masses (Mowforth and Munt 1998, see also Williams 1963) and arguments such as those presented in the next

³⁷ See for example the new requirement of the US Embassy in Finland: <http://www.usembassy.fi/servlet/PageServer?Frameset=consular.html>

chapter of this thesis; that attempts to secure environmental bubbles and enclavic spaces (Edensor 2002) always contain the germ of their dissipation.

Nevertheless, it could be argued that if this notion has been consistently applicable anywhere, it has been in the attempts of the airline industry to cognitively buffer their customers against the velocity, physicality and risk of air travel. John Tomlinson, in a discussion of over-layered time-space compressions centrally associated with the cultural experience of contemporary globalisations (see also Giddens 1990, Harvey 1989, Robertson 1995, Waters 1995), describes the hugely familiar feeling of air travel as a 'time capsule'. Physical distance shifts only with tectonic activity, but our perceptions of distance are mediated by technology, our treatment as passengers, and the willingness and competence of the mind to grasp the physical givens of velocity. As Tomlinson explains:

Planes are truly time capsules. When we board them we enter a self-contained and independent temporal regime which seems designed to remove our experience almost entirely from the business of ultra-high-speed movement through air. The familiar sequence of take-off routine, distribution of newspapers, complimentary drinks, meals, sale of duty free goods and the in-flight movies all focus us on the internal time-frame of the cabin. So, phenomenologically, our 'journey' is one through this familiar sequence of time rather than through space. (1999: 4).

Thus distance is collapsed into time, and risk into routine. It could be added to Tomlinson's description that increasingly risk is also managed by the offer of simulated complicity and transparency. Pilots, often in several languages, share details of the route, possible weather conditions and occasionally 'sights' that become visible, and increasingly route maps keep passengers apprised of the journey's progress and indicators. The innovation of a nose-cone camera offers the reassurance of the pilot's gaze by emphasising the centrality of the visual to senses of travel (Urry 2002); it reassures that you can see what I see, and nothing can go wrong while it is under our collective surveillance – otherwise why would this perspective be made available to you? The cabin, then, is more than physically an environmental bubble, it is a cultural-phenomenological one, where travel is measured and managed in terms that dislocate it from the admittedly difficult-to-conceive actuality. While Boorstin's notion arguably contains a degree of implicit judgement on tourist experience (MacCannell 1999: 103-7), in this instance it does no more than speak to the curtailment of risk; the faint yet

hovering uncertainty that the routine and now banal nature of air travel can occasionally become spectacular and tragic. The experience of within is dependent on the perception of without.

Reviewing Tomlinson's *Culture and Globalization* in 2000, Frank Lechner contended – in relation to the material quoted above - that there is not much to learn from “[...] another description of international air travel”.³⁸ This critical pronouncement was of course predicated on the assumption that little could be learnt from analysing an experience rendered as banal as that of a flight. Yet that banality was nothing more than a tissue stretched across the frame of palpable susceptibility. Writing in *The Guardian* on September 15th 2001, Ian McEwan moves quickly from describing the ‘visual impact of the scenes’ of explosion that ‘froze us in stupefied condition’ to considering the empathy unleashed by the poignancy of what are commonly regarded as limited and phatic forms of communication; phone text and voice messages. Empathy, he argues – in yet another deceptively confident formulation - is ‘to think oneself into the minds of others’, and the minimal snatches of communication that escape the planes prior to impact, last expressions of love and farewell to those on the ground, ‘compel us to imagine ourselves in that moment’. The pictures of actual impact, McEwan suggests, are fantastical; the intersection of an unprecedented event and a cinematic spectacle against the backdrop of a globally familiar skyline is paralyzing. Empathy has little possibility to extend its embrace. It is the scraps of communication and vignettes of extreme human experience, however, that puncture the environmental bubble.

McEwan's point, in a sense, is that it is only through empirical evidence that the lived experience of hijacked passengers can be guessed at, and this is at least in part because air travel as ‘a technical modality of connectivity’ (Tomlinson op. cit) strives to hollow out experience. The communication and subsequent commentaries on them by relatives are proof of prior life; such routes to empathy do not usually emerge from ‘normal’ air crashes, and in the context of Manhattan, these fragments were placed against the visual and visceral footage of bodies falling and people jumping from the twin towers. Thus empathy, that disputed cosmopolitan ‘characteristic’ – is activated by a reappraisal of

³⁸ <http://www.emory.edu/SOC/globalization/reviews/tomlinson.html>

the experience of flying, a reappraisal made possible by confirmation of what we know but manage through disavowal. A further dimension of this empathy, one more germane to the thrust of this argument, emerges if we compare McEwan's meditation on empathy with Tomlinson's litany of the in-flight routine. Being compelled to imagine ourselves in that situation, McEwan suggests, probably produces the collision of futility and the irreducible, we too would be 'crouching in the brushed-steel lavatory' attempting to reach our inner circle in the outside world. He continues:

You have very little time before some holy fool, who believes in his place in eternity, kicks in the door, slaps your head and orders you back to your seat. 23C. Here is your seat belt. There is the magazine you were reading before it all began. The banality of these details might overwhelm you. If you are not already panicking, you are clinging to a shred of hope that the captain, who spoke with such authority as the plane pushed back from the stand, will rise from the floor, his throat uncut, to take the controls.

Thus the routine, phenomenologically imbued with a familiarity and banality that produces security, is ruptured. What McEwan hints at - in an imagined grasp for routine as protection against the very collapse the routine is designed to render unthinkable - recalls the interplay of trust and risk as a 'bargain with modernity' (Giddens 1990:90). Social operation, Giddens contends, is possible only through a sublimated trust in the abstract systems that we must interact with in even the most routine activity. Thus routine, and the reliability it implies, is the interface of personal trust with systemic anonymity and action at distance. This bargain with (late) modernity is an increasingly prevalent aspect of connexity in systems that are globally diffuse and shifting – such as banking and a range of service provisions – yet activated in everyday usages and transactions. And it has been pivotal in the organisation of modern tourism and travel industries, which as Kevin Meethan argues, are emblematic of and instrumental in modernity since the seminal influence of Thomas Cook – 'an author of modernity' (2003:10). The modern lies in the way in which systems of mobility simultaneously offer the world while managing its consequences, yet transform that world in the process through the facilitation of constant discovery.

On the level of the empathetic imagination – taking Eagleton's internalising sense - a suggestion emerges here that the in-flight routine can never again function as a personal distancing from the random catastrophes that bring our trust in abstract systems into

sharp relief. Neither can it perform its ritualistic function to disavow the world beyond. Flying post September 11th – if this juxtaposition of theory and reportage is credible - has become re-humanised and randomised, and engaging in it now conceivably involves constant reflection and evaluation of that which can make itself felt in transit. It is this that precipitates a cascade of questions for the accidental cosmopolitan; mobility is seen to always involve irreducible risks, the body still only has a kinaesthetic intimation of speed and velocity yet the embodied self has greater resources with which to imagine it discordantly. And of course, the implosion of the banality of travel involves a host of irreducibly political questions. As the next sections discuss, many spaces protected by routines, rituals and myths of mobility, normality and entitlement are being contested by geo-political forces that render the disavowal of complex connectivity very difficult indeed.

Nowhere is away: shifts in spatial perception and legitimacy

Tourism has classically been regarded as playing a structural role in social life; it is liminal and ludic, and involves escape, getting away from it all, a break from the humdrum pressures of the ordinary. Many aspects of the tourist industry are clearly geared towards creating possible senses of secure transit and temporary dwelling and possession - from the presentation of place, to the management of mobility to the kinds of rarefied spaces that tourists often stay in. Such spaces work not only to limit risk, but to minimise intimations of risk and the intrusion of the world at large on the assumed legitimacies of leisure. Thus tourism often works to create what Edensor has termed enclavic spaces (2002) – spaces and places that are often themed and self-enclosed, inured against the specificities of location, and often managed through a high degree of rationalisation and surveillance. In many critiques, enclavic spaces are posited as the natural dwelling place of the typological Minority World tourist, they are ‘white ghetto hotels’ encamped in contexts where only the architecture of denial can obscure vast contradictions in life possibilities and worlds.

In the aftermath of the nightclub bombings in Bali and the attack on the Hotel Paradise in Mombassa in 2002, it could be argued that geo-political territories have been reclaiming touristic spaces to these situated concerns. Exotic locations still work to be perceived as being liminal, places to escape the pressures of modern life and find one’s self. Moreover, as Curtis and Pajaczkowska argue, the liminality of the exotic and the

exotic Other in their *appropriate place* may be seen as a way of lessening anxiety about the disruption of the binary home and away by migration and the mobility of 'vagabonds' (Bauman 1998). The alter-coherence of the exotic confirms the familiar coherences of home, and 'time out' and a 'break' are still often valued by a combination of binary juxtapositions and suggestive myths of place: "Rueful reflections on the unhurried, uncultivated pleasures of the exotic are also a celebration of the power relations that underpin the historically constituted privilege of visiting" (1994: 201).

Yet liminal spaces must be constructed and spatialised as liminal, and these attacks are extreme examples of how imaginative geographies of leisure can be ruptured by political geographies of conflict and contestation. My concern here is not with a specific analysis of the two incidents in question, but rather the ways in which the targeting of spaces imagined as being beyond territory strips privilege of its naturalisation. Getting away from it all is an implicit binary that is rarely reversed, yet it always involves a sojourn in the other's 'it all', and spaces designed for de-territorialised leisure are re-territorialised by the violent incursion of realities that are intimately bound up with the disparities of wealth and opportunity that certain forms of tourism are held to symbolise and exacerbate. The enclavic bubble of the grimly inappropriate Paradise Hotel in Mombassa, and the more porous yet softly enclavic spaces of tourism in Bali, are suddenly rendered unsustainable in a world where physical or psychological insulation is difficult.

Writing in *The New Statesman* in the aftermath of the nightclub bombings in Bali and the attack on the Hotel Paradise in Mombassa, David Nicholson-Lord attacks what he assumes to be the residual prevalence of liminal partying and quests for self-discovery in areas of the world cast as destinations regardless of their volition or suitability. As he polemically contends:

Rich westerners can 'find themselves' via Byronic meanderings through poor countries. And if they can't find themselves, or if they're not really bothering to look, never mind, they can get stuck into other, less highfalutin commodities instead: sun, sea, sand, sex, drugs, booze. Above all perhaps, they can escape, from the grimy and pressurised routine of their lives to distant paradises and wildernesses where reality is suspended, miracles occur and ends of the rainbows are located. (2002: 26)

With commendable journalistic economy, Nicholson-Lord here compresses a wealth of standard tourism sociology; the desire for the other place always involves the opposite of the everyday (Urry, 2002) and in contemporary, primarily Western consumer societies holidays assume a special significance through the widespread displacement of individual meaning and personal investment from work to leisure (Bauman 1999, 2001, Bunting 2004). His point is clear: this liminality is only achievable in situations where spaces and places are constructed and spatialised as liminal. For Lord, however, the key to understanding attacks on tourists involves examining how the delusion of getting away from *it* is sustained in a world where interdependence is making itself felt forcefully and urgently.

To extrapolate from Nicholson-Lord's polemic, the discarded metaphor of the environmental bubble continues to provide something of an operational symbol for the layers of cultural, physical, technical and economic protectionism that attempt to sustain nothing less than an uncritical acceptance of unfettered, privileged mobility. An analysis of situated all-inclusive resorts is dealt with at length in chapter three of this thesis, but in this context the appalling symbolism of an attack on the all-to-grimly apposite Paradise Resort cannot pass without mention. The all-inclusive – derided categorically as a 'reservation-style experience' – is loaded with symbolism irrespective of the divergent practices and atmospheres of specific sites. Its stark delineation of inside and outside, leisure and world, is a dichotomy that threatens tourism in a world where insulation is being exposed as grimly artificial.

Thus, Nicholson-Lord contends, western descriptions of tourists as 'soft targets' – which in an incontrovertible sense of this they are – are an evasion that do not confront the consequences of under-development, the roles of tourism in this complex political-economic picture, and the symbolism of segregated tourism in a variety of contexts. And as he hints in conclusion, a salutary observation for tourists is the complicity of tourist industries in minimising the extent and nature of risks in situations where the systemic management of risk falters. In other words, the primary environmental bubble of tourism is the cultural assumption that *anywhere can be a destination*, an assumption itself embedded in a deeper surety of the absolute right to travel. Thus, to borrow softly from Althusser, disparate tourists are constantly hailed as *tourists* by the banalisation of a panoply of myths of desire and availability, and by the naturalisation of the

'historically constituted privilege of visiting' as no more than a commodity transaction, as the overwhelming criteria for legitimating tourism. As he concludes:

What is surprising (about attacks on tourists) is that the tourists themselves, when it happens, are surprised. A few inquiries, a little bit of thought, would surely indicate that much of the planet is in turmoil or despair and that to go on partying in the midst of it all, or trying to 'find oneself', is at the very least in questionable taste..If industry refuses to spell out the issues and risks, individual travellers will have to do it for themselves – or risk paying the price. For independent travellers and package tourists alike, the world is steadily getting more dangerous. Innocence may be blameless; ignorance, after Bali and Mombassa, looks all too culpable. (2002: 27).

There are obvious limits to this kind of writing, for one it overlooks both the specificity of Bali as a predominantly Hindu island, where the centrality of tourism to the island has also created a particular type of safe and liminal space for other Indonesians, thus creating it as a hybrid target for radical factions. Similarly, the presence of Israeli tourists in Mombassa elevates that incident way beyond a straightforward attack on western-capitalist interests and lifestyles. Despite discussing specific incidents, tourists are a comfortably homogenous category for Nicholson-Lord, and are imagined solely as impositions. There is no room in his unquestioningly replicated dichotomies of home and away for the possibility of more nuanced and transgressive tourist experiences and presences. Nevertheless, the indiscriminate nature of the violence indicates that foregrounding such nuances may be little more than academic housekeeping; these dichotomies are increasingly ascribed in the identities and dynamics of actual conflicts.

From his analysis, however, we can add a second tier of questions for accidental cosmopolitanism, building on the destabilisation of mobility discussed previously. Tourists do not visit 'a place' – geographies of conflict invite more complex imaginative geographies that recognise the often patchwork, heterogeneous and zonal nature of globalised spaces (Sassen 2001). In a very stark sense, this brings Mike Featherstone's ubiquitous quotation about 'the end of insulation' (1993: 169) into relief; what can my leisure never be insulated against? What is broadly at stake in this need for and attempt at insulation? How do I sustain an imaginative disjuncture between the complex reality I inhabit and the inscription of a simplified, desired alterity elsewhere? Ultimately, in certain contexts, is a profound cosmopolitanism to be found in not moving?

Being who I/they want me to be: ascribed and affective identities

There are many senses in which the licence and imagination of leisure is under pressure, and an aspect of this that can be developed from the previous section is the crude re-implosion of ascribed political identities on people in spaces where expressive identities are central to the leisure experience. If myths of place and space underpin the sublimated privilege of mobility and leisure, visions of self in the other place underpin expectations of the extraordinary. As Abram et al (1997) contend, the desire for bodily experience in tourism is at least as important as and often artificially plied from the emphasis on the visual (Urry 1991, 2002). Thus the lifestyle explosion of pre-holiday tanning, dieting and exercise - recuperative actions historically and still consistently associated with tourism – suggest the importance of an imagined self in destination, as well as the thorough imbrication of the touristic in consumer practices and urban spaces. Similarly, while the dictum of the touristic as the opposite of the everyday is contested in analyses that refuse to treat tourism as a discrete practice or industry (Crang 2001, Meethan 2003), the liminality of certain tourist practices – most obviously that of the gap year or backpacking - stems from the established possibility of being temporarily beyond ascribed and potentially restrictive social roles and structure³⁹ (Mowforth & Munt 1998).

To provide an instructive example, the BSkyB programme *Sex on the Beach* – which employs a possibly ironic documentary approach, replete with ‘research’ – provides interesting glimpses of multiple selves at play. In the first episode ‘John’, an inspector

³⁹ It is interesting to note the ways in which the idea of the ‘gap year’ has changed, particularly in the UK. As the name suggests, it was originally conceived as a time out between school and work or university, and carries traces of Romantic notions of travel and education. However, as Lynne Chisholm and Siyka Kovacheva argue, “Young people in today’s Europe experience longer and more complex transitions to adult life. Highly flexible pathways replace formerly more standardised tracks towards employment and family building” (2002: 32). Thus the gap year is now often seen by prospective employers as something of a necessity for particular candidates, as it is seen as an acceptable degree of latitude and individuality within these flexible pathways. Moreover, the spectrum of gap year travellers has broadened far beyond a school-leaving cohort to include people whose working lives also reflect increased ‘flexibilisation’. For example: “‘Life is almost becoming a series of gap years’, according to Tom Griffiths, founder of Gapyear.com. ‘We come across those who are going before they have bought a property and dived into a long-term relationship, those who are settled and want to take off before they have kids, those who have had young kids and want to travel while they are portable and amenable, those whose children have left home, and those who are retired’”. John Crace, ‘New year, new horizons’. *The Guardian Travel*, December 28 2002

with the Royal Automobile Association in Burnley, is traced as he single-mindedly pursues clear sexual objectives. His current strategy involves pretending to be a fireman, and often without invitation, offering a fireman's lift to both voluntary and involuntary recipients. In an interview segment sandwiched by action shots, 'John' confides:

I've actually come on this holiday to be who I want to be and here I'm going to be a fireman, it makes me happy and the birds love it.

While guarding against over-interpretation, it is nevertheless significant that 'John' ties his entire self-justification for the holiday to the release of an expressive self, and in direct contra-distinction to the work role he implicates as limiting and unfulfilling. Holidays and work are a highly generalised and constant opposition; "By imagining the vacation as a space in the structuring of time, work is counterbalanced by the promise of temporal alterity, and with the accompanying promise of a revitalisation" (Curtis & Pajaczkowska 1994: 200). However John's revitalisation is intensified by the debilitating context of his labour. The holiday - as a central ritual of consumption as well as an experience of hyper-consumption - can be seen following Bauman (1999) as being inscribed within contemporary British society as a space for personal meaning and empowerment in a society where work is increasingly characterised by insecurity and tedium.

As Bauman frames it – in what may be criticised as an elegant reworking of Frankfurt School critiques of mass society - consumer societies provide incessant ameliorative resources for everything but the sources of social discontent: "There is a wide and widening spectrum of 'substitute pastimes', symptomatic in the shift from things that matter but about which nothing can be done to things that matter less or do not matter, but which can be dealt with and handled" (2001: 150). More directly, Madeleine Bunting argues that: "(As consumers) we indulge ourselves, express ourselves and feel powerful as we exercise choice, (as employees) we are required to be self-disciplined, compliant and patient".⁴⁰ This is echoed in what Michael Bracewell identifies as the disconnect between the 'rhetoric of intimacy' and the 'culture of endlessly deferred accountability' in 'Call Centre Britain' (2003: 22). Aspects of tourism may seep into

⁴⁰ Bunting, Madeleine "New Year same grind". *The Guardian* January 6 2003. See also Bunting (2004).

everyday life for a range of reasons (see Franklin 2003), yet in these particular socio-economic circumstances it remains a modality and circumscribed life-space that is intensified in its fluidity through contra-distinction with the 'everyday'.

Thus while the argument that 'we have all become tourists most of the time' (Urry 2002, Franklin 2003, Meethan 2001) encapsulates the ways in which touristic practices, aesthetics and desires bleed into wider modalities of consumption, it is still important to focus on the intensified experience of physical tourism within what Franklin and Crang describe as the shift from 'cultural tourism to touristic culture' (2001: 10). In this instance, the telling aside from one participant in a television show suggests that the promise of physical re-location still holds the possibility of, if not 'finding oneself', at least 'playing with one's selves'. Yet once again, these dynamics of individual consumption and identity play need to be read in the wider geo-political milieu that brings about what Avtar Brah theorises as the intersection of socio-political identity with subjectivities (1996, 2004).

The disbelief of 'soft targeting', as I suggested in the previous section, stems in part from the re-imposition of ascribed identities on expressive ones in contexts where territory re-marks destination. Spaces of play are encroached upon by the irresistible logic of geo-political milieus, thus tourists, playing with or negotiating their identities in a context where alterity permits fluidity, increasingly find this fluidity stunted by what Pickering has described as the 'trump card of national identity' (2000). Stepping out never extends beyond a passport, and just as the 'visa-friendly passport' (Calhoun 2002: 89) legally and imaginatively sanctions global mobility, its possession in-territory sanctions the homogenising logic of political targeting. Thus tourists are recalled from the extraordinary by the undifferentiated warnings of Foreign Ministries, entry procedures and foisted collectivity. Rod Liddle, in a *Guardian* article written in early 2003 and tellingly entitled 'They all hate us. So where do I go on holiday?' draws an ever-decreasing map of possibilities for British tourists, a recession linked to 'a splendid agglomeration of convictions associated with politics, (specifically postcolonial) religion, culture or football'. He continues:

So it was always a depressing and restricted activity, choosing a summer holiday. But not half as much as it is now. Everybody in the world, it seems, hates us these days

because of our two-step alongside George Bush. We are no longer merely pissed us, licentious, arrogant, ignorant exploitative Brits. Now we're war-mongering, supplicant, pissed-up, licentious, arrogant exploitative Brits.

Without undue portentousness, it is possible to examine here how tourism and geopolitics produce a cosmopolitanism that is at least Kantian in the dilemma it faces; if Kant opposed the transfer of the monarchical right of sovereigns to send subjects into war on their behalf to the concept of duty in the nation-state (Fine & Cohen 2002: 143), tourists here face the difficulty of resisting the ineluctable transfer of representivity regardless of their politics or individuated inclinations. While the impossibility of non-representivity is argued to be a constitutive element of nationality by Gellner (1983) among others, the post 9-11 world has witnessed an intensification and tautening of the dimensions of nationality in that social practice assumed to loosen its prescriptive parameters.⁴¹ This is discernable in the online poll conducted by the website gapyear.com, which in January 2003 asked prospective gap-year travellers if and how they would adapt their travel plans if the then proposed invasion of Iraq materialised.⁴²

The irruption of cosmopolitan problematics does not end with the self-realisation of representivity, it arguably begins with the invitation to recast 'distant others' as 'significant others' (Tomlinson 1999: 207). Gary Younge – in another article displaying the ways in which tourism has become stitched into the new horizons of political debate – suggests that the inability to *escape* political identities on the move does nothing more than fleetingly reflect a majority experience of immobilisation and marginalisation:

But with the condemnation of the attacks (in Bali and Mombassa) came indignation that there was something particularly heinous about anyone being killed on holiday. This is not only ludicrous because it presumes that paradise can reside in incredibly poor nations, like Indonesia and Kenya, where impoverished people have suffered under repressive governments that the west has propped up for years. But primarily because it suggests that we can take weekend breaks from the mayhem of which we are an integral part and to which our governments have contributed. Israeli and Australian holidaymakers can no more escape the horrors of terrorism on the beach than Palestinians can escape the tyranny of the Israeli army in their own homes or Afghan refugees can flee their incarceration at the hands of the Australian

⁴¹ This is not to imply that tourism does not also involve the performance and articulation of national identities and nationalism, see for example Meethan (2001) on heritage sites and practices of 'imagined community'.

⁴² www.gapyear.com sourced 12 January 2003

government. The same is true for the British, Americans and every other democratic nation (2002).

This argument recalls Žižek's discussion of the innocence of the victims of the World Trade centre attacks; entirely and profoundly innocent victims, yet "[...] this very innocence however, is not innocent – to adopt such an innocent position in today's global capitalist universe is itself a false abstraction (2002: 50) (see also Cohen 2001). For Younge, inescapable representivity does not mean responsibility for what is done in one's name, but that 'we are collectively responsible for the actions of the people who claim to represent us'. Whether or not one agrees with this, these examples signify a heightened rupture between the foundational liminality of modern tourism – movement beyond webs of social significance - and the inextricable nature of webs of political significance inscribed in the modern project of nation-states and international relations.

The power relations that were held to obscure the privilege of visiting now noticeably disrupt the ways in which a visit can be conceived. The established dichotomies of tourism – home/away, structure/non-structure – are once more diluted by the import of the violently ordinary in the pleurably extraordinary. Thus one is hailed as a tourist and hailed back as a political subject ascribed in roles that transcend and transgress the tourist self, and perhaps hailed to wonder at the constancy of these transgressions in the lives of the immobilised. As Younge's analysis indicates, this may lead to some very basic cosmopolitan questions on belonging and life possibilities, and the enforced reflexivity of ascription may entail a reflection on the process and dynamics of othering.

All the world's on stage

To return to Madonna, the extent of her celebrity does little more than amplify the discordant conflict between her personal narrative of travel and presence, and the ways in which her presence is performatively staged and instrumentalised by a range of agents. Madonna's visit, in basic terms, provided an opportunity to project and attempt to cement particular visions of Israel, to attempt to monitor and manage connotations of place in relation to images of destination. This aspect of globalised tourism will be discussed at length in relation to the Caribbean in the next chapter; here it can be used to sketch out another dimension of accidental cosmopolitanism. Both the Israeli tourism minister and the protestors were acutely aware that Madonna's visit was not just an opportunity for general publicity, but a chance to struggle for the primacy of their

images of place. The minister was involved in developing a global brand, in attempting to re-position Israel as a potential location of leisure despite the overwhelming connotations of conflict which are generally attached to it. The protestors, on the other hand, were engaged in what could be termed global shaming; consciously playing on disparities between preferred images and other possible visions, as well as making transparent the spatial and narrative strategies required to marginalise an awareness of those disparities. As John Urry asks;

Are 'societies' increasingly forming themselves *within* such an evolving complex (of global 'values' and dispositions) and will they be subject to scandalized disapproval if they do not display cosmopolitanism upon the world screen? (2003: 133)

Forming is an ambiguous verb here; I would contend that avowedly global projections of nations, societies and places are reflexively aware that they must conform to discourses that avoid particular types of scandalized disapproval. It is in and around this that a globalized politics of image is forming. As Bella Dicks argues, cultures – articulated through nation-states – are now globally on display, projecting images that overlap in their appeal to tourists, investors and, more generally, to something called a global public. Places and public environments, she argues, increasingly respond to the 'tourist imaginary' by explaining and narrating themselves through 'legible and coherent' narratives and symbols. Furthermore:

The world as exhibition drives nation-states too. In relation to contemporary world expositions, Umberto Eco (1986) argues that 'the prestige game is won by the country that best tells what it does, independently of what it actually does' (1986:296). This indicates the extent to which powers of display have become central to the global competition among places and corporations for economic success...this is achieved through hosting mega-events such as world cups, expos, Olympics and city of culture years, and by engaging in media-focused public relations activity. It reflects what has now become a global culture of self-promotion (2004: 17)

What this quotation does not stress is the ways in which tourism centres a repertoire of national images, myths and connotations that are replayed, recast and amplified by mega-events and one-off major activities. Furthermore, the imagic grammar of tourism is imbricated within and across appeals to transnational investment and wider publics, indeed it has been noted in contexts such as Ireland and the Caribbean that discourses of pre-modernity enhance rather than undermine their attractiveness as industrial and post-industrial locations (Cronin & O'Connor ed. 2003, Gibbons 1996, Klak 1996). As the next chapter discusses, the development of a national brand has become central to global

performativity, and tourism is a crucial conduit for articulating distinctive images and narratives of place on the global stage. These images are highly reflexive, and built on a synoptical awareness of ‘how the world sees us’.

It is this fragility and reflexivity that problematises tourist presence in many different locations. As the Madonna vignette suggests, her presence is held both to bolster official discourse, and re-framed to undermine the attempted normalcy of that discourse. Her presence is simultaneously instrumentalised by two divergent interest groups; what she sees and does not see, who she is seen with and not seen with, these moving interpretations of her movement through a ‘destination’ are beyond her control. Her presence is an opportunity for the fleeting particularisation of wider and involved issues. The presence of tourists in certain contexts becomes political capital for ‘internal’ struggles by magnifying the implications of presence on the world stage.

There are countless examples of this dynamic that can be cited. In Jamaica, for example, government officials have sporadically criticised Amnesty International over the last three years and intimated that it should not operate in Jamaica. Their argument alleged that Amnesty investigations into the extra-judicial execution of civilians by the Jamaican police force was likely to damage the image of Jamaica as a tourist destination.⁴³ In this instance, ‘defence of the image of the nation’ is articulated in terms of damage done on the global stage, but the implicit effect is to marginalise the domestic impact of civil society. Defence of the image constitutes political capital and reasonable political rhetoric, and damage to the image would seem to be a late-capitalist form of treason. The idea of responsibility to ‘the image’ is discussed at length in the next chapter. Staying in the Caribbean, human rights groups in Jamaica and Barbados have publicly denounced police actions in certain areas for what could be termed *brand cleansing*; forcibly removing those who look ‘out of place’ out of the place. However there is also a suggestion that this has met with the approval of domestic class-based interests. Thus in a reprise on the first example, projected images of place and the ways in which they are performed and secured becomes instrumental in wider processes of social control.

⁴³ Decca Aitkenhead discusses public accusations against Amnesty of cultural imperialism and Government accusations of ‘sabotaging’ the tourist industry in ‘Murder in Jamaica’, *New Statesman* 31 March 2003 p28. For Amnesty’s report on police activity in Jamaica see <http://web.amnesty.org/library/index/ENGAMR380122001>

As Madonna encountered, both soft and coercive attempts at national brand management and instrumentalisation are contested by a range of different voices and constituencies, and in the cases cited above, this dissent also strives to be heard on the global stage. Within what we could – with reservations (see Barker 2002) – call hegemonic and counter-hegemonic struggles over image, the absence and presence of tourists takes on suggestive and inescapably politicised dimensions. Particularly in the case of Burma, the presence and actions of tourists are held to be significant in legitimising and normalising not only certain narratives of place over others, but in conferring legitimacy on the nation-state itself. Under these conditions of globality, projected images are precious and fragile constructions, and their centrality to the politics of investment and wider legitimacy increasingly present a target for marginalised and oppositional politics. Through these interventions, unproblematic images and senses of place are disturbed as tourists are to some extent made aware of their own instrumentalisation and the competing imaginative geographies of place that struggle to unsettle dominant projections. Accidental cosmopolitanism appears in the direct invitation to a dialogic approach that the instrumentalisation of presence brings; how can I be seen and spoken for in these terms?

My aim in this chapter has been to situate cosmopolitanism as a useful discursive fluid – where complementary and competing ideas of cosmopolitanism shuttle between disciplines, situated analyses and theoretical constructions – and as a mobilising metaphor for the ways in which actively seeking to think through connexity always involves re-negotiating interpretations of self in relation to other, and narration in relation to inscription. The focus on tourism has deliberately refrained from venerating particular practices or from constructing the tourist as the new, counter-intuitive and romantic typology of Cultural Studies. Instead I have argued that more and more aspects of tourism involve *accidental cosmopolitanism*; the inescapability of reflecting on how one is implicated in the connexity and power geometry of political and economic globalisation. Increasingly, tourism is less about ‘getting away from it all’ than realising that we are always implicated in ‘away’, and ‘away’ is always impacting on us.

The next chapter investigates the purchase of this idea in the Caribbean, lands of fun in the sun, where countless accounts and descriptions deride tourism as a fetish of

globalisation, and where “[...] tourists continue to enjoy their holiday whatever the misery beyond the security gate”.⁴⁴

⁴⁴ Pattullo, Polly “All for one”, *The Guardian*, Saturday May 22 1999.

Chapter 3

Paradise, porousness and panopticism

*There is a territory wider than this, wider than the limits made by the map of an island,
which is the illimitable sea and what it remembers.* (Walcott 1992: 10)

*Was there for two weeks, so how come I never tell that natty dread drinks at the
Sheraton hotel? The Clash, 'Safe European Home'*

3.1 Introduction: Negotiating the contours of the Caribbean

The concept of imaginative geography developed in this thesis hinges on the indissoluble relationship between mapping and inscribing. What does this imply for something called the 'imagined Caribbean'? At first glance, this label seems to do nothing more than articulate what is implicit in all historical-geographical concepts; that geo-political territories have been 'imagined' within shifting discourses and relationships of power, and from different sites and possibilities of agency (Said 1978, on Africa see Mudimbe 1994, on Europe, Mikkeli 1998, Delanty 2003). The imagined Caribbean then, is plainly not the other of a self-evident place. There have always been imagined Caribbeans, and in a region of ethnic, national and linguistic difference, commonality and hybridity, intra-regional cultural and institutional ideas of the Caribbean are themselves deeply perspectival.⁴⁵ At a basic level, the Caribbean implies a series of overlapping and hybrid geographies, including, according to Norman Girvan, the geographical island chain, the basin area, what he terms the larger ethno-historic zone, and the transnationalised community of the Caribbean (2000:31-2). The *imagined Caribbean* under discussion is not an additional category, but is immanent in this multi-accentual geography.

This imagined Caribbean appears to be as banal as it is familiar, while inviting comment on the nature of banality.⁴⁶ The familiar recipe of Caribbean island paradise – the realm of 'fantasy islands' (O'Connell Davidson & Sánchez Taylor 1999:53) - is nothing if not banal, reproduced and circulated to the extent that only the most jarring juxtapositions attract comment. One of these is on the wall beside me; posters for a Caribbean theme

⁴⁵ This is hardly surprising or less than ubiquitous; at the time of writing (June 2004) former territories of the Austro-Hungarian Empire and the Hanseatic League were commonly referred to as 'joining Europe'.

⁴⁶ In fact, this may even be something of an entry point to Caribbean studies, as Sandra Courtman points out: "As researchers, we need to work with a sensuous, fecund and prelapsarian Caribbean in relation to a real material world with its ugly histories and with lives that are sometimes far from idyllic" (2004: xvi)

week in Helsinki school canteens, where the generous addition of tinned pineapple chunks to the regulation salad was accompanied by faux-naïve images of (pastel) white people in hammocks on deserted beaches. This prize artefact is flanked by the more ubiquitous and mundane; texts and images accumulated over years, that when taken together flesh out the logic of the exotic. Film posters, magazine stills and newspaper images jostle for attention amidst the overwhelming flow of advertisements that advocate a range of products – the Caribbean among them. It is here that banality is encountered in all of its tropical glory; a “brochure discourse” (Dann 1996) of tropes that can be deployed for any set of paradise islands⁴⁷, and particularised by the deployment of familiar cultural markers (MacCannell 1976).

The contours of the banal Caribbean are easily outlined; the texts and taglines of tourism are unerringly on-message. The website of the St Lucia tourist board foregrounds a typically empty beach, and provides a synthesising encouragement:

St Lucia is for travelers seeking pleasure and enrichment through the wonder of the undiscovered, the adventures of the unfamiliar, the freshness of the unspoiled and the stimulation of the exotic.

