

Working paper No 7, Dec 2011

RESEARCH IN SERVICE STUDIES

Tourist Camps The Ordering Power of All-inclusive Tourism

Richard Ek



The Department of Service Management
LUND UNIVERSITY, Campus Helsingborg

Tourist Camps

The Ordering Power of All-inclusive Tourism

Richard Ek

Department of Service Management, Lund University – Campus Helsingborg,
Box 882, SE-251 08 Helsingborg, Sweden
richard.ek@ism.lu.se

This is a pre-referee version of the text submitted to Antipode (<http://www.antipode-online.net/>) in December 2011.

Abstract

This paper develops a topological approach to tourism as an ordering practice through a set of biopolitical concepts. The discussion is fleshed out mainly by using Giorgio Agamben's view of the camp as the ordering model that at present has the initiative in (neo-liberal) contemporary society. The all-inclusive tourist camp (made up of nihilistic and hedonistic cruise tourism and all-inclusive resorts) serves as an example of a society of introvert camps rather than a society based on the principle of polis. The practice of all-inclusive tourism is an active, unfolding post-political force that attacks traditional notions of politics, local engagement and citizenship. All-inclusive tourism should therefore be seen as a political and spatial practice with the potential of defining politics as something different (a consumption experience, an individual escape, a vacation) and the citizen as something else (customer, tourist, guest), not only in the tourist camps but in society in general.

Keywords

Tourism, all-inclusive, topology, camp, post-politics

Introduction – The All-inclusive Phenomenon

All-inclusive tourism, including cruise tourism, is increasing more than other kinds of tourism. Since the 1960s, cruise tourism has developed from being exclusive travel packages to a tourism industry that focuses on all customer segments. The result has been a remarkable increase in the number of cruise tourists: from half a million passengers in 1970, 4.4 million passengers in 1990, almost ten million passengers in 2000 to 13.2 million passengers in 2004 (Szarycz 2008:259; Weaver 2005a:11). In the U.S., cruise tourism is the fastest growing segment in the tourism sector. In 1980 1.4 million citizens travelled on cruise liners, but in the space of only twenty years that figure had risen to 6.9 million (Miller and Grazer 2002:221). Cruise liners became increasingly larger as a result, the largest being in the Post-Panama category, i.e. a cruise liner that is too big to navigate the Panama Canal. These cruise liners are able to accommodate some 4,000 tourists and more than 1,000 crew (Wood 2000:349). For instance, the 339-metre long MS Independence of the Sea is able to receive 4,370 passengers and 1,360 crew members (Royal Caribbean 2011a).

Polly Pattullo (2005) reserves a chapter in her book 'Last Resorts' for a discussion of cruise tourism in the Caribbean and the now well-known negative consequences of tourism. The increasingly larger cruise liners more or less force the different port authorities in the Caribbean to expand the ports so as not to lose the cruise traffic. Further, when the question of taxation has been on the agenda, the cruise companies have immediately threatened to move their businesses to destinations with more modest demands. To Ulrich Beck (2000), mobile companies playing immobile places off against each other is one of the most concrete implications of globalisation. Finally, Pattullo argues, the merchandise consumed on the cruise liners is not purchased locally but is imported from leading transnational companies. Thus, the local businesses in the cruise destinations are unable to gain from the cruise industry to any significant degree (Pattullo 2005). The same goes for employees, in that “It has become common practice for cruise-ship companies to recruit their poorest paid employees from poorer countries” (Weaver 2005a:14).

Another tendency is for cruise-ship companies to buy parts of or sometimes entire islands in the Caribbean archipelago and freight the tourists there. In this way they are able to reduce the number of days in any one port and the tourists do not have to ruin their tropical fantasy by uncomfortable encounters with the locals. At the end of the 1990s the majority of the established cruise-ship companies owned their own islands (Pattullo 2005:204):

On these islands, the cruise liners show off their private beaches, where what is called 'cruise-style service' is on hand, with barbecue and bar provided by cruise staff. Princess Cruises owns Princess Cay on Eleuthera, Bahamas, ... and Saline Bay, Mayreau, in the Grenadines... The RCCL owns Coco Cay, also on the Bahamas, and leases Labadee in Haiti, an isolated promontory on the north coast where tourists spend a day on the beach surrounded by a high wall patrolled by guards.

What stands out here is a system of simulated places or enclaves, stretched out over large physical

distances but confusingly similar to each other. Cruise tourism can consequently be regarded as a pedagogical example of globalisation in the sense that it is characterised by spatial restructuring, mobility and stratification. In effect, the larger and larger cruise ship turns away from the world outside and instead becomes an insular micro cosmos (Wood 2000:350):

The new squarish-built towering ships, with their vast atriums and inward-looking architecture, are essentially floating resorts, with everything from casinos and shopping malls to golf courses and ice-skating rinks onboard. Viewing the sea is optional; even the deck chairs are likely to face inwards. The liners have emulated theming from the entertainment and hotel sectors, and conversely the hotel and entertainment giants have been increasing their presence in the cruise business.

The illustration can be continued with another giant cruise ship, 'Allure of the Seas' (Royal Caribbean 2011b):

The revolutionary design of Allure of the Seas will fill your days at sea with wonder: wake to two-story ocean views in our contemporary Loft Suites, hop onto a classic, full-sized carousel in our Boardwalk neighborhood, spend some quiet time in our adults-only Solarium, and let the kids' imaginations run wild in our Youth Zone - the largest dedicated youth area at sea. Jump right into our Pool Zone, where you'll find our H2O Zone, cantilevered whirlpools, FlowRiders® and a thrilling zip-line view of the ship and sea below. When it's time to unwind, go for a stroll in Central Park - a meandering garden and lush public space lined with foliage and fine restaurants - or take in the majestic view from any of the multiple balconies overlooking the AquaTheater, the first amphitheater at sea. With 28 ultra-modern loft suites and 2,700 spacious staterooms, this 16-deck marvel proves that the impossible is possible. You have to see it to believe it.

