Ryerson University Digital Commons @ Ryerson

Theses and dissertations

1-1-2008

The Tourism-Migration Nexus: Towards a Theory of Global Human Mobility

Nicolas Clemens Wilhelm Rode Ryerson University

Follow this and additional works at: http://digitalcommons.ryerson.ca/dissertations



Part of the <u>Tourism Commons</u>

Recommended Citation

Rode, Nicolas Clemens Wilhelm, "The Tourism-Migration Nexus: Towards a Theory of Global Human Mobility" (2008). Theses and dissertations. Paper 102.

This Major Research Paper is brought to you for free and open access by Digital Commons @ Ryerson. It has been accepted for inclusion in Theses and dissertations by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons @ Ryerson. For more information, please contact bcameron@ryerson.ca.

THE TOURISM-MIGRATION NEXUS: TOWARDS A THEORY OF GLOBAL HUMAN MOBILITY

by

Nicolas Clemens Wilhelm Rode Double Diploma Institut d'Etudes Politiques, Lille, France Westfälische Universität, Münster, Germany 2007

A Major Research Paper presented to Ryerson University

in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts in the Program of Immigration and Settlement Studies

Toronto, Ontario, Canada, 2008

Author's Declaration
I hereby declare that I am the sole author of this major research project.
Thereby declare that I am the sole author of this major research project.
I authorize Ryerson University to lend this paper to other institutions or individuals for the purpose of scholarly research.
Signature
I further authorize Ryerson University to reproduce this paper by photocopying or by other means, in total or in part, at the request of other institutions or individuals for the purpose of scholarly research.

Signature

THE TOURISM-MIGRATION NEXUS: TOWARDS A THEORY OF GLOBAL HUMAN MOBILITY

© Nicolas C.W. Rode, 2008

Master of Arts

Immigration and Settlement Studies

Ryerson University, Toronto

ABSTRACT

This paper argues that, despite multi-disciplinary efforts, migration and tourism studies

remain restricted by the paradigms to their own specialized industries: policy-relevant

approaches geared towards government agencies and their fields of intervention in the

case of migration studies as well as management perspectives directed to the expansion,

marketing, and consumption of the travel industry in the case of tourism studies. The aim

of this paper is to critique the trend of securitization in both fields of research and to hint

at similarities in impact and meaning. Apart from the differentiation between

consumption and production-led migration, both phenomena tourism and migration have

a lot in common. Both are major driving forces of globalization and social change on the

local level. By discussing recent critical literature on transnationalism, migration, and

tourism, this paper argues that hybrid forms of human mobility and the similar economic,

environmental and social impact of tourists and migrants lead to the urgent

reconfiguration of the social science paradigm through which the governance of human

mobility is being studied. Ultimately, this paper wants to cross both perspectives and hint

at similar issues of identity, social diversity, and sustainability.

Key words: migration, tourism, global governance, globalization theory

iii

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I am grateful to many people for helping me during the writing of this paper. For consistently giving me advice and asking critical questions on my drafts, my thanks go to Mustafa Koc and Myer Siemiatycki. For introducing me to anti-oppressive theories and methods, I want to thank June Yee. For providing the perfect work environment and for encouraging me with enthusiasm, I am deeply grateful to Wanda Vrasti. Finally, my father, Clemens Rode, provided me with invaluable comments and remarks on current changes in European migration policies.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Research problem	1
The global governance of human mobility	6
Migration studies revisited	14
Tourism studies revisited	32
The tourism-migration nexus	40
Hybrid forms of human mobility	47
Migrants as engines of growth	53
A potential agenda for migration-tourism research	57
Conclusion.	61
Reference list.	67

LIST OF TABLES

Research Problem

Tourism studies and migration studies are fields of inquiry à *la mode*. The disciplines have stretched, in the case of migration studies, from political economy to geography, sociology, political science, urban planning, and social work, and, in the case of tourism, from geography, anthropology to tourism management and environmental studies.

Paradoxically the two fields of research have been neglecting their epistemological and methodological similarities (Bookman 2006; Williams and Hall 2002). Despite their disciplinary diversity, each of these areas of study has been influenced by certain preoccupations and concerns unique to each of these fields. However, I argue that this uniqueness is often more constructed by disciplines than based on logic and arguments. This paper will argue that tourism studies and migration studies largely remain captive to their own specialized industry: policy-relevant approaches geared towards government agencies and their fields of intervention, namely high-skilled immigration, development, and border security, in the case of migration studies and management perspectives directed to the expansion of consumer markets in the case of tourism studies. Due to the dominance of institutional interests, researchers, in both fields of inquiry, had a limited approach to human mobility and had trouble providing a more 'experience-near' and practice-oriented understanding of their constitutive subject figures, namely tourists and migrants.

To defend this thesis, it is of primary importance to position myself as a researcher and international traveler. I am convinced that if we argue that western societies have entered a "second modernity" or "reflexive modernity" (Beck 2005:22), we, especially in our function as researchers, have the responsibility to reflect our social

location to avoid defending oppressive and imperial state practices. Thus, the reflection of our social location becomes an imperative in the sense of developing anti-oppressive theories and practices (Allahar 1998; Kirby and McKenna 1989). I see myself in this new tradition of thought. My social location is that of an educated white able-bodied middleclass heterosexual male. I consider myself a "global nomad" or "third culture kid" (Pollock and Van Reken 2001) because I have lived four years in Nicaragua (1985-1989) and three years in Senegal (1995-1997) during my childhood. In between, I have lived the life of a "hidden immigrant" in Germany (Pollock et al. 2001:54). In 2003, my academic career started with a four year French-German double diploma program in European Studies, which was institutionalized by two professors in Germany who actively supported the idea of the formation of transnational European elites. This objective has already been inscribed in the European treaty of Rome in 1957. During these four years, we were pushed to constantly relocate between two universities, one in Germany, the other in France so that by the end of the program we came to identify as Franco-Germans and believe in a transnational European future. We were students, tourists, and migrants at the same time. Thus, I refute the practices of "research as usual" in migration studies when a simple reflection on my own experiences crosses constantly the state imposed categories of migrants and tourists used in social science studies.

Consequently, this paper makes two main arguments. First, it argues that the policy-oriented research in both areas of study fails to account for the complexities of their subjects' lived experiences in a globalized *hypercomplex society* (Qvortru 2003) because they pay too much attention to delivering policy-relevant analyses, which are conducted rather for the benefit of funding agencies and governing bodies, than for the

sake of the subjects whose lives/livelihoods are at stake (Kirby and McKenna 1989:17). Second, it argues that the categories of "tourists" and "migrants" are much more flexible, mobile, and interconnected than most academic discussions of the two would let transpire (Baumann 1998; Bookman 2006; Castles & de Wenden 2006; Cox 1986; Ong 2005; Vasta & Vasoodeven 2006). The research on the tourism-migration nexus opens up the possibility of a socioglobal theory of population movements (Pajo 2006). This means that the paper is less interested in transnational patterns of human mobility, as they can be empirically observed from South to North, East to West or vice versa, than in exploring the academic treatment of migration and tourism. These distinct types of population movements are rarely studied under the same premises and theories. By trying to bridge these two fields of inquiry, this paper seeks to encourage new debates and perhaps the theorization of a new social framework for human mobility. Such theory would take as its departure point not the imposed categories of funding bodies and governing institutions, but a more reflexive approach that contextualizes and takes seriously the contradictions between national governing structures and globally mobile subjects. This paper offers a critical comparison of the scientific discourses of migration studies and tourism studies. The purpose of this study is not necessarily to demonstrate that there is no veritable difference between migrants and tourists, but to show that, in times of globalization, these two types of population movements are interconnected.

Many researchers argue that the control of who comes in and who stays out is the last battle of national sovereignty. Tourists are usually seen as the best form of human mobility, because it is short term (up to one year) and mostly based on investment and consumption, while migration is viewed mostly as problematic because it introduces

politico-administrative problems of citizenship, human rights, racism, and integration. Thus, governments divide these two categories of mobility because of biopolitical and historical reasons. Today social markers, such as nationality, class, education, race, gender and even geographic location are part of the definition of global citizenship. They define the social ranking in times of globalized consciousness (Bauman 1998; Bookman 2006; Williams and Hall 2002). A cross-disciplinary debate about the arbitrary divisions of human mobility is imperative because our perceptions of tourists and migrants continue to be restricted by the academic disciplines and the nation-state based categories we work in/with. As we are moving towards an increasingly globalized world, we need to develop a global social theory that is focused on multiple interrelated social networks and marginalized voices and not based on a "fragmented set of theories" (Massey et al. 1998:17) and "methodological nationalism" (Vasta and Vasoodeven 2006:80).

This paper proceeds as follows. In the first part of this paper, global governance will be discussed from the critical perspective of Zygmunt Bauman's modernity theory. In the second part, some of the epistemological, disciplinary, and methodological problems of migration studies will be analyzed. Here, I discuss how social science research is partly dominated by security concerns and abstract economic models based on national interests. In the third part, I examine the new trends of security studies within tourism literature. Priority will be given to the new wave of research on tourism and security (e.g. Mansfeld and Pizam 2006; Pendergast and Leggat 2006). After having described the core problems of the respective fields of inquiry, I turn towards the intersections between globalization, tourism, and migration in the fourth part of the paper (Pajo 2008; Bookman 2006; Williams and Hall 2002). In the fifth part, I will discuss the

literature on tourism-induced migration. This will be followed by an examination of hybrid forms of mobility. Based on the conclusions, I will argue in the seventh part that we have to consider migrants as mainly similar to tourists. Following the deconstruction of the boundaries of migration studies and tourism studies, I will propose a potential research agenda on the migration-tourism nexus. Before I examine the literature in more detail, it is important to mention that this is a partial and personal assessment of globalization, migration, and tourism studies. The link between biopolitical policies and policy relevant research is not yet (and may never be) fully deconstructed and democratically debated. Although the three areas of inquiry are much broader and more diverse than I can describe here (In Canada, research has been done on dual citizenship, multiculturalism, race and ethnicity, transnationalism, post-colonialism, etc.), I argue that the assumptions, theories, and models I describe continue to be dominant in shaping the socio-economic and political realities of human mobility:

"Nowhere is the conflict between the universalistic ideal and the nationally specific reality stronger than in migration studies. Despite the obvious merit of studying migratory flows and networks as transnational processes this is still not the dominant research approach. [...] Today, policy-makers in immigration countries continue to see social scientific research as an instrument for understanding (and controlling) the dangerous immigrant 'other'. This explains the strong principle of 'policy relevance' in this field" (Vasta and Vuddamalay 2006:246-247)

These unreflexive problem-solving approaches are designed to shape policies, they enter the kitchens of power to stabilize the social order without opening up new venues for social inclusion. By making a hermeneutic turn over the global governance literature this paper hopes to show the meta-structural changes increases the pressure on nation states to find more sustainable form for the governance of human mobility. However nation-sates have largely answered with the securization of human mobility.

The Global Governance of Human Mobility

A review of recent sociological debates on globalization will help us to examine the conceptual interrelation between migration and tourism studies. In this section, I will rely mostly on the critical perspective of Zygmund Bauman.

Bauman's book *Globalization: The Human Consequences*, published in 1998, highlights the intersections between mobility and immobility, global elites and left-behinds, free and forced movements, discovery and displacement. His engaging book was a wake-up call for tourism and migration researchers alike (Aas 2007; Van Houtum and Pijpers 2007; Hall and Williams 2002:27-28). The publication of Bauman's pamphlet has inspired critical researchers in geography, anthropology, and tourism studies to develop greater receptiveness to the blind spots of their respective disciplines and a greater willingness to engage in interdisciplinary research on the effects of globalization on human mobility.

According to Bauman, modern social sciences try to rationalize the "recalcitrant reality" of the diversity of social spaces, communities, and maps into a strict social hierarchy that is manageable by experts and executives. Taming uncertainty, rendering it transparent and easily manageable was the first and foremost task of the modern state bureaucracy (Bauman 1998:34). Consequently space is administered in a way to monopolize maps, rights, and power/knowledge in the hands of global administrative elites (Bauman 1998:40). This eternal pursuit of transparency, order, and security results mostly in more monotony, specialization, anonymity, separation, and securitization, all of which reduce humanity to governable economic units (Bauman 1998:46).

Neo-liberal modernization means, among other things, rendering the asymmetric constellations of the world administrable by supra-communal powers, such as multilateral and supra-national institutions like the United Nations (UN) and its institutional subdivisions, the European Union (EU), the North American Free Trade Agreements (NAFTA), and so forth (Bauman 1998:32-33). The different multilateral institutions have developed joint-task forces, ad hoc committees, and legal structures to intervene when the movement of populations become a threat to international peace and security. To avoid that internally displaced persons become international refugees and potentially "illegal immigrants". Northern states have mobilized United Nations institutions such as the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) and the International Organization for Migration (IOM) to "assist and protect" refugees and to force them to stay or to return in hostile environments. In the global governance structures, which are ruled by multiple poles of economic and political power, governments, businesses, and non-governmental organizations (NGOs) are building webs of treaties, intergovernmental bodies and shared sovereignty to control population movements in order to harness highskilled subjects and demobilize those with little capital to offer (Turner 2007; Hart 2006). Global governance structures are institutions that are transnationally interlinked or which want to be part of global administrative networks. Generally speaking, global governance is the move towards the systematic closure of the social order on a global scale. It is the attempt to draw boundaries around a distinctly global arena, designate a global public, and render the global known, predictable, and regularized. It is the effort to designate a community of destiny, a body politic, a structure of responsibility and accountability, and a rule of law as prerequisites of establishing democratic processes at the global level and of achieving order, security and predictability in the global arena (Latham 1999:29). Therefore symbiotic relations between administrative institutions (states, universities, NGOs, etc) help render fragmented spaces more legible, transparent and easier to administer.