The ‘culture of the brochure’ (Walcott 1995) naturally extends beyond St Lucia to the rest of ‘the islands’. It is almost tempting to read this brochure discourse as an elaborate, ironic commentary on the preoccupations of critical theory, a nod and a wink in the

⁴⁷ I discuss this in an essay “All Sights Reserved: All-Inclusive Resorts and the Imagined Caribbean” through an analysis of Disney’s Caribbean Beach Resort and the idea of theming. The resort in Florida is organised around different islands of accommodation – Martinique, Barbados, Trinidad, Aruba and Jamaica – that illustrate how “Themes interweave the literal and the connotative; hence tourist villages named after actual islands cling to the liminally evocative Barefoot Bay. The choice of island is thoughtful; those present represent popular destinations and a linguistic index of the region, and it is probable that Grenada, Cuba and Haiti are absent to avoid confusion and ambivalence in a US market” (2004: 205). In comparing this production to the general patterns of spatialisation and theming to be found in all-inclusive resorts, I argued that this type of Disney resort represents the ultimate result of the regional theming of the Caribbean; “The Caribbean theme park could just as easily be physically located in the Caribbean, as it simulates the imagined Caribbean crucial to the region’s tourism in a fluctuating and competitive global tourist economy” (2004: 206). It is also worth noting that theming in Caribbean tourism extends to themes which interplay suggestively; Mimi Sheller describes the ways cruise ships theme a ‘generic tropical resort’ often with Orientalist accents, playing on complementary myths of luxury and sexual indulgence (2004: 18). Robert E. Wood has tied this themed promiscuousness closely to the logic of the cruise ship as a highly structured experience, where tourists may be relieved of most of the work of constructing the fantasy. As he notes, the variety of themes on board ships can be seen as preparation for the “[...] ultimate in fantasyscapes...the fantasy islands, privately owned by the cruise companies, off-limits to all but their passengers and employees, and marketed as the true Caribbean experience – only better” (2000: 360-1).

direction of established critiques of Othering.⁴⁸ This clutch of paradise islands - undifferentiated and deterritorialised within the Caribbean meme – are available yet undiscovered, pristine yet sanitised, globally commodified yet liminally pre-modern. The sensuousness of the tropics hangs heavy in the air and sways rhythmically in its embodiments; “[...] the female body and the exotic are one; they are the Caribbean” (Strachan 2002: 88), while the ‘primitiveness’ of the male is ‘exotic and goes with the island’ (quoted in O’Connell Davidson & Sanchez Taylor 1999: 49). Privacy is the condition of fantasy; the scope of inclusivity can be extended to key players, yet contact remains contingent on coherence. After all, paradise promises the freedom to step out, to disengage from webs of social attachments and entanglements, to gaze on, soak up and relax in a setting that corresponds to the dreams that may lead us there:

As guests step ashore at Holland America Line’s new Half Moon Cay private island destination, the tune of Bobby McFerrin’s free-spirited “Don’t worry be Happy” may come to mind. Half Moon Cay recalls the idyllic Caribbean of 30 years ago. There are no hassles. It’s just you and a balmy island with a white sand beach, coral reefs and a clutter-free arrangement of attractive facilities designed for casual roaming (quoted in Wood 2000: 361-2)

The Caribbean – enacted through shifting knots of the themes hinted at above - carries a connotative import beyond the fluid borders of touristic enticement, an import which manages to remain somewhat unique in a cultural economy that scours the globe for commodifiable cultures and identities⁴⁹ (Harvey 1989, Howes 1996, Klein 2002, Stevenson 2003). This is evident from a stroll in a supermarket aisle; Alpen Caribbean –

⁴⁸ Sourced from the homepage of the St Lucia Tourist Board, www.stlucia.org. What is interesting about this imagery is primarily its studious reflexivity; in many of the interviews I conducted with tourism professionals they were absolutely aware of the symbolic economy they were calling on, as well as the range of connotations it puts into play.

⁴⁹ This is a relative emphasis; as several commentators have noted, the degree of mobilities within and without Caribbean transnational networks, and the range of ways in which Caribbean cultural forms have been influential and integrated within globalised flows of music, food, fashion, etc means that, in Sheller’s near reverse, Caribbean cultures ‘escape’ (2004: 21, see also Bradley 2001, Gilroy 1987, Hebdige 1987). Similarly, this also depends on the ways in which the ‘Caribbean’ is particularised within different national images. Jamaica, for example, has often been regarded as experiencing a tension between its generic Caribbean image (with an emphasis on ‘Hedonism’ and luxury) and its somewhat sensationalised image as a violent society and exporter of criminality (for an excellent discussion see Gunst 1995). Moreover, recent discussions of the sports company Puma’s attempt to ‘hitch their falling star to a deprived island’ (Kelner 2004) by sponsoring the Jamaican Olympic team and several reggae acts has illustrated the ways in which images and connotations also escape. This is well documented in the Channel 4 film ‘Trainers, Reggae and the Olympics’.(broadcast 14 November 2004).

purveyor of the sunshine breakfast – is accompanied by Alpen Original and Alpen Nutty Crunch, not Alpen Balearic or Alpen Orkneys.⁵⁰ Despite belonging to the parent company, Lilt will never be accused of *coca-colonisation*, not while “[...] it’s ‘totally tropical’ taste brings the Caribbean feel good feeling into the lives of those who drink it”.⁵¹ And so forth. Just as the rhetoric of the brochure holds out the promise of paradise, the Caribbean also lends its myths to products and services that travel to us. It’s in the casual theming of bars, events and parties⁵², in the downloadable screen savers that kick in with complementary images of island escapism when our minds take a wander from the monitor⁵³, and in the barely suppressed smirk of acquaintances who have just been told that you do research on the Caribbean.

This familiar grammar of paradise islands - and those that live and (don’t work) in them - is assuredly stitched tight in the fabric of imagined geographies of the Caribbean.⁵⁴ This assertion is obviously a highly qualified one, devoid of the situated insights of qualitative investigation, and predicated on the awareness that there are “[...] probably as many mental maps and imaginary places as there are viewers” (and consumers, tourists and gazers) (Larsen 1999: 114). It is important only so far in that it recognises the ubiquity of these images, and more importantly, reintroduces the interlocking dimensions of imaginative geography discussed at length in chapter one. If mapping and

⁵⁰ “Crunchy rice and wheat clusters, Papaya, Pineapple, Banana and toasted Coconut all combine to give you a taste of the Caribbean every morning”. <http://www.weetabix.co.uk/brands/alpenaribbean/default>

⁵¹ http://clubcocacola.net/v5/docs/AboutCoke_facts_studentpack.pdf

⁵² <http://www.themedeventsuk.co.uk/caribbean> provides ideas as to how to intertwine themes from movies, styles, places, and so forth.

⁵³ Caribbean theme packages for a desktop can be sourced from <http://www.ppc4all.com/appdetail.phpid=2202>

⁵⁴ A special edition of *The Sunday Times Travel* in August/September 2004, entitled ‘Fantasy Islands’, presents a twenty-two page guide to the Caribbean. The magazine cover features a young white woman in a white bikini nestling in the curve of a palm tree on an otherwise empty beach. Thirty-three photos spread over these twenty-two glossy pages could provide material for an easy introduction to content analysis; sixteen are exclusively of the beach and sea, more than half of those that feature tourists show them alone on the beach, and the vast majority of those that feature ‘locals’ involve dancing, fruit and fish, or smiling children looking directly at the camera. While banality is at work here, it is hardly mysterious; this is a magazine selling holidays, and the categories of photos present – while representative of obvious forms of touristic gaze – can be found in many different representations of tropical destinations (Dann 1996). What is interesting is their durability and congruence; I would speculate that a similar magazine from ten and twenty years before – allowing for the development of increased destinations and leisure activities – would have been broadly similar in terms of the categories of image types.

inscribing are indissoluble, how are we and others inscribed and inscribing in these familiar maps of the Caribbean?

The banality of images and connotations of something called the Caribbean stems not only from their ubiquity and tired, strained deployment, but from the intensity of the processes that have raised these historical cultural perspectives to the status of the natural. The echoes of Barthes here are deliberate, and it could be argued that the meta-imagery of the Caribbean still fits snugly into his seminal analysis. As Strachan (2002) and Sheller (2003) have painstakingly detailed, the historical and motivated images of the Caribbean - produced, disciplined and adapted within discourses of knowledge and representation, that are themselves inscribed in vast asymmetries of power and agency – have always sought the ‘natural justification’ of myth. The banal, taken-for-granted Caribbean, “[...] the image of a land of fun in the sun” (Strachan 2002: 267) derives its enduring and complex obviousness from processes of de-historicisation and de-politicisation that recall the purifying function of myth:

Myth does not deny things, on the contrary its function is to talk about them; simply it purifies them, it makes them innocent, it gives them a natural and eternal justification, it gives them a clarity which is not that of an explanation but that of a statement of fact (Barthes 1989: 156)

What could be more natural and eternal than beaches in the tropics that, even allowing for the stylised language and techniques of brochure discourse, can be seen to exist? If the polished innocence of myth depends on the veracity of its first-order signs, these signs would seem to exist in abundance in the Caribbean, or at least be capable of being wished and performed into existence. Therefore a further dimension of this banality – which builds on and adapts the airbrushed legacy of colonial constructions – is that this imagined Caribbean must constantly be re-invented, remobilised and re-produced within parameters that barely seem to shift. This Caribbean is hard work; the ‘natural and eternal justification’ of the meta-Caribbean is secured through embodiment, performance, spatialisation and a constant reflexive grooming of the ‘product’. If myth is socially constructed reality passing as natural, a whole variety of questions present themselves as to the process of construction and the sites and possibilities of agency that are involved.

Tourism offers the most obvious mode of engagement with this profoundly mythic scape, and indeed the needs of tourism – understood, as we shall see, in its broadest sense – underpin the multiple processes that feed into the constant regeneration of an eternal Caribbean. As this chapter will argue, while it is received wisdom that tourists hold stereotypes of their destinations, it is less recognised that actors in the tourist industry hold structurally orienting stereotypes of tourists and the fantasyscape tourists may expect to encounter, move through, and remain unperturbed by. The agencies, services and offer of tourism depend on a ‘lowest common denominator Caribbean’; they must assume that this Caribbean is expected, and work towards the expected expectations of those they expect to interact with. If this Caribbean must be believed to be seen, the greatest leap of faith may well be among the disparate providers of and actors in tourism, who must believe that they can always reflexively incorporate the imaginative mappings that are fleetingly transposed on their environments. The imagined Caribbean, then, is not a crude contemporary imposition of a condensed historical gaze, but an ongoing *negotiation* of perspectives and assumptions that takes place in an unequal yet complex geometry of agency, possibility, need and investment.

This negotiation takes place in and across discourses of tourism; touristic images are always on the move, and this realisation helps to explain the apparent contradiction between what I have argued is the congruency of touristic images and the conditions of informational diffuseness discussed in chapter one. Images of place and culture are subject to strategies of ‘indexing and dragging’ (Rojek 1997) in a globalised environment, and ‘brochure discourse’ bleeds into forms of popular representation such as advertising, film and television productions, and wider industrial and economic planning and marketing⁵⁵. What makes this assumed imagination *immanent* in the

⁵⁵ It is interesting to observe the ways in which touristic images – the grammar of leisure – are instrumentalised in economic discourse as ways of framing and selling locations as investment destinations. The semiotic capital of tourism is an advantage, not a problem, when it comes to framing a national site for multinational interest. Thomas Klak and Garth Myers, in a qualitative survey and analysis of foreign investment promotional materials and handbooks, argue that “[...] guidebooks are crucial statements of how a Caribbean government wishes to present the country to the outside world” (1998: 91). They highlight a ‘profits in paradise’ theme in the brochures and contend that it marks both a realisation of the centrality of tourism to regional economies, and also an appealing discursive framework that can be put to work on the level of mythology. In a somewhat parallel reflection, Luke Gibbons, in ‘The Myth of Modernization in Irish Culture’, examines the apparently contradictory yet deeply complementary relationship between images of industrial capacity promoted by the Irish Development Agency, and images of the rural idyll promoted by the Irish Tourist Board (1996: 86-93). Michael Cronin and Barbara O’Connor neatly summarise his argument: “Critics failed to see how Ireland could present itself in IDA

human geography of the Caribbean is that these assumptions – to context-specific degrees and ways – permeate multiple aspects of social life. It is this permeation that, at first glance, makes my choice of the idea of negotiation seem hopelessly devoid of a critique of power. Polly Pattullo, for example, spells out the coercive implications of a fantasy that engulfs anyone caught in its gaze:

It is the fortune, and the misfortune, of the Caribbean to conjure up the idea of ‘heaven on earth’ or ‘a little bit of paradise’ in the collective European imagination...That utopia was to some extent reinforced by Columbus who speculated that he had encountered a terrestrial paradise. In his footsteps were countless travellers bringing back news of its natural beauty. Thus the region, whatever the brutality of its history, kept its reputation as a Garden of Eden before the Fall. The idea of a tropical island was a further seductive image...not only the place, but the people, too, are required to conform to this stereotype. The Caribbean person, from the Amerindians whom Columbus met in that initial encounter to the twentieth-century taxi driver whom tourists meet at the airport, is expected to satisfy those images associated with paradise and Eden. (1996: 142)

These expectations of satisfaction have been documented in a variety of ways; O’Connell Davison and Sanchez Taylor, for example, explore desires in sex tourism in the Caribbean that are underpinned by gendered and racialised mythologies, where people embody the lush sensuousness of the landscape they are inherently part of. ‘They’ are more ‘natural’ sexually, as sensual beings living in seductively complementary surroundings; male sex buyers find local ‘hedonism’ as ‘empirical vindication of Western assumptions’ of the sensuous tropical Other (1999: 43-4),

advertising as a progressive, modern economy and at the same time, in tourism advertising, offer the image of a lackadaisical pre-modern culture...what the modernists were unable to anticipate was that it was ultimately the pre-modern that would attract the post-modern” (2003: 3). Broadly this is true of the Caribbean as well, however Klak and Myers stress the ways in which the size and nature of Caribbean societies makes the marriage of tourism and industrial themes awkward; it is hard, for example, for Barbadian promotional materials to sustain the illusion – if that is the impulse – of ‘the promotional image of serenity, peace and solitude in a vacation getaway’ when it has one of the highest population densities in the world (1998: 97). In what they call the ‘extraordinary world of neoliberal mediascaping’, they argue that the tensions between compounding images of friendly and pliant populations with evidence of dependable industriousness – that need to counteract the mythical relationship between laidback and lazy - results in absurdity: “St. Lucian workers are baldly said to be ‘as warm and friendly as the landscape and possess remarkable dexterity and manipulative skills for assembly work and manufacturing’. Jamaicans, too, are said to have an ‘easy going lifestyle’ in one sentence of the guidebook and to be the ‘most friendliest, most industrious people you’ll find anywhere’ in the very next line. Taken together, these labor messages show how investment promoters attempt to create an investor’s paradise: a blissful and laid-back tropical setting with easygoing workers who are willing to work for little” (1998: 97).

female sex buyers⁵⁶ are simply taking advantage of local men “[...] possessed of a powerful and indiscriminate sexuality that they cannot control” (1999: 49). In a broader sweep, Derek Walcott used the occasion of his Nobel lecture to draw attention to the multiple indignities involved in having to concentrate on being and becoming the figment of somebody else’s imagination:

But in our tourist brochures the Caribbean is a blue pool into which the republic dangles the extended foot of Florida as inflated rubber islands bob and drinks with umbrellas float towards her on a raft. This is how the islands from the shame of necessity sell themselves; this is the seasonal erosion of their identity, that high-pitched repetition of the same images of service that cannot distinguish one island from another, with a future of polluted marinas, land deals negotiated by ministers, and all of this conducted to the music of Happy Hour and the rictus of a smile. What is this earthly paradise for our visitors? Two weeks without rain and a mahogany tan, and, at sunset, local troubadours in straw hats and floral shirts beating ‘Yellow Bird’ and ‘Banana Boat Song’ to death. (1992: 9)

In what follows, many of the items in this polemical litany will be confirmed and substantiated. My particular focus on Walcott’s St Lucia home details sufficient evidence to sustain the anger that informs his caricature. Yet the notion of a fantasy Caribbean - foisted on the lives and habitats of reluctant ‘hosts’ - is enormously inadequate, and not only because of an obvious absence of agency and particularity. Such a notion is far too crudely linear to account for the divergence of sites, motivations and ways in which the Caribbean is imagined and equally importantly, the multi-accental nature of what appears to be so banal. As this chapter endeavours to show, the imagined Caribbean is nothing as self-fulfilling as a set of images foisted on ‘natives’ to perform, even if the tyranny of constant happiness is never far away.⁵⁷

⁵⁶ Recent research has tended to pay increased attention to the complex questions of gender, sexuality and economic-cultural power at play in female tourists’ sex tourism in the Caribbean, including the diversity of transactions understood as ‘sex tourism’ ‘romance tourism’ or prostitution. See Sánchez Taylor (2001) and Bindel (2003).

⁵⁷ Polly Pattullo has documented the ways in which expectations of sunny dispositions in sunny climates have been incorporated by regional tourism boards into public campaigns and exhortations of public ‘duty’ (1996: 141-50). Ingrained mythologies of friendly locals and their pride in showing their ‘culture’ heightens Michael Cronin’s general recognition that the personality of the tourist worker is integral to the “[...] highly personalised nature of the employee/tourist encounter and ultimately to the felt quality of experience” and the sense of legitimacy in situ (2000: 12). It also, as Pattullo points out, heightens the fear of discrepancy when even those who do not work/perform directly in tourism can be ‘cast’ as doing so. The following quotation previews some of the themes investigated subsequently in this chapter; “A Yorkshire secretary and her builder boyfriend have been to Barbados four times: ‘It’s like our second home now’. However her first impressions made her feel uncomfortable. ‘All I could see in the brochures

Neither is it a polite postmodern simulacrum, delighting in the play of dislocated historical signifiers that can be endlessly recombined to construct a generic Caribbean that demands the responsiveness of ‘indistinguishable’ islands. It is also not the continuation of colonial relations by other means, where differentiated yet unremitting forms of necessity sustain service. Elements of these critiques can be identified and applied, but none of them do justice to the complexity of securing and performing the Caribbean. It is important to recognise that –as with the discussions of automobility and tropical fruit in chapter one – there is no contradiction between the imaginative texture of these relationships, and their inscription in real relations of socio-economic inequality and oppression. The imagined Caribbean is both polyphonic, and fundamentally unjust. This chapter argues that the imagined Caribbean is the dynamic product of negotiation, from different sites, with varying possibilities and relations of power and agency, and with divergent investments and interconnections in the way in which images and ideas of the Caribbean are disseminated. To explore what this means, I will turn to two moments of literary observation.

The loosely autobiographical narrator in V.S. Naipaul’s novel *The Mimic Men* regards the island of Isabella after an absence of years, and observes, with implied distaste, a ‘near-naked Negro in spectacularly ragged khaki shorts’ (1967:53). To this observer on deck the man is clearly a docker whose pace of work seems to indicate a semi-official strike, but it also occurs to him that for ‘sight-hungry’ visitors the man must appear ‘tropically futile’. For Naipaul’s ambivalent returnee this is an over-layered re-impression; a visceral reminder of what leaving meant, but also awareness that through other eyes, this is not what arriving should mean. It is not an expected tropical sight. In Makeda Silvera’s (1999) story, “Caribbean Chameleon”, her narrator also witnesses a

were golden beaches, but on the way from the airport it looked so different. The sheep and the cows looked so thin; everything looked brown and bleak and all those wooden shacks...but then we got to the hotel and everyone was very friendly” (1996: 145). As this contrast suggests, passing through heterogeneous spaces cannot be rationalised, however the routines of presentation and performance in more controlled sites can. A travel article entitled ‘All-Inclusive holidays: leave your brain behind and enjoy’ provides a somewhat unsettling example of this: “When I first went to Sandals and its sister resort Beaches I wondered if the staff had been through a brain-washing programme to give such a convincing impression of genuinely working to give me as good a time as possible. Questioning an executive, I soon got to the bottom of this mystery. The Caribbean is full of people desperate for work. The Sandals chain can therefore be selective. It simply chooses applicants who are already sunny-natured and want to make other people happy. ‘We hire the smile’ said the executive” (Killen 2000).

story of mobility and expectation. In Toronto airport, a Jamaican woman in a 'black polka dot pant suit' is stopped for questioning by immigration officials. Her resigned daydreaming of another winter to be spent cleaning the homes of the metropolitan rich is interrupted by the demand for a full body search in an airport cell, at which she begins to 'speak in tongues' and undress without waiting for the cold comfort of the holding area. While we can only guess that gendered racial profiling frames the woman as a drug mule, we are told that what raises the suspicions of the authorities is that the woman stayed in a hotel when she was at 'home', despite having family in Jamaica:

Why a hotel? Why a hotel if you were born there?
Because sir, I go on a vacation. What you saying sir? Black people can't take vacation in their own homeland?

As vignettes of casual perception, these fragments illustrate the interplay of imagined geographies of the Caribbean. Yet how these fragments themselves interplay is not immediately evident. Taken broadly from the category modern Caribbean literature, they seem initially to suggest a diversity that borders on the fragmentary. Time, context, age, gender, class and migratory route-ways separate the narrators. Both are on the move to and from the Caribbean, but what common regional imaginary can the postcolonial *mimic man* share with the 'global woman'? (Ehrenreich & Hochschild 2004). Perhaps, however, rubbing these two stories together illustrates the strength of Kamau Brathwaite's notion that a Caribbean cultural identity persists where fragmentation is obvious and unity is 'submarine' (1974, cited in Nettleford 1995: 73). These narrators move along migratory pathways that testify to the tangibility of the 'transnational Caribbean'; while we may infer from the narratives very different practices of and identifications with the Caribbean as 'home' (see Fog Olwig 1999, 2002), these glimpses of fictional experience attest to Girvan's notion that the most recent, concentrated re-imagining of the Caribbean is one that contests internal fault-lines and recognises the fluidity of external ones:

If the Caribbean was an invention of the twentieth century, it seems certain to be reinterpreted and perhaps transcended in the twenty-first. I believe that the Caribbean of tomorrow will not be an exclusively Anglophone or Hispanic conception, and it will not be tied exclusively to geographic space or definition. (Girvan 2000: 35).

Yet common to both vignettes is a Caribbean that is tied exclusively to encrusted expectations of geographic space and one that has, it seems, the power to position and ascribe. Naipaul's narrator experiences a very particular form of transnationalised bifurcation; an almost instinctive lens frames the island of return with empathetic first impressions, it is imagined as visitors are imagined to imagine it. What they first encounter, he assumes, is the unexpected; a jarring discomfiting body in a space that should preferably be deserted, or failing that, more appropriately accessorised. In Silvera's story expectations of presence and ideas of appropriateness are also at play; rigid concepts of home and away may have been replaced with the mobile subjectivities of 'dwelling' (Urry 2000: 147), but nobody updated the in-service training for customs officers. The sheer incongruity of a Jamaican going 'home' and staying in a hotel strains the official imagination; it involves too many transgressions of status, role and belonging.

What these stories hint at is an imagined geography of the Caribbean in which touristic expectations are always immanent, even when the subjects involved are not tourists in any functionalist sense of the term. Social interaction involves the immediate and dynamic ascription of expectations and identities (Goffman 1984, Bauman & May 2001), however in these fleeting encounters far more is ascribed than the casual stereotypical categorisations of class, ethnicity and gender. Docker and migrant cleaner are subject to a very particular tourist gaze, in which both the musing reflection of the intellectual and the institutional surety of the civil servant share a vision of Caribbean space that allows them to make inferences about the lives and roles of those that inhabit it as 'locals'. The Caribbean, in these fragments, is beset with incongruity; the unexpected sight that has the power to unsettle what the narrator supposes tourists expect, and the incongruous practice of leisure in a place where institutional knowledge has long since allocated roles to 'tourists and hosts'. What is interesting is that these incongruities jar *instantaneously* with a vision of the Caribbean as a destination and as a chain of paradise islands that exists in clear and subordinate relations to its consumers. A Caribbean always already immanent with touristic expectations is, in other words, a form of common sense.

The sub-sections of this chapter outline and examine some of the main features of these deeply embedded connotations, and the seemingly paradoxical intensification of their

purchase in a world of supposedly chaotic informational flow. For now, I will tease out some of the implications of an imagined geography of the Caribbean where expectations, belonging, appropriateness and social roles are imagined from different sites of perspective and agency. For, as the Makeda Silvera story suggests, mapping the Caribbean involves practices and logics of inscription, and begins to suggest the ways in which this imagined geography of the Caribbean is performed and curated from different positions, investments and experiences. These imagined dimensions are always already inscribed in performing and engaging with the Caribbean, and they are dynamic, shifting and constantly in *negotiation*. As Mimi Sheller writes:

In its seductive appeal, the Caribbean is both real and imaginary. The imagining of the Caribbean is, as Appadurai puts it, “an organised field of ‘social practices’, a form of work...and a form of negotiation between sites of agency (Sheller 2003: 6)

The intersection of situational, local, national, regional and globalised perspectives and actions, and the differentiated agency of different tourists, residents and transnationalised actors produce this familiar, deceptively banal Caribbean. While this chapter cuts into aspects of this negotiation – in such seemingly opposite contexts as the ‘enclavic’ (Edensor 2000) all-inclusive resort and the transnationalised public sphere of the Internet – it might seem at first glance as if the anchoring examples given here illustrate anything but negotiation. Makeda’s character, for example, is subject to a ‘tourist gaze’ that keenly recalls the Foucauldian origins of the concept (Urry 2002), a situation where institutional regulation disciplines the transgression of being in-between. In this, it echoes the regimes of appropriateness I will discuss where codes of presence and legitimacy are deployed in certain resorts in an attempt to rationalise the contact between tourists and formal and informal workers in and around the resort space (see also Ritzer & Liska 1997, Crang 1997).

Similarly, while the observations of Naipaul’s character are fleeting, and soon give way to weightier preoccupations, the immediate sense of incongruity he detects is one that has guided what we could term the ‘fantasy-cleansing’ of front-stage sites in many Caribbean islands.⁵⁸ And of course, such attempted impositions are often directly or

⁵⁸ The Barbadian journalist Robert Best, for example, has detailed public protests against attempts in Barbados to limit public access to certain beaches, and also the ‘street people scandal’ in Jamaica, where

covertly resisted; in the fictional realm, the ‘distasteful’ figure does not move, and the woman forced to undress renders the situation absurd by taking it to extremes, albeit at the cost of her own distress. This and other such studies – in the Caribbean and beyond – can furnish reams of evidence of micro and concentrated rejections of the more extreme impositions of tourism. Yet ping-pong between a theory of imposition and empirical examples of resistance is a tired and ultimately useless framework in this context.

It is necessary to reject an underlying dependence on such an assumed model of structure and agency to investigate the interlocking ways in which the familiar grammar of the Caribbean is articulated. Producing and sustaining the imagined Caribbean is far more productively seen as a negotiated process, not because negotiation implies (if it ever does) equivalences of stake and opportunity, but because these mythic resonances are performed and produced across and within a wide range of interactions. Tourism of this kind imbricates people in an economy and society of signs, where visions of self, place, environment and nation cannot avoid constant interaction with projected senses of ‘what kind of place this is and what kind of people inhabit it’. The semiotic capital of tourism – capital which must be constantly assessed, embodied and materialised – involves a constant reflexivity about how ‘we’ and our place are perceived, and what we signify to those who may gaze on us. This includes the heightened senses residents display of their own contextual semiotic capital.

As I will argue in subsequent sections, with particular regard to St Lucia, tourism in a globalised world involves a dynamic of *synoptical* and *panoptical* relations; being watched, watching ourselves being watched, and simultaneously watching the watchers. At different moments of this chapter I delineate different ways in which images of place and aspects of the ‘brand’ are monitored, performed and curated, and these can productively be seen within an over-arching dynamic of panopticism and synopticism. This reference to panopticism has little to do with Foucault, although it also depends on

homeless people in Montego Bay were kidnapped and moved to another part of the island: “These people were dumped like garbage in a remote area, obviously with the hope that nobody would find out, or that like ‘garbage’ they would not blow back into Montego Bay”. Best suggests that while these tactics are obviously aimed at ‘safe-guarding’ the image of the area as a tourist resort, they also coalesce with debates about what is needed to attract inward investment, and to some extent with the class-based aspirations of some residents. Best 2000, and see also Morgan 2000.

what he describes as a ‘system of permanent registration’ (1977: 196). The reflexivity of tourist agents in St Lucia is based on a realisation that any ‘evidence’ about St Lucia can be ‘read’ into the brand. This is the potentially limitless panopticism of channel-hopping and a Google search, and it can be seen at work in the discussions of online negotiation in the final section of this chapter. However this panopticism can not be explained without a concomitant synopticism, whereby a whole range of agents with investments in tourism monitor the ways they are being represented and attempt to responsively manage these meanings.⁵⁹

Yet while I explicitly draw here on notions of surveillance and even internalised surveillance, even the range of different investments alone should indicate that these processes do not map onto clear relations of subordination. It is precisely because the politics of image are so central to tourism-dependent nations that different kinds of negotiation can take place. This is not only because high degrees of consensus are the only sustainable way of managing a tourism economy, but also because different people have different kinds of investment in and attachment to images of place, region and nation. Thus in what follows we will see disparate examples of this kind of cultural negotiation at work; negotiation where different social actors, acutely aware of the discourses that surround tourism and its product, accept, modify, and re-accent the semiotic capital they are expected to nurture.

This constant process will be discussed in terms of highly contextual examples from fieldwork in St Lucia. For the sake of illustration at this point, a few examples may be instructive. The final section examines online discussion threads and the ubiquity of the discourse of tourism needs, where even apparently local discussions make reference to how the island is perceived as a destination. However, while this can be read as the inevitable bleed and immanence of the touristic into everyday figurations – which I strongly argue is problematic – it is equally important to recognise the ways that ‘the

⁵⁹ A recent indication of the strength of this is the reaction of the Sandals chain –which has resorts in Jamaica and St Lucia – to negative publicity in the UK regarding its policy on same-sex couples. The Mayor of London had banned Sandals’ advertisements in the Tube in London, and as David Hencke reports, the ban was lifted just before a spokesman was due to appear to defend this policy with the former minister, Barbara Roche, on BBC Radio 4’s Today programme. Hencke, David “Holiday firm ends ban on gay couples”. *The Guardian*, October 12 2004.

needs of tourists' are used as a covert battle ground for well-established political confrontations. In other words, the assumed presence of monitoring tourists amplifies the dimensions of what appear to be local discussions of local issues. I also examine several instances where different social dynamics rupture the texture of certain images. In one case, images of St Lucia as a 'sinful' liminal place promoted by the tourist authority were not only criticised, but also provided an opportunity for the Catholic Church to open wider debates about 'public morality'. In the same section, we can see how the well-grounded assumptions that cruise ship tourists know little about St Lucia other than its generic Caribbean-ness provides the basis for the successful development of certain forms of locally-owned heritage tourism. In each of these examples an expectation of the banal Caribbean is present, yet in each it is possible to see how these myths become a prism through which other discussions can be refracted, and which in turn negotiate the ways in which the imagined Caribbean is produced and sustained.

At this point it may become clearer as to why I have insisted on the 'banal complexity' of the images and myths of the Caribbean that construct 'it' as a particular kind of touristic space. They may form the grammar by which the semiological distinction of the Caribbean is assembled, and through which different forms of theming and imaging are processed, marketed and performed, yet as Greg Ringer has argued, to see this as a centralised process that can be uniformly secured is to ignore the ways in which the grammar of tourism is *mediated*:

(Images) insinuate dreams and myths into the public perception of places which may come, in time, to stand, like icons, logos or mottoes, as shorthand statements of their character. How this engages with the affective attachment of residents to their own localities is still a matter of some speculation, however, because it has not been sufficiently taken into account in geographical treatments of the function of place in the formation of group and individual identity (1998:19-20).

What this chapter proposes to do is to examine – within the confines of the studies conducted – how these affective attachments engage with the myths and images of tourism, and how those of variously positioned residents, transnational St Lucians, and tourists produce and negotiate aspects of the imagined Caribbean. In doing so, I introduce some recent thinking from Human Geography's engagement with tourism landscapes (Ringer 1998), in particular the idea that seeing a place merely as a *destination* may contribute to the sense of tourist locations as inert stages, rather than

examining the different ways that imagined geographies of 'destination', 'place' and 'home' experience and interpret meanings of shared space (see also Fog Olwig 2003, Sheller & Urry 2004). In this the idea of 'landscape' emerges as a key negotiation of physical place and the overlapping ways in which it is inscribed with meaning, an ongoing, multivalent process that has a particular salience for tourism:

While the concept of 'landscapes' is somewhat ambiguous, it is an important one for its attention to the manner in which the visible structure of a place expresses the emotional attachments held by both its residents and visitors, as well as the means by which it is imagined, produced, contested and enforced (Ringer 1998: 6)

This shifting sense of landscape as an affective, contested yet collaborative production holds out the promise of fine-grained analysis. In practice it is hindered by the difficulties of access to and interpretation of such meanings in the field, but also arguably by another kind of Caribbean imagined geography. Given the kinds of luxury, all-inclusive, themed tourism that exists in the Caribbean - and the intense social conflicts that have surrounded it in some nations over the last thirty years - it is easy to see how blanket dichotomies of local reality and foisted fantasy can persist in otherwise nuanced research. If there is such a thing as a default position for approaching tourism in the Caribbean, it may well be that 'locals' have no affective attachments to the dominant images of place, or that if they do, they do so in a purified, 'authentic' fashion. Ian Gregory Strachan, for example, explores the acute question as to why "[...] the representation of the Caribbean as a paradise has persisted in spite of social, cultural political and economic phenomena that clearly embody anything but earthly bliss" (2002: 3). Quite rightly, he argues that much of the Caribbean luxury tourism that is predicated on the broad sweep of paradisiacal promise is aimed at "[...] providing for visitors a lifestyle that flies in the face of the lived experience for the majority of Caribbeans" (ibid: 11).

That tourism in the Caribbean often attempts to mask social inequality is a given, and central to the social politics of tourism and risk management strategies that are discussed later in the chapter. However, the unsettling gap between lived social conditions and the trappings of touristic excess is not the same as implying that "[...] this world (of paradise) has as much authenticity for indigenous residents as would a stage prop or movie backdrop" (ibid: 1). Leaving aside for now the critically loaded use

of authenticity, and the homogenised assumptions of ‘indigenous residents’, what this assertion misses is a recognition that tourism and tourism work are often framed in precisely these metaphorical terms. Tourism is regarded, and not just in the bland manuals of human resource management, as involving different types of performance on a variety of overlapping stages.

The following sections interrogate the idea of performance in tourism as an idea that encompasses the reflexive navigations of everyday interaction, the formal production of roles and cultural presences within touristic space, and the increasing scope of informal performances in interaction with tourism and tourists. As I will argue with regard to St Lucia, a consequence of the increasing *porousness* of enclavic resorts is the increasing erosion of distinctions between front and back stage regions. This involves a ‘host’ of pressures, yet also involves increased forms of reflexivity and modes of engagement. There are varying ways of rejecting, mediating and embracing the idea of living on a stage, but it is important to recognise the degree to which this has become immanent in social life and interaction.

The dependence of ‘paradise’ on the banal familiarity of un-peopled spaces and romantic vistas does not imply that such contrived naturalness is not brimming with competing forms of cultural signification and appropriation. As Strachan himself details with admirable clarity, paradise is not a unitary concept, and its historical longevity has been marked by constant re-calibration rather than metaphorical solidity. Similarly, the foisting of paradise on social life involves a range of negotiated re-articulations; paradise as phatic commonality, paradise as an expression of local pride and belonging, and paradise as a loaded metaphor for critiquing the all too worldly social and political conditions that tourism attempts to obscure.⁶⁰ If, as Tom Selwyn has argued, dominant images of exotic Otherness in tourism may actually “[...] conceal significant processes

⁶⁰ This is visible not only in the titles of critical literature engaging with Caribbean issues - *The Other Side of Paradise* (Barry 1984) *Far From Paradise* (Ferguson 1990), *To Hell with Paradise* (Fonda Taylor 1993) – but in the ways paradise is often articulated as an unsettling trope to tourists and as an ironic or caustic metaphor in local and national politics. Tourists – who patently do not resemble Superman – are often greeted at the waterfalls of Anse la Liberté as ‘Superman in paradise’ or ‘what are Superman and Superwoman doing in paradise?’ This is because the scene in *Superman 2* in which Superman flew to fetch a perfect orchid for Lois Lane was filmed in this national park, however the reference has an obvious edge to it.

of change within the regions of the periphery themselves, changes which may actually be read as challenges and resistances to the myths themselves” (1996: 14) then we must also allow that these dominant images of exotic Otherness are inflected with a significant variety of accents, and that this multi-accentuality tells us something about the ongoing negotiation of the banal in everyday life. To reverse Kamau Brathwaite’s notion, in the imagined Caribbean of tourism discourse, unity is obvious, and fragmentation submarine.