The cruise-ships are mobile, all-inclusive establishments; physical mobile nodes in the global network of all-inclusive tourism. But the tourist global network of all-inclusive facilities also consists of establishments on firm ground. In Sweden, the number of tourists choosing the all-inclusive facility on the ground has increased by 20-30 per cent in the last year, and will soon represent 25 per cent of charter tourism as a whole (Dagens Nyheter 2010). Today, all-inclusive establishments on firm ground are the fastest growing sub-sector of the tourism industry (Dielemans 2008). This too is a concept and practice that turns inwards, isolates itself from the physically adjacent surroundings, and focuses on functional and similar places that are physically far removed. It would seem that an arrangement like this has several winners (Dielemans 2008:124-125, my translation):

To the hotel companies it [the all-inclusive solution] is efficient: Food and beverage is that part of the business that is usually difficult to make a profit on, the guests stroll outside the hotels, eat and drink in local restaurants and bars. But not if this is included in the travel costs and served as required in the hotels... In addition, the model implies independence. What local life outside has to offer is not quite so important; the idea is that all kinds of

entertainment should be available inside the hotel. And the hotels do not have to worry that employees will put money into their own pockets, because no money is in circulation [tipping is also usually forbidden]. It isn't only the hotels that benefit. Tour operators can also reduce their staffing costs – if no one leaves the hotel there's no need for as many guides. The big hotels - in the Caribbean 2,000 rooms are not unusual - also fill a large number of airline seats, something that is naturally beneficial to the airline companies. And travel agencies that depend on commission can earn money by marketing all-inclusive packages, where the basic price is higher.

The spatialities of contemporary all-inclusive tourism have only received marginal attention in human geography and tourism studies; Claudio Minca's (2010) work on tourist enclaves filled with docile bodies being a noteworthy exception. This paper addresses this issue by analysing and problematising the spatiality of all-inclusive tourism through the explicit use of the two spatial concepts of topography and topology. Consequently, the paper is a response to the call made by Belcher et al (2008) for further spatial understanding of the societal state of exception as a topological unfolding of potentiality (see also Minca 2005). The all-inclusive practices of tourism form a post-political practice (Swyngedouw 2011; Žižek 1999) that unfolds and simultaneously has the capacity to change the conditions of a radical politics in the neoliberal contemporary.

The paper is structured as an essay with three vignettes. The first vignette discusses all-inclusive tourism as a modernistic phenomenon that should be approached topographically and topologically. The second vignette considers (all-inclusive) tourism's Logos and Eros as topologically connected. In the third and last vignette interest is directed towards all-inclusive tourism as a biopolitical organisation that rests on the topological camp as a foundational spatial principle, with post-political implications also for the world outside the tourist camp.

Seeing Tourism Topographically and Topologically

Tourism has traditionally been regarded as something that is detached from the rest of 'society' and as something separate from 'social core activities' like working life, the public sector and families' everyday lives. To Adrian Franklin (2004), this fundamental view of tourism has crystallised into two hypotheses. The first hypothesis is that modern everyday working life is such that individuals need to 'escape' from it now and again by going on holiday. The second hypothesis is that this tourist space is something extraordinary and different from the social space of ordinary everyday life.

These two hypotheses have also been dominant ontological starting-points in tourism research. Here, tourism is defined and characterised by means of a topographic ontological framework. In a topographical ontology there is an emphasis on relief, borders, physical distances and positions in physical space (with a corresponding stress on space as absolute and relative). The physical attributes usually represented by Euclidean representation techniques, such as the two-dimensional maps (shape, height, and depth), become prominent in a topographic ontology. The topographical

framework says less about the nature of the relations between, for instance, places close to each other on the map. In a topographical framework, society is imagined as a container, in which distinct social activities (taking place in society) are ontologically placed beside each other as separate phenomena. From this topographical perspective, the next step, which almost seems to come naturally, is to decide which of these social activities are central to society as a whole, which activities influence other activities most, which activities do not have any relation to each other at all, and so on. The social activities in the container are stratified and assigned a certain value depending on their position in the box, and are crystallised into a power-knowledge nexus that expresses an epistemology that harmonises with the topographical ontology. Very often, geographical and functional proximity set the tone here (places that are physically close are expected to influence each other more than distant places, leisure activities at weekends are ‘closer’ to vacation activities than to common work on a weekday etc.).

However, Franklin (2004:278), in line with other tourism researchers (formatted into a ‘critical turn’ in tourism studies, see further Ateljevic et al 2007 and Bianchi 2009), argues that this topographical ontology in tourism studies should be questioned – or at least supplemented with an alternative ontology in which tourism is not regarded as something secluded in society, but something that is society. To Franklin, tourism is an ordering practice that shapes and has shaped the modern society into what it is today. Here tourism is something that in an active way does and is society, rather than something that is in or is an outcome of society (tourism as a power order, as increased consumption or experience mediation). Not least, tourism as a modernistic practice is expressed as territorialisation, and in its continuation, as the institutionalisation of nationalism and territorial states. To Franklin (2003:38):

... tourism is not a decorative and superficial activity or even a compensatory activity for the ills of capitalism or modernism. Instead it relates centrally to modernity in a number of dimensions: politically, morally, technologically, and economically. However, as we will see in considering its intimate relationship to nation formation and nationalism, tourism can be considered one of the new cultural expressions and performances of nation formation.

According to Franklin, the critical moment in the development of tourism and nationalism is the building of the railway. The development of a set of large-scale mobility apparatus that connected different places and local economies was a prerequisite of industrial tourism and an imagined community at a national level (Anderson 1983). In the same way, developments in communication and information technologies were inherent parts of the construction of nations and resulted in an increased awareness of and curiosity about the world outside the nation (Thompson 1995). This awareness and curiosity took shape as an orientalist geographical imagination (Said 1978) that is still apparent in contemporary tourist discourses. To Franklin (2003:43):

... tourism and travel were always tied into modernity, and... modern cultures were necessarily mobile and inquisitive cultures. They were either poking around the planet, seeking to pull the world into the modern orbit or in the case of camping, parodying it in a ‘useful’

manner. It is a nonsense to imagine tourism as an escape from modern ways of life when it is par excellence the way of modern life.

Being part of the modernistic project is to be in motion, to advance in unknown terrain with an open mind towards change (Löfgren 1999:268). Nationalism made the world 'outside' the nation as relevant as the world 'inside' the nation. Inevitably, a visit 'outside' the nation, as a tourist, was a manifestation of national identity and citizenship.

Franklin advocates a topological ontology in the approach to tourism that focuses on the inherent order and properties of places. As a concept, topology includes the study of non-metric properties (not restricted to the variable of physical distance) and spatial configurations as the degree of connectivity and density. Topology has been an important concept in the project of outlining a relational notion of space in human geography and actor-network theory (Jones 2009), and has also been used to problematise notions of power as relational (Allen and Cochrane 2010; Giaccaria and Minca 2011).

In the topological approach there is a greater sensitivity towards properties that are not influenced by changes of a topographic nature (such as size and shape). In a topological ontology tourism and society are interwoven and it is not possible to separate the touristic from the social. With a topological approach, the focus is on the function and interaction between practices, rather than on distinct units, tangible similarities and surface differences. Here, the dichotomy as an ordering principle is disregarded, as well as topographic similarities and differences of any kind, in favour of the relational complexity beneath the surface of the spatial forms (Murdoch 2006). The boundaries between here and there and now and then are not so clear-cut. Instead, the world can be seen from a perspective that is both here and there and then and now, and that is interconnected in a topological entirety.