In this sense, Aihwa Ong considers the neo-liberal world order as an assemblage of mobile governing techniques, which produce place-specific subjects and effects, but not monolithic results and predetermined outcomes (Ong 2005:3). These ideas resonate well with what Roland Robertson (1995) calls "glocalization" effects, which refer to the simultaneity – the co-presence – of both universalizing and particularizing tendencies. "We are here because you were there" is the slogan of transnational interdependences of different spaces. Because capitalist production patterns colonized, exploited, and destroyed the natural environment and the social order of other societies, people move. Localities become interconnected. The famous butterfly at the other end of the world that influences other remote environments is the transnational mobile subject. Because worldwide roughly 200 million migrants and around 800 million tourists constantly define their own sovereignty and agency, "western" states engage in neo-colonial "humanitarian" interventions to stop the consequences of globalization; vagabonds and refugees. Thus globalization is managed, not to result in homogenization and universal human rights, but in a way to maintain racialized social structures, capitalist diversification, and asymmetric power relations. The complexities of human societies are managed according to utilitarian economic criteria of the strongest party involved. Thus, these processes raise the question of resistance and a new form of cosmopolitical solidarity:

"The growth of enclave societies makes the search for cosmopolitan values and institutions a pressing need, but the current trend towards the erection of walls against the dispossessed and the underclass appears to be inexorable" (Turner 2007: 301).

Political and administrative bodies have developed and continue to develop strategies of labor division and the accumulation of cultural capital. They thereby construct themselves as impenetrable unities of power that try to impose categories, rules, and hierarchies to analyze, control, and exploit the unknown risks and the human leftovers of modernization (Bauman 1998:23). In this sense globalization is not about the defense of human values across the globe, but mainly an economic process that is based on the maintenance and exploitation of historically shaped realities.

In an age of time/space compression the primary marker of social exclusion and dispossession is *immobility* (Bauman 1998:113). When forced immobility is a cruel form of imprisonment, freedom automatically becomes the ability to choose where to go and which place to call "home" (Bauman 1998:121). Poverty and its consequence, immobility, is thus not just despised but reinforced by technologies of governance – the status of the protracted refugee, the internally displaced person, and the illegal migrant remain self-fulfilling prophecies of this vicious circle (Bauman 1998:126). Forced migration goes fundamentally against the self-image of the Western world as a free, clean, and progressive process. According to Dario Melossi (2003), the forces of capitalist exploitation and war have ruined the basics for a life in dignity and literally mobilized the racialized global poor. What cannot be internalized, naturalized, or coopted by Western states, must be excluded, controlled, and demobilized by military-civil cooperation in so-called "humanitarian" interventions (Guilhot 2005).

On the micro – or human individual – level, globalization is a complex structural process which places communities and individuals from different class, race, ethnic, gender origins under the high pressures of mobility, because mobility in itself has become a symbolic capital. Yet the conditions of mobility are highly uneven: the global race is determined by globally oriented epistemic authorities and elites. The views and desires of decision-makers, knowledge brokers, and emerging professional elites shape political perceptions of the global and, thus, affect policy outcomes (Hewson and Sinclair 1999:10). On the other side of this highly asymmetric constellation, the fast running global economy produces local victims and stigmata: "being local in a globalized world is a sign of social deprivation and degradation" (Bauman 1998:2). Whereas residents of the developed world live in a time which Baudrillard called "hyperreality" – the virtual space of instantaneity and immediacy) – people from the developing world remain imprisoned in "authentic" and "pre-modern" spaces, doomed to eternal boredom and waiting. The Western tourist is prepared to stand in waiting lines in airports to see with his/her own eyes that these places still exist, that capitalism has not yet destroyed every nostalgic notion of "authenticity" and slow motion. In these post-colonial but newly managed territories time stands still and "nothing ever happens" with the exception of the occasional tourists, volunteers, and development workers coming (Bauman 1998:88-9). Territoriality, in this context, acquires the aura of imprisonment and humiliating destiny for refugees, vagabonds, and the global proletariat in general (Bauman 1998:23).

In this sense the new global elite enjoys a double advantage – it is free from the moral and the legal constraints of the local because social norms and legal orders are much more difficult to impose and monitor at the diffuse global level. Thus mobility

means the ability to escape the constraints of local communities and administrations, play with comparative advantages of different destinations, and to enjoy the asymmetric social order (Bauman 1998:125). The term "nomad", usually attached to all traveling subjects of the postmodern era, is a misnomer – it glosses over the gross inequalities of experience and subjectivity implying a simplistic uniformity – the marketing of the term "nomad" ignores the fact that locality is still a constraint and a burden for most (Bauman 1998:87).

Under the present conditions, the content of citizenship has been commodified, flexibilized, and differentiated while the demands of citizenship have been reduced to consumerism. The latter has become the social norm and the civic duty of any loyal subject (Ong 2005; Bauman 1998:80). From social inclusion to formal citizenship, every aspect of the communitarian idea of citizenship can be bought and sold (Borna and Stearns 2002). In a global economy business and tourist destinations are considered the new competitive advantages to attract the "best and the brightest" (Wahab and Cooper 2001:19). Global cities are the new partly-sovereign hubs of tourists and elites. If the destination has the right infrastructure, the right supply of services and privileges, the city enters into a global competition on high-skilled migrants, as seen in the case of the fastgrowing tourism and business destinations like Dubai and Singapore, able to ameliorate many of the factors that may attract tourists, businesses and high-skilled worker alike. Global cities are primary spaces for global elites. Aihwa Ong's considers global cities such as Dubai and Singapore as sites for national politics to actively collect global elites that are driven by neoliberal desires and promises. These global cities are built by migrant workers and inhabited by global elites. The overwhelming presence and privileged treatment of "nomadic" professionals – *pieds-à-terre* – in megacities questions not only the democratic potentialities of the city in general, but also the fundamental principles of national democracy: who is democracy for – the indigenous members (citizens) or the foreign high-skilled national? It is the individual autonomy of the global subject which benchmarks and defines the global city. This is a complete turn-over of democratic theories from Rousseau to Rawls: "[p]olitical fragmentation and economic globalization are close allies and fellow conspirators." (Bauman 1998: 69).

Despite a rapid turnover, the professional expats keep the mega-city in the global game (Ong 2007:86). The global city would like to call these professional nomads their own. States that are engaged in the competition for high-skilled migrants would like to turn them into citizens or residents and put a halt to their continual movement by offering them luring incentives, such as prestigious housing, gated communities, tax breaks, maids, international schools, golf courses, and other perks to facilitate an international life-style (Ong 2007:86). Citizenship is suddenly accorded based on a system of meritocracy where the city seeks to attract high-skilled professionals from all over the world, while only granting minimal rights to stigmatizing low-skilled labor. The rights and privileges of citizenship are only granted to the former. The latter need to claim them for themselves through judicial and political processes where they remain marginalized (Ong 2007:88). This means that the division between global south and global north is equally artificial. The human south and north have already moved or been moved to offer the advantages of asymmetric power relations at the core of Western societies. No global city could run without illegal immigrants.

The society of business people and consumers is one of permanently innovation and desire. It is a society of sensation-seekers and pleasure-gatherers, a society of thrill,

excitement and perpetual seduction (Bauman 1998:82-3). The impulse of pleasure, considered as the ultimate human interest of happiness is turned into an economic consumption machinery. The tourist is both relaxing from alienating economic imperatives and regenerating to produce more economic outcomes. In this sense, locality and fixity are signs of stagnation and deprivation. Only the pursuit of desires through the subject figure of the consumer is worthwhile and therefore unrestrainedly mobile (Bauman 1998:84). This global consumer is a product of modernity, his/her health is supervised, his/her rights are reduced to the level of his bank account, his/her "adventurous" pathways are prepared and staged. His/her agency is tunneled and limited to a "creative" destructive process, in which s/he leaves the "civilized" world to free his/her desires in the exotic/chaotic outskirts of modernity. The loose handling of global elites is directly related to the demobilization and securitization of unwanted immigrant communities, which are discursively linked to terrorism, violence, vandalism, and crime (Turner 2007:289).

To sum up this part, it can be stated that global governance is the attempt to manage and control the new social, economic, and political conflicts that appear through the asymmetric relationships and encounters of globalized subjects. Global cities are the hubs and arenas where the globalized subjects claim their space. Global cities are the primary spaces of globalization, where the migrant worker meets the banker, the tourist meets the refugee, and the student meets the homeless. These new spaces of encounter are the empirical starting point to question traditional approaches to human mobility. From Bauman's critical perspective, which knows no answers and no best practices, numerous researchers have found an inspiration to re-evaluate the ways in which

migrants and tourists are divided into different categories. After reviewing some of the more conventional approaches to the study of migration and tourism along with their questionable political implications, I will return to the more promising literature at the intersection between the two.

Migration Studies Revisited

There is a growing literature on the management of migration. Here the word management is used to de-politicize the implications that come with the objective of governments to find new *solutions* for the "immigration problem". Researchers that I will quote in this part, are largely working in Europe and in the United States which might explain why they legitimate social exclusion, securitization, as well as military and capitalist expansion. The issue is here that they are transmitting these ideas to current and future generations of policy-makers. As such, they require our critical attention.

The transfer of knowledge from the academic to the policy-making realm is an "on-going social process" that involves researchers, non-profit organizations, and state agencies. The aim is to make research more readily for application in the realm of political parties and activists. By asking policy-relevant questions, researchers help improve service delivery, public administration, and public policy. Since decision-makers are frequently confronted with information overload, specific research must be translated for them in a non-academic way by knowledge brokers (Shields and Evans 2008:3). Policy-relevant knowledge is also distributed in informal networks (conferences, meetings, e-mail servers, newsletters) that include different shareholders (international organizations, NGOs, etc.). Because "policymaking is as much an art as it is a science"

(*ibid.*7) the transfer of scientific knowledge into political decision-making processes is rather complex and "messy". This sets limits on the direct impact of scientific research. The transatlantic Metropolis project is seen as a stable environment to shape harmonious partnerships for the discussion, transfer, and mobilization of academic knowledge on immigration and settlement. The partnership functions because there is enough respect for the organizational, cultural and intellectual differences between the involved sectors. Another reason could be that Canada, as *the* leading country in this project, has a strong pro-immigration civil society and a long history of immigration and settlement. Nevertheless, the authors, John Shields and Brian Evans, argue that critical researchers might have a hard time to remain active in these circles because of irreconcilable differences (*ibid.* 10).

Most of the literature and the policy efforts concerned with the global governance of migration address single states predominantly the United States of America and the European Union as potential leaders in global governance and the transnational management of migration flows between states. The geostrategic proximity to conflict zones in Africa and the Middle East push the European Union to reflect on the orderly control of South-North migration. Although bilateral governance efforts exist between the United States, Canada, and Mexico, these are far thinner in content and context because NAFTA's ambitions do not include *external* migration management. I will use several examples from this body of literature, mostly dealing with the European Union, to argue that the idea of global governance of migration through migration management and border control are developed in power/knowledge partnerships, thereby leaving the question of subjectivity, human agency, and legitimacy completely aside.

The most persistent assumption of policy-makers is that immigration is voluntary and rational but against the interests of receiving states (Guidraundon and Joppke 2001:3). Additionally, it is seen as disadvantageous for developing countries because of brain drain, care drain, and the unethical and destructive consequences that come with it. Researchers usually present the potential advantages of labor migration in terms of remittances, efficient distribution of skills and expertise, circulation of ideas, and peaceful international relations. They argue that the introduction of circular migration schemes could create win-win situations in which both sending and receiving states along with the respective migrant community would benefit (L. Martin, F. Martin and Weil 2006:2). The idea behind this concept is that controlled recruitment, remittances, and of course returns (3 Rs) lead to "virtuous circles" in which the global labor force would be used, the global periphery stabilized, and new skills and jobs developed (ibid. 27). However, potentially low-skilled migrants must be forced to behave rationally and to stay at "home" where Western development agencies can protect and help them. The romanticized "good life" must imperatively take place at home, but again this is illusory because "it is not a lack of development but development itself that pushes migration; development dislocates people and creates the aspirations and cognitive horizons that make them ready to move" (Guidraundon and Joppke 2001:4).

Shiraz Dossa (2007) calls for a post-development movement in the academic world. He argues that the long legacy of colonialism has been extended through the idealistic concept of development. The actors in the field of development are co-opted by the financing state structures that have a rather strategic perspective on human rights (Guilhot 2005). Consequently, it is not surprising that North and Sub-Saharan Africa are

the only regions in the world where development aid outweighs remittances (Backwell 2007:4-5). Even the United Nations Millennium Development Goals include migration only as source of diseases. The "good" intentions of keeping people at their birth place leads to racist practices in development policies. Consequently, cooperation with non-democratic regimes is legitimized to keep impoverished migrants from moving North.

A primary problem related to policy-relevant academic research is that scholars must accept the categories and typologies imposed by national policy-makers. On the whole, the foreigner is classified according to his/her legal status: guest worker, temporary migrant worker, seasonal worker, refugee, illegal immigrant, and so forth. Historically, the very term migration is a political-administrative one: "The ontogenetic practices of modern statism work to secure the 'normality' of citizenship and the state yet do so by producing the 'accident' of the refugee" (Nyers 2006:9). Consequently, policyoriented researchers try to categorize mobility with the interests and rationale of sovereign power in mind. Distances, languages, dialects, and cultural differences are not relevant for defining migration. For example crossing distances within vast countries such as Russia, China, United States, Canada, etc. are not considered as migration. Permanent migration is also often illusory and problematic, because "there is no theoretically grounded definition of 'permanence'" (Williams et al. 2002:4). The choice of the time period of one year is arbitrary, because immigrants need a lifespan or even multiple generations to feel fully integrated into a society. Permanence is a two-way street that is paved with state and individual interests. These interests are frequently only synchronized by force, more often than not in direct opposition, and rarely as simple as most problem-solving theories and management recommendations would suggest. The choice of the time period of one year as separating migration from tourism is arbitrary, because immigrants need a lifespan or even multiple generations to fully integrate into a host society.