This introduction has aimed to open up some of the ways that the imaginative geography of the Caribbean is inscribed, and what follows attempts to scratch at the multivalent complexity of that ongoing inscription through modalities of tourism. Tourists to the Caribbean, who are often called upon to embrace the ‘real Caribbean’, would be better served by an analysis which attempts to tease out some of the ways that their imaginative geographies are expected, mediated and performed. While the discourse of the ‘real Caribbean’ takes its relative emphasis and intrinsic ethical probity from its deployment in eco-travel and community-based tourism (Mann 2000, Mowforth & Munt 1998) it functions to propagate the idea that fantasyscape tourism is detached, artificial, synthetic and entirely imposed on an otherwise coherent setting. This is analytically and politically facile, and ultimately represents a dynamic of one brand feeding off the diminution of another.⁶¹

⁶¹ Which is not to in turn diminish the work of genuine initiatives in this field which have made, and continue to make important contributions in St Lucia, St Vincent and in particular Dominica. They have often given impetus to the development of national regulation of heritage and parks, and, as I observed in St Lucia, the strategic thinking in heritage tourism resulted in the development of tours tailored to the rhythms and forms of all-inclusive and cruise ship tourism. Similarly, these approaches have led to the development of hybrid forms emerging from tourist desire and local possibility and necessity. The development, for example, of ‘new traditions’ of ‘Fish Fridays’ in small fishing towns such as Anse La Raye capitalised both on the image and dwindling popularity among tourists of Gros Islet’s famous Friday ‘Jump Up’ while bringing regular and regulated custom to places dependent on fishing and normally merely gazed upon during island tours. Nevertheless, as was also obvious in St Lucia, many such forms of supplemental tourism are as equally trammelled as they are nourished by the dominant forms, as the frameworks of interaction are defined by the institutional practices of the resorts and cruise ships. See the later discussion of ‘cruise ship time’ as an example. More generally, Mowforth & Munt draw attention to the ways in which eco-tourism and community tourism have also been subject to ‘greenwash’ that masks divergent needs within a catch-all logic of think global act local (1998: 181-5), and are no less susceptible to dynamics of aestheticisation and fetishism. See also Greathouse Amador (1997) for a discussion of the ways that rural tourism and ‘indigenous/ethnic’ tourism can intrude on ‘destination communities’ even with their involvement, and Tourism Concern’s debate on ecotourism as a problematic label in *Tourism in Focus* Spring 2002 No. 42.

Transcending this dichotomy is more germane to understanding the unalterable relationship of mapping and inscribing, while working on the implications of these interdependencies for consuming the Caribbean. If these constant negotiations and multivalent appropriations and articulations did not exist, then it would make little sense to explore the idea of imaginative geographies – of ‘tourists’ and ‘hosts’ – interacting in specific sites and social relations. In examining these negotiations and strategies, what is of central interest is the way moments of accidental cosmopolitanism may appear; tears and fissures in the membrane of the resort, the irruption of territorial politics into the deterritorialised spaces of leisure, evidence of global economic interdependence beyond the structuring and suggestive routes of tourist access.

The explicatory, scene-setting examples of accidental cosmopolitanism discussed in the previous chapter are inherently stark and dramatic, yet the nuanced and empirical examples analysed in this chapter can be seen as species of the same kind of disruptive experience. They are fluctuations in a primarily symbolic economy, but the effects are felt on many other registers. As Stan Cohen argues, disruptive images, experiences and information are often disruptive precisely because they compound what we already know (2001). Western tourists are always already ‘in’ the Caribbean, placed by their geo-historical positionality, their exposure to dominant representations of Caribbean places, bodies and identities, and by their day to day consumption. The breadth of subjective experiences and knowledges of tourists to the Caribbean is irreducibly vast, however I see accidental cosmopolitanism at work in the ways in which evidence of hostility and ambivalence to tourism - as well as the relationship of tourism to other aspects of global economy and dependence - question self-sustaining myths of ‘being away’ in the Caribbean. The latent aspects of the banal Caribbean are never dormant, and bonds of interconnectedness, insistent yet incomplete, continually present themselves for some form of realisation.

3.2 All-inclusive resorts as cultural type and lived form

I have argued that the symbolic capital of the Caribbean as a liminal paradise is so familiar as to appear banal. In keeping with the enduring insights of Barthes’ *Mythologies*, the analysis contended that this representational index has achieved the level of banality, and that a host of recent, significant critiques remind us that this

ordinariness should not elide histories of production. The 'brochure discourse' of the Caribbean is marked by continuities and adaptations of earlier projections of Caribbean paradise as a space of 'wild pleasure, perpetual sunshine, and leisure' (Strachan 2002: 5), exotic island imaginary can be seen as an historical product of the simultaneous imbrication of the Caribbean in Western Modernity and its uneasy disavowal (Sheller 2003). While many critics question both the analytical and ethical application of globalisation discourses to the Caribbean (Klak 1998, Mintz 1998), I outlined the somewhat paradoxical processes through which a softly hegemonic representational grammar is bolstered by the informational conditions and postmodern practices that have been held to undermine hegemonic possibilities (Barker 2002). If myth is the cultural and historical made natural, this formulation is particularly apt for the mythic production of the Caribbean.

In this context, the 'physically and symbolically bounded space' (Chaney 1993: 18) of the all-inclusive resort takes on a special importance that will be the subject of this section. The symbolic evocation of the all-inclusive resort is prevalent far beyond the Caribbean and irrespective of the divergent practices and atmospheres of specific sites. It has become a particular form of metaphor for privileged and knowing myopia and the strategies necessary for the disavowal of witnessing. Its stark delineation of inside and outside seems to sunder leisure and world, while leisure and world inescapably offer commentary on each other. This is particularly the case where the leisure is privileged and the encompassing world is predominantly not, yet even before issues of globalised cultural politics are taken into consideration, the all-inclusive resonates disturbingly on a cultural register. The act of demarcation seems to intensify the perceived fabric of place, and the idea of inclusivity leads quickly to a consideration of who and what is excluded. As Melucci writes, "Limit... stands for confinement, frontier, separation; it therefore also signifies recognition of the other, the different, the irreducible" (1996: 129).

Central to its symbolism is a sense that the resort involves a simultaneous recognition and disavowal of insistence and difference, and an acknowledgment and distancing of Otherness. In this it seems to confirm the sheerest superficialities of consumer culture, where difference is to be celebrated for its surface frisson, not interrogated for its shifting dynamics of Othering (Brah 1996, 2004). In the words of a American

entrepreneur in St Lucia; “(they) provide a pasteurised holiday in a place that might be a bit menacing... you go to a foreign destination but you’re protected from it.”⁶² This is surely what Zygmunt Bauman has in mind when he discusses ‘reservation-style experiences’ as global nodes of insulation that exempt tourists from the implications of their mobilities (1998: 58). His image is a caustic reversal of containment and freedom that pictures the disenfranchised herded to the ‘outside’, and begins to explain how a particular organisational form can assume significances far beyond its geographic distribution and economic importance.

Similarly, the image of ‘white ghetto hotels’ plays with an savage irony; that both great wealth and significant poverty imply spatial concentration and isolation, be it self or super-imposed. The all-inclusive is taken not only to signify the visible inequalities of ‘tourism in the third world’, but increasingly is held to resonate with other emerging metaphors of global inequality. Naomi Klein recently surveyed the erection of real and metaphorical fences between people and resources in processes of vested transnationalisation, and argued that fences of enclosure are increasingly suitable metaphors of hegemonic globalisation despite vaunted rhetoric of mobility and freedom. As she writes: “[...] thirteen years after the celebrated collapse of the Berlin wall, we are surrounded by fences yet again, cut off – from one another, from the earth and from our own ability to imagine that change is possible” (2002: xx). For Klein, this kind of real and virtual spatialisation has a logic as inexorable as the walls of Antwerp in W.G. Sebald’s *Austerlitz*; social life in the global village becomes a world of gated compounds, urban surveillance and “[...] a network of fortresses connected by highly militarised trade corridors” (2002: xxiii).

Gary Younge, in the article discussed in chapter two, suggests explicit parallels by drawing on Setha Low’s analysis of gated communities in the US to make explicit parallels between all-inclusives, gated communities, and the prospect of fortified continents. The paradox of inclusivity, according to Low, is that the construction of a secure inside amplifies the insecurity projected to the outside, and can be seen to increase suspicion of otherness, an increase in feelings of personal insecurity, and a creeping detachment from social involvement and solidarity (see Low 2000, 2003).

⁶² ‘Tourists fan discontent’, *The Star St Lucia*, March 13 1999.

Writing in the aftermath of the Bali and Mombassa bombs, Younge asserts that it is a globalised fallacy to assume that these oscillating dynamics of all-inclusiveness can insulate the privileged from either the consequences of geo-politics conducted in their name, or the unpredictable consequences of mobility in scapes of inequality (see also Urry 2004).

This yoking of physical resemblance and symbolic resonance has obvious limits of analytical relevance, and may even be dismissed as hyperbolic over-interpretation. Yet this line of argument revisits key problematics of awareness and living in interconnection discussed at length in chapter one. A recurring dimension of the all-inclusive as an icon of hegemonic globalisation is not only that it separates tourists from 'locals', but that it operates as a space of abstraction, an environmental bubble sanitised against general impressions of inequality, and more particular evidence of unsettling interconnections. Thus Younge, in developing his critique of compound communities, notes that "People coming to the Caribbean are having gated holidays – cooped up behind huge walls in all-inclusive hotels, for fear that global inequalities interrupt their rest and relaxation" (2002). Similarly, Pattullo, in questioning the conventional analysis that all-inclusives were an inevitable response to political violence in Jamaica, notes that:

The all-inclusive was an insurance against a bad day in that so-called paradise so that the tourists could continue to enjoy their holiday whatever the misery beyond the security gate. It was only logical then that tourists would not bother to leave the well-run abundance... because the resort itself did a much better job at creating an "exotic holiday location" than the rough and ready attempts of the real world (1999).

During the development of this thesis, the all-inclusive resort has been a central focus of theoretical, political and empirical inquiry, and this section attempts to reconcile these guiding ideas with the more nuanced analysis that fieldwork should aim to generate. I make no attempt to write out and excise the shifts in analysis that have guided this inquiry, and I would draw attention to two main reasons for this. The first is quite obvious; reflexive fieldwork must be alive to the overlapping and shifting ideas, perceptions and emotions (Coffey 1999) that inform it in times and spaces, and this is particularly pronounced in any form of tourism ethnography, where analytical projects

are refracted through questions of self-identity and the reflexive performance of overlapping social roles (Galani-Moutafi 2000, Nash 2001).

The second reason will be teased out in this section, but can be introduced by drawing attention to distinct if inseparable ways in which the all-inclusive acts as a symbolic form. In the general positions summarised above, and in the situated discussions, representations and summaries of public debate that will be presented in what follows, the all-inclusive is interpreted as a *type* of tourism, implying not only typologies of tourists and their relations with the broader socio-cultural contexts in which their resort is located, but evocative of a privileged myopia associated with 'third world tourism' and exoticisation (Mowforth and Munt 1998, McLaren 1998) and with more general suggestions of consumer multiculturalism (Hall, 1997) and consumerist cosmopolitanism (Calhoun 2001). The all-inclusive is easily constructed as a figurative and textual problematic – where situated examples are marshalled to girder the coherence of the metaphor – and it is clear that this aspect of the resort's symbolism was a powerful frame for the gestation and conduct of fieldwork objectives, trajectories, questions and subjects. I would contend that this remains unproblematic; it serves to highlight the discourses that surround the all-inclusive as a type of tourism that is taken to infer a great deal about everything from individual tourist motivations to the shape of globalised power relations. This aspect of symbolism will be teased out in what follows. The second dimension of this symbolism is the role of situated all-inclusive resorts in symbolic production, a dynamic casting and re-casting of themes and representations that is often acutely aware of and reactive to the first symbolic sense outlined. All-inclusives symbolise a *type* of tourism, while there are enormously different *forms* of spatialisation, theming and performance to be found lumped together under this term across the globe. It is likely that a significant amount of these resorts negotiate these wider connotations of type in the contextual performance of form (indeed forms cannot be understood without these considerations of type). It is equally likely that this happens for a vast range of reasons and motivations. As an article in the journal of the Ecumenical Coalition on Tourism details, the tourism industry generally regards the term 'all-inclusive' to be over-burdened, as levels of inclusivity vary from manifestation to manifestation, creating a divergence of consumer experiences of the *type* that is amplified by different expectations across demographic groups (Tüting 1999). In the Caribbean and in St Lucia in particular, many resorts answer to the name of all-

inclusive, yet they produce and manage this spatial construct in very different ways, and the recent history of social controversy has resulted in very different strategies of inclusivity and exclusivity. A situated analysis of all-inclusive resorts requires sensitivity to the ways in which these aspects of symbolism interact and are constantly marshalled.

The thesis I sought to explore in St Lucia was that all-inclusive resorts, as carefully spatialised and curated stages, attempt to secure a generic, deterritorialised Caribbean of desire through modes of performance. Following Crang (1997) and Edensor (2000), tourist places can be seen as stages that attempt to relate performance to the imaginative geography of (imagined) tourists, through the production of space, careful representational labour, and forms of surveillance and policing. As Crang argues: "Tourist places are not just imagined places, they are also performed places, and tourism employees are not just actors on a stage, they have to act out that stage" (1997: 138). While carefully resisting deterministic and simplistic psychological, cultural and mediated linkages, I hypothesised that all-inclusive resorts marshal spaces, signs and bodies to minimise cultural ambiguity and risk, and construct the multiplicity of practices of everyday life as disruptive noise in the *fantasyscape*.

However a careful distinction should be made here. The cultural risk I envisaged is not the simplistic sense of the Caribbean 'outside' being less authentic than the one 'inside' - although there is evidence that this is both a prevalent reaction and a partially held interpretation of potential tourist reactions (Wood 2000) - *but that the disjunctures and unsettling suggestions of different social realities on the island may challenge particular modes of tourist presence*. The constancy of themes of paradise embedded in more general expectations of liminality and escape do not determine tourists' expectations and experiences, but they do suggest that people may be less attuned to the other interpretations and politics of place that similarly implicate them. In other words, senses of interconnection may be blunted in the act of travelling closer to others.

To briefly put this in context, and to sketch the dimensions of symbolism to a certain degree, it is worth considering an article written by Polly Pattullo in *The Guardian* and evocatively entitled "Bitter Fruit". The article is written in the shadow cast by the then impending WTO ruling against the EU for imposing tariffs on US 'dollar bananas' from

Central America and the subsequent 'banana trade war' (1998). The end of EU protection was widely believed at the time to signal the end of a nationally significant - and globally insignificant - banana industry in St Lucia, but also the virtual extinction of a crop deeply embedded in island readings of history, land and belonging (Younge 1999). Subsequently, most Caribbean governments have been faced with the dissolution of preferential trade arrangements and the eventual removal of virtually all protective tariff and non-tariff barriers with the EU (Jessop 2003, Rush 2005).

As Pattullo narrates, tourists arriving at the Hewanorra airport in the south of the island are normally collected by hotel transport and driven to the main centre of tourism in the north-west, just north of the Castries area. In the sense used by Edensor, tourists at this point can be seen as already enwrapped in an environmental bubble congruent with the all-inclusive. Although compulsion is never fully established, the sight-framing of the bus en route, time-management, the narratives and commentaries of tourism professionals and burgeoning senses of group roles and appropriateness attempt to 'minimise disorientation' and direct interpretations (2000: 330). To adapt the old media adage, such tours may not be successful in 'telling' us what to *see*, but they are very successful in directing us in what to *look* at. What is interesting in Pattullo's account is the identification of narrative and interpretative absences that equally aim to minimise disorientation. Describing a place that is often on the itinerary of day bus tours, she writes:

At Dennery, where the road leaves the Atlantic, they will pass the point where two unarmed banana farmers were shot dead by police in 1993 during a strike where farmers blocked the road in protest at the price paid for their fruit (6p per pound). The road bloc inconvenienced the tourists who had to be airlifted to their hotels. The politicians reprimanded the demonstrators and accused them of sabotaging the tourist industry, fearing that the visitors might go elsewhere. With that unseen (and usually untold) piece of history behind them, the tourists will get a glimpse of a towering rainforest before descending into Cul-de-Sac valley, one of St Lucia's most fertile banana-growing areas.

The imbrication of tourism in the reflexive unfolding of national and international politics has been discussed in the previous chapter. At this point I wish to relate the form of the all-inclusive to what is at play in this example. While it is hardly surprising that a violent incident of this kind is absent from tourism narratives of place, what is important is the positioning of the banana plantation landscape as orienting lushness en

route to the enclavic space. Disrupting tourism is increasingly seen as a way of attracting international attention, however briefly, while the organisation of the 'tourist glance' in this routing de-links banana production from its international significances and ordinary interconnections. The import of this for a concept of imaginative geography that emphasises the imbrication of mapping (interpretation) and inscription (responsibility) is obvious. If the fair trade imagination asks consumers to empathetically connect themselves to the food chain and trace their commodities back to the context of production, in this instance the stage management of St Lucian place actively seeks to diminish those interconnections and dependencies. Constructed as landscape, a landscape without memory is a landscape that whittles and dissipates connectivity.⁶³

The plantation then, becomes a cultural marker that denies the *cumulative* nature of landscape and the significances that are attached to it. The narration of such cultural markers, and in particular the gaps in the stories, denies the cultural and political depths of meaning that the plantation continues to hold in Caribbean societies (Strachan 2003). As Ringer notes:

The development and management of tourism play a significant role in the lives of people who intersect with or live in the destination, and mediates the formation of local identities and cultural patterns of behaviour and communication...Thus to conceive of the cultural destination as a stylised vignette of local history, rooted in time and space, and lacking the dynamic conditions necessary for change, is to render mute the actions, motivations and values of local participants in the ongoing social construction of their place." (Ringer, 1998: 2)

What happens in this narration of landscape is that this dynamism and its disjunctures are precisely rendered mute. The issue here is not one of overt political manipulation,

⁶³ Doreen Massey provides a complementary perspective in discussing brochure views of the Algarve in Portugal and her experiences of being in the region during the 1974 Revolution. As she writes: "The tourist brochure says nothing of this. It is not important to do so. Yet those events of the mid-1970s are still important in this region: they live on in the minds and memories as part of the reality of the place in the imaginations of its inhabitants as they continue to farm or fish, or to work as a waitress, hotelier or casino attendant in the area's booming tourist industry" (1995: 22). The difference, of course, is that the successful consolidation of democracy in Portugal as well as the wider trend towards cultivating 'culture as a resource' in tourism (Yüdice 2003) makes it likely that the development of sites and tourist practices about the Revolution would be controversial – Massey describes the Algarve as an isolated Maoist enclave – yet possible. The difference with the Dennery example is that there is no way that this can be interpreted as anything other than a non-attraction, it signifies the result of contemporary authority that exempts itself from anything other than an administrative role in tourism. Thus Massey's conclusion that tourism tends to remove us "[...] from the responsibility of thinking about what effect our holidays might be having" (ibid) is even more apt in a St Lucian context where tourist presence has wider and ongoing significance.

nor some fatuous plea for tourists to halt in every place and soak up its resonances. Instead, it is that this kind of stage management has cumulative influence on the ways that tourists may be allowed to imagine themselves and their connexities in place. In this instance, inserting oneself into the chain is more than a question of joining the dots of St Lucian economic vulnerability. It is also a question of the significances of tourist presence, both in the dependence and political instrumentalisation illustrated in the Dennery incident, and the wider global political economy that arbitrarily dismantles one industry while increasing dependence on another. Pattullo continues by detailing an interesting commentary on the interconnectedness of modes of consumption:

Linking the consumer of bananas with the consumer of holidays was what artist Shelley Sacks was thinking about when she bought 25 numbered boxes of St Lucian bananas. The bananas were eaten, the skins dried. Having traced the individual farmers who had grown her bananas, she interviewed them and linked the tapes of the farmers' voices with their own banana skins, which had now become sculpted forms. The tapes tell us, the consumers, about the producers, about who they are and what their lives are like. They reveal an anxiety for the future, and a reluctance to become waiters or taxi-drivers.

This installation dismantles the chain to bolster the links; the social life of a commodity is seen to be embedded in place, identity and personal projections. In the "fair trade imagination", the possibility of some form of insistent empathy is enhanced by the realisation that personal investment (and dependence) exists also in the production of commodities, not just in their widely discussed consumption (Bauman 2001). Tourism, however, involves another widely remarked upon reversal, whereby the consumer moves to the product. What will be discussed later in this chapter as 'stage management' is in evidence here; narrative ellipses that at least partially compartmentalise the ways in which St Lucia can be known. In the movement of Pattullo's imagined tourists through the St Lucian landscape, physical presence dissipates the chain; being in place may weaken standing in and understanding interconnectedness.

What this example suggests, then, is that under certain forms of organisation and mobilisation, tourists are dependent on their own socio-cultural capital to work through the implications of their presence (and indeed absence). The all-inclusive form – and as we can see from the Dennery example, *all-inclusivised* practices and rationales –

assumes a tourist unable and probably unwilling to encounter social complexity and the ambiguous interconnections of tourism in the wider economy. It is this problematic that connects the wider focus on imaginative geographies with a specifically Caribbean exploration. The imagined Caribbean – where a carefully monitored tropicality is reflexively airbrushed – is mobilised to attract consumers to the images, spaces, products and bodies of the Caribbean in a range of ways, yet it also works to minimise the cultural risk of this consumption. In other words, it works hard to dilute potential irruptions and disconnections between the mapping and inscribing immanent in imaginative geography.

This soldering has a significant resonance for the question of ethics and responsibility central to Mimi Sheller's *Consuming the Caribbean* (2003). Sheller argues that contemporary consumption of the Caribbean continues to be informed by the 'emotive and figurative moorings' of historical colonial relations, and that addressing contemporary inequalities and power asymmetries depends on those "[...] living in contemporary post-slavery societies (taking) responsibility for their own practices of consumption" (2003: 7). The multiple mobilities of products, images and people between the Caribbean and the disavowing West enmeshes consumers in everyday linkages, interconnections and responsibilities that are amplified by the dynamic legacy of the historical benefits of domination. Therefore 'living in interconnectedness' with the Caribbean involves unravelling how our consumption implicates us in the involved politics of consumption hinted at by Pattullo. As Sheller writes:

In tracing these diverse mobilities I begin to develop an approach to an 'ethics of consumption' in which the connections between producer, consumer and consumed are put into play with and against each other. Although I cannot do full justice to the meaning of 'ethics', I take it to suggest an 'intimate responsibility for the other' (Ahmed 2000: 137) (Sheller 2003: 8).

The all-inclusive resort, in this reading, works to assuage; when such connections are diluted, where is the need for an ethical conversation even to take place? The resort aims to manage the way in which 'connections between producer, consumer and consumed are put into play', and to limit the risks involved in encountering obvious disjunctures between the needs, realities and politics of these agents. As an attempted rationalisation of this rationale, 'intimate responsibility for the other' must navigate

spatial segregations of varying permeabilities, scripts and routines of performative interaction, and modes of surveillance and control. The import of Sheller's ethical project is to add greater significance to Pattullo's vignette; banana plantations as transitory landscapes en route to the iconic, curated Caribbean elide both the historical bedrock of asymmetrical contact and the ongoing connexities of privilege and consumption.

Thus to a significant extent, and for reasons that will be explored in subsequent sections, all-inclusive resorts 'package' the Caribbean for a typological consumer-tourist whose baggage, metaphorically, has been lost in transit. As will hopefully become clear, I contend that these resorts generally acknowledge and attempt to reciprocate the generic Caribbean, and posit it for consumption by tourists who, in the corporate stereotype, have little ability, desire, patience or capital to engage with the distractions of social inequality, cultural complexity, ambivalent opinions on tourism and tourists, and so forth. It is neither crude cultural determinism nor a sinfully unfashionable theory of dependence (see Tucker 1999) to argue that this is a result of cultivating and protecting a 'brand' that remains relatively coherent in the global imagoscape (Appadurai 1996), and that it remains coherent by airbrushing and marginalising controversies, connotations and issues that scratch at its safely de-historicised and asocial texture. In an important sense, then, all-inclusives *curate*; they manage and oversee the spatialisation, performance, embodiment and signification of a Caribbean whose contours should be by now familiar.

Yet to an equally significant extent, proposing that a form of spatial and symbolic organisation is involved in curating the Caribbean does not suggest the production of determining, static or homogenous spaces. Resorts – regardless of the rigidities of routine and parameters of theme – can never be total institutions despite the seductive aspects of such a comparison (Goffman 1961, Ritzer and Liska 1997). The metaphor of tourism work as cultural performance (Crang 1997) and recent complementary analysis of tourist presence as social performance (Edensor 2000) suggests that even the most routinised encounters are subject to the improvisations and adjustments of embodied (re)enactment. This observation is little more than a central tenet of reflexive analysis, yet it is crucial in a context where the burgeoning symbolism of the all-inclusive promotes a slippage from tourism-type to tourist-type, and to deterministic speculation

on the motivations, behaviours and encounters of tourists and tourism workers (e.g. Bauman 1998, McLaren 1998:51-9).

Yet a basic insistence on the exigencies of lived experience and a sensitivity to ethnomethodological perspectives should not conjure up images of slippery, resistant encounters, where consumers and producers engage in 'bricolent trajectories' across a 'jungle of rationality' (De Certeau 1986). While fine-grained writing on tourists and tourist modalities has arguably been under-developed until relatively recently (see Franklin 2003, Franklin & Crang 2001), an unintended benefit has been that the 'tourist' does not have to be reclaimed from the ranks of cultural studies' heroic consumers⁶⁴ (for an overview see Fisk 1986, McGuigan 1992, Ferguson & Golding (ed.) 1997, Lodziak 2002). The all-inclusive is neither the site of behavioural determinism nor power-eliding romanticism; instead it can be seen as a polysemic symbolic space where dynamic performances result from the imbrication of institutional and personal imagined geographies in daily interaction. My contribution, then, to putting connections and responsibilities into play, is to develop a situated and nuanced analysis of the dynamics of all-inclusivity, what this suggests about the negotiation and performance of an imagined Caribbean, and what this in turn suggests for the ethics and responsibilities of tourists and consumers.

It is worth recalling that this study had neither the aim nor possibility to engage in a sustained analysis of situated interaction. Indeed, meaningful, sustained access to such interaction in tourist forms such as the all-inclusive arguably remains an enduring problematic for socio-cultural tourism research. However certain insights can be speculatively assembled from a range of research projects, most notably from a variety of interview material and reflective observation. As Gmelch (2003) has illustrated in a study conducted in Barbados, tourism worker narratives - where workers with different roles, statuses and forms of social capital reflect on their role negotiation in relation to their reading and positioning of different 'types' of tourists - yield rich material. As a general observation, many of the narratives presented in his research display a constant

⁶⁴ Indeed, my previous discussions of the tourist as a globalised metaphor would suggest that it remains precisely the opposite. It is not only the accents of massification and superficiality that count here, it is interesting to note that critiques of the resistant consumer in cultural studies have been about re-asserting dynamism in response to the apparent rigidities and immobilisations of life under capitalism. The movement of tourists cannot be approached within this framework.

negotiation between the routinisation, codification and regulation of social performance, and a constant generation of relational understandings, emotions, disjunctures and possibilities.

In the dual sense of symbolism outlined earlier, I suggested that different all-inclusive resorts are often uneasily bracketed in the same category, and furthermore, in their symbolic production of place, divergently negotiate the cultural-political connotations of the 'all-inclusive'. Resorts in St Lucia responded very differently to the high-profile public controversies of the mid-1990s (where they became a lightning conductor for particular and general discontent) through changes in their economic networking, employment practices, public relations strategies, spatial organisation and surveillance, forms of 'outreach', and so forth. Therefore, it is possible in St Lucia to speak about the 'all-inclusive issue' as a symbolic public focus, and about individual resorts as symbolic productions that encompass a reflexive awareness of ongoing attitudes, controversies and associations. By examining observation data and interview material in relation to the guiding theoretical premises I have outlined, it should become apparent that different resorts perform the Caribbean in overlapping, divergent and sometimes contradictory ways, and that the import of cultural ambiguity and risk is conceived of and managed in relation to a plethora of policies, perceptions and experiences.

3.3 The lightning rod of the all-inclusive

All-inclusives have cropped up in my engagements with Caribbean cultures since my first sustained contact; a course in Caribbean literature in my final year of a BA in English. A heavy course emphasis on *Omeros* made this somewhat inevitable:

The tourists revolved, grilling their backs in their noon barbeque\ The waiter was having a hard time with his leather soles\ They kept sliding down a dune, but his tray teetered without spilling gin and lime on a scorched back\ He was determined to meet the beach's demands, like a Lawrence of St Lucia\ except that he was trudging towards a litre of self-conscious champagne. (Derek Walcott, *Omeros*. 1990:23)

This course was in 1995, a period when Walcott himself was actively involved in St Lucian public debate about the immediate and wider implications of tourism and all-inclusive resorts on the island. All-inclusive hotels and resorts can be regarded as a Caribbean *indigenization* of British and French holiday camps, and were first developed

in Jamaica in the late 1970s (Dixey 1999: 1). Since the early 1990s, St Lucia has had the highest proportion of all-inclusive hotels and hotel rooms in the Caribbean, a development linked in the first half of the 1990s with a laissez-faire government policy regarding the 'nature of the tourist product desired by the market' (Dixey 1999: 4). As Pattullo discusses at length in *Last Resorts*, "The rise of the all-inclusive resort throughout much of the Caribbean in the late 1980s reawakened much of the hostile sentiments about tourism of the 1970s" (1996: 74). In St Lucia all-inclusives were criticised for perceived (and real) paucity of a trickle-down effect, for marginalising workers in indirect employment in the tourism industry, and for stunting the growth of 'European Plan' hotels and more diversified forms of accommodation and locations.

Pattullo, in referring to high-profile exclusions and harassments of St Lucians at resorts, argues that what 'united St Lucia in dissent' was the practices of exclusion that resorts implemented and came to ultimately symbolise. Beaches – which cannot by law be privatised – were spatially or psychologically segregated by the overt practices of security and the different ways in which public access and tourist access were facilitated. The (lack of) sight of wrist-banded tourists who had paid for everything prior to departure fuelled a specific and more general resentment about the ways in which tourism organised and benefited from St Lucia society, without perceived benefits for the national population. Moreover, the intrinsic racialisation of this conflict is hard to avoid and equally hard to theorise; there has been a drift away from situating it in explicitly colonial terms, however its representation of global inequality is similarly racialised.

The central symbolic controversy of the 1990s was the decision to allow a Swiss-based corporation to open Jalousie Plantation Resort and Spa in the valley between the two Piton mountains, the national symbol of St Lucia, and historically a sacred site for Arawaks (Pattullo 1997). The Organisation of American States (OAS) described the area as "[...] one of the most significant ecological and geological areas in the Caribbean" and Greenpeace wrote publicly to the Prime Minister John Compton to query the decision.⁶⁵ Nevertheless the resort opened in late May 1996 only to close

⁶⁵ This could be taken as an early example of needing to avoid what Urry has called 'global shaming' (2003). The same newspaper article that this information is taken from details that Compton had ridiculed

weeks later and be rescued by a government-floated restructuring plan and new corporate consortium.⁶⁶ Reflecting on the episode in a 1999 interview, Walcott drew attention to the ways in which the readiness to commodify an area of profound national importance despite public opposition spoke to a wider sense of alienation:

Even if we have the trappings and ceremonies of independence, how real are they? Our future is dependent on tourism and we are ruled from the outside, certainly in terms of economics... (tourism) needs some sense of self-respect and dignity. In the Caribbean context this means *not* whoring out our beaches because there's a dollar to be made; respecting the cost of integrity. My rage continues because in these deals (the big beachfront developments) the public is never consulted. You may say the public is never consulted anywhere; but when you are dealing with a very small beautiful space and a very valuable, limited amount of real estate, it is clear what will happen – a succession of mini-Miamis all down the archipelago, devoted to exploiting our resources.⁶⁷

What Walcott describes is different perceptions of the latitudes governments have in relation to their economic dependence on tourism. In St Lucia's case, as David Jessop illustrates, the industry's contribution to GDP was the highest in the Caribbean region at 69%, and accounted for 51% of employment (Jessop 2000). Moreover, this must be contextualised by a 62% drop in the prime export of bananas from receipts of \$52.4 million in 1996 to \$19.7 million in 1998 as a result of the World Trade Organisation's termination of the EU's preferential agreements with the Windward Islands' banana trade.⁶⁸ Moreover, it is not only dependence on tourism which is in question here, but the dynamics which encourage certain forms of tourism to predominate. As an industry representative noted in 1994, all-inclusives tend to overwhelm any sense of there being any other kinds of tourism available in a given location; "[...] it's a problem for the

local environmentalists during a dinner address at Club St Lucia (an all-inclusive resort) asking whether or not they had discovered 'a species of mosquito they wanted to preserve'. However engaging with Greenpeace recognised that they had the political possibility to effect both foreign aid and international perceptions of the tourist industry. 'Group questions Compton on environmental damage at Jalousie', *St Lucia Star*, January 18 1992.

⁶⁶ Churchill, David 'Plantation failure in the Caribbean'. *The Times* 6 June 1996.

⁶⁷ Marr, Andrew 'Interview with Derek Walcott'. *The Observer Escape* 27 April 1999.

⁶⁸ 'Investment in domestic human resources attracts foreign capital', *The Washington Times Special International Report on St Lucia*, January 25 2000. For an overall treatment see Ahmed 2004.

image of an island. For example, St Lucia is now thought of as an all-inclusive destination” (quoted in Pattullo 1996: 74).

In the period in which I engaged in fieldwork and active monitoring of debates on tourism and all-inclusives in St Lucia, the idea that it was perceived as an all-inclusive island was echoed unanimously by a range of tourism professionals and commentators in response to a direct question. The spring and summer of 2002 was characterised by ongoing fall-out from the WTO ruling and its aftermath, by the dire regional and global effects on tourism of the September 11th terrorist attacks and the ‘war on terror’, and specific controversies regarding all-inclusives that recalled issues and the prevailing tone of the previous debates over Jalousie. The fall in tourist numbers reignited intense discussion not only about overall levels of dependency on tourism – and the near-impossibility of controlling ‘tourism development strategies’ – but the ways in which regional competition for sun, sea, sand tourism (especially given economies of scale⁶⁹) and the general subsuming of different islands into an homogenous image made it difficult to differentiate their ‘product’ and diversify their market base. I will return to the implications of this later in this section. The drop in US tourists to the Caribbean was primarily off-set by large all-inclusive operations such as Sandals offering discounted holidays in the UK, thus increasing the profile and patronage of certain companies operating in the Caribbean.⁷⁰

Crystallising many of these concerns during this period was a specific controversy regarding the purchase of the Hyatt Regency Hotel at Pigeon Point (a notable landmark north of the capital, Castries) by the Sandals chain, which already operated two all-inclusives on St Lucia. The objections to this were manifold; that it resembled a parallel

⁶⁹ While large operation all-inclusives weathered the post 9-11 downturn far more successfully, this relative success is complicated by the fact that integrated tour operators (agencies plus charter airlines plus resorts) were and have continued to concentrate sun/sea/sand all-inclusives in the Dominican Republic and Cuba, where labour and hotel costs are lower, and infrastructure and proximity to the US reduces time and costs.

⁷⁰ Bird, Liz. ‘Life’s a cheap beach’, *The Observer* 28 October 2001. The Annual Report 2000-2001 of the St Lucia Hotel and Tourism Association (SLHT) provides a statistical analysis of arrivals and occupancy up until the end of September 2001. This shows a drop of US tourist arrivals in September 2001 of almost 38.9% and a drop of overall visitor arrivals of 35.2% when compared with September 2000. In numbers, this represented 1, 885 less US visitors and 5,414 less overall visitors. I have not been able to obtain comparable statistics online for 2002 and 2003.

experience with monocultural agriculture; that it placed enormous relative stock in the hands of one operator at a time of perceived risk; that the consolidation of a reputation as an all-inclusive destination primarily associated with one dominant regional brand⁷¹ went against the stated prerogatives of diversification; and that specifically it contravened government policies aimed at supporting the development of European Plan hotels.⁷² This resort – the 8,500 sq ft Sandals Grande St Lucian Spa and Beach Resort – eventually opened in late 2002.

Given this context, and the contrast between socio-economic upheaval in St Lucia and the girded simulation of paradise, I examined all-inclusive resorts to analyse the ways in which they institutionally imagined tourists and the degree of ‘cultural work’ they should necessarily engage in, and the unpredictable and shifting ways in which all-inclusive forms negotiated their relationships with wider social space. In many ways, this contrast was and remains stark, as Andrew Marr writes:

You live in a beautiful bungalow, in a beautiful little groin of land, looking out at a beautiful beach. But if St Lucia is a natural paradise, it isn't a social or economic one ... A few hundred yards from where some of the richest people on the planet are relaxing, some of the poorest are hacking down bananas and washing clothes on a riverbed. Not that the banana plantations may last (1999).