All-inclusive tourism increases in extent as well as in importance in many ways, and to follow the reasoning outlined by Franklin, is a practice that increasingly orders society. The network of mobile and stationary all-inclusive tourism enclaves are thus topographically dispersed over great physical distances but yet become increasingly topologically close to each other as the network of all-inclusive tourism is intensified and becomes denser. Through the analysis and discussion of this practice as a topology it becomes possible to say something about organised society in its entirety. It also becomes possible to say something about the direction of society, i.e. where it is heading politically, because in a topological perspective tourism and politics are not separated and distant (like two remote phenomena in the societal box in a common topographical reading), but are two aspects of the same twisted societal body, constituted through the practices that outline its internal relationship.

Especially in a political and philosophical perspective, it becomes interesting to approach all-inclusive tourism as a way of organising society and people. What characterises the spatial organisation of all-inclusive tourism is that it is organised as a camp! The cruise-ships and the stationary all-inclusive establishments are all based on a camp logic, a mainly enclosed space that is constituted through surveillance, control of mobility and canalisation of circulation. The boundary drawing is

not topographic, in which entrance is regulated by a principle of public right, but topological, in which entrance is conditional and temporary in nature, in this case based on the principle of credit (Tesfahuney and Dahlstedt 2008). Boundary setting does not follow an ‘inside or outside – logic’ but an ‘inside and outside – logic’. In other words, inclusion is always temporary and since the boundary setting is topological it can be moved around a spatially stationary person (with a changed credit worthiness for instance). Ontologically, although the tourist is never completely in the camp he or she is nevertheless forced to submit to its logic and function. The camp can then assume a different nature: it can be pleasant and/or uncomfortable, claustrophobic and/or agoraphobic, sadistic and/or hedonistic. Despite this, the underlying principle of inside and outside remains the same (Agamben 1998).

Both politically and philosophically, the camp as a spatial principle of organisation can be seen as an ontological alternative to the dominant principle of the polis, the city with its surrounding walls that delimit the human community from the wilderness outside (Tesfahuney and Schough 2009). But seeing the world from either a topographic or a topological perspective, setting two ontologies side by side and towards each other, is to reason in a topographical way. That is not what Agamben (1998) implies when he argues that the camp is the new paradigm of the world, not the polis. Instead, he insists that the relation between these two principles of spatial organisation is topological, like two principles that are interwoven. To him, the camp as an organisational principle has existed as an inherent but mostly invincible idea in the modernistic metaphysical tradition in which polis is based. The camp has been in the shadow of the polis, but the increasingly aggressive and all encompassing capitalism has made the logic of the camp more and more visible, especially in contexts of systematic oppression like detention- and asylum camps. The spatial organisation of all-inclusive tourism as camps thus constitutes a model for human organisation that is increasingly crystallised and legitimated in neoliberal rhetoric and practice and in which inclusion and exclusion are something conditional and never given.

Seeing Tourism's Eros and Logos Topologically

Relatively few research contributions discuss tourism from a topological perspective. Even fewer contributions explicitly discuss tourism as modernity, rather than a phenomenon in modernity. One exception is Ning Wang's 'Tourism and Modernity: A Sociological Analysis' (2000). Wang argues that the modernistic project is marked by an ambivalence that is the outcome of two related but simultaneously conflicting forces or directions – the first being a reason- and rationalistic-based Logos-modernity, the second a desire- and emotions-based Eros-modernity.

The first direction, Logos-modernity, permeates the philosophy of the Age of Enlightenment and can be traced back to Aristotle's reliance on reason being able to control other aspects of the human being, such as emotions. The second direction, Eros-modernity, expresses (from a perspective anchored in Logos-modernity) irrational demands and desires of bodily characteristics. Eros-modernity benefits and cherishes desire, seduction and the festive and is carnivalesque and hedonistic. Logos-modernity prioritises forces that discipline and/or suppress feelings and affect, through

rationalisation, boundary-setting, segmentation, surveillance and control of the organised modernistic space (Chanlat 2006; Ek and Tesfahuney 2008). Thus, although modernity is steered by emotions (e.g. through its many hedonistic expressions) it is at the same time rationally (instrumentally) stratified (Wang 2000:41):

Modern tourism, as institutionalized leisure travel, is one of examples of Eros-modernity that allows people to gratify their Eros impulses and desires without being punished by the agents of Logos... The gratification of Eros in and through tourism, then, releases the tensions caused by the self-constraints imposed by Logos on Eros. In this way, tourism helps reinforce the order of the home society that Logos underpins.

At the same time (Wang 2000:41-42):

Unlike tourism as pleasure travel or a leisure institution, the tourism industry, as an agent for the commodification of tourist experiences, is the embodiment of Logos. While tourists are largely motivated by Eros, the tourism industry is to a large extent informed by Logos... As a result, the relationship between the tourist experience (e.g., Eros-modernity) and the tourism industry (e.g., Logos-modernity) is one of ambivalence.

Tourism as a hedonistic practice related to rationality has been discussed to a certain extent (by e.g. Andriotis 2010; Diken and Laustsen 2004; Grappi and Montanari 2011; Jansson 2002). André Jansson (2002) emphasises the distinction between realistic hedonism and imaginary hedonism. Realistic hedonism can be embodied in the tourist who travels to the same destination again and again in order to have the same experience, while imaginary hedonism can be embodied in the tourist who is always seeking new experiences. The mediatisation of tourism loosens up these two categories, and the archetypal charter trip acquires elements of both realistic and imaginary hedonism as the tourist product goes through a product diversification. The tourist has no choice but to make choices, in that he or she is forced to customise his or her tourist experience, and becomes, in the process, embedded in hyperreal representations and practices. The paradox is complete and logos and eros melt together when “rational choice is bound to be a matter of imaginative hedonism” (Jansson 2002:438; see also Weaver 2005b).