Similarly important on the global stage is the fact that we have to deal with a multiplicity of legal categories of entry and exit. The criteria are variable, depending on individual state policies, economic imperatives, and security measures. They do not reflect the lives and experiences of migrants. What is more, predefined definitions of what constitutes a migrant or a refugee are problematic because they narrow the perspective of the researcher. Constrained by the official doctrine, Rosemary Rogers, for example, categorizes migrants in political-administrative terms: first, legally admitted immigrants; second, legally admitted temporary migrants; third, intercompany transfers, students migrants, and similar categories; fourth, illegal, clandestine, and undocumented migrants; fifth, asylum seekers; and sixth, refugees (Rogers 1992 in Demuth 2000:29). Consequently "judicial definitions more often than not have no particular link to the real reasons for migration or to the problems of migrants" (ibid. 29). Demuth critiques the political-administrative approach she uses, but proposes one based on permanent immigration, semi-permanent immigration, de-facto permanent immigration, and nonimmigration, which is equally vague (*ibid.* 46-47).

By default, refugees fall into the category of involuntary/forced migration. Yet, the literature on forced migration discusses a seemingly endless list of "refugeeness", which Peter Nyers lists in his book *Rethinking Refugees- Beyond States of Emergency*: "Charter refugee, political refugee, environmental refugee, non-status refugee, internally displaced person, asylum seeker, émigré, oustee, deportee, relocee, involuntary displaced

person, involuntarily resettled person, forced migrant, involuntary migrant and so on" (Nyers 2006:14). These proliferating categories have no real bearing on national policies (asylum, immigration, and settlement) but guarantee that experts have at least expanded the categories the state system has to offer.

Through the proliferation of legal categories policy-makers try to integrate the different types of "migrants" that are needed and to forcefully separate the voluntary from the forced migrants. Canada, for example, has the family reunion class, the economic class, the business class, the refugee class, the care-giver program, the temporary migrant worker program, and recently introduced the Canadian experience class which is primarily created for international students in Canada. But even the proliferation of categories within Canadian immigration guidelines cannot help reduce the backlog of 900.000 immigration requests in 2007 alone (Singer 2008). Mobility is paradoxically overregulated and underregulated at the same time. While tourist visas have few if any requirements (at least for Western citizens), everything that falls under the category of migration is highly regulated. Thus, people choose to avoid immigration systems and constantly overstay on the basis of tourist visas. The police and the courts can only fulfill the undignified work of judging the sin of human agency. Furthermore, these categories become themselves the cause of distortions in the labor markets, undocumented and illegal migration, securitization and criminalization of migrants, and increased importance of militarized border regions (Williams et al. 2002:16-17). What emerges from here is that the division between forced and voluntary migrants is not congruent with the lived experience of people who cross borders:

"With the passage of time, reality changed but scientific thinking about international migration remained in the past. The classical approach has now entered a state of crisis, challenged by new ideas, concepts, and hypotheses" (Massey et al. 1998:3).

Another limiting aspect in disciplinary approaches to migration is the fact that a limited explanatory framework is often favored to explain human mobility. This economic model attributes migratory flows primarily to push and pull factors (Massey et al. 1998:9). Migrants and refugees are usually imagined as *homo oeconomicus* who decide to leave their countries of origin after having rationally calculated material devastations, political instability, and other sources of loss. This is the predominant model in migration studies because of its intrinsic logic and simplicity. But during the last years it has been largely critiqued for its many false assumptions. The model assumes that human beings and structures are naturally static and that culture and language have little impact. Constraints such as borders and distance are largely ignored, and social networks and information flows are non-existent in this model (Malmberg 1997:29-30). The subjectivity of migrants and refugees is reduced to a calculating machine. Hence, family ties, cultural representations, fantasies, and desires have only recently been considered to be a variable in migration and refugee studies (Satzewich and Wong 2006).

Push and pull factors are not "objective" reasons, but subjective arguments in a decision to move (Demuth 2000:34-35). Fischer, Martin and Straubhaar (1997) revise the assumptions of the classic microeconomic model of migration and refute the ideas that migration is a cost- and risk-free activity only to defend a Eurocentric policy perspective. They argue that neither are migrants a homogeneous group that behaves in a rational manner, nor are migrants moving according to perfect and costless information (*ibid.* 57-73). Instead, they introduce the theoretical value of immobility, which is linked to the

accumulation of local knowledge in the workplace and leisure time. "These location-specific assets and abilities are not only economic, but also, and perhaps first of all, cultural, linguistic, social and political" (1997:76). The argument is that immobility is far more relevant in current societies than the irrational desires of some migrants. This does not hold true when we take into account the four times higher numbers of tourists. The post-colonial condition of migrants is without many of the assets the authors assume to be there. Their argument is based on Western assumptions and directly applied to South-North migration without being sufficient grounded in different empirical methods. By presenting the advantages of immobility, they argue that states should develop technologies of deterrence. The idea is that the increase of costs and risks for South-North migration would lead to abandon the travel. A rational (i.e. civilized) person would never try to cross illegally external European borders. The authors assume that:

"control by increasing the costs and risks of migration makes immobility more attractive. Illegal transport is much more expensive than regular transport. After arrival illegal immigrants, denied all legal rights and protections, are bound to fall prey to employment practices coming close to slave labour. This is all bound to work strongly against a decision to 'go'" (Fischer, Martin, and Straubhaar 1997:81).

In a similar policy-oriented logic, Chisato Yoshida and Alan D. Woodland (2005) try to calculate the "optimal level of the interior enforcement" against undocumented immigration. They recommend the implementation of "innovative techniques to detect and apprehend illegal foreign workers", to recover the cost of inspections, and to minimize the cost of collecting income taxes from migrant workers to raise national welfare (*ibid.* 19). A state-oriented and ultimately political agenda seems to be promoted by some academic cycles. While acknowledging that the negative effects of low-skilled

and/or undocumented immigration are minimal in terms of wages, they nevertheless welcome the various strategies of deterrence in the United States and the EU. Without questioning any further the concept of illegal immigration, they calculate the benefits of border patrolling, internal enforcement, and employer sanctions. But they refuse to take into account the loss of human lives, psychological trauma, and the cost of social welfare. The authors take the *raison d'état* for granted. In this sense objectivity is predetermined by the state and not part of the research process. Consequently, critical authors argue that

"While "irrational" from a point of view of the demographer, US immigration policy is highly rational from the point of view of the interest groups and political entrepreneurs that determine its course" (Guidraundon and Joppke 2001:4).

Bigo Agozino (2000) argues that empirical data collection filtered through a positivist machine limits our understanding of issues on the ground. Statistics generated by different national governments are often limited in their accuracy and explanatory power on temporary, circular, and informal migration. Students, retirement migrants, and others often fail to report to the municipality where they reside because of language barriers or inconvenience, which further undermines official statistic gathering (Williams and Hall 2002:7-8). Data gathered in contested fields such as immigration should be critically scrutinized, not be taken at face value. He calls for an anti-oppressive approach where the immigrant voice is given priority because, only this way can we complement our own discourses with the knowledge and voice of the other (Agozino 2000:9). In the case of marginalized groups such as black women, it is "not enough to offer a theoretical account of the data without a theoretical account of the fieldwork" (*ibid.* 13). Especially in the case of migration studies it is very hard to prove economic theories on the microlevel because human beings are very complex subjects and their agency is influenced by

many factors raging from oppression at home to the aesthetic quality of the place they are migrating to. But in an economic model these factors are easily dismissed as externalities. What matters are statistical inferences and significant variables. These, in turn, must be surveyed and securitized by the defense and border industries.

James F. Hollifield (2000) argues that "globalization is a myth, insofar as it ignores the imperatives of politics and power, which are still vested in the nation state" (ibid. 106). He argues that the asymmetry in interests and power hinders states to cooperate on migration issues, but that if liberal states act against the rule of law and the orderly movement of people, they risk threatening the "new liberal world order" because migration is directly linked to trade and investments, both of which have been extremely valuable for Western countries (ibid. 105). Here, again the argument is that states should create a regime for the orderly movement of people to maintain the status quo. What is not questioned is the inevitable commodification of human beings as resources that can be exchanged or used in the production of goods, services, and symbolic capital. The solutions that are proposed in Bimal Gosh's book Managing Migration – Time for a New International Regime originate from the perspective of policy relevance, which promotes the securitization of public goods through the integration of migrants in capitalist circuits. The arguments are not based on research but on what European governments demand in terms of problem-solving. The problem is principally one of management. How should a future international organization regulate human beings in their drive to move across borders? As long as freedom of movement is not an internationally recognized human right, the argument for more control is clearly against the interests of the concerned.

Henk Overbeek (2000) considers the globalization of migration to be driven mainly by the incorporation of previously disconnected areas or populations into the global markets, the commodification of public goods through liberalization, privatization, and deregulation, growing demand for irregular labor in "post-industrial" economies, further proletarization of the world population, and transnational migration networks. These factors are accelerated by the diminishing costs of transport and communication (ibid. 56). To answer these problematic processes, Overbeek recommends the creation of regional migration conventions which should regulate migration by enhancing regional development through educational and employment initiatives, build preferential trade agreements with countries that implement measures against human trafficking, and sign agreements on the readmission of illegal migrants. Further temporary labor migration should include return migration schemes. Additionally, permanent migration should be regulated through quotas and improved legal positions of migrants in host countries (ibid. 70-71). These recommendations correspond to the policy ambitions of the European Union as expressed in its common asylum policies. The EU Commission seeks to establish "exploratory contacts with a limited number of countries potentially interested in mobility partnerships and ready to commit themselves to cooperating actively with the EU on the management of migration flows, including by fighting illegal migration in partnership with the EU, notably in the area of readmission and return" (EU 2007:13-14). In other words, countries of origin – mostly African – are forced to accept the hegemonic position of the European Union and integrate EU legislation in order to avoid sanctions. Rather than representing a multilateral regime for migration, these policy innovations cement global inequalities through regional power plays.

The concept of migration management developed at the European Summit of Tampere in 1999 allowed the European Union to identify key interests in migration policy (Muster and Sterkx 2006). The internal harmonization of immigration and asylum procedures is one major interest, but ultimately it remains secondary to the deterrence strategy. Deterrence should be coupled with foreign trade policies designed to tackle political and economic issues in the countries of transit and origin. This will allow EU member-states to impose "repatriation" clauses for irregular migrants through bilateral agreements on trade. Migration and asylum management render, once again, African, Eastern European, and Caucasian populations the objects of European interests. The identification of key geostrategic interests and available instruments open up the possibility for creating a more comprehensive and coherent approach for the recolonization of Europe's periphery, this time around with the help of migration studies.

The push towards so-called "humanitarian interventions", defended by Loescher and Milner (2003) and many other international relations and foreign policy researchers, gives further arguments for to the expansion of the European security-industrial complex and the re-colonization of Africa. They argue that the "political nightmare" of the "asylum crisis" can be overcome only if European states are willing to work collectively on deportation, high–skilled migration, and conflict prevention (*ibid.* 601). Again, the assumption is that low-skilled migration from Africa is dangerous. They argue that the European Union should actively promote regional capacity-building in Africa. Capacity-building – a term notable for its vagueness – should be based on a military-civil cooperation to keep refugees in their place. What is more, according to this view, the

understaffed und underfinanced United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) should be integrated into the European migration management approach.

In Belachew Gebrewold's book *Africa and Fortress Europe – Threats and Opportunities* (2007) migration from Africa is clearly identified as a threat for the European Union. In this book, the authors range from political science to economic history, African politics and European governance. The authors argue that African people should give up their hopes and dreams of seeing the West because only "virtually, Europe is coming nearer to Africa" while in fact it is "staying far away" (*ibid.* 178-179). In this sense, the permanent upgrading of borders must be understood as a tool to exclude unwanted immigration, to create structures for forced circular mobility of low-skilled migrants, and to select high-skilled workers from the global labor pool in the future. Refugees are not seen in humanitarian terms but rather as over-population from underdeveloped countries. Here the privileges of whiteness – of being on the one side of the fence and looking down on the poor – are expressed in all its brutality.

Belachew Gebrewold was born in Ethiopia and studied political science, development, and security studies in Europe. He develops an argumentation that defends European claims of cultural superiority and the right to exclude African migrants (even if he himself was a migrant before). He states that "migration from Africa, as well as other parts of the world, is being increasingly considered as one of the *key threats* to European political, cultural, and social security". According to him, perceptions shape policies and the social responsibility of policy-relevant social sciences is limited to accommodate these realities. Fatalistically, he seems to accept that dark-skinned women and children represent risks to the welfare-state of European nations and black men are considered to

be potential terrorists and criminals (2007:173-174). The conclusion is that "migration and threats are interchangeable" (ibid. 172). Here, assumptions that might be part of the public opinion are taken for granted to legitimize military interventions and a repressive border regime with forced return policies. From this point of view, the EU intervention in Congo did not take place primarily because of humanitarian reasons, "but also to secure Europe by acting as political and economic civilizer in Congo, and thereby nipping migration in the bud" (Gebrewold 2007:172). Not only is it questionable that military interventions reduce North-South migration, but in these clashes, the poorest of all Africans are criminalized. Bauman's nightmarish perspective is quite real in the policyrelevant departments of Western universities. According to Gebrewold, African countries are in an "ill-conceived civilizing process" (178-179) and must therefore be assisted in the process, that is, controlled by the European Union. This logic endorses the sovereign discourse of power, which dictates the content of fear, the norms of civilization, and the limits of rational/sensible global politics. But, contrary to this view, global risks are neither natural nor innocent. They are political products that actually serve to sustain the logic of sovereign power within and beyond the boundaries of the nation-state. Thereby, some policy-relevant studies that deal with global migration patterns become complicit with the militarization of the state apparatus and serve in transmitting a frightening discourse that even critical researchers cannot describe more dramatically:

"Enframed in the perspectives of Social Darwinisms, international migration becomes an agenda for security: at stake is the survival of countries affected by 'migration explosions' from the 'Third World', which is conditional on the capacity to ward off the forces of 'disintegration'" (Tesfahuney 1998:508).