3.4 Dwelling, imagining and researching in the Caribbean

In the sections that follow I will present analysis informed by site (sight) visits and observation, focused, recorded interviews, open-ended conversational engagements interpreted and ‘reconstructed’ from notes, and an analysis of online discussions conducted before and after fieldwork. I spent from mid-June to mid-July 2002 in St

⁷¹ A resort chain of Sandals' size and reach tends to have a far superior marketing budget and advertising catchment area than any one national tourist board in the region. Some of the implications of this are discussed later in this section.

⁷² The government's position was that selling to an operator already in situ hastened the re-employment of the Hyatt Regency staff. A series of articles in *The Star St Lucia* drew attention to government pre-election promises and policy statements that it would not allow the development of any more all-inclusives, particularly as the overall % of hotel rooms in all-inclusives was then 63%. However when it came to competitive bids between Sandals and the Canadian company Fairmount Hotels, the government argued that it could not interfere in a market process. Perhaps inevitably, there was a degree of speculation as to the government's relationship with Sandals, as well as more obvious factors such as Sandals agreements with regional airlines. See Francis, Agnes 2002a and 2002b, and Francis, Eliza 2002.

Lucia, located near Rodney Bay, and frequently travelling to the capital Castries, to Soufrière in the south of the island, and to major resorts in different locations on the Caribbean coast. I intended to examine the situated understandings of all-inclusive resorts by interviewing St Lucians and tourists, and by doing so in a climate where, as the previous sections outlined, all-inclusive resorts were a contentious issue in specific and symbolic terms. I made official contacts through the Society for Caribbean Studies prior to my trip, and initially engaged in discussion with these academic and governmental contacts in order to sketch out my ideas and seek their assistance in making contacts with a variety of envisaged participants.

This particular category of interviews – with public and private tourism professionals – was relatively easy to arrange. The relevant network in St Lucia is small, and given their professional context, they are used both to conducting research and to participating in it. I interviewed researchers and policy-makers with the St Lucia Hotel and Tourism Authority, The St Lucian Tourist Board, The Office of the Prime Minister, and the St Lucia Heritage Tourism Programme. I also conducted interviews with the general manager or personnel manager of seven all-inclusive resorts. In these interviews I was interested in gathering different interpretations of the role and politics of all-inclusive resorts in St Lucia, reflections on the image and ‘brand’ of the island, and important priorities the respondents identified for the future. I worked with focused interviews; always proceeding from their personal history in and experience of the tourism industry, entering into these issues with reference to ongoing public debates (often in the paper or on the radio news of that day), and proceeding through the key topics indicated while retaining an openness to the issues and directions they were signalled as being of interest or worth.

On average these interviews lasted one hour, and on several occasions a second instalment was agreed. It became obvious that the topicality and contentiousness of what I was inquiring into encouraged people to participate, and a variety of motivations – surveillance, promotion of conflicting positions, personal engagement with ongoing public debate – were both declared and speculatively latent during these interviews. There were a few cases where the contentiousness of these issues led to a tension between my outsider status and my panoptical significance; a certain degree of hostility was tinged with the instrumentality of public relations. More generally, I found that

people were happy to talk about their work and experience, particularly as it allowed them to demonstrate the hard work, training and multiple tasks they had undertaken to be promoted to management (in contra-distinction to the prevalent image of all-inclusive managers as foreigners parachuted in at the top). They were also highly engaged and knowledgeable about the perceptions and problems discussed here, and provided their own frameworks for analysing them.

It regularly happened that such participants offered further contacts and access to further networks, and also access to their hotel grounds during particular evenings or festivities. There seemed to be an ethical dilemma here between accepting certain forms of hospitality, such as invitations to cocktail evenings, and on the other hand gaining less formal access to aspects of the life of all-inclusive resorts. In general I accepted all forms of access, as it was also an important way of seeing the kinds of contact the resorts built up with actors in the wider social space. This was further heightened by my realisation that it would be practically difficult and substantively useless to attempt to secure and conduct interviews or focus groups with tourists. Similarly, I was very careful in approaching mid and entry-level employees in the all-inclusive resorts, as a private research interview could not be considered immune from the routines, surveillance and discipline of the resort space and regime. Thus in what follows the focused interviews generally inform both my discussion of the all-inclusives and all-inclusivity, and they are similarly informed by the informal discussions and contacts forged with beach vendors on both 'privatised' and public beaches. Reflections on these engagements are presented below.

Prior to presenting a situated analysis of all-inclusive resorts and wider dynamics of all-inclusivisation, it is perhaps of more than normal importance to discuss my approaches to and experience of research in St Lucia. In particular, I wish to sketch out the ways in which I developed notions of reflexivity in this research. Reflexivity – which I understand as ongoing critical self-reflection recognising the researcher as a subject in and of their research processes, interactions and results – has become a central if diffusely understood and practised pillar of sociological, social-scientific, anthropological and intercultural research (Coffey 1999, May 1999, 2001). As May argues, basic reflexive concerns emerge from 'early philosophical pre-occupations' that acknowledge that "the knower and the known cannot be separated' (1999: 2.1), and

have been intensified in social scientific practice by the impact of phenomenological, postmodern and ethnomethodological discourses.⁷³

The increasing importance of reflexive practice in the ethical and epistemological presentation of research is amplified, I would argue, by the interlocking significances of aspects of conducting research in the Caribbean. Not only are my various positionalities dynamically at play in the conception, experience, understanding and reconstruction of research interactions, but the themes of imaginative geography I have been exploring offer comment on the practice of research. According to Galani-Moutafi, the traveller in Western discourse has traditionally involved a figurative “[...] white European male who has embarked on voyages motivated by heroic, educational, scientific and recreational purposes” (1999: 204). Her description immediately punctures any unreflexive cultural capital sustained by the assumed status of research; this researcher is such a cultural figure, and as I shall argue, the interpenetrative modalities of travel, tourism, research and dwelling keenly shaped the research project I undertook.

Furthermore, being a white man in the Caribbean – which interplay in interesting ways with preconceptions of national identity – are central tenets of reflexive praxis in this context (see Skelton 2004). This also involves a further dimension – what Tim May describes as *referential reflexivity* (1999) – intensified by the performative reflexivity of tourism under discussion. In other words, I was engaged in modes and moments of performance and negotiation, and this took place in the territorial, trans-territorial and imagined *field* of St Lucia. It is the reflexivity engendered by experiencing my own dissonances – described in the sections that follow – which suggest that the studied reflexivity of the researcher in the field cannot be easily separated from the ‘accidental cosmopolitanism’ of the tourist at play.

The following pages – developed, re-written and re-shaped over *time* – cannot do justice to the complexity of this process, and nor can or should they provide a framework that suggests the basis of a preferred reading. Nevertheless, the practice of reflexive research

⁷³ May could also have quite centrally referenced feminist theories, whose critiques of gendered normalities and power at work in research relationships have been crucial for questioning not only the taken-for-granted in epistemological approaches, but also as Stanley argues, for foregrounding relationships between epistemology and ontology (1990 in Coffey, 1999: 11)

is not to engender the paralysis of ambivalence, but to attempt, within a recognition of limitedness, to provide biographical and experiential reflection on the textual practices of research. Nor is the aim – if perhaps sometimes the unfortunate, fashionable by-product - of reflexivity to centre the self and experience of the researcher as the horizon of meaning. Instead, it is a “[...] recognition that the ethnographic self is the outcome of complex negotiations. Moreover, the definition and location of the self is implicitly a part of, rather than tangential to, the ethnographic research endeavour” (Coffey: 1999, 36).

This research project, carried out under the interdisciplinary auspices of Intercultural Studies, is comparatively a minor one, and does not qualify – in terms of breadth and depth of methodology, length of stay, as well as research aim – as ethnography. Nevertheless, I engage with discussions of ethnographic considerations, as ethnography provides ideas for the reflexive reconstruction of inquiry rather than a normative threshold for interpersonal and intercultural research. I will proceed by discussing the three vectors of reflexive practice noted above in general terms, and in relation to the unstructured and informal conversations I undertook with beach vendors in and around all-inclusive resorts

I travelled to the Eastern Caribbean to conduct a research project, but I also travelled in functional and imaginative terms as a tourist, with a partner who was ‘on holiday’ yet dwelling in the Caribbean for a longer period, and with different routines, to previous vacations. This personal process was important, as it immediately involved a significant other in reflections, decisions, parameters, and subsequently in the re-construction of memories, impressions and conclusions. It is also obvious that as a researcher who had spent years at BA, MA and PhD level thinking and writing about the Caribbean that I was engaged in moving across and within my own particular imaginative topography. I was undertaking a voyage where, for example, the instantaneousness of impressions and reactions were constantly subject to the critiques of tropical travel I had spent so long absorbing (Curtis & Pajaczkowska 1994). Thus initially, it came as some surprise to this researcher – as it does to the metro-stressual Alain de Botton on a beach in Barbados (2003) – that I had brought my body with me (see also Abram et al 1997). Research, in this context, is not only an embodied experience, but one where discourses of

embodiment and sensuousness in the Caribbean are loaded with the mythologies of liminality and possession discussed in previous sections.

I mention this specific feeling as it relates to a more general point made by Markula, that discomfort in field tourism research – or within researchers on holiday – may arise from competition and friction between settled modes of cognitive and emotional engagement that are rarely put into play with each other (1997: 221). Reflecting on a trip to Tahiti, Markula discusses the ways in which the researcher as tourist may not only unthinkingly replicate limiting binaries of difference embedded in discourses of modernity and authenticity, but that the assumption of implicit critical distance – not to mention distance from the experiences of ‘tourists’ – may blind the researcher to their own reifications of ‘how people live’ and the legitimacy of their presence (1997). Therefore my reflections on positionality and the relationships that I as a tourist-researcher engaged in with others in a touristic environment primarily focused on attempting to understand my shifting modalities of presence, engagement, identity performance and interpretation.

Some aspects of this can be opened up with reference to a debate in the *Annals of Tourism Research* concerning experiences of travel and self-consciousness. Vasiliki Galani-Moutafi examines self-reflexivity in relation to the Other – ‘the experience of the self through the Other’ (2000: 220) – through the categories of traveller, ethnographer and tourist. Her way into these typological and figurative experiences is a close analytical reading of travel narratives that approaches self-representation and Otherness comparatively: “Travelers, anthropologists and tourists can be considered observers who gaze into the elsewhere and the Other, while looking for their own reflection. Their storytellings and written works suggest that they look into the worlds of Others as a means of laying claim to their own” (2000: 220). In comparing the representations of Otherness to be found in work by the poet Patricia Storace, the travel writer Paul Theroux and the anthropologist Jill Dubisch, Galani-Moutafi argues that the singular epistemological requirements of anthropology mean that its discourses and practices are more likely to have deconstructed formational binaries in practices of representation:

Insofar as a reflexive anthropology has come to critique the emotional/objective boundary and accept the fieldwork's functioning as an inner journey, the anthropologist is obliged to recognise his/her experience as well as the emotional responses to what he/she experiences (2000: 217)

In a rejoinder to this article, Dennison Nash takes issue with the ethnographer as hero, primarily because extrapolating from types of experience, where the types have been somewhat arbitrarily selected and juxtaposed by the author, cannot provide the basis for a proto-theory of reflexive experience (2001). Indeed they may simply serve – despite being in the service of reflexivity - to reify typologies of tourists and travellers that detailed ethnographic studies have aimed to dispel and problematise. Interestingly, Nash also takes issue with the assumption of the constancy of reflexivity in ethnographic practice, and cites the anthropological study of tourism as a major exception to this apparent new normativity (2001: 495). Furthermore, following dominant theorisations of reflexivity in late modernity, Nash argues that self-reflective knowledge may also be produced by tourists (and, as my research shows, workers in and in proximity to tourism):

One could argue with Giddings that the West has come to live in a reflective world where we all become knowledge producers 'who filter and react to many sources of incoming information about life circumstances' (1996: 276). Perhaps travelers do more of this than others, and perhaps anthropologists-ethnographers head the list of self-reflective knowledge producers, but even so, the difference between them and the others may not be so great as the author concludes (2001. 495)

While Nash challenges the somewhat crude limitation of reflexive capacities and practices to a domain that is professionally engaged with particular discourses of reflexivity, I could add a further rejoinder by suggesting that his approach remains trapped by the typologies proposed by Galani-Moutafi. What is also at stake here is the ways in which reflexivity is engendered by the relationships between different modalities and understandings of presence. In other words, the reflexivity of the tourist-traveller-ethnographer in situ and in the broader temporal and spatio-cultural field may be shaped by the ways in which they understand and reflect on these modalities in *interaction with each other*.

To give an example, while endeavouring to interview vendors on the beaches of all-inclusives, my interaction with them was always informed by the desire to form a

relationship which may lead from informal discussion to perhaps a semi-structured interview, while engaging with them in ways that do not impinge on their time and energy in making a living. Thus I would wait to be approached on the beach as a tourist, explain what I was doing and why, and see if they were interested in discussing further. This presentation of self was an attempt to delineate myself from other tourists on the beach and to create a clear offer, yet it was constantly informed by my awareness that for many of the vendors I merely represented a different variety of tourist, who may, for example, simply require more work on their part to engage a sale, or be an interesting way of filling quiet time. My engagement with them was a constant dialogue between conducting initial contacts with potential research participants, and awareness that such encounters were likely to have particular expectations, logics and 'scripts'. As a researcher, my engagements needed to be conducted in the awareness that I was perceived as a tourist, as I had no right in that context to expect more. To seek an immediate exemption from the frame of 'tourist' risked both ethical ambiguity – impinging on the possibilities of others – and recourse to the assumed capital of a status that does not make sense cleansed of both the sense and perception of being a tourist.

Furthermore, while on the beaches, observing and attempting to engage in conversations, I often felt *like* a tourist, physically, emotionally and imaginatively, and this had consequences for the rhythm and concentration of research. Unlike the semi-formal interviews, where I coded my appearance appropriately, there was nothing about being on the beach to physically recall me to the modality of research. Yet, given the temporal, financial, emotional and intellectual investment I had in this fieldwork, neither was there a moment when I felt as my 'tourist self'. This shifting, critical reflection on experience and how I *should* approach that experience informed every occasion in which I participated in a touristic activity with the aim of observing and learning; bus tours, guided tours, discussions with my landlord there, an American anthropologist working nearby, and so forth. It was also present in our lived spatial relationships. We stayed in a small rented apartment complex popular with travelling salespersons, sports teams and tourists from the Eastern Caribbean, located between the hotel strip of Rodney Bay, and the wider residential neighbourhoods of the greater Gros Islet area. What is missing in the debate outlined above is not only that different modalities of tourist and researcher overlap and co-exist from day to day and moment to

moment, but that reflexivity is forged in attempting to maintain a critical relationship between these ways of seeing and engaging that cannot be satisfactorily delineated.

At this point, such modalities of experience and engagement must be considered in relation to the gendered, racialised and privileged positionalities of my research in the Caribbean. In a wider globality, as Christer Petley (2004) and Mimi Sheller (2003) argue, the Western researcher is placed in a privileged position to the Caribbean from the moment one decides to engage with a historically constructed imagined geography of a 'research area' (see also Appadurai 2003). The researcher is in a position of ideological and practical power, benefiting from access, mobility and resources, and faced with an ethical realisation that career research on the Caribbean requires careful reflection on how it interpolates researcher and participants within 'global systems of privilege and exclusion' (Petley: 2004: 21). As Skelton argues, relationships of research in general and in the postcolonial, globalised Caribbean in particular entail:

[...] a political duty through our research to make sure that we do not deepen or exploit power relations to our advantage and our interviewee's disadvantage. In some cases it might be possible to establish a space of empowerment for research participants, acknowledging that as researchers we are always empowered through our research because of what we learn and gain through the process (Skelton 2004: 29)

I felt this keenly in relating a project of textual inquiry to the significances of these issues in observed, everyday practices. In the case of research that engages with widely circulated images and myths of the Caribbean, and to some degree with the lives, experiences and investments of people in these places, landscapes and images, I felt a key duty to both the general picture of inequality and limited possibility, as well as to the complexity and polyvocality of the affective attachments at play in tourism landscapes that may be elided by the structural generalisations of political solidarity. This consciousness included a constant working through of the import of an imaginative Caribbean that both provided a focus, yet also inevitably permeated my work and the expectations I brought to the field and to the analysis of data. As Silverman discusses, there may often be an expectation of 'finding' confirming evidence of conceptual-political presumptions in interviews, and this is an often-unconscious temptation that I kept central both in the preparation and conduct of interviews, as well as in the ways in which this analysis subsequently developed (1985: 45-51). Conversely, it takes constant

vigilance and probing to unsettle the surety with which exoticising perspectives normalise themselves; the banal Caribbean conditions my interaction also (see Courtman 2004: xvi-xvii). Further aspects of this responsibility and political duty will be discussed in the conclusion to this thesis, as they pertain to the application of this research.

In situated terms, an obvious subtext to encounters with the socially marginalised workers in the informal economy is my inescapable status as a tourist – and indeed as a researcher – grounded in my presence as a white, financially privileged visitor. As Skelton has further argued, undertaking field research in the Caribbean involves foregrounding politics and ethics in readings of racialised power relations, and engaging in an open-ended process of reflexivity on questions of ‘race’ and power (2004: 26-27). Moreover, given the contextual dynamism of these relationships, it is important to recognise how they are projected and performed in touristic encounters. As a researcher-tourist I clearly stepped into the prevailing, racialised power relations of the tourist industry.

In these interactions, it must be noted that racialisation, gender and economic status are intersectional aspects. The beach vendors I interviewed were exclusively male, reflecting both the gendered nature of work in tourism services, as well as the dynamics discussed elsewhere in this chapter, whereby dreadlocked young men are regarded as too threatening to be employed in ‘frontstage’ positions. Nevertheless, as I argue, they occupy frontstage positions, and may reflexively re-code and deploy these aspects of ‘threat’ in the performance of self, particularly in relation to drugs and sexual relationships with white female tourists. As a white male researcher, I was often aware of a masculine dynamic of *proving* (Whitehead & Barrett 2001), which can be articulated without suggesting a crude determination to these performances. Projecting their physical and sexual prowess in discussion with me, for example, involves both the re-articulation of a racialised and sexually essentialist discourse, as well as some form of relative ‘empowerment’. Obviously, without further detailed and committed research this must be limited to an impressionistic reading, however the main point is to stress the interactional nature of visible signifiers of identity and status in these encounters, encounters where social identity is being constructed and negotiated in a particular site in relation to a stranger and the possibilities he presents. As Peter Collins notes,

unstructured and open interviews and discussions must be regarded as charged social interactions, where ‘multiple dialogues are conducted between multiple selves’, and where “[...] people in conversation may not primarily be communicating and sharing meanings but selves and therefore identity” (1998: 4.3). It is highly likely that this is intensified by both the performative nature of tourism, and the identity politics that these young men are involved in.

This introduces a final layer to this discussion of reflexivity; the need to recognise the profound ways in which touristic encounters are reflexive for all participants, and that this inter-subjective reflexivity is likely to be heightened by the reading brought to bear *on* and *by* the researcher. Tim May proposes the notion of *referential reflexivity* as the “[...] meeting between the reflexivity exhibited by actors within the social world and that exhibited by a researcher who produces knowledge as part of a social scientific community” (1999: 3.11). In this context, it is worth developing senses of how these interpenetrating reflexivities produce each other, spurred by the two-way interaction and involvement of conversation (Coffey, 1999: 159). My ‘status’ as researcher, for example, was on occasions used as evidence that I should support a particular political stance, provide material support, or share in complicit evaluations of tourists. While it is more generally recognised that working within the performative regimes of tourism engenders reflexivity with regard to touristic expectation and curated image, it is less recognised that – in my experience – the incorporation of perceptions and interpretations of the partner in dialogue intimately shape the reflexive performance. While the reflexive researcher incorporates feedback and information into the process of interview, the dynamics of tourism and the capacities it has cultivated in a variety of tourist workers suggests that nuanced and particularised reflexive strategies are also at work in their engagements.

An example of this is the strategy deployed by beach vendors, who often position reluctant consumers as racist for refusing ‘jus to have a talk wi me’ by publicly asking ‘so you don’t talk to locals/black people?’ Similar to my description of tour guides and the mocking/complicit performance of authenticity in Ecuador, the reflexivity at work here is one that is acutely aware of the discourses tourists may apply in their interactions with ‘locals’. The assumption – in some form - is that encountered tourists are liberal and middle-class, and thus reflective about the ways they interact and are seen to

interact with residents.⁷⁴ In this it follows Edensor's discussion of social performances in tourism: "The efficacy of the performance relies equally upon the ability of the audience to share the meaning the actor hopes to transmit... since much social drama is an attempt to transmit meaning and identity, the effect of performance is contingent upon an audience that understands the message" (2000: 327). Thus the audience for these kinds of positionings is not only the tourist hailed as 'racist', but the random ensemble of other tourists and onlookers who can work within the codes being communicated and who may potentially subject the 'racists' to a 'disciplinary gaze' (ibid).

In conclusion, I would underline Amanda Coffey's insistence on recognising the emotional connectedness to place, people and process that this kind of research involves. Lived experience is fundamentally felt experience, and the self is not suspended or immune during the period framed intellectually as *fieldwork*. As Coffey writes, while much attention has been paid to the facilitative management of identity performance in fieldwork, it is important to develop reflexivity with regard to how "Fieldwork helps to shape, challenge, reproduce, maintain, reconstruct and represent our selves and the selves of others" (1999: 8). My exploration of the trajectories of reflexivity I discerned in considering my fieldwork experience need also to be read in relation to this; the continuing honing of an effective research strategy involved shifts in how I perceived myself, my relations to the work, and to 'the Caribbean' in this context. With this in mind, I would once again contend that the reflexivity of the researcher in tourism is intensified by the kind of reflexivity I have been arguing is enhanced by the experience of disjuncture. It is also undoubtedly significant in how I have marshalled memory in the reconstruction of fieldwork and interviews. Memory and emotion are insistent as I write about the places and episodes that follow, and must now be recognised as immanent in the imaginative Caribbean I am reconstructing.

⁷⁴ An interesting variety on this tactic involved particularising it around national identity and selective confirmation; on establishing my nationality, one vendor confided that "What I like about the Irish is that they never walk away on a brother"! This line has the appearance of infinite adaptability regardless of the nationality, however it is worth noting – as a further aspect of intersectional positionality – that some sense of Irishness as a postcolonial identity, perhaps with a resonance in the Caribbean, was incorporated into interpretation on a number of occasions. Similarly, the sense of a shared island identity was proposed to me on various occasions, and I often developed this to a shared discussion of living in relation to tourism, while never purposefully eliding the massive differences in what is ultimately a phatic comparison.

3.5 The porousness of paradise

The cultural construct known as the all-inclusive resort – as a symbol of cultural separatism and global obliviousness – is charged with sustaining conditions in which the inferences of connexity are muted, and where a privileged clientele are willingly seduced by the promise of a soothingly tame alterity. In other publications, I have argued that the all-inclusive is a globalised form in the sense that it stems and manages flows and mobilities at key moments in the process of consumption (2000, 2004). As Featherstone has argued, human, material and imagic mobilities “[...] have intensified to the extent that the sense of spatial difference which separated and insulated people from the need to take into account all of the other people which make up what has become known as humanity has been eroded” (1995: 87). The resort depends on fluidity and stasis, where mobilities are physically and culturally supported by concomitant immobilities. The role of the all-inclusive is to re-insulate at particular moments of fluidity, when mobile tourists pursuing mobile imaginaries occupy the space where the code of assumed expectations is enacted.

If, as Featherstone suggests, the end of insulation creates the conditions for a constant free-play of Otherness, the resort implies that it is only through spaces of insulation that the attractiveness of the Other can be guaranteed. It is imbricated in an industry of increasing velocity that can transfer consumers rapidly to globally dispersed destinations, yet its inclusivity binds the environment against the speed that renders it accessible and desirable. The imagined Caribbean is available regardless of the island, but only by the firm re-territorialisation of a de-territorialised mythology. The import of these forms of analysis and the symbolic (over) interpretation of the all-inclusive is that, as a site of prestigious leisure, it is only through the erection of barriers that the world can be offered as being without frontiers to the mobile and privileged. In doing so, it undermines the ‘unfurling awareness’ rationale of fair trade thinking, all the more so given the lingering veracity attributed to the idea of ‘travel broadening the mind’.

Yet a close ‘reading’ of sites and their mobilisation (Sheller 2004) reveals a picture that is far more complex than this. Different resorts have reacted to the negative image of the all-inclusive with divergent strategies, and their physical locations alone make it

difficult to map clear relationships between spaces and practices of spatialisation. This is also because, as Baker has argued, spaces are made and remade materially, discursively and touristically, and are profitably understood as palimpsests (2001). Thus even all-inclusive resorts cannot efface the markings, associations and imaginative geographies that enwrap them in wider cultural topographies. Such constantly rewritten and over-written texts, to continue the metaphor, include beaches, access routes, boundaries and coral reefs. As keen semiological realisations, resorts are aware of the ongoing constructions of values and meaning that are negotiated between guests and a variety of residents, and thus constantly adapt in relation to their reading of this. A pertinent example is the spatial and temporal organisation of the 'informal economy' within resorts, and the degrees to which this is controlled.

A key notion proposed in this section is the idea of *porousness*. Tim Edensor has characterised tourism spaces as enclavic and heterogeneous (2000), dynamic spaces where tourists, tourism workers and bystanders (who are always at least engaged in semiotic labour) engage in heightened dimensions of everyday social performance. This framework, and his skilled elaboration and application of metaphors of performance, provide a solid basis for approaching all-inclusive resorts:

While they (sites) cannot determine performance, tourist stages are materially and organizationally constituted in particular ways to provide the establishment of 'meaningful settings that tourists consume and tourism employees help produce (Crang 1997: 143). While representational practices (by tourism employees, guidebooks, films and TC travel programs) (re)construct symbolic sites, they tend to be fluid entities whose meanings and usage change over time and are apt to be contested by different tourist groups. Accordingly, ideas about what sites symbolize may generate myriad forms of performance on a single stage, in which different roles, scripts, choreographies, group formations, instructions and cues are followed (2000: 325-6)

Enclavic spaces are a 'species of purified space' that are spatialised, policed and monitored for 'their coherence with and distinction from' other 'stages' (2000: 328). Performances are monitored and trammelled by both formal agents such as security and management, and by the informal intersubjective discipline of interaction in a themed and relatively prescribed environment. Edensor describes, following Lefebvre (1991), the ways in which the 'freedom' of the resort is achieved through processes of material and symbolic centralisation and programming, where theming 'imposes a visual order'

(2000: 329) and where routing and internal organisation embeds specific pathways and spatial narratives (2000: 339). Edensor is careful to argue against reducing his metaphorical approach to any form of spatial determinism, while suggesting that enclaves may resemble ‘total institutions’ in Goffman’s sense (1961) (2000: 330).

While all-inclusive resorts are - metaphorically and empirically – quite obviously enclavic, I develop Edensor’s observation that “[...] few spaces are hermetically sealed against intrusions and disordering elements” (2000: 328) to examine the ways in which all-inclusive resorts are porous through design, intrusion and inevitability. *Porousness* applies to physical, symbolic and psychological boundaries, and the trajectories and pathways traversed and travelled by human, informational, material and ideological mobilities. It does not imply an idealised state of impermeability as the inevitable, rational desire of all-inclusive resorts, although certain resorts do strive for high degrees of exclusion, resistance and control. As well as the interviews discussed, I investigated this through site visits and observation, guided tours, and where no other options were available, through public visits.⁷⁵

○ *Boundary maintenance*

Several factors influence the degree to which a resort establishes and maintains a sense of clear differentiation between inside and outside. Given that most of them are located in prime physical locations – ‘incorporating’ a beach, or bay, nestling in between cliffs at sea level or perched on one – it is quite easy to sequester the resort, and to render it invisible from main thoroughfares and urban centres. Standing in a resort it is normal to be confronted on one side by a beach and sea vista and to have all other angles covered by ‘lush tropical gardens’ that are cultivated to obscure roads and backstage areas. Nevertheless, there seemed to me to be a correlation between the proximity of a resort

⁷⁵ All-inclusives in the north of the island – Castries and Gros Islet - tended to be more accessible and amenable to interview. They were also – given their proximity to a wider tourist market – more open to day-visitors. I was able to have supported access to Wyndham Morgan Bay Resort, Windjammer Landing, Sandals Halycon St Lucia, and Anse Chastenet. Of these I obtained both formal interviews and discussions in all but the last. Rendezvous – a couples-only resort – granted me a short interview and escorted me on and off the premises without access to the tourist areas. Sandals St Lucia Golf Resort and Spa provided me with promises of interviews and ultimately a guided tour. In the Soufrière region I visited Jalousie Hilton Resort and Spa and the Ladera (which is not technically an all-inclusive resort, but given its location and security, to all extents can be culturally considered as one) Of the major all-inclusive or ‘objectively’ all-inclusive resorts on the island at the time, I could not access Marigot Beach Club Hotel and Dive Resort, Le Sport, and Club St Lucia.

to residential and heterogeneous tourist spaces, and the degree of conscious porousness. Wyndham Morgan, for example, which is located close to both Castries, the Gros Islet area and a shopping centre, had the highest proportion of tour companies represented on site, a bus service linking with local restaurants, and a range of open events. Moreover, management in this resort openly discussed their attempts to avoid the stigmatisation of the all-inclusive, and the overall comparison of the tourism industry with 'plantocracy'. This is in direct distinction to a resort such as the Jalousie Hilton, where the entrance to the resort is set back more than a kilometre from the main campus.⁷⁶ Another factor in this is the nature and clientele of the resort; Rendezvous, a couples-only resort, is visible only from a side-road, and a small gate arched by two kissing fish is the only break in a thick perimeter of vegetation that acts as a horseshoe extending from the beach.

All resorts have screening and security at their initial entrance, and visitors' names and often passport numbers are noted. Few non-employed residents enter the resort this way, as all of the resorts are obliged to maintain public access routes to the beaches. Given the wide perimeter of many of the resorts, these routes were at least demanding and in some cases arguably symbolic. However while some of these routes may not have facilitated meaningful public access, what was interesting to note was the degree of tourist traffic outwards and drug traffic inwards, as the mouths of these routes became places of exchange between vendors and tourists. The mouth of the public route was generally a place of congregation for vendors, and often a place of focus and concentration for resort security.

The incorporation of beaches into the body of the resort and as a natural perimeter is a complex phenomenon. The beach is a naturally and socially heterogeneous and liminal space, and the stage management of beaches often entails the immobilisation, rather than marginalisation, of vendors. The physical size of the beach obviously affects the

⁷⁶ It is interesting to note – that even in a 'small island' – the degree of physical distance from residential areas and potential 'infiltration' brings with it a sense of multi-faceted autonomy and exceptionality. The Jalousie Hilton, for example, openly advertises its 'private beach' – "A day at the beach at Jalousie Bay is a day spent luxuriating under the West Indies sun, away from the crowds. Our private beach affords you the ultimate in relaxation" (brochure quotation) – despite the fact that this is legally prohibited. The 'entertainment menu' for guests was topped by cartoon carvings of black topless grass-skirted women, further signifying the distance a resort such as this may feel from wider social discourses. This particular resort is well-known for importing white sand from Guyana to create its paradise beach, perhaps again signifying the degree to which simulacry prerogatives take precedence.

degree of porousness, as does its proximity and affective relation to local populations⁷⁷ and the monitoring and policing practices of security. Beach vendors adopt a range of visible tactics⁷⁸ to attract consumers and integrate themselves into the beach-scape. They tend to remain on the fringes – setting up their wares in the shade of large trees – and sometimes engage individual tourists in conversation, rather than approaching groups. Many refine tactics according to their appearance.⁷⁹ On some beaches, they remain bobbing in the water with examples of their goods, or paddle close to the beach on surfboards without ever beaching. On all-inclusive beaches, vendors tend to be licensed to operate on a particular beach, an official tactic that combines access and control.⁸⁰ On some beaches it is clear that a degree of latitude is permitted to the ‘authentic’ and to particular types of performances; on Jalousie, the otherwise rigidly monitored beach is transformed by fishermen landing their catch (which they are legally entitled to do) and immediately becoming a spectacle where tourists come down to the water to take pictures.

In conclusion, the degree of external access and internal exit from resorts is not defined by boundary-maintenance, as this varies enormously, and must be understood in relation to the further factors considered below.

⁷⁷ As previously noted, this has been an intense source of controversy in many Caribbean nations, and with the exception of Jamaica, none more so than in St Lucia where exclusion from beaches has become a symbol of cultural alienation, political-economic powerlessness and the nature of sovereignty. Pattullo quotes the Mighty Sparrow Calypso ‘Alien’ which protests “Some put on Sandals, Exclusive vandals, It’s a scandal. The way they operate, Building brick walls and barricades, Like a state within a state” (1999). It is worth noting, however, that it is not only a question of all-inclusives encompassing a beach and substantively privatising it. In Rodney Bay, where many EP hotels face the beach, the practice of placing sun screens, sports services and deck chairs – with signs reminding people that they are reserved for patrons – has an equally exclusive impact on a beach that is in close proximity to areas such as Gros Islet.

⁷⁸ Although I spoke at length with many, I know little of more cumulative strategies such as the relationships with individual security guards.

⁷⁹ I interviewed many Rastas and men with dreadlocks working the beach. There seemed to be something of a consensus that their image works for them with guests – ‘folks like to buy from a Rasta’ – but that it also increased the level of surveillance they were subject to. Some consciously performed ‘outlaw status’ as part of this (‘Norbert’ provided me with a rehearsal of his techniques for working the beach strip, and his different ways of passing ‘gear’ to tourists in a hair-band) whereas others had a reflective approach to the overall image of Rastafarians in society – ‘they say Rasta only work outside the system’ – and spoke of the constraints of needing to earn a living (see next footnote) while trying to defuse ways they felt they were perceived.

⁸⁰ According to one vendor on Wyndham Morgan beach, his local authority licence cost him 150 SLD plus a set tax rate of 50SLD per month.

○ *Internal staging*

As ‘stages’, resorts must be themed, semiotically managed and surveyed. As Edensor notes: “The rhythms and choreographies of enclavic space are characterised by purposive, directed movements along strongly demarcated paths. Such paths are organized to facilitate directional movement by reducing points of entry and exit and minimising idiosyncratic distractions” (2000: 339). All resorts direct movement along pathways between such nodes as reception, restaurants and bars to distinct accommodation ‘villages’ or ‘secluded’ chalets and to different sites of activity. Moreover, this form of purposeful spatialisation enhances theming by allowing signposting with street names, cobbled footpaths, distinct themed identities for different zones, and so forth. The development of clear routes allows the demarcation of frontstage and backstage areas within complex spatial arrangements. In some resorts spatial control is made explicit by the absence of footpaths and the presence of ‘complimentary’ shuttle buses to and from certain areas of the resort, and often from the security perimeter to the reception area.

Many of the resorts develop ‘stages within stages’; particularly those offering ‘weddings and honeymoon packages’ need to develop sub-routes and sub-enclavic spaces within the resort space as a whole: to and from the ‘love shack’ wedding chapel and the ‘bowery bush’. The stage within a stage is used as a tactic for allowing licensed vendors to operate on the premises, a development that many of the managers interviewed described as a concession to local ‘perceptions’ of economic exclusion. Resorts incorporated vendors into their theming through staging ‘handicraft villages’ or similar variations, which were either marginalised or obviously demarcated within central areas. At Sandals Halcyon, for example, vendors were organised in a permanent area at a remote area of the perimeter, and licensed vendors were also permitted to set up stalls near the swimming pool on Tuesday and Thursdays. These can be read as sub-spaces of heterogeneity, however it is more appropriate to see these as strategic practices of heterogenisation that serve to intensify the overall enclavic dynamic.

Internal staging is also achieved through temporal organisation. Every resort offers a timetable of activities, and I would once again tentatively link the nature of these schedules to the overall resistance to porousness tangible in particular sites. Rendezvous, for example, provided an entertainment menu that demanded different

kinds of time-commitment from guests, up to and including rehearsing and staging a pantomime. Sandals resorts operate a points system for participation in activities, with different levels of points acquiring different gifts and Sandals merchandise.⁸¹

○ *Interpersonal performance*

The attempted rationalisation of tourist-worker interaction has been centrally discussed in tourism studies (Crang 1997, Edensor 2000, Meethan 2001, Ritzer & Liska 1997). The dominant – and disputed - paradigm has been Ritzer and Liska's 'McDisneyfication', which combines the application of instrumental rationality with processes of theming (1997). Their contention that people desire predictable, efficient, calculable and controlled holidays is echoed both in general rationales for all-inclusives (1997: 99-100), and in interview with human resources professionals in all-inclusive sites. Critiques of Ritzer and Liska's formulation have pointed out that apparently free-form and uncontrolled modes of tourism develop informal practices of control and surveillance (Meethan 2001: 75-77); that thinking through the implications of performance entails a recognition that "Even the most delineated social performance...and its reception cannot be controlled by the performer" (Edensor 2000: 324); and that such a rationalising notion fails to consider the irrationality of rationalisation and degrees and practices of improvisation (Crang 1997).