The expansion of all-inclusive tourism is an indication that Eros-modernity has at least gained a qualitatively new position in the intricate topological balancing act between eros and logos in modernity. In particular, it takes a new distinct spatial shape – the introvert hedonistic camp that is canalised and stratified in the network of tourism-related activities and places, closely linked topologically but topographically out-stretched on a global scale – with substantial political implications. However, touristic hedonism in relation to the (political) organisation of society and in the prolongation, the design of the citizen, has been discussed to a very insignificant degree. The spatial logic of the camp provides a ‘hedonistic overcoat’, in which all-inclusive tourism becomes a structured hedonism that creates human subjects. In her analysis of discussion forums connected to cruise tourism, Christine Chin (2008:109) concludes that:

Rising demands for tourism goods and services in general and cruise tourism in particular are indicative of how pleasure culled from extraordinary experiences has become an integral dimension to experiences of 'self-actualization' ... Even though the centrality of pleasure consumption has not wholly eliminated posters' flashes of critical evaluation, located in a global context of neoliberal economic restructuring however, posters much like other citizen-consumers are expected to resolve free market created contradictions and moral dilemma by resorting to the perspective of individual choice, action hence responsibility. ... It is not that 'the political' has been eliminated per se, but that it is redefined in a distorted version of feminism's 'the political is personal,' so to speak.

Intertwined in this introvert, hedonistic, all-inclusive tourism, where it is not necessary or hardly desirable to look at the sea or the surroundings of the stationary all-inclusive establishment, is a touristic nihilism, a will to nothingness, a passive nihilism (Diken 2009a). To Nietzsche, nihilism was an historical movement and an imminent logic in the history of the West that was summarised in the declaration of God's death. Here 'God' is equal to ideas and the realms of ideas. To be more precise, the Platonic metaphysics institutionalised into Western metaphysics had reached its impasse (Heidegger 1977:57-61, 67). Nietzsche traces nihilism's origin to the three monotheistic religions that all turn away from life on Earth (by addressing a heavenly world beyond life). But the rise of secularism did not imply the end of nihilism, since escapism can also take non-religious forms. However, with the rise of modernity and the Age of Reason, religious nihilism divided into a radical and a passive form (Diken 2009a:3).

Passive nihilism is based on the assumption that there are no values, meanings or authority. In this meaningless condition – a world without values – there is no reason to take political responsibility or have societal goals. Only intoxication and flight remain. Radical nihilism, on the other hand, confronts and attacks existing value-systems in order to, in a state of pure spite and malevolence, destroy them. The reason for this is that the superior values of the radical passivist can never be realised. In other words, the radical nihilist's values are without a [worthy] world (Diken 2009a:33; 2009b:100). However, these two forms of nihilism constitute a symmetry that is complementary rather than conflict-ridden, and where hedonistic passivity and extremist passion occupy the same social space (see Diken's [2009a] analysis of Michel Houellebecq's Platform [2003]). Radical nihilism in the shape of pure malevolence and passive nihilism in the form of post-political practices like all-inclusive tourism are topologically interwoven (Diken 2009a:6). The traditional (topographical) view of these two forms of nihilism as radically different is thus a 'false antagonism' (Diken 2009a:11).

Touristic nihilism thus unites a negative and an affirmative nihilism, in the proclaimed right to live in a hedonistic way, such as appropriating the cruise-ship's supplies without remorse and at the same time calculating that it is a business opportunity not to be missed. By way of example, let us look at the stationary, all-inclusive establishment of Secrets Capri Riviera Cancun, in Playa del Carmen in Southern Mexico. Although children are not allowed here (perhaps because everyone is treated like a child?) adults are free to engage in the registered brand Unlimited-Luxury® (AM

Resorts 2011a):

Embrace our sensuous world of Unlimited-Luxury®, where everything is included, with our all-new Preferred Club, concierge-style resort. Share our spectacular Caribbean scenery. Play at challenging golf courses. Rejuvenate in world class spas. Pamper yourself with 24/7 concierge and room services. Indulge in our many gourmet restaurants. Dance the night away under the stars.

Included among the facilities is the unlimited supply of juice and soft drinks, a mini-bar that is re-filled every day, wine-tasting, luxurious bathing facilities, service personnel at the pool, an outdoor Jacuzzi, a floating bar in the pool, beach parties, unlimited possibilities to play golf, and no need to carry presence-legitimizing bracelets. One of the guests testifies to the experience on the website (AM Resorts 2011b):

Wow! This resort is fantastic! I would like to say that this is one of the best vacation decisions I've made. When I arrived they greeted me with a cool towel, a glass of champagne and the floor concierge walked me to my room while introducing me to the hotel. The moment I arrived, I was either beach side, poolside or by the Jacuzzi. The entire resort's service is impeccable. They are so polite and helpful. There's plenty of onsite poolside and beachside activities. Both pool side and beach side service is outstanding. The resort is very intimate and private. The pool is huge with, of course, a swim up bar. It was, hands down, the best resort experience to date. I will certainly be going back as quickly as I can!

At the same time, Super Clubs Breezes Resorts tempts visitors by offering “super-inclusives” (Breezers 2011):

Okay, so you've already heard the term, “super-inclusive.” So what exactly is it? Simply put, it's the best vacation value in the world. All your meals. All your drinks. All your entertainment. An incredible variety of land and water sports, with professional instruction. All included. And tipping is never permitted. We created the Super-Inclusive concept because we understand that the whole point of a vacation is to get as far away from the real world as possible. And nothing brings that point closer to home than going out for the day and leaving your wallet behind.

Finally, Hedonism Resorts, promotes itself as “the pleasure seekers ultimate super-inclusive playground” and states on its website that everyone is welcome to hedonism and that this is indeed possible (Hedonism Resorts 2011):

Sleep in. Stay up late. Give up counting calories. Have a drink before noon. Give up mineral water. Dine in shorts. Talk to strangers. Don't make your bed. Go skinny-dipping. Don't call your mother. Let your hair down. Don't pay for anything. Don't leave a tip. Be your beautiful self in spectacular Negril or Runaway Bay, Jamaica. Hedonism is a sandbox for your inner child, nourishment for the mind, body, spirit and soul. Pleasure comes in many

forms. Choose one. Or two. Or more. And with absolutely everything included in one up-front price you never have to think about money. Not even tips. Just what to do next. And when. And with whom at one of two Hedonism resorts to chose from, the original Hedonism II in Negril and the new Hedonism III in Runaway Bay.

Here eros and logos are blended and packaged as a unity. The rational path to happiness is to leave your wallet at home, while the hedonistic condition can be reached by means of different possible alternatives - Hedonism II or Hedonism III. Hedonism II costs 50\$ for women and 100\$ for men for a day- or night pass, whereas Hedonism III costs 65\$ for men and women (day pass) alternatively 75\$ for men and women (night pass). What is the most rational, logic alternative for you? Read the small print first, and 'To learn more about what's included click here' (Hedonism Resorts 2011).

In these hedonistic environments the touristic subject or agent is encouraged to become a certain type of human; a conclusion that leads us in a biopolitical direction. To some degree we have to return to the connections between nation building and tourism as a practice, whose topological contact surface is embedded in the same sociospatial strategy: territorialisation.