Researchers concerned with policy-relevance are often caught in the paradigm of "methodological nationalism". In France, the paradigm of national sovereignty, centralization, and state secularism has hindered researchers to analyze the concept of ethnicity (Vasta and Vasoodeven 2006:105), while in Germany the state was mostly concerned with the repatriation of *Aussiedler* (Outsettlers) after the loss of territories in Eastern Europe (e.g. from the former German territory of East Prussia/Königsberg, but also from Russia, Romania, etc.). This explains why for decades researchers often ignore the ways in which disciplines, experiences and live performances mesh their work (Castles and Wenden 2006:223):

"The social sciences tended to take dominant national understandings as an unquestioned starting point, rather than as topic of analysis. Their choice of topics, research questions and methods was shaped by national preconceptions on immigration and diversity, and, more directly, by the needs of policy-makers" (Castles, Withol Van Wenden 2006:238).

Ellie Vasta and Vasoodeven Vuddamaly (2006) argue that in Western countries, such as France, Germany, and Australia, there is "a high degree of national specificity with regard to theoretical and methodological approaches as well as underlying assumptions on the relationship between migration, the state and society" (*ibid.* 2). Instead, academic research should focus more on the link between the social sciences and nationalism because higher education along with administrative institutions are venues for promoting "normal conduits of mass loyalty in modern states" (*ibid.* 80).

In a time when fear from waves of immigration, real or perceived, have the ability to channel great national tensions and anxieties (Gosh 2000:10), it is questionable if sovereign power is providing the right framework to analyze the social question which has now become a militarized one. To remain relevant to decision making-processes in

political institutions, many researchers in migration studies accept to look at im/migration from a predetermined framework with its predefined categories and assumptions (Lithman 2004:179). The more the other can be portrayed as misfit or deviant, the less academics have to question the official policy. In conclusion, the migrant becomes an object of knowledge and control (Lithman 2004:173-174).

Paradoxically, social scientific research claims for itself a universal space of openness, internationalism and independent reasoning, when in fact it is heavily embedded in national institutional environments. Bill Readings (1996) argues that universities have lost the link to their national cultures and have become overwhelmed by businesses, think tanks, and political interests to become autonomous bureaucratic corporations that serve to reproduce and legitimize the status-quo. The civilizing aspect of secondary education has been disconnected from any national identity or culture and is now based on "neutral" concepts such as "excellence", "total quality management", and "best practices". Others argue that this is primarily a linguistic shift to cover the nationalistic and Eurocentric roots of the academe through value-free language (Lithman 2004:156). The list of the negative effects of Eurocentric thinking in academe is long. Eurocentric perspectives in social sciences have had a damaging effect upon non-European societies through the "colonization" of their intellectuals. They have also impoverished European academic disciplines by closing an eye on their political function, which has served to legitimate international systems of inequality and exploitation (Gheverghese, Reddy and Searle-Chatterjee 1990: 21-23). In the current environment of state-financed research on migration, critical researchers are heavily disadvantaged and can only question the dominant system of thought but rarely influence it. Usually, critical

researchers are facing, at worst, irrelevance or "analysis paralysis" and, at best, denial and resentment by pro-policy researchers, journals and institutes (Castles et. al. 2006:229).

Steve Garner (2007) sees whiteness studies as a useful trans-disciplinary approach to identify the more subtle forms of racism we face in Western institutions. He summarizes the various facets of whiteness into five categories: whiteness as absence or invisibility where white people's identities are never questioned; whiteness as content meaning, which implies a social identity with certain privileges; whiteness as a set of norms including Christianity, rationality, cultural gentility, and decision-making; whiteness as economic, cultural, and historical resource; and, finally, whiteness as a contingent hierarchy in which access to economic and cultural capital depends on class, ethnicity, gender, and sexuality. As Sarah White states: "my whiteness opened me doors, jumped me queues, filled me plates, and invited me to speak" (2002:408). Setting whiteness at the centre of migration studies can represent a basis for more reflexive research that refuses to take for granted the categories, privileges, and policies of Northern-based migration studies. A self-reflexive study of migration, with an eye to race, class, and performative identity, would not use migration studies exclusively as an explanatory framework of reference. It would also incorporate already-existing academic insights on migration as variables to be studied, as peculiarities to be explained, and as policy platforms to be problematized. Migration studies is not only the disciplinary field in which we move, write, and work, but also an *object* of inquiry, which can tell us quite a lot about our deeply held assumptions on the relationship between mobility and security.

In this section, I have tried to demonstrate that there is an indispensable relation between the quest of policy relevance and self-disciplining. In the case of international migration, the state turns toward the university to give it advice on the "problem" of migration but under the limitation of the categories the state provides. Social scientists have been indispensable to the functioning of the state ever since the beginnings of modern scientific inquiry. Be they historians, economists, geographers, political scientists, statisticians, epidemiologists or any other sort of professionals and experts, they help governments by rendering social reality understandable and manageable. Reciprocally, governments represent a stable source of funding and employment for the most ambitious of academic researchers, who can put their work into the service of the state. The relationship is hence a reciprocal one (Rose and Miller 1992:182).

Migration, especially as the visibility, significance, and political urgency of this practice increases, makes no exception to this rule. In a sense the close cooperation between government and academia is what enabled the field of migration studies to grow so prolifically over the past few decades throughout, at least, the Western hemisphere. But this cooperation is exercising pressure on the political ambitions of migration studies these days, especially as more critical voices refuse to promote a science of the state or to participate in Western securitization projects (Cohen 2006:138). The question is both an ethico-political one – should migration studies further the interests of the state or remain loyal to the experiences of migrants? – and a technical one – should social science promote the interests of national political units or push the envelope of "methodological nationalism" to respond to dreams of a universal freedom of movement? As I will elaborate in the concluding section, my answer rests with the latter option.

Tourism Studies Revisited

Similarly to migration studies, much of the tourism research community is dominated by business-related research that internalizes the logic, requirements, and ambitions of the tourism industry thus making it difficult to distinguish between academic (i.e. theoretical) approaches to tourism and those targeting the hospitality and marketing industry. A second problem with the literature on tourism is that it treats tourism purely as an economic phenomenon, a set of transactions, utility calculations, cost-benefit analyses and risk assessments (Franklin and Crank 2001:6). A third problem concerns the way in which tourism has been framed for study, that is, the division of tourism into its constituent parts (e.g. discreet destinations, localities, activities, experiences, modes of travel, etc.) and their simultaneous reduction and reification. The ensuing craze to label, categorize, and systematize the components of tourism, are responsible for producing "a tradition of flat-footed sociology and psychology" behind tourism literature (*ibid.* 6).

In determining what is an interesting tourism destination a variety of factors play a role, amongst which biodiversity and healthy climate, cultural and social characteristics, accessibility of the destination, local attitudes towards foreigners, elaborated and easy to use infrastructure, price levels, shopping and commercial facilities, sportive, recreational, and educational facilities, management and service quality, market and organizational structures that make traveling easy and pleasant, convenient (cheap) factors of production, safety and security (Wahab and Cooper 2001:16). This section is mostly concerned with the latter – the securitization of specific geo-cultural sites for tourism.

The prototypical tourist is usually reduced to pure consumption, driven by dreams, free will, and pleasure. In most literature, this category possesses neither

economic interest nor socio-political consciousness. The tourist is only a receiver of premanufactured psychological landscapes. The mobility patterns of tourists and travelers are thought to be influenced by existential quests, spiritual pursuits, symbolic capital, cultural representations of the exotic, and the notions of physical pleasure and adventure of white middle class subjects. The exclusive focus on the subjective dimension of tourists and travelers serves to obfuscate the political and economic processes that make tourism possible in the first place. Even business-oriented approaches to tourism, such as hospitality and tourism management studies, can be accused of a similar problem. Although they are not as interested in the subjective elements of tourism, as are sociological and anthropological studies, the capitalist political economic framework that allows some people to enjoy leisure time in exotic destinations while others serve them is never questioned (Brown 1998:12-15) because, according to the World Tourism Organization, leisure and tourism are considered a right, not a privilege. What is more, the mobility trajectories of both migrants and tourists are thought to be invariably linear. While the migrant crosses a border to reach a permanent host country, the tourist escapes into the "exotic", "authentic", and "unknown" for a relatively short period of time only to return inspired and experienced to the Western/Northern workforce.

Tourism studies usually take one of two forms: research focuses either on the subjective dimension of tourists and travelers – their desires, fantasies, psychological motivators, cultural capital, etc. – or it is committed to the promotion of best practices to further the interests, profits, and output of the tourism industry. In both cases the political and economic processes that make tourism possible in the first place are concealed. Thus tourism studies are rarely controversial or problematic, and never a sore issue. Tourism is

considered benign, pleasurable, and culturally enriching. Here, my goal is to unsettle these received notions about tourism by first challenging the political context in which tourism occurs and then by unpacking some of the analytic concepts within which tourism studies take place.

Here is some factual information to understand the magnitude of tourism. Tourism grew from 25 million international arrivals in 1950 to 750 million international arrivals in 2004. According to the World Tourism Organization, there will be around 1.5 billion tourists per year by 2015 (Weaver 2006:2-3). Tourism is one of the five most important export "goods" of 83% of developing countries. It represents 10 percent of the global GDP, and is the "fastest growing foreign income sector worldwide" with a 4.4 trillion US\$ industry, thereby "overtaking the defense, manufacturing, oil and agriculture industries" (Bookman 2006:2-3). The tourism industry represents 12% of world employment and around 330 million people are working in tourism-related sectors (ibid. 3). The informal sector could be ten times higher. Tourism is a major engine of socioeconomic change in less-developed countries as it produces socio-economic "linkages, multipliers, and externalities", influencing "preexisting patterns of supply and demand as well as production and consumption." When tourism becomes a national strategy of development it changes the allocation of the labor force and the distribution of national income. In other words, "tourism leaves a huge footprint on less developed economies" (*ibid.* 3-4).

One of the first conditions that has to exist in order for tourism to take place is neither luxury nor aestheticism, but security. How comfortable tourist resorts are, how lush and exciting the natural setting is, or how well-preserved the historical ruins are, these are only second-rate considerations. What matters first is whether the destination is safe to travel to and remain in. Such decisions are in fact so crucial that they are not always left up to individual travelers and tourism providers. Governments often have a say in this as well. Institutions such as the Canadian Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade, the American Department of State Citizens Emergency Centre, and the British Foreign and Commonwealth Office Travel Advice – just to name a few examples – issue regular travel advisories and warnings. They play an active role in assessing the security of a destination, regarding both violence and disease.

Since 9/11, the Bali bombings, and other consecutive attacks on Western tourists in the Near and Middle East (e.g. in Algeria, Morocco, Tunisia, Turkey, Yemen, the global tourism industry and the global governance structures that support it have been in a constant state of emergency. These extreme forms of violence against foreigners have been followed by multiple crisis summits, guidelines, and reports with the aim to built up global, regional and national security networks to anticipate, respond to, and limit the impact of terrorists attacks, natural disasters and health crises (Wilks, Pendergast and Leggat 2006:234). At times when security has become a priority for governments, the safety of Western tourists has become a growing field of study, because the tourist comes to embody the West – as a political presence, a symbolic artifact, or a cultural product – abroad. Hence, an attack on Western tourists is often read as an attack on Western civilization as a whole and the expression of some larger political project with demonic dimensions. Consequently, the tourist along with all other sectors involved in promoting and providing touristic experiences must be assessed, measured, informed, and prepared to reduce the risks of touristic activities.

The tourist is also an agent of securitization of "less developed countries" because "travelers no longer fear tourism security but demand it" (Tarlow 2006:43). Terrorist attacks, organized robberies on buses and cars, kidnappings, and ransom negotiations have claimed the attention of tour operators, local governments and media to the problem of safe-guarding the global consumer. The drive to see the world with one's own eyes is heavily reduced if the mass media show images of dead bodies. Therefore, public relations, advertising, and marketing of tourism are invested with the difficult task of solving the crisis caused by atrocious imagery and develop tactics to restore trust in locales and regions affected by natural and human threats. Tactics range from acknowledgement and tackling of the issue, demonstrative invitations, special events, counter-messages, new logos, to changing the target group (Avraham 2006:236-246). Because of its importance for the global and local industries, security enters the front stage of tourism concerns, next to ethics and best practices. The tourism industry is therefore seen as the big peace-making machinery that fights against globalized insecurity. Implicitly, the tourism industry becomes a useful weapon in various state-led securitization projects from development work to humanitarian interventions, peace talks, guerilla warfare, and the war on terror.

"Terrorism fears the onslaught of a free flow of human interaction and information for which tourism stands. Tourism requires globalization, while terrorism cannot live with globalization; tourism promotes cultural and information interchange, but terrorism dies from such interchanges; tourism requires caring and human kindness, and terrorism promotes the principle that only one's own are true human beings." (Tarlow 2006:45)

Tarlow (2006) argues that tourism and terrorism compete in the quest for authenticity. Both feel alienated from the fast growing social changes in their societies

and, as a result, have to struggle over the meaning of nostalgia. He differentiates between the passive-reflexive nostalgia of the tourist and the restorative nostalgia of the terrorist. The latter tries to revive ideas of lost notions of wealth, honor, and masculinity through militarized actions (*ibid.* 45): "From the perspective of the terrorist, the non-pilgrim tourist is merely a user of idleness, one who loves money and hates productivity" (*ibid.* 36). According to this perspective, then, to attack the foreign tourist is part of the strategy of "restoration" of imagined "untouched" social order.