However the value of the aspects yoked together clumsily in McDisneyfication is that it draws attention to the representational labour central to mobilising a themed resort. Most of the resorts have clearly delineated policies on appearance, which would be unremarkable apart from the fact that many discussants outside of the resorts saw this as a latent policing of dreadlocks. One manager was explicit about this, citing tourist associations of dreads with guns and drugs, whereas in some resorts dreadlocks were allowed for gardeners, and thus could be interpreted as a micro-theming building on associations of Rastafarianism with nature. Similarly, most of those involved in staff training openly discussed the idea of 'hiring the smile', while framing it in terms of the reciprocity of staff-tourist satisfaction.

⁸¹ The tour guide of Sandals golf resort constantly referred to this as 'group-building' and 'fostering togetherness' and also freely admitted that it was designed to keep as much activity on-site as possible. See also my subsequent discussions of Sandals networked site on St Lucia.

A common theme proffered by human resources managers – apart from the consistency of the product - was that scripted approaches and clearly delineated boundaries of engagement protected staff from difficult situations and conflict. Thus staff were trained to ‘reference upwards’ once they had provided a certain degree of information and explanation. This was clearly pronounced in relation to barmen and their dealings with customers who had drunk too much yet were ‘entitled’ to keep drinking. As Gmelch documents, however, the role of the barman is also one where more improvisational and personalised strategies and interactions are encouraged (2003). Given that I had no period of situated immersion to draw on, it is hard to say in practice how strategies of rationalised encounter are lived. It depends both on the broadly ‘frontstage’ and ‘backstage’ nature of the roles, and within frontstage roles, on the coded and hierarchical nature of the work.⁸² Tour guides, for example, who tend – in Cohen’s categorisation (1985) – to be *pathfinders* within resorts, seemed in my interpretation to be drawing on both scripts and cumulative parameters of improvisation, while concentrating on reiterating and expounding values and elements of importance to the brand.⁸³

○ *External networking*

Edensor draws attention to what he sees as the mobility of touristic enclaves, where – as can be seen in the Dennery discussion – an environmental bubble shields tour groups, and where the regimentation of schedule and itinerary as well as practices of professional direction and interpretation reproduce aspects of rooted enclaves (2000: 330). In St Lucia, a central economic criticism of all-inclusives has been that they take business from restaurants, sites and businesses dependant on wider tourist mobilities. One general development in relation to this, which emerged as part of the cluster of

⁸² This is clearly both a fascinating and practically difficult opportunity for sustained and possibly ethnographic analysis. However, as I primarily have interview material that disproportionately represents management, I do not want to speculate too much on how certain processes unfold. It was next to impossible to interview general staff, both because of the reluctance of management and my deep-seated reluctance to place people in that position (especially without an opportunity to do more than a solitary interview). Similarly, discussions that I had with people hostile to all-inclusives makes for fascinating suggestion yet hardly reliable indication of policies in this area. I can cite one that I heard from more than one source, which is that in certain resorts some staff refused to serve gay couples. Practices such as this are unequivocally discriminatory, however they are also germane as some indication of issues where all-inclusive staff members feel free or vindicated to ‘import’ wider social positions into a themed environment.

⁸³ In the tours I took in Sandals resorts, for example, the guides constantly stressed the togetherness of the guests, and constantly showed ‘proof’ of this in what they drew my attention to.

attempts by some resorts to improve image and linkages, is the organisation of transport to and from selected restaurants, and providing on-site space and publicity for a variety of island tours. I will discuss these strategies and forms of movement in the next section, as they point to a wider process that I will discuss as wider social *all-inclusivisation*.

In conclusion, if it is difficult to use the idea of ‘all-inclusive’ as a functional term in tourism, it is equally difficult to describe it as a cultural form in St Lucia. I have tried to outline factors that influence the degrees and aspects of porousness that appear through institutional policy and practice, locational aspects, transgressive practices and the sheer inevitability of permeability. Some resorts display and cultivate modes and sub-spaces of heterogeneity, which in turn can blend with the enclavic, or serve to reinforce it. Perhaps ironically, the attempts of some resorts to cultivate porousness and movement to more heterogeneous spaces – through for example day-tours and ‘dine out’ programmes – may cultivate enclavic spaces and mobilities within wider social place. Thus it is necessary to turn from investigating the cultural significance of all-inclusive resorts as supposed embodiments of social apartheid of a monolithic spatial type, to the ways in which the symbolism and strategies of the all-inclusive construct St Lucia more generally as an enclavic island.

3.6 The creep of *all-inclusivisation*

The general thrust of this field analysis has been to illustrate the discrepancy between the globalised idea of the all-inclusive as a figurative cultural construct and the divergent socio-spatial practices that demarcate and integrate these resorts into their wider social environment. If we take Melucci’s analysis of boundaries further, then the limit and the barrier involve an intrinsic recognition of insistence, they signify a relationship with the ‘world beyond’. Despite being unable to conduct any significant qualitative analysis with tourists, it is clear that in a variety of ways ‘the world beyond’ flows and impinges on fantasyscapes that cannot and to different extents do not strive for hermetic status. It also seems that what can only be described as the (reluctant) reflexivity of the resort is a product of a number of factors; wider public debate and

pressure, co-existence in a small industry in a competitive region, the self-consciousness of guests, and the embedded social sensitivities of staff.⁸⁴

Moreover, there is a real danger that a politics of form leads to a determinist approach to all-inclusivised experiences where an imagined tourist continues to play the role of ‘the enemy of social sciences’ (Harrison 2001: 160). As Harrison (2001), Abram et al (1997) and Urry (1995) have demonstrated, the analysis of tourism has involved an ongoing struggle for adequacy where ‘the tourist’ has incrementally been granted increasingly differentiated motivations, experiences and relationships with place. Graburn and Barthel-Bouchier describe this gradual expansion in concern from frames of typologisation and differentiation to an investigation of subjective experiences as the progress from ‘ubiquitous tourists’ as ‘part-persons’ to ‘the tourist as a whole person’(2001: 149-151).

Questions of imagination and imaginative geography – which have for a relatively long time been investigated and theorised in relation to ‘situated’ consumers – have only recently begun to be related to tourism (Franklin 2003). Lengkeek adapts Cohen’s model of phenomenological categorisation of modes of tourist experience (1979) to argue that imagination has been under-considered in theorising the ways that tourists make connections between themselves, their life-world and the temporary holiday context, “[...] imagination leads to an extension of our reality with the attribution of meaning: something is brought ‘in’” (2001: 178). Similarly, Yiping Li remarks on the notable absence of recognition of the geographical consciousnesses of tourists despite the obviously (imaginative) geographical nature of tourism (2000). A geographical consciousness, he argues, manifests itself in the forms of capital, modes of experiential learning and personal bonds tourists may relate to places and destinations (2000: 877-8). A reflection on his empirical work with Canadian package tourists to China “[...] shows that travel is joined with other dimensions of living: the socioeconomic, interpersonal

⁸⁴ There is often a tendency – because of the degree of foreign ownership and investment involved in resort tourism in St Lucia – to forget that management is increasingly drawn from St Lucians that have worked their way ‘up through the ranks’. This was the case with nearly all of the management I interviewed, who had progressed from entry-level jobs and stages of training and work abroad to their current positions. This should not read as a narrative of ‘making it’, or elide the class and status differences involved in this kind of mobility. What it does point to, however, is an emerging group of people who are conscious of the social issues and criticism surrounding all-inclusives, and who, for again an unknowable variety of reasons, are unlikely to want to exacerbate those associations and tensions.

and spiritual worlds, which in sum comprise an individual's geographic consciousness (2000: 874).

Thus the integrative, diffuse, longitudinal and cumulative aspects of tourists' experience are lost by privileging the supposedly determining aspects of form. As Harrison argues, following Porteous (1996), there has been scant consideration of the way in which tourists' may be immersed in a flow of experience – rather than in a sequence of gazes or segments of experience – a point she elaborates with reference to landscapes, which one cannot step back from, but where one may be 'involved, environed, enwrapped, surrounded' (2001: 167). That is to say, in this context, that even if a tourist is physically insulated in a resort, that is not to say that their sense of engagement with place is similarly fragmented. This move towards incorporating the imaginative and diminishing the hold of the typological should not be taken to mean that tourists are not involved in instrumental calculation. As Tim Edensor points out in relation to tours, tourists may make a conscious trade of 'freedom' for pleasure and a degree of organisation and predictability (2000), a point borne out by the almost unanimity of tourism professionals that I interviewed in arguing that the prime motivation for tourists to choose all-inclusive resorts was the predictability of the price of stay and kind of 'base' they could have on the island.

Two final points on the discursive politics of form are required. The first is that criticisms of all-inclusive resorts tend to assume that the lack of contact between 'tourists' and 'locals' is inherently a bad thing, as long as contact is the 'right kind' of contact (see Smith 1989, 1992). As Litvin demonstrates in a review of existing academic literature, the value of tourism in promoting 'intercultural understanding' has tended to be debated from either side of a chasm of generalisation, and that what empirical research exists unsurprisingly details heavily contextualised results (2000). He could have added that the guiding question is also built on a dubious set of assumptions. In popular representations, open contact between tourists and 'locals' is often predicated on displaying the cultural capital of the tourist, and their sense of authenticity-by-proxy, as the following description of a knowing journalist in St Lucia illustrates:

Most visitors simply plop down on the beach, leaving their sunloungers only for a stroll to the sea or the bar. On St Lucia, one of the favourite flopping spots is the five-star Jalousie Hilton, set in a perfect location at the foot of the Piton mountains. Here outings often mean little more than the trip by minibus from reception to the white-sand beach. But by remaining in their own corner of manicured heaven, tourists don't know what they're missing. Beyond the confines of St Lucia's resort hotels lies an island that's easily explored on trips through unspoilt forests and deserted, overgrown plantations... from the Rastafarians who turned a boa constrictor into an ad hoc tourist attraction just outside Canaries village, to the smiling bead-sellers who offer to take tourists' pictures, everyone is trying to make their way in the tourist industry – but it's rarely a hard sell. When a man named Rock Bottom tries in vain to flog me a necklace on the beach, I end up having rum punch and a discussion about football with him instead⁸⁵.

In travel journalism, all-inclusives are either invoked as relational ciphers of inauthenticity, or as knowing, post-touristic options for those with sufficient habitus to transcend their connotations (Killen 2000). These lingering and habitus-based assumptions of authenticity through access (see also Markula 1997, Munt 1994) actually serve to diminish the interconnections at play in co-presence by pretending to illustrate them. Recent discussions of *zooification* (Mowforth and Munt) and 'poverty tourism' (Lennon and Foley 2002) recall the tenor of the discussion on witnessing, and there is evidence to suggest that some local communities far prefer the regulated predictability of resorts and tour groups to the random trajectories of backpackers and conscious tourists⁸⁶ (MacLeod 1997).

In all of this, what is missing is sensitivity to the ways in which *all-inclusivising* practices operate beyond any set of obvious and firm boundaries. As Wood argues in an

⁸⁵ Hyde, Amanda: "The other side of the island". *The Sunday Times Travel* August/September 2004, pp 84-5.

⁸⁶ As aspect of this is also the ways in which different tourists regard and evaluate the idea of 'local contact'. A consumer debate in Tourism Concern's magazine *Tourism In Focus* pits two consumers – who turn out to be tourism professionals – for and against the statement 'consumer interaction is important to me on holiday'. One, in discussing a fair trade holiday to Morocco, argues that this form of access involved genuine cultural exchange, a sense of contributing to the local economy, and probably without intending to emphasise it, a relational sense of capital vis a vis 'independent travellers': 'I had proved to myself that ethical travel doesn't have to mean an in-your-face, backpacking wholemeal yoghurt experience' (2002: 8). As opposed to this, another writer argues that middle-class tourists should face up to the ways in which we hanker for hard-earned holidays to be perfect, and that we 'strive for a fortnight of perfect moments'. Thus the expectation that 'we' should be in contact with locals – as if this in and of itself had an ethical quality – amounted to western cultural delusion: "Who gains what if I swap the relaxed brandy, cigars and chat for local hooch, a rough bed and strained interaction that makes me fretful with all that white liberal guilt?" (ibid). Of course, given the incommensurability of these experiences and contexts this can hardly be regarded as a debate, but it goes some way to showing how such normative questions are by now almost devoid of relevance.

instructive Caribbean example, the cruise ship can be regarded as a floating slice of economic globalisation and its human consequences; they are “physically mobile; massive chunks of multinational capital; capable of being ‘repositioned’ anywhere in the world at any time; crewed with labor migrants from up to 50 countries on a single ship, essentially unfettered by national or international regulations” (2000: 352-3). Moreover, in one estimate, only 7% of those staff crews are likely to be from the region, despite high unemployment. While all-inclusives symbolise segregation, Wood discusses the ways in which the majority of the ship’s workers – those, within an ‘ethnically stratified’ workforce that do not need to be seen – lead an ‘almost completely segregated off-work existence’ living and working backstage. Most do not disembark at ports for financial - and visa reasons - thus remaining immobilised by the ship’s constant mobility. As the organisations War on Want and Tourism Concern have noted, the physical, political and financial mobility of cruise ships, as well as the rigidly enforced spatial organisation, have allowed labour exploitation to flourish while making it difficult to mount consumer campaigns.⁸⁷

More germane to the discussion that follows is the ways in which cruise lines develop and simulate fantasy-islands that simulate controlled Caribbean environments, and the recent proliferation of private clubs and secluded areas for cruise passengers in ports, which signals an attempt to “[...] try to become an extension of the fantasy environment of the ship, one which reproduces in new form the enclave development long characteristic of the region” (2000: 363). Jaakson discusses this in terms of the shifting

⁸⁷ Registering ships under ‘flags of convenience’ and standard practices of forcing workers to sign varieties of rights-waivers have allowed the proliferation of labour and human rights abuse. As War on Want quote: “A ship owner can go any place in the world, pick up anybody he wants, on almost any terms. If the owner wants to maximise profit at the expense of people, it’s a piece of cake... It’s a sweatshop at sea.” <http://www.waronwant.org/?lid=2891&cc=1> In this context the rhetoric of myopia is entirely accurate, as campaigns are directed at convincing consumers of people and practices they have been in prolonged proximity to while never seeing. This theme permeates Tourism Concern’s new campaign which incorporates cruise ships: While we relax in the sunshine around the world, life is far from paradise for the waiters, cleaners, cooks, porters, drivers, receptionists and other staff working to make our holidays happy and carefree. Once again this highlights the difference between fair trade in products and fair trade in tourism; interconnection with a product involves an explicit imaginative connection, we must trust in intermediary information and representation. However in tourism it is always possible to say I did not see, and therefore did not witness, campaigns may be subject to different interpretative practices involving veracity and experience.

scope of the tourist bubble⁸⁸, where tourists in an empirical study in Zihuatanejo move from the 'inside' of the ship to the 'outside', to the core land bubble zone, and often to 'periphery zones' where a mixture of infrastructure, formal signs and 'boundary cues' orient tourists to the dimensions of the bubble (2004: 52-7).

What I wish to suggest is that all-inclusives – where dissonance is an obvious creation of the tension between strategies of theming and rationalisation and the inevitabilities of porousness – is less an issue than the development of modes, routes and strategies of all-inclusivisation. In my theorisation, all-inclusivisation is a process of extending practices of curation and control to the social world beyond the resort. It involves an increase in physical tourist mobility to places and in ways that cohere with this logic of all-inclusivisation, and I would speculatively contend that it serves to diminish connexity while seeming to enhance it. Without the physical and symbolic limits of the resort, yet in a context of binding and curating practices, the power of insistence is muted as the possibility of dissonant evidence is no longer suggested by obvious limits and their persistent representation of difference. The gradual heterogenisation of enclavic space increases – perhaps imperceptibly – the enclavic dimensions of the heterogeneous. The potential flow of experience discussed by Harrison (2001) is less subject to obvious spatio-cultural regimes; as the earlier example of the plantations at Dennery suggests, the interconnections between place, producers and consumers may be obscured by new modes of framing and over-writing.

The foundational reason for this, which then manifests itself in many ways, is that St Lucia as a whole is concerned with theming and curation; this is not a strategy of all-inclusive resorts alone. The common refrain that St Lucia is an all-inclusive island - which normally refers to the predominance of the form and the effect it has on the island's image - can also be extended to the new forms of routing, staging and theming that are being developed. The process of all-inclusivisation in turn needs to be understood in relation to the island's tourism 'product' in the global market place. In

⁸⁸ Jaakson adapts Cohen's notion of the 'environmental bubble' in order to avoid the over-burdening of environment and because 'tourist bubble't makes more explicit the physical and psychological emphases of the concept (2004: 44-6).

interviews with tourism professionals in the different national agencies, a common theme that emerged was the sustainability of the island's image and *brand*.

A brand, as Lash argues, is dependent on codifying a prior recognisable presence in the public domain. As this domain is global in scope, recognising that which is a recognisable presence becomes more difficult. The idea of branding is more than a euphemism for marketing an island destination; in the informational economy it has migrated not just to tourism, but to general ways of thinking about nations and identities in a context of apparently hectic, globalised informational flows.⁸⁹ As Urry has argued, the global expansion of brands and markets facilitates wide dissemination of images of place, particularity and culture, to the extent – to recall Bella Dick's phrase – that cultures are always on stage, or in Urry's variation, that “[...] there is a movement from banal nationalism to brand nationalism in the new global order, especially at moments of global celebration and consumption” (2003: 107).

The contours of a national St Lucian brand must constantly acknowledge the dominant images in circulation, and how these images are perpetuated. St Lucia's current market niche is as a romantic destination for the cheerily titled 'weddings and honeymoons market' (Barnett 2003). In common with many islands, agreeably liminal latitudes for romance are mainly secured by the all-inclusive resort, however the underlying reliance on sun-sea-sand paradise holidays is ultimately unsustainable given the far more powerful regional and global economies of scale that offer such a generic 'product'. Thus St Lucia's brand dilemma involves continuing to cultivate a successful market – which depends on an established representational grammar – while marshalling its

⁸⁹ Emerging primarily from the UK, reports such as *Nations for Sale* (1994) - which assessed the associative power of nationalities and brands - were followed by arguments that promoted corporate re-branding strategies as ways for countries to take charge of their image and its connotative potential for investors, tourists, and the world at large (see for example Leonard 1998). According to Pratrapp Rughani, some advocates of 'nation marketing' encourage branding strategies as ways for the countries of the Global South to tackle poverty by re-framing themselves in the eyes of creditors and potential investors (2002: 19). Beyond the spuriousness of theories of make-over development, the idea of branding may hold an obvious attraction for the industrial reflexivity of tourism, where the task is to augment or airbrush images that, for one reason or many others, are associated with your destination. A recent report illustrated a step further in this logic; Liechtenstein announced that its tourist policy would now be based on a unique rent-a-state offer, including the possibility of corporations temporarily branding their transitory territory. See Osborn, Andrew. "Country for hire: low rent, all amenities". *The Guardian* 14.2.03

physical and cultural particularities as a globalising resource (Yūdice 2003). What is crucial to understand about this dilemma is that strategies of diversification and consolidation inevitably lead to dissonance and conflict around staging, cultural value, and dominant senses of place.

The all-inclusive is not just a powerful aspect of an island brand; it is a brand and series of brands in itself. Many of my interviewees expressed the opinion that the all-inclusive subsumed the particularity of St Lucia in a number of ways. While the all-inclusive form on St Lucia developed primarily for economic considerations, a widespread fear was that the close association of the form with Jamaica may result in a form of taint by association. Given the comparative lack of global profile enjoyed by St Lucia, they argued that the dominance of a type of experience associated with necessary security could result in St Lucia being perceived as an unsafe ‘little Jamaica’. More specifically, the regional dominance and national centrality of the Jamaican-owned Sandals chain results in a situation where, as one local hotelier put it, “What bothers me and other St Lucians is that we no longer see tourists who have come here because they choose St Lucia...they are not coming to the island, they’re coming to Sandals”.⁹⁰

Sandals now operates three large all-inclusive sites on St Lucia, and in advertising economies of scale, many interviewees argued that St Lucia is seen, particularly in North America, as a Sandals destination. Sandals offers an unapologetically McDisneyfied package (Ritzer & Liska 1997) of themed resorts predictably similar regardless of physical location, and the combined import of the form and the dominant brand is that diversification is made hugely difficult. Sandals operates a policy of ‘pay at one, stay at three’, which allows Sandals customers to constantly shuttle between Sandals sites without ever stopping anywhere en route, hardwiring a Sandals cartography into the landscape. In the logic of branding, a dominant brand exists. As one interviewee put it, in unavoidably loaded terms, ‘the all-inclusive has colonised the image of St Lucia’.

⁹⁰ Quoted in “Tourists fan discontent”, *The Star St Lucia* March 13 1999.

While the all-inclusive was recognised to limit the development of other forms of tourism on the island, it is still overwhelmingly central to the simulation of a ‘generic Caribbean’. Diversification, crucial to social and economic sustainability in the roulette development that is Caribbean tourism, remains bound up with the expectations and organisation of signs of Caribbean-ness. Thus, to return to the proposition that the mobilisation of heterogeneous practices by all-inclusives increases a *meta-enclavicness*, this can be explained by the need for the island’s industry as a whole to foster forms of all-inclusivisation. An obvious example of this is the half-day and day tours which depart from resorts and hotels, and which take highly scheduled and prescribed routes from north to south and vice versa. One tour operator I interviewed described the process of selling this tours as convincing tourists to ‘sacrifice a day’ for something different. Yet this difference involves the clear incorporation of some sights and spaces, and the equally clear marginalisation of others.

This script editing may pivot on slippage between supposed visual expectations and the fidelity of the encountered sight. A waterfall in the south of the island that regularly featured in day-tours from the north was removed from particular itineraries because of the local addition of a concrete ledge to facilitate access to the waterfall pool. Paradise, after all, needs to accessorize more accurately. Certain stops – such as general stops in Soufrière where tourists have been ‘harassed’ – are made redundant, and others become nodes for nominally heterogeneous yet highly regulated walkabouts, picture-taking and souvenir-shopping. Areas that are of obvious visual interest yet that cannot be ‘trusted’ or integrated into a full node, are subject to the ‘tourist glance’ through minibus, and explained by guides who fluctuate between narratives of pathfinder and mentor⁹¹ (Cohen 1985).

⁹¹ It is interesting to note how this gives rise to new processes of objectification and zooification. At Canaries, for example, where tour buses heading from Castries to the Pitons pass through without stopping, guides regularly slow down to allow tourists to take photos of women washing their clothes on rocks under a bridge. On my tour, the guide announced this as something to watch out for, as the defining spectacle of Canaries, and slowed the bus down on the bridge to facilitate sight-seeing. All-inclusivisation may involve – given the ways in which it dilutes regulated frontstage and backstage areas – dynamics whereby residents place each other on stage, processes grounded in the perceived authenticity of their commentary and sight-framing.

This need to continually cultivate a limiting image as part of a move towards diversification inevitably entails a resurgent discourse of 'hosting'. This is evident in the proposed⁹² public information campaign being devised in 2002, which encourages islanders to see tourists as visitors to their home. In other words, all are always already hosts (again), despite the political and sociological critiques of that foisted collective in St Lucia.⁹³ This re-articulation of hosting in the wider social context is as implicitly concerned with performative staging as the insulating environment of the all-inclusive. The imagined Caribbean is offered as the character motivation and emotional memory for enhanced staging and social performance. The problem, of course, is that 'hosting' is a non-practice, open to countless interpretations and infiltrating noise in the brand-scape.

The disjunctive tension immanent in the limits of the resort, I contend, may also emerge in the disjunctures that appear between practices of all-inclusivisation and the irreducible differences and modalities of social life. Examples of the inevitably limited purchase of hosting emerge from the ways that assumed performers react to particular images. The tagline of the St Lucia Tourist Board – 'St Lucia, Simply Beautiful' - is designed to allow variations of the 'Simply' theme that emphasise particular dimensions. Within this logic, 'simply sinful' was used, with obvious liminality, to appeal to the romance market and foreground cuisine, shopping and lifestyle consumption. It elicited criticism from church leaders in St Lucia, who objected to sinfulness as a brand identity, and not just because of competing visions of sin and the paradise in question (see Ballerino Cohen 1994 for a discussion of the polysemy of sexual images in tourism marketing in the British Virgin Islands). Criticism recognised a clear disconnection between the discourse used to attract an international audience and the legitimacy accorded to it domestically by certain sectors of society, who objected

⁹² This campaign was discussed in these terms with the relevant agencies in interview. I have not been able to find more material relating to it at this time.

⁹³ The St Lucia Tourist Board has undertaken several attitudinal surveys, the latest being produced by its Research and Information Systems Department in November 2001. My point here is one of inherent and assumed collectivisation, not a lack of consultation.

ethically and out of a realisation that hosting imagery is closely linked to potentially having to embody it.⁹⁴

Yet embodiment can be contested in divergent and contradictory ways, as the situation of 'true and false' Rastafarians indicates. Rastafarians, or at least dreadlocks, are a recurring signifier of exotic Caribbean-ness in the west (Guerero, 1992) and a primary personification of cultural presence. Yet despite the ubiquity of dreaded matchstick men on t-shirts and shot glasses, and of synthetic ones stitched to hats, dreaded young men are rarely found in official frontstage roles in the tourist industry⁹⁵, and instead performatively stage themselves as vendors on the beaches and near tourist sites. This leads to the following offer of security, and also cultural, orientation by the tourism authorities:

Dreadlocks and Reggae music are what comes to mind to most at the mention of Rastas. For others it is drugs and violence. But how many people know that many Rastas are hard working, educated and independent people. True Rastas that is! Here in St Lucia there are many young men and women who claim to be Rastafarians. They do have the appearance, including the dreadlocks, but very few abide by the practices...that true followers of this Christian sect adhere to.⁹⁶

What evidently aims to be an informative piece combating prejudice inadvertently offers a game of cultural *Cluedo*, with possible answers limited to true or false. It invites tourists, on the basis of evidence limited in time and space, to adjudicate the identities of others in significantly polarised terms. While this may not be particularly sound intercultural advice in most circumstances, it is particularly fraught within the general power dimensions of Caribbean tourism, and in particular relation to Rastafarianism as a glocalised identity. It also misses a point central to this form of micro performance, which is that 'false Rastas' are busy embodying the imagined Caribbean of t-shirts, and thus reclaiming its possibilities for their own involvement in the informal economy.

⁹⁴For an influential discussion of a highly theorised process, see hooks (1992). In the Caribbean context, Pattullo (1996) discusses the pervasive sexualisation of gender and ethnicity in tourism, as well as the specificities of Caribbean sex tourism (pp86-91). See also Kempadoo (1999). I am grateful to Jennifer Lutton for drawing my attention to this controversy.

⁹⁵ There is no data on this, it is based on interview notes. Note the themed exception of gardeners discussed previously.

⁹⁶ *Paradise St Lucia* magazine, summer 2001 p13.

The prerogatives of the performed Caribbean are prone to being re-routed, mediated or absurdly reified. They suggest that diversification involves not just policy and the offer of more and different attractions, but also an admission of socio-cultural complexity that the strategies of branding and image management cannot reduce or anchor. This is well recognised within certain sectors of the tourism industry, among those who with comparatively limited resources explore ways of developing diversified and consultative forms of tourism while recognising the ongoing tensions in the process of sight-framing and the construction of attractions.⁹⁷ It is the hallmark of this kind of development that while diversification moves glacially, paradise must still be cultivated, and as these examples indicate, must also secure forms of social assignation. The next section analyses one particular discussion of perceived responsibility to and investment in the image, and clicks onto St Lucia online.

3.7 Knowing me, knowing you, knowing me: negotiating St Lucia online

Theoretically, and through a fine-grained analysis of specific sites and processes in St Lucia, this chapter has argued that the imagined Caribbean must be regarded as a dynamic production despite the seeming coherence and banality of its recurring signifiers and myths. This dynamism is a result of what I have described as a multivalent negotiation; conducted from different sites, with varying possibilities and relations of power and agency, and with differing and sometimes conflicting investments in the way in which images and ideas of the Caribbean are interpreted and circulated. This emphasis on negotiation is important in that it both marginalises crude theories of a paradise product foisted on passive local populations, while teasing out how different power asymmetries shape responses to living with and in a very particular form of touristic social economy. In turning to a study of how St Lucia as a tourist destination is negotiated online, this section extends the overall thrust of the analysis.

⁹⁷ In interview a heritage tourism planner coined the novel phrase 'cruise ship time' to describe one of the basic parameters for constructing an instance of heritage. On the one hand he noted that the general lack of expectations held by cruise ship passengers benefited their operations, yet the limited duration of the shore visit dictated very specific parameters for the display of heritage. Potential attractions should not just be accessible, but capable of being coherently staged and packaged within the time constraints of the cruise ship schedule. This he noted, contributed to the clustering and concentration of services in some areas, new ways of commodifying practices and places for known parameters, and a lack of development in parts of the island rich in heritage but remote by the coordinates dictated by cruise ship time.

By examining the ways in which the image of St Lucia is discussed in online newsgroups, it traces the ways in which resident and transnational St Lucians negotiate a sense of responsibility for the country's image, as well as the ways in which that primarily touristic negotiation provides opportunities for the amplification of social issues and projections of identity.

It also gives some indications of the ways in which tourists become implicated in this process of all-inclusivisation, and as such links profoundly with the questions of knowledge and knowledge about, as well as the over-arching question of navigating interconnectedness. The immanence of the touristic can be most obviously discerned in these discussions by the assumed presence of 'the tourist'. In general, online discussions are often conducted with an awareness of lurkers – readers who follow postings without declaring themselves or participating (Hine 2000: 24-5). In these discussions, while actual tourists may lurk and surf, what is more significant is the ways in which the tourist as lurker is assumed as a constant regulating presence, an unknown audience whose power lies in the ability to consume or not consume on the evidence encountered in these discussions. Many discussants display a high degree of reflexivity precisely on this issue; an awareness that any utterance may be read into the interpretation of *St Lucia as imagined Caribbean*, an awareness which brings with it forms of performance that resonate with the face-to face instances discussed in previous sections. What this analysis will suggest is that a version of enclavic space is possible virtually, despite the unknowable porousness of the Internet. The *synoptical* subject –who must assume that 'we' are being read, and remain on the look out for those readings – is trammelled by reflexive awareness of the *panoptical* possibilities available to tourists.

Parameters of the study

The material under discussion in this section is drawn from particular discussion threads found in newsgroups on the website of the main St Lucian newspaper *The Star*, which is issued in paper copy and online on Wednesdays and Sundays. Over a period of months during the summer and autumn of 2002, I monitored message threads with title references to tourism, or threads that, based on their reference to then current events, were likely to involve discussion of tourism. I did this for a number of reasons. Primarily this complementary study – which was conceived prior to my field work period in St Lucia – allowed me to maintain a sense of what kinds of discussions

tourism was engendering, and how issues and controversies that were current during my stay there were being played out.⁹⁸ Moreover, the discussions in these newsgroups allowed me highly particular glimpses of ‘host-tourist’ interaction – which I did not attempt to observe in a structured way during the fieldwork – and the ways in which transnational St Lucians may engage in the production and negotiation of an imagined Caribbean.

The methodology of this section needs to be discussed initially as it has a significant impact on the degree and mode of possible interpretation. Discussion threads in newsgroups appear as theoretically open texts; they take the form of a dialogue over time, often comprising of intertwined bilateral and multilateral discussions. News groups tend to be asynchronous, as threads – a set of messages related to a topic that accumulate over time – develop through postings (Hine 2000). However it is possible for a discussant (or researcher) to be present continuously and co-temporally over a period of time, by initiating a thread or following it closely. Equally, it is possible to read a thread as an almost closed text, by reading back over the sequence of messages that have been posted. In sites such as this one, where threads are archived online, constant addition is possible, yet in practice most are formed in a limited flurry of activity and topicality.

The particularities of this newsgroup site are important to mention. The site is unmoderated, often resulting in moderating roles emerging in discussion, a process discussed later in this section. As the newspaper is issued twice weekly, the threads can act as an interim discussion space for the wired minority, and because of the strong public personalities associated with the newspaper, the threads often involve direct address or commentary on issues raised by these personalities, or on the people themselves. The online availability of the main national newspaper is likely to attract a significant transnational St Lucian readership, and it is possible to speculate that the

⁹⁸ Another dimension of the process of research reconstruction discussed in section two should be mentioned here. Prior to my period of stay in St Lucia, and while I sketched the parameters of this study, I of course also read as a ‘tourist’; once again the perspectives I brought to bear cannot be meaningfully differentiated into lens corresponding to nominal roles and modalities. Thus I carried random impressions and questions from this site to the physical one, and subsequently carried them back in modified form. This is important when it comes to the discussions of reading and discursive frameworks broached later in the section.

possibility of online participation has an important attraction for this constituency. Also of import is the fact that many routes are provided to this site from other major websites of St Lucian interest. The site is hyperlinked to the St Lucia Tourist Board and a range of other sites providing touristic information and services, suggesting potential trajectories and paths for tourists to come into contact with the newspaper site and with this particular content.

Given the public discourse on tourism and micro-tensions between projected image and inhabited spaces and identities under discussion, the general aim of monitoring the threads was to examine how the image of St Lucia was discussed in the newsgroups. Firstly I coded and analysed the material for indications of what the image is held to be, and the dominant connotations of Loosha-ness and the Caribbean discussed and discursively assumed by contributors. Given the instability currently pervading tourism in the region, a second question traced in the corpus was the factors associated with the fragility of the image, the threats and opportunities discerned, and the impressions and evidence cited in discussion. And finally, in the light of this fragility, I wished to examine how responsibility to the image was discussed, and how this related to negotiations of hosting and performing imagined Caribbeans.

Situating the researcher/tourist online

Discussing this material involves acknowledging that the analyst is confronted with a very particular form of text (Dicks & Mason, 1998) – knowable only as text, but generated interactively and inter-contextually in a space that overlays the public and the private. While a neologism such as ‘netnography’ may appear seductive, it is only applicable to ethnographies that consider the Internet as imbricated in use and context (Slater & Miller, 2000), or that engage online with cyber-constituted groups or networks over a period of time (Ward, 1999). It is not the intent nor within the scope of this study to approach the online material as *lived culture*, and it will be analysed as *cultural artefact* in carefully circumscribed ways. In discussing these inter-related concepts, Christine Hine offers some interesting principles for what she terms ‘virtual ethnography’, principles she offers as a basis for particularisation and adaptation (2000: 63-7). In dialogue with her principles, it is possible to argue that this study is congruent with the overall applied research in this chapter, in that it has heightened ethnographic

dimensions, while not attempting to transcend some fundamental thresholds of ethnographic research.

As Hines argues, virtual ethnography is interstitial and necessarily partial, and readings can be “[...] based on ideas of strategic relevance rather than faithful representations of objective realities” (2000: 65). Thus what follows is not presented as an online counterpoint to a hitherto offline study, instead these discussions are regarded as being equally imbricated in the production and negotiation of the imagined Caribbean. The discussion threads provide another site of interaction, one that is incorporated in different ways and with different significances into the lives of discussants, yet one that does not in this instance necessitate speculation about the offline world of those who submit postings. Following Ward, I approach discussants “[...] as having a transitory, unconditional relationship with the online community” (1999: 2.1) while agreeing with Hine that deploying the concept of community is implicitly political work (2000: 19).

