



ARTICLE

Dreaming Forward: Postidentity and the Generative Thresholds of Tourism

Keith Hollinshead^{1*} Alfred B. Vellah²

1. Independent Scholar, Cheshire & Warwickshire, England

2. Tourism Studies, Doctoral Student, The Business School, The University of Bedfordshire, England

ARTICLE INFO

Article history

Received: 30 July 2020

Accepted: 31 August 2020

Published Online: 30 September 2020

Keywords:

Postcolonialism

Deleuze

Becoming

Palpation

Interrelationality

Aboriginality the governmentality of tourism

The positive inscriptions (of tourism)

The flows of possibility (of tourism)

ABSTRACT

This manuscript from Hollinshead and Vellah calls for researchers in Tourism Studies and related Fields to reflect upon their own role in refreshing the social imaginaries of “after-colonialism” under the nomadisms of our time. Deleuzian in outlook, it positions the “post” of postcolonialism not as an end to colonialism’s imperatives but as a generative-portal through which new-seeds-of-“becoming” are discernable as the postidentities (rather than the “identities”) of populations are interpretable in multidirectional, non-hierarchical, and not easily-predictable ways. In provoking (after Deleuze) thought per *rhizomatic processes* (rather than via *fixed concepts*), the manuscript - critiquing these dynamic matters of “postidentity” - then harnesses the insights of (Leela) Ghandi’s on hybrid-nomadic-subjects, and of Venn on alternative-(com)possible-futures. Thereafter, these concerns of and about “after-colonialism” are critically contextualised within Aboriginal “Australia”, via the views of a pool of Indigenous intellectuals there, who synthesise the disruptive dialectics of belonging-cum-aspiration which they maintain that they and fellow Aboriginal people (of many sorts) face today. Throughout this manuscript, the agency and authority of tourism hovers in its sometimes-manifest / sometimes-latent generative power to project empowering postidentities for the world’s “host” or “visited” populations today.

1. Introduction: Identity and Discourses of Being and Becoming

1.1 Tourism and the Inscription of Being and Becoming

In this manuscript an attempt is made to examine the role and function of tourism as an industry and research site the texts and utterances of which make meaningful exposition of and about the world *after* the zenith of colonialism, that is under the so called postcolonial

or neo-colonial temper of our time. Initially based upon the Foucauldian concept of governmentality (following Foucault ^[1]), it inspects the ways in which *the world after colonialism* is seemingly discursively talked about today generally across the social sciences. An attempt is accordingly made to critique how those wider understandings and misunderstandings relate to the specific orientations of the tourism industry (mainly through Tourism Studies, with its particular forms of knowledge about the peoples, places, pasts, and presents of the postcolonial/neo-colonial era).

*Corresponding Author:

Keith Hollinshead,

Independent Scholar, Cheshire & Warwickshire, 157 Higham Lane, NUNEATON, Warwickshire CV11 6AN, England;

Email: khdeva@btopenworld.com

To these ends, in the paragraphs that follow, an effort is made to inspect some of the lead discourses of and about the postcolonial/neo-colonial moment while these hailings of and about populations and their places/spaces seemingly hold sway, as they serve as Foucauldian regimes of discursive truth (see Dean ^[2]) on Foucauldian “governmentality” (i.e., on “regimes of institutional thought-space”). As such, these held discourses are known to favour certain ways of speaking about peoples living in potent after-colonialism scenarios) and coterminously denigrate other less-potent ways. And these discursive maps of meaning of and about peoples and their cultures will then be loosely translated to scenarios within tourism/Tourism Studies. In the manuscript, therefore, tourism will *not* thereby deemed to be a neutral medium in the cultivation and articulation of values and understandings about populations under postcolonialism/neo-colonialism - viz., within this paper, for the Indigenous peoples of Australia, in particular - but will be seen to be an active constructor of meaning and a determinant maker of “subjects”. In this light, it is the author’s intention to highlight not only the pre-established givens that might already lie with the naturally occurring discursive texts of and about “after-colonialism”, but to critique how tourism (in concert with other industrially-scripted industries) conceivably echos what is generally communicated about our postcolonial/neo-colonial times. Thus the inherent mission behind the paper is to infer what may be interpreted about the power of the discourse of tourism to project freshly corrective or newly-empowering visions of being during our current era - an age which has supposedly followed after the conceivable peak of colonialism - for peoples who (and for places which) are striving for improved external representation. In this regard, the manuscript inherently elides into a critique of the projective and empowering here-and-there futurism of tourism, and it responds to the undergirding question as to what tourism does and/or can potentially generate to help populations freshly enunciate *themselves* to the wider world or otherwise be freshly scripted and articulated *by others* across and beyond the industry. In these senses, this discursive scrutiny of established forms of governmentality of and about the postcolonial mood or neo-colonial condition interpretively morphs into an inspection of the potential and positive inscriptive agency of tourism. To this end, it inspects the role of tourism to contour the myriad values, forces, and desires in which (in particular and ultimately, for this paper) the Indigenous populations of Australia are enmeshed today, sometimes wittingly and willingly, sometimes not so. Thus what might begin as a Foucauldian treatment of projected and

already-produced “being” speedily metamorphoses into a Deleuzian assay of what such Indigenous populations might “become” rather than just “be”. In this Deleuzian regard, then, the manuscript conceivably transmutes into a neovitalist Deleuzian commentary on the states of flux in which postcolonial populations/neo-colonial cultures are ensnared during our vibratile moment “after-colonialism”. All told, the manuscript consequently probes for the flows of possibility and plausibility that may lie within the conditions of fluidity and along the contours of mutability under the ongoing effects of the changing and unhinging relationalities of globalisation.