From Topographical Polis to Topological Camps

The reasoning thus far could be regarded as based on an exaggerated binary thinking, but the central idea is that tourism is characterised by the same ambivalence that permeates the modernistic project. Tourism cannot be reduced to an isolated phenomenon, or to a space-time in which the oppressed eros finds its discharge in hedonistic practices, as tourism research has usually described it. In contrast to the topographical either/or view of tourism, tourism should be regarded as a hybrid practice that contains both instrumental reason and the emotional and corporeal, i.e. reason and emotion become entangled. Tourism is a part of Nomos (the conquest, ordering and made useful through territorialisation, see further Schmitt 2003) and simultaneously a biopolitical conduct that creates biopolitical subjects.

Biopolitics is critical to modernity, the creation of territorial belonging, national identity and culture. Disciplinary, control and surveillance technologies that arise during modernity shape the population into a unity. Biopolitics shapes bodies, senses and imaginations from thoughts about norms and deviation, similarity and difference (Foucault 2008). Tourism is and has been a crucial part of nation-building and the construction of imaginations and myths about one land and one people, inside and outside, 'us' and 'them'. Tourism has also been part of the disciplinary, control and surveillance apparatus that has been mobilised as such for a variety of reasons (Löfgren 1999). Moreover, tourism does not only shape people, but also shapes spaces and territories, as a creating force. The tourist gaze (Urry 1990) is central here, because it is an optic machine and a series of mirrors that create boundaries. Thus, the tourist gaze is a creating force for society in general.

Biopolitics implies that our biological lives are politicised within the frame of the societal, and, consequently, all contemporary politics can be regarded as biopolitics. Agamben is perhaps the intellectual thinker who has pointed Foucault's ideas in the most radical direction. Agamben uses ideas from several philosophical frameworks in his ambition to clarify why the camp and not the city – polis – should be considered as the guiding thought paradigm in the attempt to comprehend contemporary modernity, power and ordering. Hannah Arendt is another influential source. Arendt (1951) argued that the political distance between western democracies and totalitarian states was not as wide as has commonly been supposed. Topographically it is possible to imagine a continuum with two end poles, the most ‘democratic’ and the most ‘totalitarian’, although topologically speaking the two extreme poles are closer because they both base their authority and legitimacy on each others’ populations. Both democracies and totalitarian systems are, in the end, biopolitical apparatus. Both systems have population as the primary target and the difference is more a question of how biopolitics is conducted than whether it is conducted.

Agamben (1998) develops this conclusion and points to another topological relation that ties democracies and totalitarian systems. That this is the most suitable way of organising and managing own population as a biopolitical resource is based on a specific spatial principle. This spatial principle operates/works as a camp or a zone, whose basic characteristic trait is that there is no predetermined protocol for what is going to remain in force and what is not.

The camp gives the sovereign total freedom of action and flexibility to decide the rules accordingly – something that optimises control in a power- and steering perspective. The camp is based on a topological principle where inside and outside are interlaced. The camp is thus the hidden Nomos in modernity that successively becomes visible and discernible – not least under the auspices of colonial and imperial regimes and in the concentration camps during the Second World War. From a topographical understanding the concentration camp is revealed as an anomaly, a pathological exception that categorically does not belong to Western modernity or have any metaphysical connection with democratic systems. It is an abomination that is only realisable in totalitarian, dictatorial systems. However, in a topographical reading, concentration camps are an extrapolation of biopower and biopolitics. The camps represent a condensation of the organisational principle that exists in all political systems and institutions (Clegg et al 2006).

Of course, ideas like these are provocative, especially as concentration camps constitute a sensitive chapter in the history of Western modernity. Concentration camps as a materialisation of the spatial logic of the camp or zone first appeared in Cuba, Namibia and South Africa (Campbell 2002) in the context of slavery, estate economy and European colonisation (Teschfahoney and Dahlstedt 2007). The concentration camp is thus a colonial invention that found its optimal utility when it was brought back to European soil in the shape of Nazi concentration- and annihilation camps. What is more, such thoughts can be regarded as an illicit reading of power and sovereignty, because one of the consequences is that the people who are stuck in the camp are excluded from the principal safety that polis affords as long as they are situated within its walls but are still in the grasp of (a potentially lethal) power. The person or figure in this situation is *homo sacer*; someone who is unworthy

of being sacrificed but is possible to kill without punishment (Agamben 1998:82). A quick reading of Agamben might give the impression that he argues that all people are homo sacer, but what he insists on is that we are all potentially homo sacer. Our political and civil rights, which are anchored in national and territorial belonging, and our human rights, based on the definition of what counts as humanity through the anthropological machine, can actually be withdrawn as they were in the concentration camps, where the internees were not even allowed to decide on their own deaths (Agamben 2002; Bauman 1989).

A dismantling of people's political and human rights is usually traced with some acceptance to so-called extraordinary circumstances, states of exception in war or states of crisis. The point of issue for Agamben, in his reading of Carl Schmitt's (1985) conclusion that the state of exception is pronounced by the sovereign (the very essence of sovereign power is to have the capacity to do that), is that this proclamation (of a state of exception) is not possible to stop (since the decision to proclaim is arbitrary). All humans are thus philosophically speaking potentially homo sacer or bare life (the bearer of the link between violence and law to Benjamin 1978; see also Derrida 2005) but with a wide variation when it comes to probability, 'realpolitically' speaking (Agamben 1998).

Expressed in more explicit spatial terms, the camp or the zone, as a spatial rule of conduct in a hypothetical context, puts 'us all' in a situation where we run the risk of becoming the bearer of bare life through a topological relation to sovereign power characterised by inclusive exclusion. That is, the very apparatus that makes 'us' subjects can also be turned into an apparatus of violence (Butler 2004). This situation should then be compared to the situation schematically at hand in polis, with the foundational boundary between inside and outside (the dominant ontology in political philosophy and executed politics as in migration politics). In polis, we have a simple dichotomy in which it is only possible to be either inside or outside. Ontologically speaking the camp is both more complicated and simpler, since the only position is on the threshold. Here the relation between the sovereign and its subjects in polis is viewed through topological lenses – the dichotomy inside-outside is topographical. However, this topographical approach misses the sovereign power's potential or potency (a potential that becomes visible in a topological perspective) and has been the case since Aristotle made a distinction between biological life (zoē) belonging to the sphere of the household (oikos) and politically qualified life (bios) belonging to the sphere of the societal (polis). Bare life, on the threshold between oikos and polis, was made invisible (Mills 2008:64). Polis, and the boundary-setting that constitutes this traditional spatial model, is a mirage that has directed the Western world of ideas to a realm of seemingly simple dichotomies that have shaped foundational thought patterns; something that is particularly tangible in the institutionalisation of territorial states and nations (Tesfahuney and Schough 2009). In Agamben's opinion we need to rethink, since it is the ban that is the original sovereign act and not the application of belongingness in communities of citizenship (Agamben 1998:29). It is not the citizen that is the primeval authentic figure in political philosophy and political conduct, but the sans papier who are living and dying on the borders of Europe at this very moment (van Houtum and Boedeltje 2009; see also Dahlstedt and Tesfahuney 2004).