The general mobility of online participation and the mobilities of the images and myths under discussion also cohere with Hine’s research trajectories. Space, she argues, is made and re-made through mediated interaction, thus virtual ethnography is obviously less concerned with situating itself in bounded locations than exploring the “[...] making of boundaries and the making of connections” (2000: 6). These negotiated boundaries – of inclusivity and exclusivity, of the ‘real’ Caribbean and its pollutants – are central to the inquiries of this section. Yet it is also important to recognise the core non-ethnographic properties of this study. In the vast majority of cases, I analysed these threads when they were already ‘frozen’, and I decided not to attempt to reinvigorate them with a posting, whether declared or undeclared as a researcher.⁹⁹

⁹⁹ Constituting these discussions as data entails a range of disputable decisions. As Allison Cavanagh (1999) has pointed out, online interactions on bulletin boards, mailing lists and chat rooms may assume public status through their virtual availability, but they can equally be framed as private conversations embedded in public space. In the case of a forum attached to a newspaper, it may fairly be assumed that it is generally regarded as a space of public debate, where even ongoing bilateral dialogues are conducted with an awareness of, or even an appeal to, a larger readership. Does that readership, however, include an active researcher? Can contributors be regarded as research subjects, publicly observable, when they are knowable only through textual utterance? In other words, if any interaction can become an ethnographic or ethnomethodological subject, and an emergent principle of this is that online interactions be respected as being ‘real’ to the participants (Hines 2000: 24), how can this respect be combined with the empirically textual nature of the material? The self is textually invested, yet to a large degree textually absent. In this instance the nature of the data collection means that the constraints of a declared research presence and the ethics of lurking are not of immediate concern to this study. The question of intrusion through

While an enlarged study would clearly benefit from such participation, and from the chance to instigate more targeted bilateral communication, experiential participation was unnecessary, as my analysis does not aim to profoundly examine an online cultural configuration. What this limited brief entails, however, is not only a restricted degree of textual interpretation, but relinquishing “[...] claims to the kind of ethnographic authority that comes from exposing the emergent analysis to challenge through interaction” (Hines 2000: 48). Moreover, while I did not lurk co-temporally within the newsgroups, constructing them as data involves a specific set of interpretative-ethical challenges concerning the status of the postings as public pronouncement and research data. These challenges are particularly salient given that later sections engage with the constraining presence of declared and imagined tourists in these online sites.

What is clear then, is that the interpretative methodology deployed must be a restricted one. Katie J. Ward employs the useful notion of a phenomenological snapshot (1999) to describe the inherent limits of inquiry present in this kind of analysis; message threads present discursive formations both constituted and arrested in the form available online. Practically, this snapshot approach allows for specific questions to be traced through the enormous bulk of material that newsgroups accrue (Hines 2000: 21). Where the interactive possibilities of researcher involvement in co-temporal interaction are absent, the analyst can only engage in an avowedly *speculative reconstruction* of what may inform the discussions.

Conceptualising online presence

A shifting spectrum of people initiate and contribute to the newsgroups, and in many instances, they sit uneasily in anything but fluid categories. First time tourists post requests for advice and reassurance, and returned tourists often offer feedback and vignettes of different kinds of experience they think ‘locals’ should know about. In

research instrumentalisation is however. In broaching this I once again follow Hine in thinking that as with face-to-face research, the ethical responsibilities of the researcher begins with identifying what is sensitive in the contexts being studied (2000: 24). Given that a key theme in my analysis is that these ‘local’ debates are amplified with wider non-local readerships in mind, research that regards itself as being in solidarity with situated social opportunity and justice in a touristic economy can responsibly reflect on situated debates on society and tourism. Given my non-participation in the discussions, the analysis strives to restrict interpretations to the online interactions in the general context of tourism in St Lucia.

isolated incidences, tourists continue the dialogue they began prior to their arrival; sometimes with the thread discussants as a whole, sometimes addressing particular discussants, thanking them for good advice or sharing their impressions in situ. The majority of discussants in the threads I have selected identify themselves as resident or diasporic St Lucians. Within the framework of discussions of tourism a range of dynamics can be interpreted; physical location is significant as discussants jostle for legitimacy and authenticity of opinion, and island politics is often present in coded form for a more select variety of readers.

Even a limited study such as this one provides a rich tapestry of analytical possibilities, therefore I will limit the threads discussed in this section to those originated by transnationalised St Lucians, as denoted by information included by them in their postings. If the imagined Caribbean is negotiated from a range of sites, concentrating on these threads means that new dimensions of this multi-sited construction can be explored. The majority of these threads involve a particular communicative loop, whereby discussants proffer information about St Lucia, encountered beyond St Lucia, to St Lucians, and flag the domestic consideration of this information as being important for the image of the island internationally.

The range of issues that stimulated these discussions gives some credence to the idea that a synoptical reflexiveness is cultivated by tourism of this kind. The threads were frequently initiated in reaction to various kinds of media representations; travel shows broadcast in the USA, commentary on St Lucia encountered on travel and tourism websites and publications, and reflections on *The Star* website discussions as read from the current location. Reflections on personal experience was a second, prevalent category of stimulus; these included comparative perspectives following visits to other Caribbean islands, return visits to St Lucia, and return visits in the company of non-St Lucian friends. A third major category that stimulated comment was the perceived absence of information; both the general lack of any circulated images of St Lucia in their current location, and specific questions concerning the promotional work of the St Lucia Tourist Board abroad.

In approaching the analysis of transnational discussions, I have already asserted that well-rehearsed debates concerning online communities are of limited relevance to this

material (see Elmer 2000, Ward 1999). It is neither possible nor necessary to speculate on the ways in which these online engagements are imbricated in wider social networks. These discussion threads are not a representative sample of any community, and do not relate to any meaningful notion of 'public opinion' (Hines 2000: 21). St Lucia online is imagined from a range of sites, with reference to various collectivities, and in relation to suggested and inferred experiences. While transitory online formations congregate around certain issues, what is pertinent is to ask how notions of community, or related collectivities, are emically deployed in these discussions. In asserting investment in the image of St Lucia, collectivities based on ideas of national and regional belonging, and on hierarchies of legitimacy between resident and transnational, are constantly invoked.

These collectivities, sometimes assumed, sometimes contested, are also imbricated in the ways that the island as home and destination are imagined. In many instances it becomes apparent that transnationalised St Lucians present themselves online as hosts with a personal investment in representing the island abroad, and in subsequently feeding back impressions to the online residents. Transnationally, and from shifting sites, St Lucia is negotiated and imagined as a unified place. In an article on what he calls the virtual Croatian diaspora, Paul Stubbs argues that computer mediated communication

[...] affords new possibilities for the polytextual production of images and self-imaginings of particular nations and peoples, both in and for themselves, and in relation to equally stylised, but also radically unfinished 'Others'. (1999: 2.2).

Speculatively, contributions to the threads produce St Lucia from ongoing engagements with senses of 'Looshan-ness' within transnationalised networks and in the migration locations, and in relation to present and assumed dialogues with those resident. Touristic experiences also inform this production - not just through the re-presentation of the media representations encountered - but through the ongoing representation of St Lucia to non-Lucians in their current location, from imagining the island as a destination through the eyes and reactions of friends and known tourists, and in some instances, through the imagined eyes of imagined tourists that signify potential in need of cultivation.

Yet the dappled texture of this unified construct hints at a vast heterogeneity of experience and investment. As Karen Fog Olwig has argued in research on Caribbean transnational family networks, home is a syncretic ‘reified place of origin’ publicly articulated in shared socio-cultural networks, and also a changing focus of personal identification that unfolds over time and through experience (2003). In this forum, the public articulations cluster around unifying categories of place and nation, yet they are articulations that contain multiple imaginative geographies, formative contexts and experiences, and unknowable relationships with ‘home’. They are also articulations of place and home that consistently engage with the contours of the imagined Caribbean, and where the production of self-imaginings is imbued with an acute awareness of the ‘radically unfinished Others’ who may bring highly particular modes of reading to bear on their representations.

The image of St Lucia

The main elements of the image can be assembled from tourist feedback on St Lucia encountered in their current location by the contributor, and from preambles to the main arguments in certain postings. In general, explicit and implicit references to the island’s image cluster around the natural beauty of beaches and rainforest, the motif of paradise, and a high premium is placed on the capital of ‘Looshan’ friendliness and the particularisation of the Caribbean welcome:

All over the world when you meet people who have been here they tell you that Lucians are a very hospitable people¹⁰⁰.

The people were friendly, food excellent and they will definitely go back next year.

The theme of friendliness is often a gateway issue for discussions of the nature and scope of service and a ‘service mentality’. What is striking about many of the discussions – which may relate both to the specific work experience of individual discussants and to the centrality of tourism in public debate - is the high degree of familiarity with the nature of the tourist market, with several discussions focusing on the need for St Lucia to identify its ‘niche’. Many contributors echo the conclusions of tourism industry professionals I interviewed, reflecting on St Lucia as a ‘love birds

¹⁰⁰ I have not attempted to standardise spelling or grammar in the quotations from the online threads.

vacation’, a romantic destination aiming both to consolidate its ‘weddings and honeymoon industry’ while particularising the generic paradise island to a St Lucian offer:

St Lucia needs to find its niche market. And the way I see it it is couples and romance.

The romantic island image is frequently presented as inseparable from the form of the all-inclusive resort, to the extent that there is a general impression that many tourists seek ‘the Caribbean experience’ within this form. This almost inevitably leads, given the context of these threads, to discussions of the sustainability and symbolism of the resorts themselves. It is also worth citing the quote below, which reflects pragmatic interventions that emphasise value for money as a prime consideration in sun holidays, and that St Lucia is competing with larger economies of scale for the same business:

Some tourist like nature yes but most tourist like a good time, st lucia dosent have a lot of night life, the bottom line most tourist go where the dollar is worth more.

This sense of the delicate balance between generic Caribbean and specific location is, as the next section details, far more pronounced in postings that begin to interrogate the vulnerability of the tourism industry.

Fragility of the image

Contributions posted during the period of controversy discussed in section five often refer specifically to ongoing issues concerning government policy and the development of further all-inclusive resorts. The fundamental near-dependence on tourism is explicit and implicit in these threads, with far more contributions regarding it as a sometimes barely tolerable necessity – ‘a way out of the rut we’re in’ – than anything currently approaching a sustainable industry. The regional competition of Jamaica, Barbados and the Dominican Republic is linked to the perceived reliance on generic appeal – St Lucia is not the only paradise:

St Lucia may be beautiful. I am just as patriotic as most of you – however, there are many places which have even nicer beaches, larger waterfalls, more impressive rivers, and equally or more stunning natural features. We are selling a product that most islands, from the Caribbean, to the Mediterranaen to the South Pacific, have in common. We are not as special as we think.

In some instances the lack of differentiation implicit in the offer of a paradise product is seen to be compounded by scales of recognition. Some contributors based in the USA argue that St Lucia has a very limited profile, and that they are constantly hailed as Jamaicans or as being from 'somewhere in the Caribbean'. The 'product' is known to be globally available, and there is a steady acknowledgement that St Lucia cannot compete on price and profile. Its attractiveness, according to some arguments, is because of the friendliness of the island, and this is a quality that must be nursed:

The tourist Board should launch a campaign to sensitise St Lucians to the issues and to encourage them to leave up to their friendly image.

To this end, bad experiences - both personal and confided - are offered as evidence of the apparent disconnection between projected welcome and real encounters, and these real encounters are amplified in a number of ways. While the urgency of some postings may relate to the intensity of the experience, there is also a prevalent sense that the comparative size and profile of St Lucia amplifies the significance of every contact, and indeed every representation. As one student resident in the US implies, any images in circulation can wind up in the index of destination:

The clip (from a US travel show) portrayed St Lucia as a backward country...they talked about witch doctors as our means to medicine, featured a rasta man cooking on three stones and the like. Is this how we market our country for tourist...would please tell the minister of tourism that she need to do something about this misrepresentation.

While it is not clear how a small tourism ministry can hope to influence particular productions, this impression of amplified significance involves an intimation of duty, and perhaps concomitant liability for what 'irresponsibly' circulates.

Responsibility to the image

Beyond individual experiences of and formal involvement in tourism, responsibility to a fragile image is predicated on an assumption that everybody is inescapably representative, while home, away, and as we shall see, online. An obvious discourse of national collectivity is at work here, but again it is sharpened by sensitivity to the amplification of randomly available information. As one contributor pithily summarises, 'everyone is an ambassador'. Looshan-ness is overlaid with mutually reinforcing

dimensions: representativity is inescapable because of national identity, which also compounds the inescapability of being a *host*. The most contentious debates ferment around these linkages. In emphasising the need to live up to a friendly image, or to embrace hospitality, or to sensitise and educate, contributions display a heightened awareness of the performative element of the tourist product, and its increasingly broad application. Regardless of employment, everybody;

...need(s) to see themselves as part of a package.

This echoes Urry's observation that any form of service available in proximity to a tourist zone must be careful not to subvert, and if possible should compound, the expected encounter (2001:67). Some of these opinions go further, explicitly recognising that complementary service is fundamentally imbricated in presence, and that the service is one of performance. These calls are for a Caribbean welcome that is distinctively of the island, and that remains constant beyond the more formal performative space of the all-inclusive. These arguments recall the paradox discussed in section five, that as all-inclusive resorts become more porous, wider social space becomes increasingly enclavic.

There is a particular variation on the inexorable nature of hosting that emerges in reflections on the nature of the online discussions. As alluded to previously, unmoderated newsgroups such as these ones often witness the emergence of moderating roles, often through appeals to standards of rationality, taste, or commitment. However a recurring strategy in these discussions involves an appeal to the implications of a presumed readership:

Please remember these threads could be the first insight that a potential visitor to St Lucia may see.

This form of moderation once again implies an ingrained consciousness of the limited image bank of St Lucia, and vigilance towards potentially contradictory information. Congruent with the synoptical-panoptical dynamic, cyber-space assumes the dimensions of a fishbowl, and a website imbued with a variety of functions within a transnationalised public sphere needs to be attuned to what could be called a global

tourist gaze. The implication once again is that there is never not hosting; online discussions provide a potential service in augmenting or contradicting the impressions and expectations of the inquisitive tourist. This recalls a perceptive point by Vincent Mosco, who argues that

Connectivity does not mean that distance is dying or geography is at an end...it offers powerful tools to deepen and extend existing practices that tighten certain power relations (1999: 61)

It is possible that the constraining practice extended here is the constraining nature of imaginative geographies organised in a tourist-host relationship of desire and necessity. Moderation and admonitions of this type attempt to fix micro-versions of the reflexivity discussed earlier, where a constant question mark hovers on the discussant's shoulder – how would this be read by a browsing tourist? While online interaction has rarely been portrayed as possessing high Habermasian characteristics (White, 1999), contributions to these discussions within the framework of a newspaper and a wider transnationalised public sphere could be seen - and are seen by some - as acts of citizenship. Constant invitations to internalise the significance of all actual and potential encounters - an invitation that is itself framed as an act of citizenship - recasts this public space within the world of brochures. To paraphrase one tourist contributor, the island is lucky that the threads were not her first contact, because otherwise she would not have come, and this should be borne in mind for the future.

The immanence of touristic considerations online involves a range of implications. Primarily, it suggests that performance is inherent even in such limited utterances as those encountered in a newsgroup. In a forum of this type, online utterance produces the self, but with the complicity that the uttered self is known only in shared, limited dimensions. The implication of the emergent moderating roles, and the ominous warnings of disappointed tourists, is that utterance produces selves that the tourist may actually encounter. Discussants are not only performing but also auditioning; they provide orientations and evaluations within a framework of desired encounters. In yet another reflexive meltdown, the audience that monitoring is being conducted for may actually monitor the monitoring of the image. The 'radically unfinished Others' posited by Stubbs in the earlier quotation need never be completed, or even fleetingly present, as the possibility of a presence empowered and motivated by consumption is enough. In

general terms, the presence of lurkers in newsgroups is often registered and sensed, and it is theorised that their silent presence may be ignored or instrumentalised as a form of audience for active contributors (Hine 2000:25). In this context lurkers must be assumed to be present, and to be the ones most likely to engage in instrumentalisation.

This form of trammelled reflexivity poses questions about the nature of reading in a random, online environment. What the emergent moderators attempt to do, in one sense, is to ensure a discursive fit between the postings and their perception of a generalised framework of tourist interpretation. Yet the discursive configurations that prevail in discussion sites that are closely related to particular cultural networks are unlikely to correspond to any approximation of 'brochure discourse' (Dann 1996). As Miller and Slater argue in relation to Trinidadian diaspora and Internet chat, transnational Trinidadian sites are popular as spaces to perform 'Trini-ness', and this includes aspects chatters felt would be misunderstood or discursively re-framed in host UK or North American societies (2000: 94). Their fluid participation in divergent social networks involves basic differences in discursive formation (Morley 1992). This is not significant as a reductionist comparative example of Caribbean\Other communication, but as an example of the ways in which online forms, even newsgroup threads, may develop and strengthen discourses understood within certain cultural networks, and less readily in others. There is no unified voice or shared domain in these exchanges, yet the common focus places discussion within a St Lucian, transnationalised public sphere.

As Hine argues, understandings of the Internet are 'only locally stable phenomena', implying that significant divergences will always exist in reading practices and approaches to the retrieval and interpretation of 'information'. Factors that sustain internal stability within such loose networks involve an inverse ambiguity for surfing readers. In this instance, the specificities generated by the appropriation of the newsgroup format to a particular socio-cultural context implies the need for dialogic and reflexive readings:

Newsgroups are a highly differentiated form of social space which is collaboratively maintained by users performing their postings as temporally and situationally relevant to the group (Hine 2000: 11).

While the reading practices of surfing tourists are obviously in the realms of the unknowable, these recurrent gestures of invited introspection hint at a familiar caveat encountered elsewhere in this analysis; that reflexivity can only be assumed as being unidirectional. As with the particular trajectories that situated tourists may pursue in physical space and interaction, online 'hosts' must interact with the simulacra of tourists. The constraints that this may impose on discussion, and the performative roles that it may necessitate and sustain, suggests that enclavic conditions exist in this online environment. Enclavic space is characterised by a high degree of role differentiation and specification, surveillance of internal coherence, and ultimately, by a studied aversion to the risk of cultural dissonance. The prevalence of these forms of self-regulation online suggest that putative boundaries are set that map broadly onto those of the physical enclave; parameters for the social performance of self, and contours of the expected, imagined Caribbean. While enclavic spaces are rendered porous almost as a result of their attempted exclusivity, the space that is 'made and re-made' online can be seen to shift quickly from a theoretically gaping porousness to a state of quasi-regulation, precisely because of the implications of that porousness.

As elsewhere, however, it is important that a sustained exploration of these particular connections does not obscure the fact that even these powerfully conformist currents are imbricated in an ongoing matrix of negotiation. The attempted imposition of discursive constraint is often opposed, mocked and bypassed, and the corollaries to these discussions of image management are often exploited to magnify other social issues. Unsurprisingly, the constantly expanding dimensions of responsibility to an image and product are contested in a range of ways. I will focus on two strategies; invocations of cultural imperialism, and a shifting of the focus of responsibility from the performance of an airbrushed image to securing its social substance. Comparisons of predominantly white Anglo-American tourism in St Lucia to the power relations of colonialism are commonplace, and stand within an established mode of critically recasting postcolonial tourism (Sreberny-Mohammadi 1997: 63-65). In these discussions colonial references provide a range of potent metaphors and rhetorical possibilities, as are abundantly displayed in the following quotation:

I suppose those who did not like the locals around St Lucia came to the island expecting cute, picture postcard “yess master” types who had not developed an edge from living in a land that rich gringos expect to be their playground.

The relationship of expectation and fulfilment in touristic consumption is here parodied as a postcard gaze, and it is subjected to the disjuncture of imagined and encountered perspectives predicted by Naipaul’s returning narrator. In other postings, tourists are explicitly compared to the colonial ruling classes, accused of displaying ‘plantation attitude’ and desiring a ‘little black servant experience’. In a converse of the process whereby ‘local selves’ are produced from online utterance, in these instances ‘touristic selves’ are imaginatively fleshed out and fixed by a powerful return gaze that arguably targets the self-image of the ‘white tourist’. The lure of authenticity as a touristic motivation may be hotly disputed in the sociology of tourism (see Mowforth & Munt 1998: 55-63), yet here its rehearsal knowingly increases potential discomfort for tourists with some reflexive sense of the connotations of their presence.

In discussion, the colonial parallel functions as a trump card in a weak hand; it returns a racialising gaze that many tourist contributors appear unwilling or unable to challenge, as evidenced by the fact that many opt to mediate such charges in relation to the distinction of their own experience. These postings recall the tactics employed by vendors – “What, you don’t talk to local/black people?” - that re-cast the power relations between them and recalcitrant consumers by attempting to fix a public interpretation of a fleeting encounter. Other postings posit a different interpretation of a supposed asymmetry between expectations and experience by foregrounding the relationship between theming and colonial images of an available paradise. The advice quoted below – which criticises tourists for expecting to encounter a sanitised social reality - explicitly draws attention to the ways in which enclavic space attempts to rationalise and control, and rejects these expectations of St Lucia:

Stick to Cancun, or better still, Disneyland or Las Vegas!

A second, prevalent strategy attempts to undermine the rationale of responsibility by re-situating it from the curation of mythic images to the social realities of St Lucia that create this dissonance. In certain cases this is enacted by blunt questioning of the inversion of priorities that fantasy-scape tourism gives rise to:

I think for too long we have been trying to sell the island to the foreigner i think it is time we begin to sell the island to ourselves.

The most prevalent line of argument contends that dissonance is unavoidable where attempts are made to secure and perform unproblematic and unambiguous images in a social context of inequality and economic dependence on tourism. Poverty, social exclusion and environmental considerations cannot be merely airbrushed away:

As much as you profess to love St Lucia lying boldface about the problems is not the answer...distasteful or not, we have got to face reality and tackle the problem.

One particular contribution to a discussion thread – instigated by a question about whether people in the town of Gros Islet had ‘reaped the benefits of tourism’ in the area – employs a parodic sarcasm that can be discerned in other contributions:

Oh Yes! We have it made...Diabetics in Gros Islet no longer have to worry about having their legs amputated because of highly specialized medical care-free insulin, weekly visits by nurses for follow up. It offers a cure for men suffering from “Erectile disfunction”...Gros-Islet has 4 secondary schools, every child in Gros-Islet is guaranteed a higher education-all for free, meals included. And! if Gros Islet people are not satisfied with the service that is being offered, they have an 8 lane highway that will take them to Vieux Fort in 15 mins...¹⁰¹

By refusing to acknowledge a tacit relegation of ‘backstage’ areas and issues, contributors absolve themselves of duties as a postmodern performer, constantly required to police ambiguity and dissonance, and instead focus on addressing the sources of these ambiguities. The implication of these postings is that - to return to the marketing argot - the image of St Lucia circulating in a globalised tourist economy is more at risk the further the imagic brand strays from the encountered product. On one level, an image based on rapture and paradise always contains the seeds of inevitable disillusionment, an experiential moment that Chris Rojek has argued reflects Walter Benjamin’s notion of the loss of aura in the age of mechanical reproduction (1997).

¹⁰¹ Threads such as this display signs of being a discussion between people who at least recognise each other’s political party affiliations. The amplificatory dimension of a debate about tourism has the added advantage of potentially discrediting the current government to anyone who encounters these discussions.

What compounds this is the likelihood that this experience is tainted by actions that are never associated with the lingering asociality of a paradise island:

Ask your government to clean up their act, and start finding ways to solve crime and make St Lucia the beautiful country that you are about to portray.

While the quotation above - which was posted by a self-declared former tourist - draws attention to the problematic relationship between, for want of better terms, image and reality, it also hints at a desire for a congruent reality to be re-established. The uni-directional emphasis on reflexivity commented on earlier in this chapter is once again present in postings which concede that the rationale of the exotic location means always having to assume that tourists expect to encounter a coherent reality. Certain contributors, in debates that focus on crime and harassment, note that while many tourists come from North American cities, the escapist nature of the promised Caribbean lowers tolerance for any conditions comparable to those of daily life. The fact that every country in the world has 'bad parts' doesn't create a point of identification, rather it represents a jarring anomaly in an intensified experience of mythic time and space.¹⁰² The nuanced reflexivity at work in the newsgroups constantly emphasise that the performative dimensions of 'hosting' and working in tourism allow an assumption of competence and flexibility on the part of the formal and informal host-performer only.

In concluding this section, it is worth noting that while these constrictive modes of imagining and regulating 'tourist-host' contact have an obvious significance for many St Lucians, there are some intriguing glimpses of the limitations tourists experience as well. The following quotation details a tourist's 'escape' from an all-inclusive resort, an escape that aims to establish contact with the 'real St Lucia', and subsequently, to establish the credibility of the narrator in the eyes of online locals:

After 2 days of hanging out with a whole bunch of English Tourists (mummy it's too hot!) we asked some of the staff how to escape :) We walked from the hotel to Rodney Bay and Gros Islet, met some taxi drivers, got some local info and bought

¹⁰² This only pertains to paradise tourism; as Mowforth and Munt argue in connection with backpacking, poverty and perceived risk also become aestheticised (1998: 78-82), and as Foley and Lennon point out, 'dark tourism' has emerged around the Holocaust, recent European conflicts, and African famines (2000).

food at the local market to take “home” with us...everyone we met (Looshans that is) was wonderful, Rastas selling the necklaces, vendors in the market...I wish there was some way for every St Lucian to recognise that not all of us who come visit are wealthy Americans or Europeans and that some of us would rather be invited for a meal in their home than lie on a beach in a roped off ocean. I’d rather buy a Piton at a wagon and play dominoes (badly) with the locals than have to sit next to some guy who just flew in from my neighbourhood.

Several things in this contribution play within established critiques of tourist behaviour and discourses of authenticity; the performance of social differentiation from other tourists (Mowforth & Munt 1998), the unreflexive assumptions of unrestricted access to and being an unproblematic presence in the life-world of others (ibid), and the construction of a ‘real’ locality beyond the rationalised space of the tourist resort (Macleod 1997). Nevertheless, it could be argued that this kind of contribution signifies a desire for more meaningful interaction, interaction based on fluid and divergent expectations and interpretations of tourists’ motivations and identities. It is, in some sense, a plea for the recognition of the reflexivity of tourists. As I have argued, the spatial, visual and interactive logic of tourism that depends on curating a fantasyscape involves attempting to inculcate reflexive performances from ‘hosts’, while institutionalising particular stereotypes of tourists and their desires.

Postings such as this one attest, in a very limited way, that many tourists may feel uncomfortable within rationalised, spatialised and scripted encounters, if only, to return to Melucci’s logic, because limits also signify something of what lies beyond. Lest this be misinterpreted as a dewy-eyed presentiment of the intercultural possibilities of such contact, it is obvious that what is missing from such aspirational postings is not only a realisation that the kind of contact the discussant has in mind inescapably involves a performative dimension, a dimension that may well extend an enclavic logic. What is also missing is a dialogic awareness of the power geometry of such ‘real’ encounters, and the constantly constraining nature of tourism where the economy of signs is inextricably connected with an economy of exchange.

00000

This chapter has approached the dominant imaginative geography of the Caribbean as a rubric within which senses of interconnection and bonds of interdependence are at play.

The established argument that the Caribbean is of and not of the West endures in a global era; the mobility of people, things and vast swathes of information from the Caribbean appears to be sequestered from the dominant flows and (re) constitutions of a generic Caribbean that is timeless, pliant, and continually primed for possession. The evocative images of tour buses blithely traversing landscapes that are bound up in and dependent on micro and macro policies formed in the crucible of the tourists' 'home' underscores the tensions of imaginative geography, where narratives are anchored but not stabilised by inscriptions. The implications of connexity, as chapter one detailed, vary hugely within the physical and imaginative dimensions of proximity.

Nevertheless, this chapter has also sought to extract the complexities of imaginative geography from the reductive metaphorisation that characterises certain understandings of tourism in the Caribbean. That practices of curating and securing a desired, deterritorialised Caribbean aim for the minimisation of cultural risk and dissonance is evident. However the thrust of my situated analysis has been to caution against assuming that the specificities of forms can be read from the connotations of type. All-inclusive resorts, given the realities of permeability and porousness through design, intrusion and inevitability, could be argued to be rich sites of accidental cosmopolitanism, apparently holistic environments where dissonance may well be amplified by its sharp disjuncture from the performative norm. Accidental cosmopolitanism occurs, or may occur, when a dialogic sense of self in place and in connection to the life-worlds of others is unavoidable. In the spaces and routines of risk management, the horizons of limitation set by enclavic practices always already insist on what lies beyond.

This is undoubtedly a speculative conclusion, but it goes somewhat towards considering the significance of connexity beyond dualisms of girded spaces and oblivious tourists. As I have argued, the bonds of interconnection are light and heavy; durable in their insistence, yet shifting in the understandings that may temporarily prevail. Thus all-inclusivisation, a process that extends the enclavic dimensions of the resort to the wider social environment, may serve to obscure forms of interconnection by removing the subversive invitation provided by limits and by suggesting new narratives of access and contact. For the interconnected tourist-consumer, the ethical task is not one of 'seeing past' the apparent artificiality of the generic Caribbean to partake and contribute to the

real one, but to develop a reflexivity of connectivity that is sensitive to constant imbrication in a mobile, dynamic negotiation. The implications of this analysis are explored in the conclusion.

Conclusion

This thesis has been centrally concerned with the implications of privileged dwelling within a 'global ecumene' (Hannerz 1996), and the bonds of interconnection and interdependence that such a notion suggests. I have argued that such bonds are constituted through relationships of imagination and implication; they necessitate an integrated consideration of imagining self-in-the-world and the diffuse resources that sustain this imagination (Appadurai 1996), and a consideration of ethics resulting from issues of 'global concern' becoming part of 'everyday moral life-worlds' (Beck 2002: 17). I have contended that the constitutive role of the imagination is absent from dominant concepts of globalisation that have been influential in promoting these prerogative senses of 'one-worldism' and 'global consciousness'. Notions of global awareness and responsibility are often implicitly constructed as rational models of unfurling consciousness, and fail to take account of the 'dialogic imagination' as it has been developed here. As a critique and future-oriented alternative to this, I have tried to develop what I will discuss in this conclusion as 'bridging metaphors' that put into play both the inseparability of and tensions between experiential, phenomenological and subjective narrations of the world, and the constancy of inscription. In this conclusion, I

will present what I regard to be some of the key issues and directions these arguments suggest for further research and educational policy.

My critique of the lack of sensitivity towards the profoundly constructionist nature of ideas of globalisation is not rooted in a postmodern insistence on indeterminacy, despite my critiques of globalisation as a covertly acceptable postmodern meta-narrative. Instead, I agree with Wolf Schäfer, who quotes the physicist Murray Gell-Mann in arguing that “It is vitally important that we supplement our specialized studies with serious attempts to take a crude look at the whole” (2001: 301). Schäfer argues that this crude look is necessitated by “Globalization...pushing the problems of the world into everybody’s face, the global whole is honing in on us” (2001: 302). The micro-responses discussed in chapter one are responses both to the in-your-face-ness of global interdependence and the public discourses of awareness that exist; these responses are born of a sense of having been honed in on, and feeling a duty to respond to the well-being of the whole and its unknown Others. A continuing commitment to struggling with ‘the crude look’ is crucial.

Thus the problem with global discourses is not their scope, but a latent assumption that – under optimum conditions of access to information, reflective awareness and ethical responsiveness – people will understand and react to a process of *honing* in broadly predictable ways. It is my contention that what is of central importance to a ‘crude look at the whole’ is a complementary series of crude yet committed looks at how the whole is commonly and divergently imagined *from the inside*. Stressing and exploring the constitutive importance of imaginative engagement may, in tracing the ways in which people produce the global through tracing trajectories, filling gaps and making connections, provide a basis for reconstituting these normative notions of awareness and consciousness.

As the choice of issues considered in this thesis indicates, I have arrived at this analysis through a critical engagement with the political positions I inhabit. To return to the idea of ‘fast castes’ referenced from Susan George in introduction, her analysis of the fundamental bonds of historically accrued and contemporaneously reinforced obligations between Minority and Majority worlds is a basic tenet of my own sense of globality. However, a commitment to the notion of globality as I have discussed it suggests that

merely stating the imperative nature of these obligations *a priori* misses the key challenge of working with and through the dynamics and potentialities of imaginative geographies. This realisation can be recapped with reference to Susan George's development of her argument:

We all use the word 'globalization'; it figures in the titles of countless seminars, conferences, and lectures and has been repeated so often that we tend to accept it uncritically. Allow me to suggest that by doing so, we become victims of a particularly successful ideological hijacking of language because the word 'globalization' gives the impression that all people from all regions of the globe are somehow caught up in a single movement, an all-embracing phenomenon and all are marching towards some future Promised Land. I would argue that precisely the opposite is the case, that the term 'globalization' is a trap because it masks rather than reveals present reality and is convenient shorthand for *de facto* exclusion (2003: 16)

While the myopic utopianism she caricatures is unlikely to be found beyond the happiest of op-eds in the *Wall Street Journal*, her critique recalls both Harvey's (2000) retrospective lament of the uncritical depoliticisation that characterised an analytical scramble for globalisation during the 1990s, and my contention that globalisation remains teleologically pre-disposed to such totalising manifestations. However George's idea of 'hijacking' singularly fails to take into account that the rapid and global dissemination of 'globalisation' as a naturalising framework of understanding means that its ubiquity and multi-accentuality are beyond correction. 'It' does not mask or reveal anything, and the different shorthands it connotes are far from evident. Globalisation is a metaphor loaded with positional political and cultural narratives, and as I argued, is more productively seen as an aspect of globality, an explanatory cut into the ambiguities of the 'crude whole'.

The political work that Susan George discusses requires the cultural work that frames the introduction to this thesis; the need to work with cultural hermeneutics, lived understandings of global rhetoric and bonds of interconnection, and the implacable realities of inscription. As I stated in introduction, global awareness is an increasingly weak slogan. As an ontological claim it must engage with the ways, modalities and understandings in which interconnectedness is imagined and the worlds of 'one world' are mapped. There are several undertakings that can support this. The first is what could be called a basic discursive duty to make apparent the precise processes, dynamics and relations that are intended and couched in a recourse to the keyword 'globalisation' and

its derivatives. At this point in time, this pertains more to the wider public sphere than to the distinct rigours of academic engagement, as the modes, speeds, conventions and routines of communication differ in obvious ways.

Globalisation may be one of the issues Graham Murdock had in mind when, in discussing public discourse and knowledge, he argues “Knowledge is no longer a gift, carefully wrapped by experts. It is the stake in a continual contest of positions” (1999: 12). Globalisation is such a competitive terrain, and while in sympathy with the idea of it having been ‘hijacked’, what is of central importance is the dissemination of diversifying and countervailing discourses that render the nature of that competitive terrain visible. As Murdock concludes in a discussion of core principles for contemporary public discourse; mass communications must “[...] balance the promotion of diversity of information and experience against citizen’s rights of access to frameworks of knowledge, and to the principles that allow them to be evaluated and challenged” (1999: 16).

In research terms, the perhaps unprecedented circulation of globalisation and its corollaries presents an opportunity for empirical investigation and discursive analysis that seems to me to be surprisingly under-developed. As globalisation has entered into habitats of meaning, it has simultaneously proposed itself as a frame of sense-making. But how, and in what different ways, is it incorporated in everyday interpretations? In a review of ‘the function of the concept of globalization’ in the social sciences during the 1990s, Jens Bartelson distinguishes between the emergence of three overlapping yet centrifugal understandings; transference, transformation and transcendence. In delineating the conceptual history of these emergent notions, Bartelson keenly questions what he sees as the suspension of constructivist approaches in the apparent consensus that globalisation *is*, and that therefore what is of consequence is work on *what it is*. As he writes:

But what goes on ‘in here’, in the discourse of globalization? To my mind, the wide acceptance of globalization as a fact *is itself a social fact* worth investigating, especially since it might be argued that this fact is partly constitutive of what globalization is about: nothing changes the world like the collective belief that it is changing, albeit rarely in directions desired by the believers (2000: 180-181)

Having posed this question, Bartelson does not pursue the obvious implication that investigating the 'in here' of globalisation as a social fact also involves attempting to investigate a variety of situated positions beyond the relatively limited divergences of academic debate. In re-interpreting the significance of globality, I have argued that it provides a metaphor that captures the interplay of subjective and highly divergent senses of consciousness of the world as a whole and the kinds of ambivalent global figuration these may encompass. At the same time, it provides an analytical space for relating divergent ways of understanding and standing in interconnectedness to the dominant discourses that currently circulate. Nevertheless, a future imperative must be to develop qualitative research projects that begin to examine the ways in which globalisation as an implicit social fact, and as an over-arching rhetoric for imagining processes that impact on co-existence, is understood.