Consequently the authors of the book Tourism, Security and Safety - From Theory to Practice (2006) push towards the implementation and evaluation of security measures through the increased presence of law enforcement organisms or military, higher visibility of security measures, greater legal sanctions for crimes against tourists as a major criminal offense, positive communication, surveillance technology, security training, educating local citizens, and the implementation of Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED) in the construction sector (Mansfeld and Pizam 2006:11). All these measures are propositions influenced by mainstream security studies. Tourism studies become part of the necessary input of legitimacy for the deployment of police, military and surveillance. These industries not only have the unthankful task to stop refugees at the border but now guarantee the free movement of tourists in the countries of origin of migrants. In this interdisciplinary field of security and tourism studies, the local other is seen (similarly to migration studies) as a potentially unpredictable threat. The security measures must be both invisible (surveillance) and visible (deterrence). What matters is the quality and visibility of security services to complement the provision of good services and best practices in tourism provision. Peter E. Tarlow explains that the two are inseparable:

"There is a difference between security measures and hassle measures. Tourism requires both good security and good service. Half of the equation is not enough. Tourism security is different from other forms of security. It depends to a much greater extent on the quality of personnel training. Machines and passive measures are not a substitute for a well-trained employee." (Tarlow 2006:47)

Also important to consider is the intersection between tourists and refugees. Ruth V. Russell (2003) sees coinciding socio-cultural impacts between the two. Many refugees he interviewed in Kenya were "professors, lawyers, schoolteachers, and nurses" (*ibid*. 836). Russell found that both in the case of tourist trajectories and refugee movements, there was a growing recognition of their respective presence and encounter (*ibid*. 840). For example, short trips from resorts to the local S.O.S Orphan camp are included in tourist packages in Banjul, Gambia. Russell states that "[t]he impact of tourists and refugees are similar because both relate to host countries as "separate cultures" and both live under separate industries of "assistance and protection" in "enclave-style" camps (*ibid*. 841). Both groups must live within the compartments and walls of enclaves because they are heavily dependent upon external intervention techniques and foreign protection. Russell concludes that:

"the developing world tourism industry and refugee relief effort will continue to foster excessive foreign dependency that contributes to a relinquishing of local control over economic resources, environmental integrity, and cultural identity and social control to outsiders" (*ibid.* 844).

But securitization goes both ways. The question is not only how to protect the tourist from various transnational hazards, such as bombings, civil unrest, kidnappings, deadly viruses, and mass contagion, but also how to protect the local population, culture,

and environment from the uneducated and sometimes even the adventurous tourist (Wilks et al. 2008:8-9). Because of differences in customs, manners, dress codes, and overall cultural milieu, tourists are thought to "behave differently when away from home, often doing things in a state of disorientation or 'anomie'" (ibid. 97-98). While most of the time the tourist is an accepted deviant because his/her purchasing power makes him/her the driving force of economic change at the destination, this logic no longer seems entirely convincing in the face of vocal environmental politics, increasingly outspoken cultural and identity politics, and proactive heritage protection agencies. When seen from these perspectives, the tourist is mostly a predatory figure, often an uneducated ignorant who must be enlightened regarding environmental sustainability, local cultural norms, and heritage sites.

These days, there is a mushrooming quantity of tourism research literature that hopes to provide this knowledge and, in doing so, promote "best practices" of sustainable tourism (Page and Connell 2008; Weaver 2006). They discuss alternative tourism, responsible tourism, adventure tourism, scientific tourism, eco-tourism, agrotourism, and volunteer tourism – each with its own code of conduct and seductive ethico-political appeal. These practices continue to reinforce the logic of securitization to further the interests of the tourism industry by incorporating or inventing new markets, new destination sites, and even new types of tourists.

In this section, the rising concerns with security in tourism studies have been critically assessed. It has been argued that the expansion of tourism, which is already at an all time high, is legitimized by appealing to the possibilities of responsible or sustainable tourism that are assumed to be possible through public-private partnerships

and global codes of conduct. For a summary of the different forms of human mobility discussed so far please refer to table 1 on page 64. The table represents a typology of human mobility which includes controversial categories such as class, race and ethnicity. The multidirectional flows of human mobility (e.g. North-South, South-South) are abstractions based on personal assumptions. In fact, the table should be seen as a reflection on different types of human mobility. A larger categorization should have included pilgrimages and other forms of tourism. The table only includes the four main categories of tourists, business and state elites, labor migration, and refugees. However, even these categories are rather unstable and are transgressed by those who engage in multiple activities during their travels as we will see in the section on new hybrid forms of mobility.

The Tourism-Migration Nexus

After having discussed the increasing security concerns in both migration and tourism studies, the paper discusses the work of Milica Z. Bookman (2006), Karen O'Reilly (2003), as well as Michael C Hall and Allan M. Williams (2002) on the tourism-migration nexus and new hybrid forms at the intersection of tourism and migration.

Inspired by the radical turn towards primary observation rather than categorization of mobile life forms by Bauman, these authors have partly abandoned the dividing categories between tourism and migration. For authors engaged in research on the tourism-migration nexus, tourism is an integral part of migration: "with respect of freedom of choice, the spectrum of population movements includes leisure tourist travel at one end and ethnic cleansing at gunpoint at the other" (Bookman 2006:28). Mobility

can be analyzed through a matrix of desire, time and space. The continuum of desire goes from voluntary to forced, the spatial from local to national to international and finally the time spectrum goes from hours to years: "[t]ourism falls somewhere in the middle, farther from home than shopping or excursions, less permanent than seasonal labor" (Bookman 2006:25)

The authors engaged in the tourism-migration nexus only differentiate between consumption-led-migration and production-led migration. Tourism as consumption-led migration and economic migration as production-led migration encounter each other in global cities, touristic islands, and generally in tourist destinations. For the tourist the migrants are mostly invisible because they are employed as cleaners, cooks and craftsmen. Similar to Marx, these researchers consider the migrant worker to be the primary means of production who is driven to sites of high productivity, which in many less developed countries are tourist resorts. This division between production and consumption allows to avoid state-based categories and to consider migration and tourism as interrelated and overlapping.

It is quite surprising that the move towards interdisciplinary approaches comes from the tourism studies sector. Why is this so? First of all, migration studies have neglected tourism studies because tourism is considered as voluntary and not of primary concern when it comes to labor policies and state interest. Consequently "of all population movements, it is tourists who receive the least academic attention" (Bookman 2006:4). Tourism studies have been more engaged in business matters and less in political aspects of human mobility. By looking at the supply side of tourism, researchers in tourism studies had to acknowledge that migrant labor is an important part of the

service industry. Every student in tourism studies knows that the hotel business depends upon the availability of a substantial number of low-skilled workers (Legrain 2007:74). For researchers in the area of tourism, the demand side is the driving force of the mobile supply side:

"Tourism, an industry based on population movements *par excellence*, results in yet other kinds of population movements as people adjust to tourism-induced changes in the labor market [...]. Thus, one type of movement induces others and at the same time is *enabled* by those others in a self-reinforcing causal circular flow" (Bookmann 2006:4)

The authors that work at the intersection of tourism and migration studies consider tourism to be an integral part of migration (O'Reilly 2003:302). They are also concerned with Bauman's oversimplification who literally let the distinctions between various kinds of human mobility collide. However this preliminary critique is seen as important to reevaluate the importance of tourism studies for other disciplines that are engaged in migration studies but which hardly touch the fields of tourism and hospitality.

Milica Z. Bookmann argues that tourism is an engine of multiple displacements and therefore one of the main driving forces behind globalization. It is one of the top globalizing sectors, ahead of wars, manufacturing and global food production (Bookman 2006:16). In fact, human mobility is the consequence of privatization, deterritorialization, and the free movement of goods, capital, services, and ideas. Tourists spend between half and up to twice the amount of their expenditures for accommodation outside of it. Consequently, the presence of tourists is followed by foreign investments of global corporations such as Starbucks, McDonalds, and so forth and by governmental expenditure in infrastructure. These are followed by multiple sub-enterprises that provide

transportation, food and beverages, accommodation, rentals, recreation, etc. (Bookman 2006:33).

The World Tourism Organization (UNWTO) underlines the self-inducing growth effects of tourism. First, it is consumed at the point of production. Second, as an export industry it relies on internal capacities in capital, production, labor, and natural "resources" such as exotic environments, healthy climate and local cultures. Third tourism is first of all a service industry that needs a variety of skills and therefore distributes the income more widely among the population. Fourth, different formal and informal sectors are blended into the tourism industry. Consequently tourism is seen by many cities, regions and governments as "the" development tool par excellence next to family remittances. States are now creating policies of "moving people to attract people" (Bookman 2006:146, original emphasis). Developing countries are becoming more and more destinations for tourists. Consequently, governments try to implement tourist friendly policies, train local staff, commodify their natural resources and indigenous peoples, and regulate the excesses of tourism (Bookman 2006:56). The World Bank also plays a critical role in promoting tourism as a strategic benchmark for sustainable development. To promote alternative tourism, the World Bank supports projects that level the number of tourists by promoting environmental, economic, and social sustainability (Bookman 2006:70-71).

In reality, tourism has rather ambiguous effects as a development tool. Tourism is considered by Milicia Z. Bookman as an "invisible export industry" because it is mostly an industry that crosses different sectors from manufacturing, banking, and education without really creating a clear-cut tourism industry. The management of tourism is rather

invisible; in less-developed countries it is managed by foreign consortia similar to sweat shop factories, with little or no impact on the local modernization process and relatively separate from the local economy (Bookman 2006:22). Most of the time, Western tourists book, fly, and sleep in Western-owned agencies, airlines, and hotels. The trickle-down effect to marginalized parts of the local population in this case is nearly zero (Bookman 2006:68). Nevertheless, policy-makers and researchers consider tourism to be one of the main driving forces of globalization:

"Tourism is now a major economic driver behind increased human mobility and economic and political globalization, particularly new supranational structures such as APEC (Asia Pacific Economic Cooperation) and the European Union. However, the significance of this has only received marginal attention in studies of migration, even though there are significant linkages and networks in tourism/migration systems which governments are increasingly seeking to exploit in order to gain national and regional benefits [...]" (Hall et al. 2002:279)

This information alone shows that the ignorance of tourism in migration studies creates an incredible gap of knowledge on disciplines such as hospitality, management, cultural ethnography, social work, etc.. Williams and Hall argue that the tourism-migration nexus is a particularly useful starting point, "offering rich rewards for tourism and migration researchers" (Williams et al. 2002:3). Yet, a weak theoretical framework, data constraints and the lack of a holistic perspective have contributed to an "overall lack of research on circulation and temporary mobility related to tourism" (*ibid.* 3).

Tourism-induced displacements and development-induced displacements are both directed at disenfranchised socio-ethnic groups within a state that should protect them. In the model of development-induced migration, one marginalized groups without political clout are forced into poverty or into displacement because of local, national or

international development projects (national parks, gentrification, hydroelectric dam projects, etc). In the model of tourism-induced migration: "one type of population movement (tourists) stimulates other movements (workers and involuntarily displaced peoples) in a causal, self-perpetuating way" (Bookman 2006:7).

Underneath the leisure and pleasure of the tourist lies the work of many local and migrant workers. There is direct and indirect demand for migrant labor in tourism-related industry. Direct demand comes from the hotels, rental agencies, etc. Indirectly it comes from expenditures outside the booked tourist resort when the tourist uses local transport systems, banks, entertainment, and so on. There is also an indirect tourism-induced demand because the employees spend their money in the local economy. These three types of labor demand are interconnected (Bookman 2006:91). Labor mobility is driven from agriculture to tourism services, even in the countryside of western countries (*ibid*. 55). The increase of the service industry in the last thirty years is directly linked to the increased mobility of human beings. To satisfy tourist and business travelers, localities have been turned from enclosed communities to open service gates where the client is handed over from one service point to the next.

Because tourism requires a high amount of service providers, countries that rely on tourism are dependent on the inflow of high-skilled and low-skilled migrants because tourism is very labor intensive (Bookman 2006:35). Workers are displaced by business cycles and structural (non-)changes which force them to move towards regions of growth: "the more tourist-oriented the country, the greater the inflows of foreign and domestic workers" (Bookman 2006:38). As we have noted earlier, migration is heavily defined by race, class, gender, age, and education. In tourism-induced migration this is particularly

important, where we find a vertical mosaic of foreign workers. While the upper managerial positions of hotels and airlines are mostly dominated by foreign trained white males, the peripheral positions in kitchens and seasonal services are designated for indigenous employees from the region (Williams 2002: 28-29). This is mostly true in less-developed and developing countries. In countries such as Canada and Australia, temporary worker schemes target directly low-skilled personal because the local population and most of the immigrants are unwilling to fulfill low-skilled work in the recreation sector. Bookman argues that the higher the number of local suppliers, the higher the multiplier effect of the tourist for the local economy (Bookman 2006:94):

"As a result of their consumption of local services and products, tourists and travelers have stimulating effects on the local economy. They bring foreign capital both directly by spending and indirectly by inducing investment. In the process, the domestic service sector is developed, and its linkage and multiplier effects spread throughout the economy. Thus, the principal economic impact of tourism is on foreign exchange, GDP, and employment" (Bookman 2006:33)

Consequently, it can be concluded that the economic growth generated by tourism create a demand for diverse skills that can not be fully covered by the local population, especially because tourism companies send expatriates to the tourist destination to serve the tourists on the ground. Tourism consequently induces multiple rounds of mobility. First by displacing the local population through rising real estate prices and construction projects, second by inducing more tourism and third by the diversification of demands, tourism creates demand for higher-skilled workers. These workers are increasingly the tourists themselves.

Hybrid Forms of Mobility

In the beginning of this paper I have argued that the primary concern of policy-relevant research with the orderly and state-controlled movement of population leads to oversimplified categories of migrants and tourists. In the previous part the division between production and consumption-led migration has been introduced to show the economic linkages between the two forms of movement. In this section I will demonstrate how the human experience of traveling leads to quite individual understandings of globalization and what it means to be a "tourist" or a "migrant". This section will introduce the student as the tourist migrant worker and the retirement migrant as transnational social entrepreneur who invests locally but who never loses but rather increases transnational ties with the former "homeland".