The tourist camp again reminds us that the camp is in a topological relation to polis as an inherent principle, but with the consequence that the state of nature is in the same way an inherent principle in civilisation, as in the touristic catchphrase 'sea, sun, sex' (Diken and Laustsen 2004; see also Worthington 2005). Here, the tourist camp symbolises a privilege, the advantage of being able to travel as a tourist, embedded in a mobility apparatus that gives security, exclusivity and luxury in different places. The tourist chooses, almost in a Hegelian sense, to be besieged in order to indulge in hedonism and touristic nihilism, escape in pleasure and, in the continuation, give up life. Conventionally, the humans outside the tourist camp are regarded as excluded, but here the logic remains the same, even if it is inverted. Getting out is not difficult; it is coming in that is the problem (the same is true for refugees, migrants and in gated communities [Diken & Laustsen 2005]). Tourism, cruise tourism and other forms of all-inclusive tourism constitute mental images and materialised aspects of the global topological order that manifests itself as stratified camps on different topographical scales, from gated communities to Fortress Europe.

The result of the spatial logic of the camp becoming increasingly influential in society is that the spatial and temporal status of citizenship is rearranged, and in the continuation, the definition of and expectations of the citizen are changed. What used to be a consistently held practice of citizenship connected to a territory is no longer a certainty. For instance, the figure *homo sacer*, in the gestalt of the *sans papier*, points to the fact that the right to have and the right to keep citizenship is in the end dependent on a (more or less) capricious sovereign decision (perhaps most obvious in asylum processes in the different European countries).

Citizenship is here no longer connected to a universal idea (in theory if not in practice) of human rights, but to biopolitical ideas about the economic value by which citizenship is increasingly graded (Ong 2006). The social contract that has traditionally regulated inclusion and exclusion and represented some sort of stability, predestination and simplicity, now takes the shape of continuous negotiation, in which the conditions relentlessly change and value displacements happen all the time. Political ideas about equity and solidarity are replaced with principles based on the notion of economic value, and where the singular person and his or her body constitute a biopolitical value (Teschfahney and Dahlstedt 2007). The principal dismantling of polis (and often also in urban-material meaning) is part of political 'de-citizenification', since the city is a ground condition for citizenship (Dahlstedt 2009:33):

Through centuries the fight for citizenship has taken place in cities. The city is neither the background to this struggle or the arena the fight for hegemony has been about. The city is more of the arena on which different societal groups has identified their rights, made demands, fought and articulated citizen rights and obligations.

This social tendency, the reduction of traditional citizen functions and the mobilisation of a population to increase its biopolitical value can all be regarded as post-political practices and, as such, related to governmentality (see for instance Miller and Rose 2008; Mitchell 2007; Mouffe 2005).

Here the ideal behaves more like a tourist who does not engage in the places through which s/he passes, and thus does not burden a public sector like a place-bound citizen according to neoliberal discourses (Sparke 2005).

Conclusion – The Hedonistic Camp

In this paper a specific form of tourism, namely all-inclusive tourism, has been discussed. This all-inclusive tourism usually consists of cruise tourism and a touristic visit to a stationary, all-inclusive establishment. This form of tourism has become increasingly popular in recent decades and continues to grow. What for a hundred years ago was regarded as an aristocratic affair has now developed into a net of simultaneous mobility and the storage of millions of people, globally stretched out in a cartographic pattern that can be described as an imprint of colonial relief.

In this paper it has also been stressed that tourism should not be seen as something isolated or discernible in society. Traditionally, tourism has been dichotomised and compared to the ‘everyday’ and ‘ordinary’ as something ‘outside’ everyday life and ‘extraordinary’. Tourism per se has also been categorised in dichotomies, for instance ‘ordinary’ charter tourism versus ‘extraordinary’ backpack tourism (Andersson Cederholm 1999). Regarding and interpreting the world in this way – comparing phenomena and practices as complementary or mutually exclusive and pitting them against each other as ontologically separated even though there may be countless connections – is to approach it through a topographical world-view. The alternative is to see the world topologically. Here, tourism is not something in society, a compartment among others with more or less tangible relations of cause and effect. Rather, tourism is society, i.e. it orders and structures society and co-institutionalises territorial states and Eurocentric geographical imaginations. Tourism and politics should be read as one-in-one, not as two separate societal spheres. All-inclusive tourism is a political practice.

However, in addition to being a political practice, all-inclusive tourism is also a spatial practice (spatial practice as a concept that is close to a tautology). Schematically, all-inclusive tourism can spatially be expressed as a practice that is canalised and arranged in camps. Agamben's idea of the camp as a spatial organisation principle in which power works topologically offers a reasoning and terminology that enlightens the discussion further. Power, primarily crystallised as an institutionalised sovereign power (an emperor with absolute power, a dictator, democracy at the end of history, an empire, etc.) finds its capacity to execute through the topological relation between the two spatial models of organisation, namely polis and the camp. Polis makes a territorial power over societies and populations possible, while the camp facilitates a biopolitical power over people – in the end power over people's lives and deaths. When the two spatial models coincide, an encompassing iron cage of territorially based execution of law and power is created (Bauman 2003).

Reasoning about the worst possible scenario reveals something about less charged tendencies and trajectories, such as the growing all-inclusive tourism, its shapes and figures. The tourist camp constitutes the spatial model that crystallises the inherent presence of the state of nature in polis, or

to be more precise, the system of territorial states. The same tourist camp becomes the place where the eros and logos of tourism meet and materialise. The tourist camp expresses and materialises a certain post-political system and at the same time actively orders and structures the very same post-political system. Could the tourist camp, the all-inclusive tourist facility at sea or on firm ground, be the primary model for and representative of a post-political situation and societal tendency? When the tourist escapes into the all-inclusive establishment does he or she then become someone who does not care about politics, equality or anything that can pass as metaphysical, principal, or a question of justice? Someone who instead focuses on the corporeal, the pleasure and the experience, and is encouraged to do so by the sovereign power that has created and ordered the servicescape that the hedonistic tourism that circulates within, filling his or her numb body with food and drink – in effect a reversed version of the prisoner in the concentration camp who circulated in order to find food and drink in order to survive (Agamben 2002). In the end, the reasoning becomes ethical. The question is, what kind of ethics does the hedonistic camp express?