In the introduction and first sections of chapter one, I cited a range of theoretical writing that juxtaposes the 'facts' of globalisation, and the fact of concomitant awareness of these processes. What is a priority now is to investigate – with both an awareness and embrace of the positional and contextual dimensions of qualitative cultural research – the different imaginative geographies of 'globalisation' that imbue this notion with ongoing and shifting meanings. This may be both an extremely focused investigation, and I will return to this in subsequent discussions of non-formal education and 'global consciousness'. If I may be permitted to speculate in more aspirational terms, it may also begin to surface narratives of globality that give fine-grained substance to linear exhortations to unicity. As K. Anthony Appiah writes in relation to notions of global citizenship:

The trouble with borrowing a rhetoric of fellow feeling from the nation, however, is that the national story is so much a story of a nation among nations, an *inter*-national narrative. And the standard national story creates solidarity by contrasting what *we* do with what *they* do, usually, as we all know, to *their* disadvantage. If there is no agent outside the human community, no antagonist to its protagonist, can we tell stories that will bind us together? (2003: 197)

Yet, as the disparate practices investigated in chapter two under such labels as 'dynamic rootedness', 'ordinary cosmopolitanism' and 'planetary humanism' suggest, felt and imagined practices of global connexity are not solely dependent on the relationship between particularity and universalism that defines the interplay of national identities.

Globalisation has imputed a variety of meta-narratives, yet we know little of how these have been imbued with perhaps expansive and countervailing 'vernacular' micro-narratives.

In response to the key contemporary question of how a global ecumene is constructed and understood, I regard my key theoretical work in this thesis to be the development of bridging metaphors of imaginative geography and accidental cosmopolitanism. In *Sociology Beyond Societies*, John Urry suggests not only the need to recognise that "[...] being and thinking sociologically cannot be undertaken outside of metaphor", but that the social sciences go through periodic fits of discomfort with the centrality of metaphor to theoretical practice (2000: 22-23). Globalisation, he argues, foregrounds the metaphoric nature of 'society': in dialogue with the ambiguities of 'the global', normative relationships between society, nation, boundary, community, and territory are unsettled. In examining how globalisation is elucidated through metaphors of network, scape and flow, he argues that the spatial nature of sociological metaphors has become marked by dimensions of movement and mobility, as opposed to territory (2000: 32-48). Following Urry, it could be proposed that a central critique of globalisation is that the notion tends towards disguising its figurativeness, and that what is necessary is to explore the ways in which globalisation is read as a metaphorical invitation. My response to this has been to develop metaphors for approaching the 'in here' of globalisation and global interconnectedness. A new sense of imaginative geography seeks to find ways of examining positionality within networks, scapes and flows, and to explore the immanence of contextual understandings in constituting bonds of interconnection and interdependence. As I have conceived of it, imaginative geography works to foreground the complex of issues that are subsumed in normative, instrumental tropes of awareness and consciousness. Lingering dependencies on models of transmission, linear communication and rational engagement are redundant when faced with contemporary conditions of never being outside of information (Lash 2002). My prolonged consideration of 'knowledge about' issues of interdependence and the ways in which different situated knowledges inform ethical engagements gathers together a basic matrix of factors that must be considered in conceptualisations of how interconnected subjects step into their bonds, and how agents of 'awareness raising' imagine and address these subjects.

The concept of imaginative geography fuses two complex dimensions of mediated knowledge about the world. The first pertains to the relationship between insistence and interconnection. As Stanley Cohen argues in his masterful study *States of Denial*: “Our knowledge is not dependent on chance. It is permanent and continuous; those single moments when a crying Rwandan orphan appears on screen are reminders of what we already know” (2001: 295). Thus for Cohen, the test for the ethical imagination is living between such moments of confirmation in the flow known as normality. A second dimension, and converse reading, is proposed by Sonia Livingstone, in arguing for a return to the question of what knowledge people produce from their engagements with mediated texts: “Mediated knowledge is not just about recognition of the familiar or legitimation of the known, but also about the discovery of the new, about becoming familiar with the unknown, about legitimating the hitherto marginalized” (1999: 97). The relationship between these dimensions of knowledge is at the heart of the vignettes presented in the introduction. The complexities of imaginative geographies derive from the ongoing production of self in interconnection with Others, and the role of mediated knowledge in relation to the practice of global imagination is a crucial focus for further study.

With the vignettes of disjuncture in mind - and the subsequent analysis - I have conceptualised these metaphors as bridges between theoretical investigation and educational practice. Non-formal, or ‘informalised’ education under the rubric of *global citizenship* provides a compelling space for investigation of the imaginative and implicated dimensions of writing the world. I see a clear need, following the kind of pioneering qualitative and quasi-ethnographic work conducted in media education by David Buckingham and Julian Sefton-Greene (1994, 1998, 2000, 2003), to develop both the consideration of situated knowledge and mediated texts, and the ways in which understandings of connexity are reconstructed and articulated. A possible contribution of this research would be to develop transversal relationships between media education, ‘global citizenship’, and the issues raised by imaginative geography. The different manifestations of global education I have encountered work from acknowledging that we stand in interconnectedness and interdependence. How do the constitutive, imaginative dimensions of this putative participatory citizenship enhance understandings of interconnectedness and the constancy of inscription?

Accidental cosmopolitanism, as a bridging metaphor, seeks to suggest moments of micro-crisis in the habitual practice of everyday imaginations. It is located in the moments of stretch and ambiguity that irrupt in the 'flow of normality', and contra Cohen, speculates that the dimensions of normality do not snap back into exactly the same shape. In theoretical terms, accidental cosmopolitanism is an attempt to shift a renewed interest in cosmopolitanism – understood as a mobilising metaphor and discursive fluid – beyond the circularity of aspirational projections and ethnographies of 'actually existing' cosmopolitanisms. Instead, moments and experiences of this kind, at a minimal level, manifest a realisation of interconnection, interdependence, and the heavy fluidity of bonds. The accidental is cosmopolitan in that it implies the appearance of limits and gaps that must at least be acknowledged, its fundamental power lies in the reflexivity of implication and partiality, and the invitation to cultural work.

Accidental cosmopolitanism shifts the prevailing discursive focus from cosmopolitanism as a state or variety of practices and competences to cosmopolitanism as process. In the light of this, the contemporary re-politicisation and de-mythologising of tourism creates spaces and moments where connexities are unavoidably impressed upon situations. Furthermore, the residual cultural construction of tourism as a liminal practice of 'stepping out', along with the imaginative geographies of exoticism that continue to shape a variety of touristic frameworks, intimates that dissonance and ambiguity are amplified by situations where trajectories and relations of connexity have been sublimated and disavowed. The re-territorialisation of spaces of play; the re-ascription of political identities in periods of play; the political instrumentalisation of tourists and tourism in places dominantly presented as being apolitical; it may be that tourism currently provides a modality where 'global figuration' and 'accidental cosmopolitanism' are increasingly and intensively experienced.

If this speculation has any purchase, then tourism as a cultural practice and modality of interconnection needs to be unpacked in a number of ways. An increasingly influential current in tourism research emphasises the complex of mobilities that are subsumed in the limited notion of 'tourism' (Sheller & Urry 2004: 3-5). Adrian Franklin argues that 'the manner of the tourist' can increasingly be understood as a metaphor for life in consumer societies, and that "[...] tourism is *infused* into the everyday and has become one of the ways in which our lives are ordered and one of the ways in which consumers

orientate themselves, or take a stance in a globalised world” (2003: 2). Undoubtedly, relationships between consumption and multiculturalism, the increased prevalence of heritage sites and multi-purpose urban spaces, the ubiquity of mediated and virtual travel, and the de-coupling of leisure from a structural relationship with work lends credence to this argument. It also has implications for considerations of imaginative geographies; what everyday *stances* in the global ecumene can be productively understood as touristic?

Allowing for the analytical purchase and creative possibilities of this argument, however, I would maintain that we need to retain a concerted focus on tourism as a distinct form of movement that involves influential phenomenological and social-psychological implications. Not to do so would be to lose sight of the ‘in there’ of touristic experiences, and consequently the forms of accidental cosmopolitanism that global tourism currently engenders. To return to Franklin’s thesis, he argues that “[...] it is so difficult (and pointless) to define tourism in spatial terms: it simply is not behaviour that only takes place away from home” (2003: 24). In sociological terms I am in complete agreement, yet to consider this as the new default paradigm for approaching tourism is to elide the continued importance of tourism as a phenomenological experience. The analysis presented in chapter two is predicated on people retaining an important sense of divergence between home and away; it is precisely in the interstices between these notions that terror was inserted and so keenly felt. Tourism - as a stance towards difference and novelty, for example – may not simply be something that only takes place away from home, but this is not to suggest that it operates as an emic category of experience both home and away. Tourism may indeed involve ‘taking a stance to a globalised world’ precisely because the interconnections of this globalised world have re-inscribed tourism with the complexities and dangers of the ‘it all’ we cannot get away from. Accidental cosmopolitanism is the experiential space of re-inscription.

In wider public discourse, tourism and the tourist continue to be marked by a sense of limited cultural capital and artificiality of experience, and it is possible to speculate that this is influential in cordoning off the experience of ‘actually existing’ tourism from a more considered reflection on its implications. In a variety of recent public debates in Ireland and the UK the tourist has been employed as a cipher of detachment and

superficiality; citizenship tourists, maternity tourists, genetic tourists and asylum tourists. Mark Latham, leader of the Australian Labour Party, recently characterised what he sees as urban elites preoccupied with multiculturalism and aboriginal rights as ‘tourists’, in a description that may give Adrian Franklin pause for political thought:

(Tourists) travel extensively, eat out, and buy in domestic help. They see the challenges of globalisation as an opportunity, a chance to further develop their identity and information skills. This abstract lifestyle has produced an abstract style of politics. Symbolic and ideological campaigns are given top priority. This involves a particular methodology: adopting a predetermined position on issues and then looking for evidence to support that position¹⁰³

Tourism, as a practice and modality of interconnection, demands increased public attention beyond the limitations imposed by its metaphoric disavowal. While an organisation such as Tourism Concern engages in concerted campaigning, its prominent position in the field is also a commentary on how these lingering senses of tourism’s superficiality stunts a wider address of its import for human, labour, environmental and potentially cultural rights. In educational terms I see a direct possibility for ‘global citizenship’ to engage with tourism and interconnectedness; participative education benefits from engaging at the level of reflected experience, and incorporating tourism into the range of life areas where connexity is at play may begin to soften the diffuse yet important ways in which ‘being away’ sanctions different perspectives on presence, interaction and responsibility.

The idea of ‘tourist education’ may seem, in Mark Latham’s terms, to be fancifully touristic, however I see it as part of a process of integrating globality as a transversal consideration in all forms of social, cultural, economic and political education. If, as I have argued, senses of ‘the global’ are filled with meaning and incorporated into social practices, then ‘the global’ cannot be shired off solely into special areas dedicated to ‘it’. What I do not have in mind here is the kind of shift envisaged by Martha Nussbaum, where ‘the global’ becomes the aspirational outer circle described by Zeno. Instead, I see it as a process recognising the interconnections that are always at play

¹⁰³ Quoted in Crandell, Jordan, ‘Under fire: residents versus tourists’. http://www.wdw.nl/underfire-archive/topic.php?topic_id=90 It is interesting that Latham’s populist rhetoric, to all extents and purposes, substitutes ‘the tourist’ for ‘the cosmopolitan’.

and, to some extent, rendering them banal; stitched resolutely in the fabric of life and the subject areas it is arbitrarily divided into.

The need for this integral approach to globality, and the analysis that has underpinned it, is finally rooted for me in the untouched beaches and sensuous lushness of the Caribbean, and in the warm perpetual smiles of those lucky enough to be born in paradise. This is the imaginative geography I have spent so much time exploring, and it is my conviction that the political economic promulgation of these limiting mythologies is a continued impediment to re-negotiating a more equitable and sustainable power geometry. Bonds of connexity and interdependence exist between the Caribbean and its peoples, and the tourists that shape its globalised contours through mobility, consumption and the power of expectation. My work in St Lucia could undoubtedly have benefited from the richness, expansiveness and dissension of qualitative work with tourists. Nevertheless, it is important to bear in mind that the potency of the generic Caribbean lies in the flashes of reflexivity displayed by Naipaul's narrator and Makeda's character; it is the imagined tourist, in the shape of performed and reified expectations of expectations, that girders the congruency of these lived mythologies.

This is why I argue that the metaphoric and political importance of the all-inclusive may eventually be over-played. There is no doubting its power as a symbolic fusion of political, cultural and economic exclusion. This symbolic strength may thrive regardless of the divergent practices of specific sites, as its symbolism is most acute at moments of political-economic convulsion. Yet ultimately it is a symptom of the wider problem, which is the role allotted to St Lucia in an economy of signs and an economy of money. *All-inclusivisation*, in my reading, is taking place despite attempts at diversifying the nature and the market for tourism in St Lucia and the Eastern Caribbean. With tourism accounting for 69% of GDP and 51% of employment in a context where revenue from bananas dropped by 62% in the late 1990s and continues to drop, cultural risk maps far too snugly onto economic risk. The economy of signs and money in tourism powers the dialectic of panopticism and synopticism discussed in chapter three; tourism requires monitoring how we are seen, and known, and desired, and *regarded to be interconnected*. This is tourism reflexivity as a 'system of governmentality' (Sheller & Urry 2004: 3), but it is a reflexivity of 'knowledge about' from a position of relative powerlessness.

This analysis does not, and should not be read as a reductive commentary on the tactics, and strategies of people dwelling in performance. What it contends is that the responsibility for exploring the dimensions of interconnection and interdependence ultimately rests with tourists. Tourists evidently do not possess and impose a homogenous set of expectations congruent with an oppressive practice of paradise, however the power geometry of this tourism restricts ‘hosts’ to working within an approximation of this practice. Caribbean tourism needs to pay concerted attention to cultural as well as economic sustainability, as the two cannot be sundered. In St Lucia specifically, I am convinced that complementary, critical empirical work with tourists is needed to broaden the register of assumptions that are naturalised by ‘attitudinal surveys’ and ‘satisfaction studies’. The tourist industry could begin by re-imagining tourists as people already on the move, inhabiting the binds of connexity, and capable of confronting the interconnections that their consumption implies. After all, we are all expected to do more cultural work today.

LIST OF REFERENCES

1. Primary Sources

1.1 Newspaper and magazine articles

Aitkenhead, Decca, ‘Murder in Jamaica’. *The New Statesman*, March 31 2003

Atkinson, Nancy, ‘How to recognise a tourist’, *The Official Publication of the St Lucia Hotel and Tourism Council*, Vol. 6 (1) 1995/6

Baker, Lindsay, ‘Sleeping Beauty’. *The Guardian*, May 6 2000

Barnett, Anthony, ‘Honeymoon island fit for all the family’. *The Guardian Travel*, December 8 2002

Best, Robert, ‘Keeping out undesirables’. *The Barbados Nation*, February 8 2000

Bindel, Julie, ‘The price of a holiday fling’. *The Guardian Weekend*, July 5 2003

Bird, Liz, ‘Life’s a cheap beach’. *The Observer*, October 28 2001

Boseley, Sarah, ‘US accused of sabotaging obesity strategy’. *The Guardian*, January 16 2004

Bunting, Madeleine, ‘A hall of mirrors’. *The Guardian*, January 17 2005

- Bunting, Madeleine, 'New Year same grind'. *The Guardian*, January 6 2003
- Churchill, David, 'Plantation failure in the Caribbean'. *The Times*, June 6 1996
- Crace, John, 'New year, new horizons'. *The Guardian Travel*, December 28 2002
- Dawe, Tony, 'Barbados plays up its culture'. *The Times*, January 4 1996
- Francis, Agnes, 'More on Sandals'. *The St Lucia Star*, April 10 2002
- Francis, Agnes, 'When it comes to Sandals who does Bousquet speak for?' *The St Lucia Star*, April 17 2002
- Francis, Eliza, 'PM says government policies support European Plan hotels'. *The St Lucia Star*, April 10 2002
- 'Group questions Compton on environmental damage at Jalousie'. *The St Lucia Star*, January 18 1992
- Hencke, David, 'Holiday firm ends ban on gay couples'. *The Guardian*, October 12, 2004
- Hickman, Leo, 'How green is your house?' *The Guardian*, January 29 2004
- Hyde, Amanda, 'The other side of the island'. 'Fantasy Islands'. *The Sunday Times Travel*, August/September 2004
- 'Investment in domestic human resources attracts foreign capital'. *The Washington Times*, Special International Report on St Lucia, January 25 2000
- Jessop, David, 'The week in Europe'. *The Barbados Advocate*, February 20 2003
- Kelner, Martin, 'Puma sent dancing to the wrong tune'. *The Guardian*, November 22 2004
- Killen, Mary, 'All-inclusive holidays: leave your brain behind and enjoy'. *The Independent*, November 27 2000
- Lee-Sing, Wayne (ed.) *Paradise St Lucia*, (Castries, Summer 2001)
- Liddle, Rod, 'They all hate us. So where can I go on holiday?' *The Guardian*, January 7 2003
- Mansfield, Paul, 'Beaches to die for, yeah'. *The Telegraph Travel* (date unconfirmed)
- Marr, Andrew, 'Interview with Derek Walcott'. *The Observer Escape*, April 27 1999
- McEwan, Ian, 'Only love and then oblivion. Love was all they had to set against their murderers'. *The Guardian*, September 15 2001
- Chris McGreal, 'Madonna in mystical mode dismays Orthodox Jews'. *The Guardian*, September 20 2004
- Monbiot, George, 'War X 4'. *The Guardian*, July 6 2004

- Morgan, Oliver, 'Car makers still in love with their 4x4s'. *The Observer*, October 3 2004
- Morgan, Peter, 'The road to the beach'. *The Barbados Nation*, February 10 2000
- Nicholson-Lord, David, 'Against the western invaders'. *The New Statesman*, December 9 2002
- Osborn, Andrew, 'Country for hire: low rent, all amenities'. *The Guardian*, February 14 2003
- Pattullo, Polly, 'All for one'. *The Guardian*, May 22 1999
- Pattullo, Polly, 'Bitter Fruit'. *The Guardian*, June 6 1998
- Pemberton, Lynne, 'How they ruined my island in the sun'. *The Mail on Sunday*, September 15 1996
- Prag, Sam, 'Access to beaches reveals deep divisions in the society'. *The Herald* (Jamaica) May 30 1999
- Rush, Rebecca, 'EU/ACP countries banana war continues'. Scoop Independent News, <http://www.scoop.co.nz/stories/WO0505/S00253.htm> May 16 2005
- 'Tourists fan discontent'. *The St Lucia Star*, March 13 1999
- Younge, Gary, 'No refuge from reality'. *The Guardian*, December 2 2002
- Younge, Gary, 'Green gold loses out to "dollar bananas"'. *The Guardian*, April 20 1999

1.2 Reports

- Dixey, Louise, 'All-Inclusive Resorts in St. Lucia. Environment, Economy and Society', UK Centre for Economic and Environmental Development Discussion Paper (Cambridge, June 1999)
- International Confederation of Free Trade Unions (ICFTU) *Export Processing Zones – Symbols of Exploitation and a Development Dead-End* (Brussels, September 2003)
- Ministry of Planning, Development, Environment and Housing, Government of St Lucia, *St Lucia National Report to the World Summit on Sustainable Development* (Castries, July 2001)
- Research and Information Systems Department, St Lucia Tourist Board, *Tourist Attitudinal Survey 2001* (draft version)
- St Lucia Hotel and Tourism Association (SLHT) *Annual Report 2000-2001* (Castries, 2002)

1.3 Literary works

Naipaul, V.S. *The Mimic Men* (London: Penguin, 1967)

Silvera, Makeda, 'Caribbean Chameleon' in Brown, Stewart & John Wickham (ed.) *The Oxford Book of Caribbean Short Stories* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999)

Walcott, Derek, *Omeros* (London: Faber & Faber, 1992)

2. Secondary Sources: books, book chapters and journal articles

Abram, Simone et al (ed.) *Tourists and Tourism: Identifying with People and Places* (Oxford: Berg, 1997)

Abu-Lughod, Lila, 'Writing Against Culture' in Fox, R.G. (ed.) *Recapturing Anthropology* (Santa Fe: School of America Research Press, 1991)

Adam, Barbara, 'Re-vision: The Centrality of Time for an Ecological Social Science Perspective' in Lash, Scott, Bronislaw Szerszynski & Brian Wynne (ed.) *Risk, Environment and Modernity: Towards a New Ecology* (London: Sage, 1996)

Adorno, Theodor and Max Horkheimer, *Dialectic of Enlightenment* (London: Verso 1979)

Albrow, Martin, *The Global Age* (Cambridge: Polity, 1996)

Alsop, Rachel, Annette Fitzsimons & Kathleen Lennon, *Theorising Gender* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 2002)

Anderson, Amanda, 'Cosmopolitanism, Universalism and the Divided Legacies of Modernity' in Cheah, Pheng & Bruce Robbins (ed.) *Cosmopolitics: Thinking and Feeling Beyond the Nation* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1998)

Anderson, Benedict, *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origins and Spread of Nationalism* (London: Verso, 1983)

Appadurai, Arjun, *Modernity at Large: Cultural Dimension of Globalization* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1996)

Appadurai, Arjun (ed.) *Globalization* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2001)

Appiah, Anthony, 'Citizens of the World' in Gibney, Matthew J. (ed.) *Globalizing Rights* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003)

Arendt, Hannah, *Eichmann in Jerusalem. A Report on the Banality of Evil* (London: Penguin, 1994)

Arnold Matthew, 'Culture and Anarchy' (1869) in *Matthew Arnold Selected Prose* (London: Penguin Books, 1987)

Back, Les, *New Ethnicities and Urban Culture. Racisms and Multiculture in Young Lives* (London: UCL Press, 1996)

- Bagnoli, Anna, 'Constructing the Hybrid Identities of Europeans' in Titley, Gavan (ed.) *Resituating Culture* (Strasbourg: Council of Europe Publishing, 2004)
- Bairner, Alan, *Sport, Nationalism and Globalization: European and North American Perspectives* (New York: State University of New York Press, 2001)
- Baker, Jody, 'Production and Consumption of Wilderness in Algonquin Park', *Space and Culture*, Vol. 5 (3) (2002): 198-210
- Ballerino Cohen, Colleen, 'Marketing Paradise, Making Nation', *Annals of Tourism Research*, Vol. 22 (2) (1995): 404-421
- Barber, Benjamin, *Jihad Vs McWorld* (New York: Random House, 1995)
- Barker, Chris, *Making Sense of Cultural Studies: Central Problems and Critical Debates* (London: Sage, 2002)
- Barker, Chris, *Television, Globalization and Cultural Identities* (Oxford: Open University Press, 1999)
- Barry, Tom, Beth Wood & Deb Preusch, *The Other Side of Paradise: Foreign Control in the Caribbean* (New York: Grove Press, 1994)
- Bartelson, Jens, 'Three Concepts of Globalization', *International Sociology*, Vol. 15 (2) (2000): 180-196
- Barthel-Bouchier, Diane, 'Authenticity and Identity: Theme-Parking the Amanas', *International Sociology*, Vol. 16(2) (2001): 221-239
- Barthes, Roland, 'Myth Today' in Sontag, Susan (ed.) *A Roland Barthes Reader* (London: Vintage, 2000)
- Baudrillard, Jean, *The Gulf War Did Not Take Place* (1991) (London: Power Books, 2004)
- Bauman, Zygmunt, (a) 'Wars of the Globalization Era', *European Journal of Social Theory*, Vol. 4 (1) (2001): 11-28
- Bauman, Zygmunt, (b) *The Individualized Society* (Cambridge: Polity, 2001)
- Bauman, Zygmunt *Liquid Modernity* (Cambridge: Polity, 2000)
- Bauman, Zygmunt *Globalization: The Human Consequences* (London: Routledge, 1998)
- Bauman, Zygmunt & Tim May, *Thinking Sociologically* (Oxford: Blackwell, 2001)
- Beck, Ulrich, 'The Cosmopolitan Society and its Enemies', *Theory, Culture and Society*, Vol. 19 (1-2) (2002) 17-44
- Beck, Ulrich, *Risk Society: Towards a New Modernity* (London: Sage, 1992)

- Benjamin, Walter, 'The Work of Art in the Age of Mechanical Reproduction', in Arendt, Hannah (ed.) *Illuminations* (London: Fontana, 1992)
- Bennett, Milton, 'Towards Ethnorelativism: A Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity' in Paige, Michael R. (ed.) *Education for the Intercultural Experience* (Maine: Intercultural Press, 1993)
- Berking, Helmuth, 'Solidary Individualism: The Moral Impact of Cultural Modernisation in Late Modernity' in Lash, Scott, Bronislaw Szerszynski & Brian Wynne (ed.) *Risk, Environment and Modernity: Towards a New Ecology* (London: Sage, 1996)
- Billig, Michael, *Banal Nationalism* (London: Sage, 1995)
- Bindé, Jérôme, 'Towards an Ethics of the Future' in Appadurai, Arjun (ed.) *Globalization* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2001)
- Boorstin, Daniel, *The Image: A Guide to Pseudo-Events in America* (New York, Harper Press, 1964)
- Bracewell, Michael, *The Nineties: When Surface was Depth* (London: Flamingo, 2003)
- Bradley, Lloyd, *Bass Culture: When Reggae was King* (London: Penguin, 2001)
- Brah, Avtar, 'Diasporic Spatiality, Difference and the Question of Identity' in Titley, Gavan (ed.) *Resituating Culture* (Strasbourg: Council of Europe Publishing, 2004)
- Brah, Avtar, 'Global Mobilities, Local Predicaments: Globalization and the Critical Imagination' *Feminist Review*, 70 (2002) 30-45
- Brah, Avtar, *Cartographies of Diaspora: Contesting Identities* (London: Routledge, 1996)
- Braveboy-Wagner, J.A. & Dennis J. Gayle (ed.) *Caribbean Public Policy: Regional, Cultural and Socioeconomic Issues for the 21st Century* (Boulder: Westview Press, 1997)
- Brennan, Timothy, *At Home in the World* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1997)
- Breckenridge, Carol A. et al (ed.) *Cosmopolitanism* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2002)
- Buckingham, David, *After the Death of Childhood: Growing Up in the Age of Electronic Media* (Cambridge: Polity, 2000)
- Buckingham, David, (ed.) *Teaching Popular Culture: Beyond Radical Pedagogy* (London: Routledge, 1998)
- Buckingham, David & Julian Sefton-Greene, *Cultural Studies goes to School* (London: Taylor & Francis, 1994)

- Bunting, Madeleine, *Willing Slaves: How the Overwork Culture is Ruining Our Lives* (London: Harper Collins, 2004)
- Calhoun, Craig, 'The Class Consciousness of Frequent Travellers: Towards a Critique of Actually Existing Cosmopolitanism' in Vertovec, Steven & Robin Cohen, *Conceiving Cosmopolitanism: Theory, Context and Practice* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002)
- Campbell, John R. & Alan Rew (ed.), *Identity and Affect: Experiences of Identity in a Globalising World* (London: Pluto, 1999)
- Canclini, Nestor, 'Hybrid Cultures, Oblique Powers', in Durham, Meenakshi Gigi & Douglas Kellner (ed.), *Media and Cultural Studies Keywords* (Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 2001)
- Capella, Juan-Ramón, 'Globalization, A Fading Citizenship' in Burbules, Nicholas C. & Carlos Alberto Torres (ed.), *Globalization and Education: Critical Perspectives* (London: Routledge, 2000)
- Castells, Manuel, *The Power of Identity: The Information Age – Economy, Society and Culture: Vol 2* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1997)
- Cavanagh, Allison, 'Behaviour in Public? Ethics in Online Ethnography', *Cybersociology* 6 (1999) <http://www.socio.demon.co.uk/magazine/6/cavanagh>
- Cham, Mybe (ed.), *Ex-Isles: Essays on Caribbean Cinema* (Trenton N.J: Africa World Press, 1992)
- Chaney, David, *Fictions of Collective Life* (London: Routledge, 1993)
- Chisholm, Lynne, and Siyka Kovacheva, *Exploring the European Youth Mosaic. The Social Situation of Young People in Europe* (Strasbourg: Council of Europe Publishing, 2002)
- Clifford, James, *Route: Travel and Translation in the Late Twentieth Century* (Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 1997)
- Coffey, Amanda, *The Ethnographic Self: Fieldwork and the Representation of Identity* (London: Sage, 1999)
- Cohen, Erik, 'A Phenomenology of Tourist Experiences', *Sociology: The Journal of the British Sociological Association*, Vol. 13 (2) (1979): 179-201
- Cohen, Stanley, *States of Denial. Knowing About Atrocities and Suffering* (Cambridge: Polity, 2001)
- Collins, Peter, 'Negotiating Selves: Reflections on "Unstructured" Interviewing', *Sociology Online*, Vol. 3 (3) (1998)
www.socresonline.org.uk/socresonline/3/3/2.html
- Cook, Ian, Philip Crang and Mark Thorpe, 'Tropics of Consumption? "Getting with the Fetish" of "Exotic" Fruit?' in Hughes, Alex & Suzanne Reimer (ed.) *Geographies of Commodities* (London: Routledge, 2004)

- Coulter, Colin, 'Introduction' in Coulter, Colin & Steve Coleman (ed.), *The End of Irish History? Critical Reflections on the Celtic Tiger* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2004)
- Courtman, Sandra, 'Introduction' in Courtman, Sandra (ed.), *Beyond the Blood, the Beach and the Banana: New Perspectives in Caribbean Studies* (Kingston: Ian Randle Publishers, 2004)
- Cowan, Jane K. et al (ed.), *Culture and Rights: Anthropological Perspectives* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001)
- Crang, Philip, 'Performing the Tourist Product' in Rojek, Chris & John Urry (ed.), *Touring Cultures: Transformations of Travel and Theory* (London: Routledge, 1997)
- Crang, Philip & Peter Jackson 'Geographies of Consumption' in Morley, David & Kevin Robbins (ed.) *British Cultural Studies: Geography, Nationality, Identity* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001)
- Cronin, Michael, *Across the Lines: Travel, Language, Translation* (Cork: Cork University Press, 2000)
- Cronin, Michael & Barbara O'Connor (ed.), *Irish Tourism: Image, Culture and Identity* (Clevedon: Channel View Publications, 2003)
- Curtis, Barry & Claire Pajaczkowska, 'Getting There: Time, Travel and Narrative' in Robertson, George et al (ed.), *Travellers' Tales: Narratives of Home and Displacement* (London: Routledge, 1994)
- Dann, Graham M.S. 'Images of Destination People in Travelogues' in Pearce, Douglas G. & Richard W. Butler (ed.), *Tourism Research: Critiques and Challenges* (London: Routledge, 1993)
- Dann, Graham M.S. 'The People of Tourist Brochures' in Tom Selwyn (ed.), *The Tourist Image: Myths and Myth-Making in Tourism* (London: John Wiley & Sons, 1996)
- De Certeau, Michel, *The Practice of Everyday Life* (San Francisco: University of California Press, 2002)
- Delanty, Gerard, 'Conceptions of Europe: A Review of Recent Trends', *European Journal of Social Theory*, Vol. 6 (4) (2003): 471-488
- Delanty, Gerard, *Citizenship in a Global Age* (Cambridge: Open University Press, 2000)
- Deleuze, Gilles & Felix Guattari, *Anti-Oedipus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1983)
- Devereaux, Eoin, 'Good Causes, God's Poor and Telethon Television', *Media, Culture & Society* 18 (1996): 47-68
- Dicks, Bella, *Cultures on Display* (Berkshire: Open University Press, 2004)

- Dicks, Bella & Bruce Mason, 'Hypermedia and Ethnography: Reflections on the Construction of a Research Approach', *Sociological Research Online*, Vol. 3 (3) (2002) www.socresonline.org.uk/socresonline/3/3/3.html
- Dirlik, Arif, 'The Postcolonial Aura: Third World Criticism in the Age of Global Capitalism' in Leistyna, Pepi (ed.), *Cultural Studies: From Theory to Action* (Oxford: Blackwell, 2005)
- Dirlik, Arif, 'Global Modernity? Modernity in an Age of Global Capitalism', *European Journal of Social Theory*, Vol. 6 (3) (2003): 275-292
- Durham Peters, John, 'Witnessing', *Media, Culture and Society* Vol. 23 (2001): 707-723
- Eagleton, Terry, *The Idea of Culture* (Oxford: Blackwell, 2000)
- Edensor, Tim, 'Staging Tourism: Tourists as Performers'. *Annals of Tourism Research*, Vol. 27 (2) (2000): 322-344.
- Ehrenreich, Barbara & Arlie Russel Hochschild (ed.), *Global Woman: Nannies, Maids and Sex Workers in the New Economy* (London: Granta, 2003)
- Ellis, John, *Seeing Things* (London: IB Tauris, 2000)
- Elmer, Greg, 'The Economy of Cyberpromotion' in Herman, Andrew & Thomas Swiss (ed.) *The World Wide Web and Contemporary Cultural Theory* (London: Routledge, 2000)
- Elwes, Anneke, *Nations for Sale* (London: BMP DDB Needham, 1994)
- Featherstone, Mike, 'Cosmopolis: An Introduction', *Theory Culture & Society*, Vol. 19 (1-2) (2002): 2-16
- Featherstone, Mike, *Undoing Culture: Globalization, Postmodernism and Identity* (London: Sage, 1995)
- Featherstone, Mike, *Global Culture: Nationalism, Globalization and Modernity* (London: Sage, 1990)
- Featherstone, Mike & Scott Lash (ed.), *Spaces of Culture: City, Nation, World* (London: Sage, 1999)
- Featherstone, Mike Scott Lash & Roland Robertson (ed.), *Global Modernities* (London: Sage, 1995)
- Ferguson, James, *Far From Paradise: An Introduction to Caribbean Development* (London: Latin American Bureau, 1990)
- Ferguson, Marjorie, & Peter Golding (ed.), *Cultural Studies in Question* (London: Sage, 1997)
- Fine, Robert, 'Taking the "Ism" out of Cosmopolitanism', *European Journal of Social Theory*, Vol. 6 (4) (2003): 451-470

- Fine, Robert & Robin Cohen, 'Four Cosmopolitan Moments' in Vertovec, Steven & Robin Cohen, *Conceiving Cosmopolitanism: Theory, Context and Practice* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002)
- Fiske, John, *Television Culture* (London: Routledge, 1986)
- Fog Olwig, Karen, 'Caribbean Place Identity: From Family Land to Region and Beyond', *Identities*, Vol. 5 (4) (1999): 435-68
- Fog Olwig, Karen (a) 'Migrants' Visions and Practices of Home: Perspectives from a Caribbean Family Network', *Suomen Antropologi/Journal of the Finnish Anthropological Society* Vol. 28 (2) (2003): 2-14
- Fog Olwig, Karen (b) 'Global Places and Place-Identities – Lessons from Caribbean Research' in Hylland-Eriksen, Thomas (ed.) *Globalisation: Studies in Anthropology* (London: Pluto, 2003)
- Fonda Taylor, Frank, *To Hell with Paradise: A History of the Jamaican Tourist Industry* (Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1993)
- Foucault, Michel, *Discipline and Punish* (London: Penguin, 1977)
- Foucault, Michel, *The Archaeology of Knowledge* (New York: Pantheon Books, [1969] 1972)
- Franklin, Adrian, *Tourism: An Introduction* (London: Sage, 2003)
- Franklin, Adrian & Mike Crang, 'The Trouble with Tourism and Travel Theory?' *Tourist Studies: An International Journal*, 1 (1) (2001): 5-22
- Friedman, Jonathan, *Cultural Identity and Global Process* (London: Sage, 1994)
- Friedman, Jonathan, 'Global System, Globalization and the Parameters of Modernity' in Featherstone, Mike et al (ed.) *Global Modernities: From Modernism to Hypermodernism and Beyond* (London: Sage, 1995)
- Friedman, Thomas L., *The Lexus and the Olive Tree: Understanding Globalization* (New York: Anchor Books, 1999)
- Fukuyama, Francis, *The End of History and the Last Man* (New York: Free Press, 1992)
- Galani-Moutafi, Vasiliki, 'The Self and the Other: Traveler, Ethnographer, Tourist', *Annals of Tourism Research*, Vol. 27 (1) (2000): 203-224
- Garner, Steve, *Racism in the Irish Experience* (London: Pluto, 2004)
- Garnham, Nicholas, *Capitalism and Communication* (London: Sage, 1990)
- Gellner, Ernest, *Nations and Nationalism* (Oxford: Blackwell Publishers, 1983)