Through development, demographic shifts, social, economic and political interdependences, societies become increasingly mobile, but unrestricted research on international human mobility has yet to attract the interest of funding bodies and decision-makers. In fact, "there have been few attempts to merge all these different types of population movements, to observe them in their totality and globality, and to develop a comprehensive international perspective". (Bookman 2006:5). This is an attempt to review the literature on hybrid forms of migration and an invitation to more empirical research on these forms of human agency. Most states and agencies define tourism as a stay that lasts between one day and a year, but temporary migrant workers often fall under this category too. According to the World Tourism Organization, a tourist is a person who travels outside its usual environment for less than one year. However this definition is unsatisfactory because while tourist visas are usually granted for a period of

up to 3 months, but many tourists overstay their visa time limit to finance their vacation. The definition includes travel for recreation, business and family meetings, religious and educational purposes. Neither the purpose nor the activities are relevant (Bookman 2006: 46). Some researchers defend the thesis that tourists are principally traveling voluntarily and for leisure activities but nearly every kind of short term traveler engages in leisure activities. Even the most disadvantaged migrant worker engages in some touristic activities. This is the reason why Zygmunt Baumann (1998) speaks of the tourist as the primary human condition in times of globalization.

In fact, tourists and migrants have multiple motivations that easily change at the point of destination, therefore the divide between tourism and migration is a fluid one. The definition of tourism is also problematic because many tourists acquire real estate in destination countries and use them as secondary or even primary residences.

Karen O'Reilly followed British retirement migrants to the Costa del Sol in South Spain. These retirement migrants include "permanent, temporary and seasonal migrants" (O'Reilly 2003:303). They are mostly driven by the search for a better life-style, but soon realize that no matter how long they reside in Spain, they continue to be considered as tourists because of their West European origins (O'Reilly 2003:310-312). Similarly with transnational migrants, these "residential tourists" are confronted with issues of discrimination and stereotyping.

These findings are particularly important for the so-called hypermobile elites and retirement migrants who have different residences across the world. These permanently mobile upper classes "occupy a 'network of places' rather than a usual residence" (Williams et al. 2002:6). The implication of human globalization is the growth of

multiple localities with increased trade and travel between them, patchwork identities, negotiated families, dense networks and kinship ties, home and host society dissolution over time, and remittances to the "home" community (Hall et al 2002:283-284)

At both ends of the age spectrum, traveling, even for more than 3 times a year, has become an expectation and an integral part of cultural consumption and production. The accumulated relative wealth in these two categories, i.e. retirees and young people has increased various forms of "tourism-related migration" (Williams 2002: 12-14). New hybrid forms of tourism and migration, leisure and work appear: "Life style migration has been increasing in recent years and has been grounded on changes in value systems, and facilitated by teleworking" (Williams et al. 2002:25). The division between work and leisure established during the Industrial Revolution has been dismantled by new economic practices (Florida 2002). Tourism and mobility in general have become a major part of the bourgeois lifestyle in leading industrial countries. A main assumption in Western societies is that "a modern person is more prone to travel because he or she has a broader horizon" (Bookman 2006:47). These new global subjects are both actors of global social change and the result of globalization. In the case of volunteer-tourism and city-hopping, mobility is "branded, marketed and commodified" to satisfy individual desires of transgression and business interests of internationalization of their employees (Williams and Hall 2002:2). The gap year becomes an integral part of their curriculum vitae. Schools and universities support cultural expeditions and exchange programs across borders. The earlier the child learns foreign languages and different manners the better the capacity for social skills that might be an advantage later in the work life. Educational tourism therefore becomes a must. So the capacity and the incentives are

heavily interconnected: the more educated, informed, wealthy and Western-looking an individual is, the more he/she will be considered a tourist rather than a migrant. Tourists with a bourgeois life style increasingly seek to distance and differentiate themselves from mass tourism. Different forms of work related activities during touristic travels become increasingly popular. Hence, voluntourism is becoming the fastest growing market of tourism which is increasingly subsidized by governments and philanthropic foundations. Tourism also includes segments, such as students, business travelers, and others who could similarly fall under the category of temporary migration with primarily economic interests such as socio-economic upward mobility:

"Voluntary migration for the tourist involves an assessment of the price of the trip relative to the value derived from it. Most voluntary migration is motivated by expected economic benefits, namely a better job (including higher wages, improved working conditions, greater status, more possibility for advancement, increased job satisfaction, and so forth)" (Bookman 2006:29)

The gains in human capital include: "foreign language proficiency, extensive contacts with foreign people, having lived or worked in a foreign country, specific cultural knowledge, knowledge of foreign business ethics and practice, and formal study of a foreign country" (Williams et al. 2002:30). The new "heroes" in Anglo-Saxon countries are the young students that go for a "gap year" or a "Big OE" (Overseas Experience) to either rediscover nature or their Western heritage (*ibid.* 1).

The tourist-worker is a particular case in point. His/her motivations are a mixture of economic and leisurely interests. The destination is chosen for its touristic attractions, while the stay is partly or entirely financed by work at the tourist destination (Williams and Hall 2002:29). For example, the young foreigner works in New York to pay for his

education, but engages in touristic activities on week-ends, all at once he may be "a student, a labor migrant and a tourist" (ibid. 2). Consequently individuals may have "multiple motives and therefore slide between one category and another at different points in time" (Bookman 2006:26). Governments have recognized these trends and have started to actively recruit young travelers as labor migrants. Especially Australia has been active in recruiting skilled foreign workers for the tourism industry (Williams et al. 2002:27). Also, Canada has included numerous categories of tourism-related workplaces as part of its fast-track temporary migrant worker programs. Australia has introduced a working holiday-maker program that allows young travelers (aged 18 to 30) from many countries to work while visiting Australia for up to twelve months, and to extend their stay for another twelve months if they work for at least three months in agriculture (Migration News 2008: 14:2). Australia and Canada are leading in high-skilled immigration but their systems are also too complicated and always include second-best guesses regarding the priorities and needs of employers. No expert can guess how the skills of an immigrant will boost the country's economy. In fast changing economies, bureaucrats are unable to evaluate the human potentials of immigrants and labor market needs (Legrain 2007:110-112).

The crossing of boundaries of movement is not limited to relatively wealthy younger generations. Retirement migrants and their relatives often engage in Visiting Friends and Relatives (VFR) tourism after having acquired a certain Western socioeconomic and legal status. This VFR tourism is an "outgrowth of migration" (Williams and Hall 2002:3), which itself creates a post-colonial transnational space. People who engage in VFR tourism might be migrants that return to their "home" or people who visit

their emigrated family members. In both cases, it is migration-induced tourism. VFR tourism is based on a motivational continuum from family/friends related goals (i.e. marriage, family celebrations) to place-oriented goals (i.e. family or friends equal cheap accommodation). This type of tourism includes various interests, from gathering at an annual local event, to presenting their "home" to traveling friends, to helping the family e.g. at harvest time. The motivations, here again, can be mixed (*ibid.* 38). Other different factors come into play: the socio-economic status of the traveler, the attachment and the attractiveness of the place, the relationship with the relatives and so on. Especially from immigration countries such as Canada, Australia and the United States, VFR tourism is one of the dominant motivations to travel abroad (*ibid.* 39). It has become an important part of post-modern life-styles, "a form of secular pilgrimage and important component of cultural renewal in establishing personal and collective identities" (*ibid.* 285). VFR tourism might also be a pre-stage for return migration or of transnational communities:

"At a global scale the role of return visitation is integral to the migration process and is important element in the creation of transnational identities as well as the maintenance of multiple sense of place" (Hall et al. 2002:285).

While return-migration is defined by European policy-makers as successful by itself, people are often less enthusiastic about their return migration. It might encompass forced migration or retirement, success or failure. In the case of voluntary return, they have often accumulated enough capital to purchase houses and rent rooms to tourists or to move to a more prosperous region in their country (Williams 2002:32-33).

There is a knot of tourism and migration relationships at the destinations where the first explorative tourism induces mass tourism and temporary migration (*ibid*. 8-9). This leads partially to permanent immigration which itself leads upward mobility which

often results to return migration and VFR tourism. Consequently countries of origin are becoming similar hubs of tourism and migration. Or in other words, the aggregation of tourist and migrants at one place can have spill-over effects on sending destinations (VFR tourism, remittances, distribution of democratic ideas, etc.). This phenomenon is more complex than simple foreign investments and mobility of goods, because it is mostly invisible to data gathering.

Migrants as Engines of Growth

After having reviewed recent literature on the tourism-migration nexus, it can be argued that migrants and tourists are both potential "engines of growth"; migrants and tourists spend local currency for housing, nutrition and communication, they become part of the local demand for goods and services. Tourists and migrants are both "economic enablers and lubricators" that stimulate "multiple rounds of economic activity" (Bookmann 2006:7): "Simply put, these multidirectional population flows are the root of development. As such, population flows are both the cause and the effect of economic growth" (*ibid.* 7).

It seems to be possible to compare tourist-friendly countries to immigration-friendly countries, regions and cities. I assume that research in this area would lead to interesting insights on diversity, cultural perspectives, and hospitality. Both tourism and migration movements affect national policies such as visa policies, urban planning, development policies, and foreign investments. Both movements can have negative impacts on social cohesion, urban congestion, housing and so forth because they both use the "common pool resources" that the local population created in the first place

(Briassoulis 2008:498). The question is how to involve both migrants and tourists in the maintenance of sustainable cultural and natural environments. For example, the building of mega resorts with hordes of noisy and drunken package tourists cause the same or more local upheaval than the accommodation of new migrants that fight for their rights to have a representative place of worship (see Siemiatycki and Isin 2002). Similarly to immigration destinations, tourist destinations try to "get people hooked" to further "return-tourism" (Bookman 2006:55). Once heavily invested in the industry of human mobility governments try to maintain attractiveness through multicultural policies, expansion of services, extension and renovation of infrastructure, provision of manpower training, etc.

Tourism and immigration are also important for public sector finance. The state actually taxes temporary and permanent migrants for employment insurance, health insurance and pensions that most of them are unable to access. In the case of tourism natural parks fees and customs duties are additional sources of income. In both cases the state profits from the increased economic activities. Rising business, consumer, and income taxes apply if the budget is reinvested in the economic framework conditions for new cycles of human mobility.

The distribution and expansion of infrastructure towards tourism or immigration is important. More immigration might lead to more housing and service demand which creates jobs but also to urban congestion and expenditures for language courses, training, credential recognition, etc.. In the case of tourism, resorts might consume high amounts of water and electricity while the rest of the country is still not developed (Bookman 2006:62). Both immigration and tourism need a functioning banking sector to export and

import money, and to have a credit system for investments in training and businesses (restaurants, rental cars, etc.). Immigration countries such as the United States, Canada, Australia, New Zealand have to find a balance in their immigration and tourism policies: between supporting their global megacities as national powerhouses and improving the regional distribution of immigrants and tourists; between high-skilled migration/rich tourists and mass migration/tourism; between maximizing job creation by generating high volumes of immigrants/tourists versus conservation of the environment; and between community development and indiscriminate mass immigration/tourism (*ibid.* 2006:57). On the other side, governments might prohibit migration into and within a country. Economically this does not make much sense. It is a contradiction if states liberate the movement of capital, goods and services and at the same time block the movement of people who provide new services and goods (Legrain 2007). Researchers in the 1980's estimated that free migration could "more than double the size of the world economy" (*ibid.* 2007:64).

As we have seen above, tourism is labor intensive, but to really take off a local economy needs a variety of services and skills that often only a mixture of high-skilled and low-skilled immigration can provide. The question of what serves the local economy better, high-skilled or low-skilled immigration, departs from ill-informed premises. The typical answer is that workers generally need a relatively high level of formal basic education, have to be trained and get more skills as the economy develops. That is why Western countries are still leading as tourism destinations. They have the pool of high-skilled, well-educated, language-proficient workers to accommodate tourists and business travelers. Immigrants are often marginalized by urban segregation, social exclusion and

racialized school systems. Their contribution to the local economy is therefore below their potential. Tourism agents but also policemen, municipal workers and sales staff must be trained in the predominant international languages to accommodate the international population flux. Ireland started to employ Polish-speaking policemen and public administrators to cater for that tenth of the population that has in recent years come from Poland.

Different types of migrations naturally coexist. It is the state that distorts circular flows of population through artificial barriers (Bookman 2006:32-38). In an ideal world, the internationalization of tourist markets might be the opener for production-led migration. However state barriers to labor migration limit the contribution of migrant workers to growth (Williams and Hall 2002:23). Migration and tourism are here to stay because we witness in many Western countries a demographic crisis with a shrinking workforce also caused by an aging population which leads to a scarcity of skilled and unskilled workers in local industries and services. In the case of immigration the economic impact of free migration might be even higher. Family reunion must be permitted but it is only one condition among others. Only with a full-spectrum integration system in place, the local economy can profit from immigration. It is dependent on integrating political initiatives if immigration is to be beneficial for all (sending countries, host countries, and migrants). The full potential of free choice of movement is yet to be explored. Even in declared immigration countries, the immigrant work force is not fully integrated because of discriminatory practices in public life, education, and the labor market. This not to say that tourism and immigration is entirely the same, but I argue that tourism has a lot to tell us about how immigration could be managed.

A Potential Agenda for Migration-Tourism Research

Contrary to the fragmentary way in which human mobility is approached in academic research, tourism and migration studies intersect and sometimes overlap in terms of interdisciplinary debates, key concepts, and the lived experiences of their respective mobile subjects. Both fields of inquiry share an interest in race and ethnic relations, diasporic communities, the problem of nostalgia and authenticity; environmental and socio-cultural sustainability, and the psychological impacts of mobility. This section provides a summary of these connections.