References

- Agamben G (1998) *Homo Sacer: Sovereign Power and Bare Life*. Stanford: Stanford University Press
- Agamben G (2002) *Remnants of Auschwitz: The Witness and the Archive*. New York: Zone Books
- Agamben G (2004) *The Open. Man and Animal*. Stanford: Stanford University Press
- Allen J and Cochrane A (2010) Assemblages of state power: topological shifts in the organization of government and politics. *Antipode: A Radical Journal of Geography* 42(5):1071-1089.
- AM Resorts (2011a) Secrets Capri Riviera Cancun. <http://www.secretsresorts.com/Capri/whatsinc.asp#> (last accessed 11 November 2011)
- AM Resorts (2011b) Secrets Capri Riviera Cancun Testimonials. <http://www.secretsresorts.com/capri/awards-testimonials.asp> (last accessed 11 November 2011)
- Anderson B (1983) *Imagined Communities. Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. London: Verso
- Andersson Cederholm E (1999) *Det Extraordinära Lockelse. Luffarturistens Bilder och Upplevelser*. Lund: Arkiv
- Andriotis K (2010) Heterotopic erotic oases: the public nude beach experience. *Annals of Tourism Research* 37(4):1076-1096

- Arendt H (1951) *The Origins of Totalitarianism*. New York: Harcourt
- Ateljevic I, Pritchard A and Morgan N (eds) (2007) *The Critical Turn in Tourism Studies: Innovative Research Methodologies*. Amsterdam: Elsevier
- Bauman Z (1989) *Modernity and the Holocaust*. Cambridge: Polity Press
- Bauman Z (2003) Utopia with no topos. *History of the Human Sciences* 16(1):11-25
- Beck U (2000) *What is Globalization?* Malden: Polity Press
- Belcher O, Martin L, Secor A, Simon S and Wilson T (2008) Everywhere and nowhere: the exception and the topological challenge to geography. *Antipode: A Radical Journal of Geography* 40(4):499-503
- Benjamin W (1978) *Reflections: Essays, Aphorisms, Autobiographical Writings*. New York: Harcourt
- Bianchi R V (2009) The 'critical turn' in tourism studies: a radical critique. *Tourism Geographies* 11(4):484-504
- Breezers (2011) What is super-inclusive? <http://www.breezers.com/whats-super-inclusive/> (last accessed 11 November 2011)
- Butler J (2004) *Precarious Life. The Power of Mourning and Violence*. London: Verso
- Calarco M (2007) Jamming the anthropological machine. In Calarco M and DeCaroli S (eds) *Giorgio Agamben. Sovereignty and Life* (pp 163-179). Stanford: Stanford University Press
- Campbell D (2002) Atrocity, memory, photography: imaging the concentration camps of Bosnia – the case of ITN versus *Living Marxism*, Part 2. *Journal of Human Rights* 1(2):143-172
- Chanlat J-F (2006) Space, organisation and management thinking: a socio-historical perspective. In Clegg S R and Kornberger M (eds) *Space, Organizations and Management Theory* (pp 17-43). Malmö and Copenhagen: Liber and Copenhagen Business Press
- Chin C B N (2008) *Cruising in the Global Economy: Profits, Pleasure and Work at Sea*. Aldershot: Ashgate
- Clegg S, Courpasson D and Phillips N (2006) *Power and Organisation*. London: Sage
- Dagens Nyheter (2010) Allt inkluderat-resorna fortsätter att öka. <http://www.dn.se/resor/nyheter/allt->

[inkluderat-resorna-fortsatter-att-oka](#) (last accessed 11 November 2011)

Dahlstedt M (2009) *Aktiveringens Politik: Demokrati och Medborgarskap för ett Nytt Millennium*. Malmö: Liber

Dahlstedt M and Tesfahuney M (2004) Rörlighetens paradox: om 'migrationshot', ett inhägnat EUropa och en paranoid samtid. In Dahlstedt M and Lindberg I (eds) *Rasism i Europa: Migration i den Nya Världsordningen* (pp 53-81). Stockholm: Agora

Derrida J (2005) *Lagens Kraft. Seminarium med Jacques Derrida på Södertörns Högskola i Maj 2000*. Eslöv: Östlings bokförlag Symposion

Dielemans J (2008) *Välkommen till Paradiset. Reportage om Turistindustrin*. Stockholm: Atlas

Diken B (2009a) *Nihilism*. London: Routledge

Diken B (2009b) The (impossible) society of spite: revisiting nihilism. *Theory, Culture & Society* 26(4):97-116

Diken B and Laustsen C B (2004) Sea, sun, sex and the discontents of pleasure. *Tourism Studies* 4(2):99-114

Diken B and Laustsen C B (2005) *The Culture of Exception: Sociology Facing the Camp*. London: Routledge

Ek R and Tesfahuney M (2008) Den post-politiska regionen som fångst- och rörlighetsterritorium. In Andersson F, Ek R and Molina I (eds) *Regionalpolitikens Geografi: Regional Tillväxt i Teori och Praktik* (pp 81-113). Lund: Studentlitteratur

Eng C (2002) Future consideration for improving end-of-life care for older persons: Program of All-Inclusive Care for the Elderly (PACE). *Journal of Palliative Medicine* 5(2):305-309

Foucault M (2008) *The Birth of Biopolitics: Lectures at the Collège de France, 1978-1979*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan

Franklin A (2003) *Tourism: An Introduction*. London: Sage

Franklin A (2004) Tourism as an ordering: towards a new ontology of tourism. *Tourist Studies* 4(3):277-301

Giaccaria P and Minca C (2011) Nazi biopolitics and the dark geographies of the selva. *Journal of Genocide Research* 13(1-2):67-84.