- George, Susan, 'Globalizing Rights?' in Gibney, Matthew J. (ed.), *Globalizing Rights* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003)
- Gibbons, Luke, *Transformations in Irish Culture* (Cork: Cork University Press, 1996)
- Giddens, Anthony, *Runaway World: How Globalisation is Reshaping Our Lives* (London: Profile Books, 1999)
- Giddens, Anthony, *Beyond Left and Right: The Future of Radical Politics* (Cambridge: Polity, 1994)
- Giddens, Anthony, *The Consequences of Modernity* (Cambridge: Polity, 1990)
- Gillespie, Marie, *Television, Ethnicity and Cultural Change* (London: Routledge, 1994)
- Gilroy, Paul, *There Ain't No Black in the Union Jack* (London: Routledge, 1987)
- Gilroy, Paul, *Between Camps: Nations, Cultures and the Allure of Race* (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 2001)
- Girvan, Norman, 'Creating and Recreating the Caribbean' in Hall, Kenneth & Denis Benn (ed.), *Contending With Destiny: The Caribbean in the 21st Century* (Kingston: Ian Randle Publishers, 2000)
- Gmelch, George, *Behind the Smile: The Working Lives of Caribbean Tourism*. (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2003)
- Goffman, Erving, *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life* (London: Penguin Books, [1961] 2004)
- Goffman, Erving, *Behaviour in Public Places* (New York: The Free Press, 1985)
- Gorringe, Timothy, *Fair Shares: Ethics and the Global Economy* (London: Thames & Hudson, 1999)
- Graburn, Nelson H.H. & Diane Barthel-Bouchier, 'Relocating the Tourist', *International Sociology*, Vol. 16 (2) (2001): 147-158
- Gray, John, *Straw Dogs: Thoughts on Humans and Other Animals* (London: Granta Books, 2002)
- Gray, John, *False Dawn: The Delusions of Global Capitalism* (London: Granta Books, 1998)
- Greathouse Amador, Lousia M. 'Ethnic, Cultural and Eco Tourism', *American Behavioral Scientist*, Vol. 40 (7) (1997): 936-943
- Greenberg, Cheryl, 'Political Consumer Action: Some Cautionary Notes from African American History'. Paper presented to the *International Seminar on Political Consumerism*, Stockholm University, May 31 2001

- Gripsrud, Jostein (ed.), *Television and Common Knowledge* (London: Routledge, 1999)
- Grißhaber, Dirka, *Challenging Perspectives: The Majority World on Irish Television* (Cork: Comhlámh Action Network, 1997)
- Gunder Frank, Andre, *Capitalism and Underdevelopment in Latin America* (New York: Monthly Review Press, 1967)
- Guerero, Norman, "'Jah no Dead": Modes of Resistance in *Rockers* and *Countryman*' in Cham, Mybe (ed.), *Ex-Isles: Essays on Caribbean Cinema* (Trenton N.J: Africa World Press, 1992)
- Gunst, Laurie, *Born Fi' Dead: A Journey through the Yardie Posse Underworld* (London: Canongate Books, 2003)
- Hall, Kenneth & Denis Benn (ed.), *Contending With Destiny: The Caribbean in the 21st Century* (Kingston: Ian Randle Publishers, 2000)
- Hall, Stuart, 'Political Belonging in a World of Multiple Identities' in Vertovec, Steven & Robin Cohen (ed.) *Conceiving Cosmopolitanism: Theory, Context and Practice* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002)
- Hall, Stuart, 'Cultural Studies: Two Paradigms', *Media, Culture, Society* Vol. 2 (1) (1980)
- Hall, Stuart & Paul Du Gay (ed.), *Questions of Cultural Identity* (London: Sage, 1996)
- Hannerz, Ulf, 'Several Sites in One' in Hylland Eriksen, Thomas (ed.), *Globalisation: Studies in Anthropology* (London: Pluto, 2003)
- Hannerz, Ulf, *Transnational Connections: Culture, People, Places* (London: Routledge 1996)
- Hardt, Hanno, *Myths for the Masses* (Oxford: Blackwell, 2004)
- Harkin, Michael, 'Modernist Anthropology and Tourism of the Authentic', *Annals of Tourism Research*, Vol. 22 (3) (1995): 650-670
- Harrison, Julia, 'Thinking about Tourists', *International Sociology*, Vol. 16 (2) (2001): 159-172
- Hart, Keith, 'Epilogue' in Hylland Eriksen, Thomas (ed.), *Globalisation: Studies in Anthropology* (London: Pluto, 2003)
- Hartley, John, 'Television Audiences, Paedocracy and Pleasure', *Textual Analysis* Vol. 1 (2) (1987)
- Harvey, David, 'From Space to Place and Back Again: Reflections on the Condition of Postmodernity' in Bird, Jon et al (ed.), *Mapping the Futures: Local Cultures, Global Change* (London: Routledge, 1993)
- Harvey, David, *Spaces of Hope* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2000)

- Harvey, David, *The Condition of Postmodernity* (Cambridge: Blackwell, 1990)
- Hebdige, Dick, 'Postmodernism and "The Other Side"' in Storey, John (ed.), *Cultural Theory and Popular Culture* (Hertfordshire: Harvester Wheatsheaf, 1994)
- Hebdige, Dick, *Cut 'n' Mix: Cultural Identity and Caribbean Music* (London: Methuen, 1987)
- Held, David, 'Culture and Political Community: National, Global, and Cosmopolitan' in Vertovec, Steven & Robin Cohen (ed.), *Conceiving Cosmopolitanism: Theory, Context and Practice* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002)
- Held, David, (ed.) *The Global Transformations Reader* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 2000)
- Held, David, *Democracy and the Global Order: From the Modern State to Cosmopolitan Governance* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 1995)
- Held, David & Anthony McGrew, *Globalization/Anti-Globalization* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 2002)
- Henderson, Hazel, *Beyond Globalization: Shaping a Sustainable Global Economy* (West Hartford: Kumarian Press, 1999)
- Hesse, Barnor (ed.), *Discrepant Multiculturalisms* (London: Zed Books, 2000)
- Herman, Andrew & Thomas Swiss (ed.) *The World Wide Web and Contemporary Cultural Theory* (London: Routledge, 2000)
- Hertz, Noreena, *The Silent Takeover: Global Capitalism and the Death of Democracy* (London: Arrow Books, 2001)
- Hiebert, Daniel, 'Cosmopolitanism at the Local Level: The Development of Transnational Neighbourhoods' in Vertovec, Steven & Robin Cohen (ed.), *Conceiving Cosmopolitanism: Theory, Context and Practice* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002)
- Hine, Christine, *Virtual Ethnography* (London: Sage, 2000)
- Hines, Colin, *Localization: A Global Manifesto* (London: Earthscan Publications, 2000)
- Hoggart, Richard, *The Uses of Literacy* (Harmondsworth: Penguin, [1957] 1969)
- Höijer, Birgitta, 'The Discourse of Global Compassion: The Audience and Media Reporting of Human Suffering', *Media, Culture and Society*, Vol. 26 (4) (2004): 513-531
- hooks, bell, *Black Looks: Race and Representation* (Boston: South End Press, 1992)
- Hourihane, Jim, 'Spaces in the Mind' in Hourihane, Jim (ed.) *Engaging Spaces: People, Place and Space from an Irish Perspective* (Dublin: Lilliput Press, 2003)

- Hollinger, David, 'Not Universalists, Not Pluralists: The New Cosmopolitans Find Their Own Way' in Vertovec, Steven & Robin Cohen (ed.), *Conceiving Cosmopolitanism: Theory, Context and Practice* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002)
- Howes, David (ed.), *Cross-cultural Consumption: Global Markets, Local Realities* (London: Routledge, 1996)
- Hughes, George, 'Tourism and the Semiological Realisation of Space' in Ringer, George (ed.), *Destinations: Cultural Landscapes of Tourism* (London: Routledge, 1998)
- Huntington, Samuel et al, *The Clash of Civilisations: The Debate* (New York: W.W. Norton, 1997)
- Huysen, Andreas, 'Present Pasts: Media, Politics, Amnesia' in Appadurai, Arjun (ed.), *Modernity at Large: Cultural Dimension of Globalization* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1996)
- Hylland Eriksen, Thomas (ed.) *Globalisation: Studies in Anthropology* (London: Pluto, 2003)
- Hylland Eriksen, Thomas, *Tyranny of the Moment: Fast and Slow Time in the Information Age* (London: Pluto, 2001)
- Hylland Eriksen, Thomas, *Ethnicity and Nationalism: Anthropological Perspectives* (London: Pluto, 1993)
- Ignatieff, Michael, *The Warrior's Honour: Ethnic War and the Modern Consciousness* (London: Vintage, 1998)
- Inda, Jonathan Xavier & Renato Rosaldo (ed.), *The Anthropology of Globalization: A Reader* (Cambridge: Blackwell Publishing, 2001)
- Iwabuchi, Koichi, *Recentering Globalization: Popular Culture and Japanese Transnationalism* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2003)
- Iyer, Pico, *The Global Soul: Jet Lag, Shopping Malls and the Search for Home* (London: Bloomsbury, 2000)
- Jaakson, Reiner, 'Beyond the Tourist Bubble? Cruiseship Passengers in Port', *Annals of Tourism Research*, Vol. 31 (1) (2004): 44-60
- Jameson, Fredric, *Postmodernism, or, the Cultural Logic of Late Capitalism* (London: Verso, 1991)
- Jameson, Fredric, 'Notes on Globalization as a Philosophical Issue' in Jameson, Fredric & Masao Miyoshi (ed.), *The Cultures of Globalization* (Durham: Duke University Press, 1998)
- Jeng, Malick, 'All-inclusive Holidays will Deny Us Even the Crumbs', *Concern (Magazine of the Gambia Tourism Concern)* June/July 1997

- Kaul, Inge et al, *Providing Global Public Goods* (New York: Oxford University Press Inc, 2003)
- Kellner, Douglas, 'Globalization and New Social Movements: Lessons for Critical Theory and Pedagogy' in Burbules, Nicholas C. & Carlos Alberto Torres (ed.), *Globalization and Education: Critical Perspectives* (London: Routledge, 2000)
- Kellner, Douglas, 'Overcoming the Divide: Cultural Studies and Political Economy' in Ferguson, Marjorie, & Peter Golding (ed.), *Cultural Studies in Question* (London: Sage, 1997)
- Kempadoo, Kamala (ed.), *Sun, Sex and Gold: Tourism and Sex Work in the Caribbean* (Oxford: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, 1999)
- Kingsnorth, Paul, *One No, Many Yeses* (London: Free Press, 2003)
- Kirby, Peadar, Luke Gibbons & Michael Cronin (ed.), *Reinventing Ireland: Culture, Society and the Global Economy* (London: Pluto Press, 2002)
- Klak, Thomas, (ed.), *Globalization and NeoLiberalism: The Caribbean Context* (New York/Oxford: Rowan & Littlefield, 1998)
- Klak, Thomas & Garth Myers, 'How States Sell Their Countries and Their People' in Klak, Thomas (ed.), *Globalization and NeoLiberalism: The Caribbean Context* (New York/Oxford: Rowan & Littlefield, 1998)
- Klein, Naomi, *No Logo* (London: Flamingo, 2000)
- Knight, Franklin W., *The Caribbean: The Genesis of a Fragmented Nationalism* (second edition) (New York: Oxford University Press, 1990)
- Kundnani, Arun, 'The Rise and Fall of British Multiculturalism' in Titley, Gavan (ed.), *Resituating Culture* (Strasbourg: Council of Europe Publishing, 2004)
- Lamont, Michèle & Sada Aksartova, 'Ordinary Cosmopolitanisms: Strategies for Bridging Racial Boundaries among Working-Class Men', *Theory, Culture & Society*, Vol. 19 (4) (2002): 1-25
- Larner, Wendy & Richard Le Heron, 'The Spaces and Subjects of a Globalising Economy: A Situated Exploration of Method' (unpublished paper)
- Larsen, Peter, 'Imaginary Spaces: Television, Technology and Everyday Consciousness' in Gripsrud, Jostein (ed.), *Television and Common Knowledge* (London: Routledge, 1999)
- Lash, Scott, *Critique of Information* (London: Sage, 2002)
- Lash, Scott, Bronislaw Szerszynski & Brian Wynne (ed.), *Risk, Environment and Modernity: Towards a New Ecology* (London: Sage, 1996)
- Latour, Bruno, 'On Recalling ANT' in Law, John & John Hassard (ed.), *Actor Network Theory and After* (Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 1999)

- Lea, John, *Tourism and Development in the Third World* (London: Routledge, 1988)
- Leavis, Frank Raymond, *Mass Civilisation and Minority Culture* (Cambridge: Minority Press, 1930)
- Lefebvre, Henri, *The Production of Space* (Oxford: Blackwell Publishers, 1991)
- Lengkeek, Jaap, 'Leisure Experience and Imagination: Rethinking Cohen's Modes of Tourist Experience', *International Sociology*, Vol. 16 (2) (2001): 173-184
- Lennon, John & Malcolm Foley, *Dark Tourism: The Attraction of Death and Disaster* (London: Continuum, 2000)
- Leonard, Mark, *Britain™. Renewing Our Identity* (London: Demos, 1998)
- Lerner, Daniel, *The Passing of Traditional Society* (New York: Free Press, 1958)
- Levitt, Kari & Michael Witter (ed.), *The Critical Tradition of Caribbean Political Economy – The Legacy of George Beckford* (Kingston: Ian Randle Publishers, 1996)
- Lewis, Justin, *The Ideological Octopus: An Exploration of Television and its Audience* (London: Routledge, 1991)
- Li, Yiping, 'Geographical Consciousness and Tourism Experience', *Annals of Tourism Research*, Vol. 27 (4) (2000): 863-883
- Litvin, Stephen W., 'Revisiting Tourism and Understanding', *Annals of Tourism Research*, Vol. 27 (2) (2000): 526-529
- Linklater, Andrew, 'Cosmopolitan Political Communities in International Relations', *International Relations*, Vol.16 (1) (2002): 135-50
- Livingstone, Sonia, 'Mediated Knowledge: Recognition of the Familiar, Discovery of the New' in Gripsrud, Jostein (ed.), *Television and Common Knowledge* (London: Routledge, 1999)
- Lodziak, Conrad, *The Myth of Consumerism* (London: Pluto Press, 2002)
- Lomborg, Bjorn, *The Skeptical Environmentalist: Measuring the Real State of the World* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000)
- Low, Setha, *Behind the Gates: Life, Security and the Pursuit of Happiness in Fortress America* (London: Routledge, 2003)
- Low, Setha, *On the Plaza: The Politics of Public Space and Culture* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 2000)

Luke, Allan & Carmen Luke, 'A Situated Perspective on Cultural Globalization' in Burbules, Nicholas C. & Carlos Alberto Torres (ed.), *Globalization and Education: Critical Perspectives* (London: Routledge, 2000)

MacCannell, Dean, *The Tourist: A New Theory of the Leisure Class* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1999)

Macleod, Donald V.L. "'Alternative" Tourists on a Canary Island' in Abram, Simone et al (ed.) *Tourists and Tourism: Identifying with People and Places* (Oxford: Berg, 1997)

Malik, Kenan, *The Meaning of Race: Race, History and Culture in Western Society* (London: Palgrave, 1996)

Mann, Mark, *The Community Tourism Guide: Exciting Holidays for Responsible Travellers* (London: Earthscan Publications, 2000)

Manuel, Peter et al, *Caribbean Currents: Caribbean Music from Rumba to Reggae* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1995)

Markula, Pirkko, 'As a Tourist in Tahiti: An Analysis of Personal Experience', *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography*, Vol. 26 (2) (1997): 202-224

Massey, Doreen, 'A Global Sense of Place', *Marxism Today*, June 1991, 25-26

Massey, Doreen & John Allen (ed.), *Geographical Worlds* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995)

McGuigan, Jim, *Cultural Populism* (London: Routledge, 1992)

McIntosh, Alastair, *Soil and Soul. People versus Corporate Power* (London: Aurum Press, 2001)

Meethan, Kevin, *Tourism in Global Society: Place, Culture, Consumption* (Hampshire: Palgrave, 2001)

Melucci, Alberto, *The Playing Self: Person and Meaning in the Planetary Society* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996)

Meyer, Birgit & Peter Geschiere (ed.), *Globalization and Identity: Dialectics of Flow and Closure* (Oxford: Blackwell Publishers, 1999)

Mignolo, Walter, 'The Many Faces of Cosmo-polis: Border Thinking and Critical Cosmopolitanism' in Breckenridge, Carol A. et al (ed.) *Cosmopolitanism, Public Culture*, 32 (2000): 577-590

Mikkeli, Heikki, *Europe as an Idea and as an Identity* (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 1997)

Miller, Daniel & Don Slater, *The Internet: An Ethnographic Approach* (London: Berg, 2000)

- Miller, David, 'What Kind of Equality Should the Left Pursue?' in Franklin, Jane (ed.), *Equality* (London: Institute for Public Policy, 1997)
- Minh-Ha, Trinh T. 'Outside In Inside Out' in Pines, Jim & Paul Willemen (ed.), *Questions of Third Cinema* (London: BFI Publishing, 1989)
- Mintz, Sidney W., 'The Localization of Anthropological Practice: From Area Studies to Transnationalism', *Critique of Anthropology*, Vol. 18 (1998): 117-133
- Mirzoeff, Nicholas, *Watching Babylon: The War in Iraq and Global Visual Culture* (London: Routledge, 2004)
- McDonald, Dwight, 'A Theory of Mass Culture' in Storey, John (ed.), *Cultural Theory and Popular Culture* (Hertfordshire: Harvester Wheatsheaf, 1994)
- McLaren, Deborah, *Rethinking Tourism and Ecotourism: The Paving of Paradise and What You Can Do to Stop It* (West Hartford: Kumarian Press, 1998)
- McLoone, Martin, *Irish Film: The Emergence of a Contemporary Cinema* (London: BFI Publishing, 2002)
- McMichael, Philip, *Development and Social Change: A Global Perspective* (Thousand Oaks: Pine Forge, 1996)
- Mohammadi, Ali (ed.), *International Communication and Globalization* (London: Sage, 1997)
- Monbiot, George, *The Age of Consent* (London: Harper Perennial, 2004)
- Moore, Shaun, *Interpreting Audiences: Ethnography of Media Reception* (London: Sage, 1993)
- Morley, David, *Television, Audiences and Cultural Studies* (London: Routledge, 1992)
- Mosco, Vincent, 'Webs of Myth and Power: Connectivity and the New Computer Techopolis' in Herman, Andrew & Thomas Swiss (ed.), *The World Wide Web and Contemporary Cultural Theory* (London: Routledge, 2000)
- Mowforth, Martin & Ian Munt, *Tourism and Sustainability: New Tourism in the Third World* (London: Routledge, 1998)
- Mudimbe, Valentin Y., *The Invention of Africa: Gnosis, Philosophy and the order of Knowledge* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1994)
- Mulgan, Geoff, *Connexity: How to Live in an Interconnected World* (Boston: Harvard Business School Press, 1998)
- Munck, Ronaldo, & Denis O'Hearn (ed.) *Critical Development Theory: Contributions to a New Paradigm* (London: Zed Books, 1999)

- Munt, Ian, 'The "Other" Postmodern Tourism: Culture, Travel and the New Middle Classes', *Theory, Culture & Society*, Vol. 11 (1994): 101-123
- Murdock, Graham, 'Rights and Representations: Public Discourse and Cultural Citizenship' in Gripsrud, Jostein (ed.), *Television and Common Knowledge* (London: Routledge, 1999)
- Nash, Dennison, 'On Travelers, Ethnographers and Tourists', *Annals of Tourism Research*, Vol. 28 (2) (2001): 493-496
- Nederveen Pieterse, Jan, 'Globalization as Hybridization' in Featherstone, Mike Scott Lash and Roland Robertson (ed.), *Global Modernities* (London: Sage, 1995)
- Nettleford, Rex, *Inward Stretch Outward Reach* (Exeter: Macmillan Caribbean, 1995)
- Niezen, Ronald, *A World Beyond Difference: Cultural Identity in the Age of Globalization* (Oxford: Blackwell, 2004).
- Nussbaum, Martha, 'Patriotism and Cosmopolitanism', sourced online at: www.phil.uga.edu/faculty/wolf/nussbaum1.htm
- O'Connell Davidson, Julia & Jacqueline Sanchez Taylor, 'Fantasy Island: Exploring the Demand for Sex Tourism' in Kempadoo, Kamala (ed.), *Sun, Sex and Gold: Tourism and Sex Work in the Caribbean* (Oxford: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, 1999)
- Parekh, Bhikhu, *Rethinking Multiculturalism, Cultural Diversity and Political Theory* (London: Palgrave, 2000)
- Parinello, Guili Liebman, 'The Technological Body in Tourism Research and Praxis', *International Sociology*, Vol. 16 (2) (2001): 205-219
- Patomäki, Heikki & Teivo Tevainen, *A Possible World: Democratic Transformation of Global Institutions* (London: Zed Books, 2004)
- Pattullo, Polly, *Last Resorts: The Cost of Tourism in the Caribbean* (London: Cassell/Latin American Bureau, 1996)
- Pearce, Douglas G. & Richard W. Butler (ed.) *Tourism Research: Critiques and Challenges* (London: Routledge, 1993)
- Pickering, Michael, *Stereotyping: The Politics of Representation* (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2001)
- Pollock, Sheldon et al, 'Cosmopolitanisms', in Breckenridge, Carol A. et al (ed.) *Cosmopolitanism, Public Culture*, 32 (2000): 577-590
- Poon, Auliana, 'All-inclusive resorts', *EU Travel and Tourism Analyst*, No. 2 (1993) (London: The Economist Intelligence Unit)
- Porteous, J. Douglas, *Environmental Aesthetics: Ideas, Politics and Planning* (London: Routledge, 1996)

- Rajagopal, Arvind, *Politics After Television: Hindu Nationalism and the Reshaping of the Public in India* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001)
- Ralston Saul, John, 'The Death of Globalism' *Australian Financial Review*, February 2004
- Rapport, Nigel & Joanna Overing, *Social and Cultural Anthropology: The Key Concepts* (London: Routledge, 2000)
- Ray, Larry, 'Crossing Borders? Sociology, Globalization and Immobility' *Sociological Research Online*, Vol. 7 (3) <http://www.socresonline.org.uk/7/3>
- Rentschler, Carrie A. 'Witnessing: US Citizenship and the Vicarious Experience of Suffering', *Media, Culture and Society*, Vol. 26 (2) (2004): 296-304
- Richards, Greg, 'Time for a Holiday? Social Rights and International Tourism Consumption', *Time & Society*, Vol. 7 (1) (1998): 145-160
- Ringer, George (ed.), *Destinations: Cultural Landscapes of Tourism* (London: Routledge, 1998)
- Rischar, Jean-Francois, *High Noon: Twenty Global Problems, Twenty Years to Solve Them* (New York: Basic Books, 2003)
- Ritzer, George, *The Globalization of Nothing* (London: Sage Publications, 2004)
- Ritzer, George & Allan Liska, "'McDisneyfication" and "Post-Tourism": Complementary Perspectives on Contemporary Tourism' in Rojek, Chris & John Urry (ed.) *Touring Cultures: Transformations of Travel and Theory* (London: Routledge, 1997)
- Robertson, Roland, 'Glocalization: Time-Space and Homogeneity-Heterogeneity' in Featherstone, Mike et al (ed.), *Global Modernities* (London: Sage, 1995)
- Robertson, Roland, *Globalization: Social Theory and Global Culture* (London: Sage, 1992)
- Robertson, Roland, 'Mapping the Global Condition: Globalization as the Central Concept' in Featherstone, Mike (ed.), *Global Culture. Nationalism, Globalization and Modernity* (London: Sage, 1990)
- Robinson, Gillian & John F. Rundell (ed.), *Rethinking Imagination: Culture and Creativity* (London: Routledge, 1994)
- Rojek, Chris, 'Indexing, Dragging and the Social Construction of Tourist Sights' in Rojek, Chris & John Urry (ed.), *Touring Cultures: Transformations of Travel and Theory* (London: Routledge, 1997)
- Rosenberg, Justin, *The Follies of Globalization Theory* (London: Verso, 2002)
- Rosengren, Karl Erik, *Communication: An Introduction* (London: Sage, 2000)

Ross, Karen & Virginia Nightingale, *Media and Audiences* (Berkshire: Open University Press, 2003)

Rughani, Pratrapp, 'Representing Cultures: From National Story to a National Brand and Back', *British Studies Now*, 15 (2002): 13-21

Sachs, Wolfgang, *Planet Dialectics: Explorations in Environment and Development* (London: Zed Books, 1999)

Said, Edward, 'The Clash of Definitions: On Samuel Huntington' in *Reflections on Exile and Other Literary and Cultural Essays* (London: Granta Books, 2001)

Said, Edward, 'Speaking Truth to Power' in *Representations of the Intellectual* (London: Vintage, 1994)

Said, Edward, *Orientalism: Western Conceptions of the Orient* (London: Penguin, 1978)

Sanchez Taylor, Jacqueline, 'Dollars are a Girl's Best Friend? Female Tourists' Sexual Behaviour in the Caribbean', *Sociology*, Vol. 35 (3) (2001): 749-764

Sassen, Saskia, *The Global City: New York, London, Tokyo* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 2001)

Schäfer, Wolf, 'Global Civilisation and Local Cultures: A Crude Look at the Whole', *International Sociology*, Vol. 16 (3) (2001): 301-319

Schiller, Herbert, 'Not Yet the Post-Imperialist Era' in Durham, Meenakshi Gigi & Douglas M. Kellner (ed.) *Media and Cultural Studies: Keywords* (Oxford: Blackwell, 2001)

Scholte, Jan Aart, *Globalization: A Critical Introduction* (Basingstoke: Palgrave 2000)

Schramm, Wilbur, *Mass Media and Development* (Stanford CA: Stanford University Press, 1964)

Selwyn, Tom (ed.), *The Tourist Image: Myths and Myth-Making in Tourism* (Chichester: John Wiley & Sons, 1996)

Shaw, Martin, 'Globality as a Revolutionary Transformation' in Shaw, Martin (ed.), *Politics and Globalisation: Knowledge, Ethics and Agency* (London: Routledge, 1999)

Sheller, Mimi, 'Automotive Emotions: Feeling the Car', online draft version, <http://www.lancs.ac.uk/fss/sociology/papers/sheller-automotive-emotions.pdf>

Sheller, Mimi, *Consuming the Caribbean: From Arawaks to Zombies* (London: Routledge, 2002)

Sheller, Mimi, 'Demobilising and Remobilising Caribbean Paradise' in Sheller, Mimi & John Urry (ed.), *Tourism Mobilities: Places to Play, Places in Play* (London: Routledge, 2004)

- Sheller, Mimi & John Urry (ed.), *Tourism Mobilities: Places to Play, Places in Play* (London: Routledge, 2004)
- Silverman, David, *Qualitative Methodology and Sociology* (Aldershot: Gower, 1985)
- Shiva, Vandana, *Tomorrow's Biodiversity* (London: Thames & Hudson, 2000)
- Singer, Peter, *How are We to Live? Ethics in an Age of Self-Interest* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997)
- Signorelli, Nancy & Morgan, Michael (ed.) *Cultivation Analysis: New Directions in Media Effects Research* (London: Sage, 1990)
- Skelton, Tracy, 'The Importance of Reflexivity in Caribbean Research: Thinking through "Race", Self and Politics' in Courtman, Sandra (ed.) *Beyond the Blood, the Beach and the Banana: New Perspectives in Caribbean Studies* (Kingston: Ian Randle Publishers, 2004)
- Slattery, Patrick, 'A Postmodern View of Time and Learning: A Response to the National Education Commission Report *Prisoners of Time*', *Harvard Educational Review*, Vol. 65, (4) (1995): 612-634
- Smith, Mark J., *Culture: Reinventing the Social Sciences* (Buckingham: Open University Press, 2000)
- Smith, Valene L. (ed.), *Hosts and Guests: The Anthropology of Tourism* (second edition) (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1989)
- Smith, Valene L. 'Hosts and Guests Revisited', *American Behavioral Scientist*, Vol. 36 (2) (1992): 187-199
- Sontag, Susan, *Regarding the Pain of Others* (London: Penguin 2003)
- Sousa Santos, Boaventura, 'On Oppositional Postmodernism' in Munck, Ronaldo & Denis O'Hearn (ed.), *Critical Development Theory: Contributions to a New Paradigm* (New York: Zed Books, 1999)
- Spivak, Gayatri Chakravorty, *In Other Worlds: Essays in Cultural Politics* (London: Methuen, 1987)
- Spiby, Tony, *Globalization and World Society* (Cambridge: Polity, 1996)
- Sreberny-Mohammadi, Annabelle, 'The Many Faces of Cultural Imperialism' in Golding, Peter and Peter Harris (ed.), *Beyond Cultural Imperialism* (London: Sage, 1997)
- Stevenson, Nick, *Cultural Citizenship: Cosmopolitan Questions* (Berkshire: Open University Press, 2003)
- Stokowski, Patricia A. 'Social Networks and Tourist Behavior', *American Behavioral Scientist*, Vol. 36 (2) (1992): 212-221

- Stubbs, Paul, 'Virtual Diaspora? Imagining Croatia Online', *Sociological Research Online* Vol. 4 (2) (1999), www.socresonline.org.uk/socresonline/4/2/
- Strachan, Ian Gregory, *Paradise and Plantation: Tourism and Culture in the Anglophone Caribbean* (Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2002)
- Taylor, Charles, *Multiculturalism and The Politics of Recognition* (Princeton NJ: Princeton University Press, 1992)
- Tester, Keith, 'The Moral Consequentiality of Television', *European Journal of Social Theory*, Vol. 2 (4) (1999) 469-483
- Therborn, Göran, 'Entangled Modernities', *European Journal of Social Theory*, 6 (2003): 293-305
- Therborn, Göran, *European Modernity and Beyond* (London: Sage, 1995)
- Thomas, Clive Y. *The Poor and the Powerless: Economic Policy and Change in the Caribbean* (London: Latin American Bureau, 1988)
- Titley, Gavan (a), 'Everything Moves? Beyond Culture and Multiculturalism in Irish Public Discourse'. *The Irish Review*, No. 31 (2004): 11-27
- Titley, Gavan (b), (ed.), *Resituating Culture* (Strasbourg: Council of Europe Publishing, 2004)
- Titley, Gavan (c), 'All Sights Reserved: All-Inclusive Resorts and the Imagined Caribbean' in Courtman, Sandra (ed.), *Beyond the Blood, the Beach and the Banana: New Perspectives in Caribbean Studies* (Kingston: Ian Randle Publishers, 2004)
- Titley, Gavan, 'The Nation as Location – Transnational Discussions of the Image of St Lucia', *Suomen Antropologi/Journal of the Finnish Anthropological Society*, Vol. 28 (2) (2003): 36-53
- Titley, Gavan, 'Global Theory and Touristic Encounters', *Irish Communications Review*, 8 (2001): 80-89
- Tomic, Alice & Crispin Thurlow, 'Editorial', *Language and Intercultural Communication*, Vol. 2 (2) (2002): 81-86
- Tomlinson, John, *Cultural Imperialism* (London: Pinter, 1991)
- Tomlinson, John, *Globalization and Culture* (Cambridge: Polity, 1999)
- Tourism Concern, 'Who's Excluded from an All-Inclusive?', *Tourism in Focus*, No. 26 Winter 1997/8
- Tourism Concern, 'Ecotourism', *Tourism in Focus*, No. 42 Spring 2002
- Tourism Concern, 'Community Interaction is Important to Me on Holiday', *Tourism in Focus*, No. 44 Autumn 2002

- Tucker, Vincent, 'The Myth of Development: A Critique of a Eurocentric Discourse' in Munck, Ronaldo, & Denis O'Hearn (ed.), *Critical Development Theory: Contributions to a New Paradigm* (London: Zed Books, 1999)
- Turner, Bryan S. 'Cosmopolitan Virtue, Globalization and Patriotism', *Theory Culture & Society*, Vol. 19 (1-2) (2002): 45-63
- Turner, Victor, *The Ritual Process* (New York: Cornell University Press, 1982)
- Tüting, Ludmilla, 'Some Observations about All-inclusive Holidays', *Contours*, Vol. 9 (2-3) August/September 1999
- Urry, John, *Global Complexity* (Cambridge: Polity, 2003)
- Urry, John, *The Tourist Gaze*. (second edition) (London: Sage, 2001)
- Urry, John, *Sociology Beyond Societies* (London: Sage, 2000)
- Urry, John, *Consuming Places* (London: Routledge, 1995)
- Van Binsbergen, Wim, Rijk Van Dijk & Jan-Bart Gewald, 'Introduction' in Van Binsbergen, Wim & Rijk Van Dijk (ed.), *Situating Globality: African Agency in the Appropriation of Global Culture* (Leiden: Brill, 2004)
- Vertovec, Steven & Robin Cohen (ed.), *Conceiving Cosmopolitanism: Theory, Context and Practice* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002)
- Walcott, Derek, 'The Antilles: Fragments of an Epic Memory'. Nobel Lecture, (Stockholm 1992)
<http://nobelprize.org/literature/laureates/1992/walcott-lecture.html>
- Wallerstein, Immanuel, *The Modern World System* (New York: Academic Press, 1974)
- Ward, Katie J., 'The Cyber-Ethnographic (Re)Construction of Two Feminist Online Communities', *Sociological Research Online* Vol. 4 (1) (1999)
www.socresonline.org.uk/socresonline/4/1
- Warner, Keith Q. *On Location: Cinema and Film in the Anglophone Caribbean* (London: Macmillan & Warwick University Caribbean Studies, 2000)
- Waters, Malcolm, *Globalization* (second edition) (London: Routledge, 2001)
- Watson, C.W. *Multiculturalism* (Buckingham: Open University Press, 2000)
- Webster, Frank, *Theories of The Information Society* (London: Routledge, 1995)
- Welsch, Wolfgang, 'Transculturality: The Puzzling Form of Cultures Today' in Featherstone, Mike & Scott Lash (ed.), *Spaces of Culture: City, Nation, World* (London: Sage, 1999)

- Werbner, Pnina, 'Global Pathways: Working Class Cosmopolitans and the Creation of Transnational Ethnic Worlds', *Social Anthropology* Vol. 7 (1) (1999): 17-36
- Wheen, Francis, *How Mumbo-Jumbo Conquered the World* (London: Harper Perennial, 2004)
- White, Aidan, 'The Information Society' in Jacobowicz, Karol et al, *Media and Democracy* (Strasbourg: Council of Europe Publishing, 1998)
- Whitehead, Steven M. and Frank J. Barrett (ed.) *The Masculinities Reader* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 2001)
- Williams, Raymond, *Television: Technology and Cultural Form* (London: Fontana, 1974)
- Williams, Raymond, *Marxism and Literature* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1977)
- Williams, Raymond, *Culture and Society 1780-1850* (London: Penguin Books, 1963)
- Williams, Raymond, *The Long Revolution* (London: Penguin Books, 1961)
- Wood, Robert E., 'Caribbean Cruise Tourism: Globalization at Sea', *Annals of Tourism Research*, Vol. 27 (2) (2000): 345-370
- Wynne, Brian, 'May the Sheep Safely Graze? A Reflexive View of the Expert-Lay Knowledge Divide' in Lash, Scott et al (ed.), *Risk, Environment, Modernity: Towards a New Ecology* (London. Sage, 1996)
- Yūdice, George, *The Expediency of Culture: Uses of Culture in the Global Era* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2003)
- Zelizer, Barbie, 'Finding Aids to the Past: Bearing Personal Witness to Traumatic Public Events', *Media, Culture and Society*, Vol. 24 (2002): 697-714
- Zubaida, Sami, 'Middle Eastern Experiences of Cosmopolitanism' in Vertovec, Steven & Robin Cohen (ed.), *Conceiving Cosmopolitanism: Theory, Context and Practice* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002)
- Žižek, Slavoj, *Welcome to the Desert of the Real* (London: Verso, 2002)