When compared to research on migration, tourism studies is a relatively recent field of inquiry because its constitutive category has only recently – since the appearance of the jet stream airplane in the 1950s – acquired a global reach. Due to their distinct historical and political points of origin, tourism studies is a rather ahistorical, non-political and uncontroversial field of study that is mostly concerned with the expansion and regularization of the industry, whereas migration research is mostly preoccupied with the management of populations and the integration of cultural, social, and economic difference within the frameworks of national politics. The two have much to learn from each another. On the one hand, migration studies can apply some of the more neutral and organizational perspectives of tourism research to offset its heavy focus on domestic politics and national administration. On the other hand, tourism studies can learn to pay more attention to matters of "racialized social hierarchies" and "color-blind racism" (Bonilla-Silva 2003; 1997), which migration research has become so attuned to over the past decade or so.

Attacks on "ethnic" tourists and discrimination in resorts around the world make the research on ethnic relations and tourism an urgent need because minority groups such as African Americans, East Asians, and the gay and lesbian community has an increasing spending power, which the tourism industry would benefit from tapping into (Willming 2001:1). Contrary to what most writings on the topic seems to suggest, tourism is in fact highly relevant to understanding the ways in which political tensions and cultural relations take shape at the intersection of the North and the South. Thus, research on tourism could benefit research conducted on race and ethnic relations in migration studies.

The second potential theme and maybe the most interesting aspect of the tourism-migration nexus, are diasporas and their role as post-colonial communities where tourists, migrants, and refugees encounter one another. Both disciplines revolve around diasporas – groups of people of common origin living in a foreign environment – faced usually with similar issues of discrimination and racism. Tim Coles and Dallen J. Timothy identify diasporic communities in their book *Tourism, Diasporas and Space* (2004) as the missing link between migration and tourism because they challenge "prior orthodox narratives of fixity and mobility" (2008:7). Other authors that have reassessed the value and role of diasporas in times of globalization are Lloyd Wong and Vic Satzewich (2006), Evans Braziel and Anita Mannur (2003), Alan B. Anderson (1998) and Stuart Hall (1993). Coles and Timothy argue that "diasporas have been under-valorized in tourism discourse because the potency of the mutually implicated relationships between tourism and the dual conditions of 'being' and 'becoming' have yet to be fully

recognized" (*ibid.* 13). The link between diasporas, tourism, and development is understudied.

Drawing upon the subject of transnational communities or diasporas, we can identify a third theme: nostalgia and the problem of authenticity. The purpose of tourism is to access the backstage, to "discover" the unedited version of the everyday life of peasants, natives, and prominent figures who have been promoted in travel brochures and television shows. Yet wherever the tourist goes, she is presented with a front stage. Even when the backstage is put on display, it is only a mise-en-scene of what the backstage might really look like (Frow 1997:70). The impossibility to ever access the "real" makes tourism an industry of nostalgia. Since modern subjects feel alienated from the fast growing changes taking hold of their home societies, the tourism industry becomes an eternal quest for authenticity. The touristic pursuit for authenticity mirrors the problem of cultural purism that we find in Western immigrant receiving countries that are desperate to protect their heritage from foreign elements even at the cost of committing cultural and demographic suicide. The construction of discriminatory "invisible ceilings" in immigration countries is a parallel phenomenon to the problem of the backstage in tourist sites. Many immigrants long in similar ways to understand and to "meet" the host society, yet the "locals" protect their "backstage" by making discriminatory choices in housing, hiring practices, and social networks (Teelucksingh and Galabuzi 2005).

Fourthly, it would be interesting to reflect on the problem of sustainability at the intersection between tourism and migration studies on the term of "sustainability" that is highly debated in tourism. Even if the term is highly controversial and, for some, even a matter of "fake greenery", John Robinson identifies three imperatives for sustainability:

- the ecological imperative is to respect and maintain the biophysical carrying the capacity of the planet;
- the economic imperative is to provide adequate material standard of living for all;
- the social imperative is to provide systems of governance that propagate values to which everybody can adhere (Robinson 2008:167-168).

These imperatives are mutually interconnected and permanently in conflict. Multiple stakeholders (e.g. states, communities, organizations, etc.) emphasize one imperative over the other (Robinson 2008:170). Sustainability is therefore a controversial political and social process that is specific to local conditions. A quick look at the settlement process in Canada can help clarify some of the similarities between sustainable tourism and sustainable immigration. In Canada, many non-governmental organizations (NGOs) in the immigration and settlement sector engage in similar activities as tourism resorts and organizations. They provide group activities, sport activities, language courses, and child care. NGOs (such as the Centre Francophone de Toronto) see the integration and organization of immigrants as a holistic task which includes the psychological, social, and physical well-being of the newcomers. Just like the tourism industry seeks to preserve and cultivate the sites around which it conducts business, host countries seek to adjust their immigrant populations to the socio-economic, cultural, and more recently ecological challenges they are faced with. As such, both tourism and migration studies can benefit from finding a common language for sustainability by jointly seeking to mobilize the local knowledge of locals and hosts and by promoting the community engagement of tourists and immigrants.

Finally, the fifth pertains to the psychology of mobility. I would argue that the experiences of tourists and migrants are on many levels predominantly the same as they are confronted with difference. Short term, both have to deal with linguistic barriers, climate adaptation, disillusionment, and so on (Nam 2007). In the long run, race, gender, ethnic, and religious discrimination threatens both groups either as a result of poor integration and settlement networks or because of the more personal traumas related to culture shock. Potential questions in this area could include: How do culture shocks affect tourist and migrants? How is the decision-making between tourists and migrants different? How much do tourists rely on already existing transnational ties? How does the host-guest encounter contribute to increasing the local population's incentive to migrate?

The list of intersections between tourism and migration research could continue, but again, this paper only wants to hint at a potential fruitful cooperation between the researchers in these two fields of inquiry. Themes such as racism and discrimination, diasporas and transnationalism, nostalgia and the problem of authenticity, diversity and sustainability are good starting points.

Conclusion

The modest objective of this paper was to hint to important intersections between migration and tourism studies. The policy-relevant researchers that are engaged in these fields of inquiry and their knowledge production have been examined in their relationship to predominant trends of securitization. Critics could argue that migration studies have undergone a significant paradigm-shift to include and account for multiculturalism, socio-economic integration, and diaspora studies. There is considerable migration

literature contending that migration is good for the receiving country. In response to this criticism, I would argue that a great part of migration researchers are still heavily committed to promoting and defending national research frameworks. Even if more and more authors have started developing pro-immigration standpoints and defending the rights of migrants (at least theoretically), state sovereignty and security continue to represent political values that overshadow all social aspects of human mobility. Even when migration is promoted as a desirable or beneficial socio-economic force, migration policies can still reduce human beings into commodities exchanged between states even when they seem to appeal to the promotion of "best practices" and the implementation of "good governance", "development", and "global security". Although there is increasing pro-immigration research, when this research output is to be translated in policy relevant advice it loses much of its political edginess and becomes reduced to national political lines. The task of this paper is not to prove that the study of human mobility is monopolized by securitization approaches, but to show that parochial, exploitative, and racist practices are still being legitimated in contemporary research. The other main aim of this paper has been to look beyond nationalistic research agendas and open up research venues across, beyond, and at the intersection of already established fields.

This paper has started with a review of Bauman's theory of globalization. Bauman argued that in times of globalization the social realm is being divided between global elites and locally marginalized communities. Because globalization leads to population movements, international and supranational institutions create new regimes for the orderly movement of people. However, because these institutions are governed

and funded by dominant nation-states, it is likely that the new regimes will reinforce and increase the divide between mobile and immobile subjects.

The unfairness of the current global migration system is partly based on political and economic theories that have been developed in universities to assist Western decision-makers to solve the "problem" of the mobilized poor. To demonstrate that migration studies are a highly politicized research field policy-relevant analysis of the current migration research patterns have been summarized and examined. The aim was to deconstruct the permanent concerns with state policies and categories which mostly neglect research on bottom-up transnationalism.

The securitization of human mobility does not stop at migration studies but is also becoming a trend in tourism studies as well. The conservative momentum against immigration and the rise of terrorist activities targeted at tourism has inspired research on security issues in both field of inquiry. In the section on tourism studies the connection between policy recommendations and business interests has been discussed and critiqued. By showing that tourism studies have to deal with similar problems of policy-relevance and securitization, I hoped to create an impulse for more inquiries, courses, and lectures across both fields of inquiry.

To overcome the boundaries of tourism and migration studies, tourism has been considered as an integral part of migration. This is the fourth part, in which I discussed the bourgeoning literature on the tourism-migration nexus. The only division according to Bookman (2006), Williams and Hall (2002) is the division between mobile labor (production-led migration) and mobile consumers (consumption-led migration). By avoiding legal categories, researchers have the possibility to "think outside the box" and

find new connections that have been hidden by disciplinary and epistemological boundaries. Tourism has more to say about migration than most migration researchers would like to admit. New forms of hybrid mobility such as tourist-migrant workers and retirement migrants show that human agency is far messier and more complex than the categories imposed by nation-states and global governance organisms would allow.

Finally, this paper argues that migration could have similar beneficial economic effects as tourism, if migration researchers would work with tourism researchers on topics such as diversity, race and ethnicity, hospitality, and sustainability. As the questions of hospitality and settlement of immigrants will become more urgent in states that have to struggle with ageing populations (Italy, Germany, the European Union as a whole; Japan, Korea to name only a few), tourism and migration studies would have at least some ideas to share. But to do so, it would be necessary to turn away from the obsession with state policies and economic models in the case of migration studies and from business interests in the case of tourism studies. This seems to be urgent. If reflexivity is really the benchmark of social sciences then researchers have to consider the social responsibility in the theorizing of future regimes of human mobility.

	Tourists	State and business elites	Labor migration	Refugees
Reasons for moving	Voluntary, Cheap goods and services, retirment life time experience, pleasure, luxurious life-style	Less voluntary State interests, "saving the world", self- fulfillment, pleasure	Less forced Individual and community interests in creating wealth and prosperity, self- fulfillment	Forced Destroyed living conditions, reasonable "fear"
Legal status and time	Temporary admitted, falls under the law of the host nation, seasonal	Temporary admitted (3-5 years, often diplomatic immunity	Temporary or permanent, circular, seasonal	Often without legal status or refugee after the Geneva Convention 1954, permanent, forced or voluntary return migration
Global flow directions	South-South North-North North-South	North-North South-South South-North North-South	South-North South-South	South-South South-North
Spaces of settlement	Private White enclaves, resorts, hotel, accommodations through relatives	State funded and protected Diplomatic Enclaves, military bases	Private Hotel, apartment, container houses on construction sites	State funded and protected Camps, Enclaves, tents, container
Modes of trans- portation	Airplane, sea cruiser, bus, train	Airplane	Airplane, bus	Foot, boat, bus, train
Class	Predominantly middle class	Predominantly upper class	Predominantly middle to lower class	Different classes but the dangerous and expensive travel reduces the importance of class

Gender	Approximately 40% female	Predominantly male, 5-25%	Increasingly female, 40% female	Around 40 % female
Travel industry	Tourist and real estate agencies	State supported	Family, trafficker, recruitment agencies	State supported or trafficker
Race and Ethnicity	Predominantly white, increasingly from other ethnicites (Asia, etc.)	Predominantly white	Predominantly racialized	Predominantly racialized

Table 1. The different conditions of human mobility

REFERENCE LIST

Aas, Katja Franko (2007) "Analysing a World in Motion: Global Flows Meet 'Criminology of the Other", *Theoretical Criminology*, 11, 283-303.

Agozino, Biko (2000) Theoretical and Methodological Issues in Migration Research – Interdisciplinary, Intergenerational, and International Perspectives, Sidney: Ashgate.

Allahar, Anton. (1998). "Race and Racism: Strategies for Resistance". In Vic Satzewich, *Racism and Social Inequality in Canada*. Toronto: Thomson Educational Publishing Inc., 335-354.

Anderson, Alan B. (1998) "Diaspora and Exile: A Canadian and Comparative Perspective", *International Journal of Canadian Studies*, 18, 13-30.

Avraham, Eli (2006) "Public Relations and Advertising Strategies for Managing Tourist Image Crisis, In Yoel Mansfeld and Abraham Pizam, *Tourism, Security & Safety – From Theory to Practice*, Oxford: Elsevier Butterworth-Heinemann, 233-249.

Bauman, Zygmunt (1998) *Globalization: The Human Consequences*, New York: Columbia University Press.

Bayart, Jean-Francois (2007) *Global Subjects – A Political Critique of Globalization*, first published in 2004, translated by Andrew Brown, Cambridge (UK): Polity Press.

Beck, Ulrich (2005) "World Risk Society and the Changing Foundations of Transnational Politics", in Edgar Grande and Louis W. Pauly, *Complex Sovereignty: Reconstituting Political Authority in the Twenty-First Century*, Toronto: Toronto University Press, 22-47.

Bonilla-Silva, Eduardo (2003) *Racism Without Racists – Color-Blind Racism And The Persistence of Racial Inequality In The United States*, New York: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc.

Bonilla-Silva, Eduardo (1997) "Rethinking Racism: Toward a Structural Interpretation", *American Sociological Review*, 62 (3), 465-480.

Bookman, Z. Milica (2006) *Tourists, Migrants & Refugees: Population Movements in Third World Development*, Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner

Borna, Shaheen, James M. Stearns (2002) "The Ethics and Efficacy of Selling National Citizenship", *Journal of Business Ethics* 37. 193–207.

Briassoulis, Helen (2008) "Sustainable Tourism and the Question of the Commons", In Page, Stephen and Joanne Connell (20080 Sustainable Tourism – Critical in the Social Sciences, New York: Routledge, 481-503.

Brown, Frances (1998) *Tourism Reassessed – Blight or Blessing?*, Oxford: Butterworth – Heinemann.