Grappi S and Montanari F (2011) The role of social identification and hedonism in affecting tourist

- re-patronizing behaviours: the case of an Italian festival. *Tourism Management* 32(5):1128-1140
- Hedonism Resorts (2011) Welcome to Hedonism. <http://www.hedonismresorts.com/> (last accessed 11 November 2011)
- Heidegger M (1977) *The Question Concerning Technology and Other Essays*. New York: Harper & Row
- Houellebecq M (2003) *Platform*. London: Vintage
- Jansson A (2002) Spatial phantasmagoria: the mediatization of tourism experience. *European Journal of Communication* 17(4):429-443
- Jones M (2009) Phase space: geography, relational thinking, and beyond. *Progress in Human Geography* 33(4):487-506
- Löfgren O (1999) *On Holiday. A History of Vacationing*. Berkeley: The University of California Press
- Miller P and Rose N (2008) *Governing the Present. Administering Economic, Social and Personal Life*. Cambridge: Polity Press
- Miller, A R and Grazer W F (2002) The North American cruise market and Australian tourism. *Journal of Vacation Marketing* 8(3):221-234
- Mills C (2007) *The Philosophy of Agamben*. Stocksfield: Acumen
- Minca C (2005) The return of the camp. *Progress in Human Geography* 29(4):405-412
- Minca C (2010) The island: work, tourism and the biopolitical. *Tourist Studies* 9(2):88-108
- Mitchell D (2007) *Governing Societies*. Maidenhead: McGraw-Hill
- Mouffe C (2005) *On the Political*. London: Routledge
- Murdoch J (2006) *Post-Structuralist Geography. A Guide to Relational Space*. London: Sage
- Olsson G (2007) *Abysmal. A Critique of Cartographic Reason*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press
- Ong A (2006) *Neoliberalism as Exception: Mutations in Citizenship and Sovereignty*. Durham: Duke University Press

Pattullo P (2005) *Last Resorts. The Cost of Tourism in the Caribbean*, 2nd Edition. London: Latin American Bureau

Royal Carabbean (2011a) Fakta om fartygen i Freedom-klassen. http://www.royalcaribbean.se/sv/kryssningsfartyg/freedom-klassen/fakta_om_fartygen_i_freedom-klassen.htm (last accessed 11 November 2011)

Royal Carabbean (2011b) Allures of the Seas. <http://www.royalcaribbean.com/findacruise/ships/class/ship/home.do?br=R&shipClassCode=OA&shipCode=AL> (last accessed 11 November 2011)

Said E W (1978) *Orientalism*. New York: Pantheon Books

Schmitt C (1985) *Political Theology. Four Chapters on the Concept of Sovereignty*. Cambridge MA: MIT Press

Schmitt C (2003) *The Nomos of the Earth in the International Law of the Jus Publicum Europaeum*. New York: Telos

Sparke M (2005) *In the Space of Theory: Postfoundational Geographies of the Nation-State*. Minneapolis: The University of Minnesota Press

Szarycz G S (2008) Cruising, freighter-style: a phenomenological exploration of tourist recollections of a passenger freighter travel experience. *International Journal of Tourism Research* 10(3):259-269

Swyngedouw E (2011) Interrogating post-democratization: reclaiming egalitarian political spaces. *Political Geography* 30(7):370-380

Temkin-Greener H and Mukamel D B (2002) Predicting place of death in the program of All-Inclusive Care for the Elderly (PACE): participant versus program characteristics. *Journal of the American Geriatrics Society* 50(1):125-135

Tesfahuney M and Dahlstedt M (2007) Lägrets politik: undantagstillstånd, övervakningsansamlingar och migration. In Lövgren S and Johansson K (eds) *Viljan att Styra. Individ, Samhälle och Välfärdens Styrningsmentaliteter* (pp 133-164). Lund: Studentlitteratur

Tesfanuney M and Dahlstedt M (2008) Inledning: betraktelser över en postpolitisk samtid. In Tesfanuney M and Dahlstedt M (eds) *Den Bästa av Världar? Betraktelser över en Postpolitisk Samtid* (pp 10-29). Stockholm: Tankekraft Förlag

Tesfahuney M and Schough K (2009) Postpolis. In Graninger G and Knuthammar C (eds) *Samhällsbyggande och Integration: Frågor om Assimilation, Mångfald och Boende* (pp 119-148) Linköping: Linköpings universitet

Thompson J P (1995) *The Media and Modernity: A Social Theory of Media*. Cambridge: Polity Press

Urry J (1990) *The Tourist Gaze: Leisure and Travel in Contemporary Societies*. London: Sage

van Houtum H and Boedeltje F (2009) Europe's shame: dearth at the borders of the EU. *Antipode: A Radical Journal of Geography* 41(2):226-230

Wang N (2000) *Tourism and Modernity: A Sociological Approach*. Oxford: Elsevier/Pergamon

Weaver A (2005a) Interactive service work and performative metaphors. The case of the cruise industry. *Tourism Studies* 5(1):5-27

Weaver A (2005b) "Passports to pleasure": credit cards and contemporary travel. *International Journal of Tourism Research* 7(3):151-159

Weaver F M, Hickey E C, Hughes S L, Parker V, Fortunato D, Rose J, Cohen S, Robbins L, Orr W, Priefer B, Wieland D and Baskins, J (2008) Providing all-inclusive care for frail elderly veterans: evaluation of three model of care. *Journal of the American Geriatrics Society* 56(2):345-353

Wood R (2000) Caribbean cruise tourism: globalization at sea. *Annals of Tourism Research* 27(2):345-370

Worthington B (2005) Sex and shunting: contrasting aspects of serious leisure within the tourism industry. *Tourist Studies* 5(3):225-246

Žižek S (1999) *The Ticklish Subject: The Absent Centre of Political Ontology*. London: Verso

1. The anthropological machine is a set of symbolic and material mechanisms that works in different scientific and philosophical discourses and classifies and separates out humans and animals by putting them in a topological relation, a double process of inclusion and exclusion where animal aspects of the human nature are specified and isolated (Calarco 2007) This first step is then followed by boundary-setting following the same characteristics and logic: "And it is enough to move our field of research ahead a few decades, and instead of this innocuous paleontological find we will have the Jew, that is, the non-man produced within the man, or the néomort and the overcomatose person, that is, the animal separated within the human body itself" (Agamben 2004:37, original emphasis). In the end the anthropological machine is arbitrary and changeable (like the language game according to Wittgenstein) and based to a large extent on the crystallisation of contrasts between the human and the non-human; an ontological practice that is interwoven in the tourist practice and its fascination with the exotic and unfamiliar.

2. A specific biopolitical topology can be found in the modality of 'all-inclusive'; also a concept found in the abbreviation PACE, Program of All-Inclusive Care for the Elderly that aims at making it possible for very sick elderly people to live in their homes as long as possible (Eng 2002; Temkin-Greener and Mukamel 2002; Weaver et al 2008:345).

3. I am aware that this reasoning could be seen as topographical and constituted around a locking dichotomy, and to some extent this may be true. But this is a first step in breaking up the same dichotomy, since the topographical and the topological do not mutually exclude each other, but meet in the least common denominator, topos, place. More ontological starting points could perhaps be used, for instance ontology without topos as an element, or perhaps the ontology of the Abyss, the ontology that existed before any other ontology (Olsson 2007)?



LUND UNIVERSITY
Campus Helsingborg