Castells, Manuel (2004) *The Network Society: A Cross-cultural Perspective*, Northampton, MA: Edward Elgar Publishing

Castells, Manuel (2000) *The Rise of the Network Society: Economy, Society, Culture*, 2nd ed., New York: Blackwell

Castles, Stephen, Catherine Wihtol de Wenden (2006) "Framing International Migration: from National Models to Transnational Critique", in Ellie Vasta and Vasoodeven Vuddamaly (eds.), *International Migration and the Social Sciences – Confronting National Experiences in Australia, France and Germany*, New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 222-51.

Cohen, Stephen (2006) *Deportation is Freedom! The Orwellian World of Immigration Controls*, London: Jessica Kingsley Publishers.

Coles, Tim and Dallen J. Timothy (2004) *Tourism, Diasporas and Space*, London: Routledge.

Cox, W. Robert (1986) "Social Forces, States and World Orders: Beyond International Relations Theory, in Keohane, O. Robert (ed.), *Neorealism and its Critics*, New York: Columbia University Press, 204-54.

De Haas, Hein (2007) *The Myth of Invasion: Irregular Migration from West Africa to the Maghreb and the European Union*, International Migration Institute Research Report

Dossa, Shiraz (2007) "Slicing Up 'Development': Colonialism, Political Theory, Ethics", *Third World Quarterly*, 28(5), 887-899.

Doty, Roxanne Lynn (2006) "Fronteras Compasivas and the Ethics of Unconditional Hospitality", *Millennium: Journal of International Studies*, 35(1), 53-74

European Commission (2007) Communication From the Commission of the European Commission to the European Parliament, the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions On circular migration and mobility partnerships between the European Union and Third Countries, cor.ip.lu/COR_cms/ui/ViewDocument.aspx?siteid=default&contentID=90ba986f-55ca-4125-abe2-bf3230bcc591, retrieved 10/04/2008

Evans Braziel, Jana and Anita Mannur (2003) "Nation, Migration, Globalization: Points of Contention in Diaspora Studies", *Theorizing Diaspora: A Reader (KeyWorks in Cultural Studies, 6)*, Malden: Blackwell Publishing, 1-22.

Fischer A., Peter, Reiner Martin, Thomas Straubhaar (1997) "Should I Stay or Should I Go?", In Hammar, Tomas, Grete Brochmann, Kristof Tamas, Thomas Faist (ed.)(1997) *International Migration, Immobility and Development – Multidisciplinary Perspectives*, Oxford: Berg, 49-90.

Florida, Richard (2002) The Rise of the Creative Class: And How It's Transforming Work, Leisure, Community and Everyday Life, Basic Books.

Foucault, Michel (1997) "Technologies of the Self", in Paul Rabinow (ed.), *Essential Works of Foucault 1954 – 1984*, *Vol. 1: Ethics, Subjectivity and Truth*, New York: The New Press, 223-251

Franklin Adrian, Zygmunt Bauman (2003) "The tourist Syndrome: An Interview with Zygmund Bauman", *Tourist Studies* 3(2), 205-217.

Franklin, Adrian and Mike Crang (2001) "The Trouble with Tourism and Travel Theory?", *Tourist Studies*, 1(1), 5-22

Frello, Birgitta (2008) "Towards a Discursive Analytics of Movement: On the Making and Unmaking of Movement as an Object of Knowledge, *Mobilities* 3(1), 25-50.

Frow, John (1991) "Tourism and the Semiotics of Nostalgia", October, 57, 123-51.

Gebrewold, Belachew (2007) Africa and Fortress Europe – threats and Opportunities, Burlington: Ashgate.

Gheverghese, Joseph G., Vasu Reddy, Mary Searle-Chatterjee (1990) "Eurocentrism in the Social Sciences", *Race & Class*, 31(4), 1-26.

Gosh, Bimal (2000) *Managing Migration – Time for a New International Regime?*, New York: Oxford Press.

Guilhot, Nicolas (2005) Democracy Makers: Human Rights and the Politics of Global Order, New York: Columbia University Press.

Guiraudon, Virginie, Christian Joppke (2001) "Controlling a New Migration World", In Guiraudon, Virginie, Christian Joppke (eds.) *Controlling a New Migration World*, New York: Routledge, 1-27.

Hall, Michael C., Stephen J. Page (2002) *The Geography of Tourism and Recreation – Environment, Place and Space – Second Edition*, New York: Routledge.

Hall Stuart (1993) "Cultural Identity and Diaspora" In Patrick Williams and Laura Chrisman, *Colonial Discourse and Post-Colonial Theory: A Reader*, Hertfordshire: Harvester Wheatsheaf, 392-403.

Hart, David M. (2006) "Managing the Global Talent Pool: Sovereignty, Treaty, and Intergovernmental Networks", *Technology in Society*, 28, 421–434.

Karatani, Rieko (2005) "How History Separated Refugee and Migrant Regimes: In Search of Their Institutional Origins", *International Journal of Refugee Law*, 17, 517-541.

Kirby, Sandra, Kate McKenna (1989) *Experience – Research – Social change – Methods from the Margins*, Toronto: Garamond Press.

Lithman, Yngve (2004) "When Researchers Disagree: Epistemology, Multiculturalism, Universities, and the State", *Ethnicities*, 4, 155-184.

Latham, Robert (1999) "Politics in a Floating World", In Hewson, Martin and Timothy J. Sinclair (1999) *Approaches to Global Governance Theory*, New York: SUNY Press, 24-47.

Legrain, Philippe (2007) *Immigrants – Your Country Needs Them*, Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Loescher, Gil, James Milner (2003) "The Missing Link: The Need for Comprehensive Engagement in Regions of Refugee Origin", *International Affairs*, 79(3), 595-617.

Malmberg, Gunnar (1997) "Time and Space in International Migration", In Hammar, Tomas, Grete Brochmann, Kristof Tamas, and Thomas Faist (1997) *International Migration, Immobility and Development – Multidisciplinary Perspectives*, Oxford: Berg, 21-48.

Mansfeld, Yoel and Abraham Pizam (2006) *Tourism, Security & Safety – From Theory to Practice*, Oxford: Elsevier Butterworth-Heinemann.

Martin, Philipp L., Susan F. Martin, Patrick Weil (2006) *Managing Migration – The Promise of Cooperation*, Oxford, Lexington Books.

Massey, Douglas S., Joaquin Arango, Graeme Hugo, Ali Kouaouci, Adela Pellegrino, J. Edward Taylor (1998) *Worlds in Motion – Understanding International Migration at the End of the Millenium*, Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Melossi, Dario (2003) "In a Peaceful Life': Migration and the Crime of Modernity in Europe/Italy", *Punishment and Society* 5(4), 371-397

Mezzadra, Sandro, Brett Neilson (2003) "Né qui, né altrove: Migration, Detention, Desertion: A Dialogue", *Borderlands E-journal* 2 (1), http://www.borderlandsejournal.adelaide.edu.au/vol2no1_2003/mezzadra_neilson.html, 31/10/2007

Migration News (2008) 14,2, http://migration.ucdavis.edu/mn/more.php?id=3358_0_5_0, 3/07/2008

Mosse, George L. (1985) *Toward the Final Solution – A History of European Racism*, Wisconsin: University of Wisconsin Press.

Mustonen, Pekka (2005) "Volunteer Tourism: Postmodern Pilgrimage?", *Journal of Tourism and Cultural Change*, 3(3), 160-177.

Nam, Janima (2007) "Paris Syndrome: Reverse Homesickness?", *ASA Conference* 2007 – *Thinking through Tourism*,

htp://www.nomadit.co.uk/asa/asa07/panels.php5?PanelID=173, 28/07/2008.

Nyíri, Pál (2001) "Expatriating is patriotic? The discourse on 'new migrants' in the People's Republic of China and identity construction among recent migrants from the PRC", *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 27(4), 635-653.

Nyers, Peter (2006) *Rethinking Refugees – Beyond States of Emergency*, New York: Routledge.

Omelaniuk, Irena (2005) "Best Practices to Manage Migration: China", *International Migration*, 43 (5), 189-206.

Ong, Aihwa (2005), "(Re)articulations of Citizenship", PS: Political Science & Politics, 38, 697-9.

Ong, Aihwa (2007) "Please Stay: Pieds-a-Terre Subjects in the Megacity", *Citizenship Studies*, 11(1), 83-93.

Page, Stephen and Joanne Connell (20080 Sustainable Tourism – Critical in the Social Sciences, New York: Routledge.

Pajo, Erind (2008) International Migration, Social Demotion, and Imagined Advancement – An Ethnography of Socioglobal Mobility, Irvine: Springer.

Pollock, C. David and Ruth E. Van Reken (2001) *Third Culture Kids: Growing Up among Worlds*, Yarmouth: Intercultural Press

Qvortru, Lars (2003) The Hypercomplex Society, New York: Peter Lang Publishing

Robertson, Roland (1995) "Glocalization: Time-Space and Homogeneity-Heterogeneity", in Mike Featherstone et al (eds.), *Global Modernities*, London: Sage, 25-44

Rose, Nikolas and Peter Miller (1992) "Political Power beyond the State: Problematics of Government", *The British Journal of Sociology*, 43(2), 173-205

Robinson, John (2008) "Squaring the Circle? Some Thoughts on the Idea of Sustainable Development" In Stephen Page and Joanne Connell (20080 Sustainable Tourism – Critical in the Social Sciences, New York: Routledge, 151-175.

Rosenau, James (2006) "Global Governance as Disaggregated Complexity", in Ba D. Alice and Matthew J. Hoffmann, *Contending Perspectives in Global Governance: Coherence, Contestation and World Order*, New York: Routledge, 131-153.

Russell, Ruth V. (2003) "Tourists and Refugees: Coinciding Sociocultural Impacts", *Annals of Tourism Research*, 30(4), 833-846.

Sassen, Saskia (2006) "The Repositioning of Citizenship and Alienage: Emergent Subjects and Spaces for Politics", in Kate E. Tunstall (ed.) *Displacement, Asylum, Migration*, New York: Oxford University Press, 177-209.

Satzewich, Vic, Lloyd Wong (2006) *Transnational Identities and Practices in Canada*, Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press.

Shields, John and Bryan Evans (2008) "Knowledge Mobilization/Transfer, Research Partnerships, and Policymaking: Some Conceptual and Practical Considerations", *Policy Matters*, 33, Toronto: CERIS, http://ceris.metropolis.net/PolicyMatter/2008/PolicyMatters33.pdf, 28/07/2008.

Siemiatycki, Myer, Engin F. Isin (2002) "Making Space for Mosques – Struggles for Urban Citizenship in Diasporic Toronto", In Sherene H. Razack, *Race, Space, and the Law: Unmapping a White Settler Society*, Toronto: Between the Lines, 186-209.

Simpson, Kate (2005) "Dropping Out or Signing Up? The Professionalization of Youth Travel", *Antipode*, 37(3), 448-69.

Simpson, Kate (2004) "'Doing Development': The Gap Year, Volunteer-Tourists and a Popular Practice of Development", *Journal of International Development*, 16, 681-92.

Stephenson, Marcus L, Howard L. Hughes (2005) "Racialised Boundaries in Tourism and Travel: a Case Study of the UK Black Caribbean Community", *Leisure Studies*, 24(2), 137 – 160.

Tarlow, Peter E. (2006) "A Social Theory of Terrorism and Tourism", In Yoel Mansfeld and Abraham Pizam, *Tourism, Security & Safety – From Theory to Practice*, Oxford: Elsevier Butterworth-Heinemann, 33-48.

Teelucksingh, Cheryl and Galabuzi, Grace-Edward (2005) "Working Precariously: The impact of Race and Immigrant Status on employment opportunities and Outcomes in Canada", *Directions* (Canadian Race Relations Foundation), 2(1), 15-52.

Turner, Bryan S. (2007) "The Enclave Society: Towards a Sociology of Immobility", *European Journal of Social Theory*, 10(2), 287-303.

Van Houtum, Henk and Roos Pijpers (2007) "The European Union as a Gated Community: The Two-faced Border and Immigration Regime of the EU", *Antipode*, 39 (2), 291-309.

Van Munster, Rens, Steven Sterkx (2006) "Governing Mobility – The Externalization of European Migration Policy and the Boundaries of the European Union", In R. Holzhacker and M. Haverland, (eds.), *European Research Reloaded: Cooperation and Integration among Europeanized States*, Springer, 229-250.

Vasta, Ellie and Vasoodeven Vuddamaly (2006) "Difficult Comparisons: Social Science and Migration in Three National Societies", in Ellie Vasta and Vasoodeven Vuddamaly *International Migration and the Social Sciences – Confronting National Experiences in Australia, France and Germany*, New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 1-12.

Wahab, Salah and Chris Cooper (2001) *Tourism in the Age of Globalization*, New York: Routledge.

Weaver, David (2006) Sustainable Tourism, Oxford: Elsevier Butterworth-Heinemann.

White, Sarah C (2002) "Thinking Race, Thinking Development", *Third World Quarterly*, 23(3), 407-419.

Wilks, Jeff, Donna Pendergast and Peter Leggat (2006) *Tourism in Turbulent Times – Towards Safe Experiences for Visitors*, New York: Elsevier.

Williams, M. Allan and Michael C. Hall (2002) "Tourism, Migration, Circulation and Mobility: The Contingencies of Time and Place", in Hall C. Michael and Allan M. Williams (eds.) *Tourism and Migration – New Relationships between Production and Consumption*, Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 1-52.

Willming, Cynthia L (2001) Leisure-Travel Behaviors of College Educated African Americans and Perceived Racial Discrimination, University of Florida, quotes from Noteworthy news: from staff and news wire reports - University of Florida - Brief Article: Racial discrimination a reality for black tourists (2001), Gainesville, http://findarticles.com/p/articles/mi_m0DXK/is_18_18/ai_80553782, 03/04/2008

Yoshida, Chisato, Alan D. Woodland (2005) *The Economics of Illegal Immigration*, New York: Palgrave.