In what follows, discursive understandings of and about matters of the identities and the post-identities of peoples “after-colonialism” will be inspected from three particular fields of vision:

(1) Firstly, they are further examined per medium of Deleuzian thought on *virtual* versus *actual* “being”, under the nomadic logic and the generative allegiances of today;

(2) Secondly, they are distilled via Gandhi’s perambulation through the complexities of both *the colonial aftermath* and *postcolonial remembering* which have been witnessed over recent decades; and,

(3) Thirdly, they are refined in terms of Venn’s insights on the emergent *transmodern and alternative challenges* which the world’s postcolonial peoples freshly face today.

Thereafter, an attempt will be made to reflect somewhat more penetratingly upon the specific found condition of Indigenous peoples, per se, today as set against these fissures of the after-colonialism era. This will be carried out:

(1) by initially perusing what *a select collation of Indigenous intellectuals (in Australia)* themselves voice about their varied life-spaces and aspirations today, as deciphered from Grossman’s ^[3] cornerstone edited text *Blacklines: Contemporary Critical Writing by Indigenous Australians ...* hereafter referred to as *Blacklines*; and then,

(2) by scrutinising what Dibley and Turner have uncovered about the on the grounded effort of Indigenous groups and communities to work with the government of Australia to establish *a national television service for all Aboriginal peoples* across the dry continent. The Dibley and Turner analysis is important since it covers collaborative efforts to secure enunciative freedom for such seemingly newly enfranchised Indigenous groups and communities as those very endeavours rub up against the larger real-world policies of “nationing” for all manner of things, including television services. The critique of and about Dibley and Turner’s treatment of the cross-cultural politics of self-determination and sovereignty thus com-

poses a deep consideration of what Graham and Penny^[4] style as “the applied performance of Indigeneity”. Although it is pitched within the media industry here in this paper, it portends much for the projection of the postcolonial condition of “the Indigenous realm” through tourism and related projective industries.

In all these aforesaid (three plus two) five instances, an attempt will be made to translate what is specifically learnt about this and that under the postcolonial imperatives and the neo-colonial impulses being covered to the overall concern for tourism and Tourism Studies. This will be carried out via the provision of five *RUMINATIONS FOR TOURISM/TOURISM STUDIES* reflections as provided within the body of the manuscript.

The word *RUMINATIONS* has been purposely adopted here because Deleuze had a distinct distaste for what was commonly regarded as the proper and established institutional / disciplinary “knowledge” of en groupe specific bodies and associations: what he supported instead was the continued live thinking about all of the supposed “things” / all the supposed “issues” / all the supposed “subjects” that such institutions and disciplines peddled (May^[5]). What mattered to him was ongoing alert / vital / viable cogitation, contemplation, and pensiveness about the events and encounters of the world, hence the choice of the word *RUMINATIONS*, here. In a nutshell, to Deleuze, held “knowledges” all too frequently become dogmatic entities themselves, and in that state of obstinate over-certainty they can quickly stifle subsequent reasoning: what has to be cultivated within each body or association is the ongoing practice of deep and assiduous / rich and responsive “thought”.

2. New Vistas on the Ontology of “Identity”: Deleuze and Interrelationality

Let attention now be turned to the first of the aforementioned three start-up vistas over postcolonialism/neo-colonialism. At this early stage in the exposition of the reasoning uncovered in this paper, it is thus useful to dwell a little further on some platform Deleuzian insights on matters of “identity” for people today. Indeed Deleuze himself works to an ontology of and about life that does *not* indeed privilege identity, per se. To him, what really counts is not only the difference between people and the difference between things, it is pointedly the never-fully-fixed/never-completely-sure difference between people/people and (in like fashion) the difference between things/things that matters. To him, advancing ideas as first put forward by his co-researcher the psychotherapist Guattari (see Dosse^[6]), identities are too readily deemed in almost

all (in veritably all?) fields to be set and secure codes of understanding that are articulated within rather concrete and structured forms of stratification and bureaucratization. To him, identities tend to be overdetermined ascriptions of being. They tend to be accepted axiomatically by routine-loving institutions: they tend to be propelled within interest group doxa without sufficient forethought. In these regards, they are *molar* in the sense of the tangible, the specific, and the calcified, but (to repeat the point) they are inclined all-too-frequently to be overdetermined. To Deleuze, understandings of identity ought to be held in a more hesitant fashion in order to account for what is increasingly (these days) the disjunctive features of both our emergent “ascriptions of identity” and our unfolding “associations of being”. In this regard, interpretations of identity and being ought to tune into the flow of contemporary life with all of its starts and stops, its accelerated influences, and its failed as well as its hailed intricacies within the era after the summit of colonialism. To Deleuze, master-signifying “identities” are rather troublesome understandings to invest in therefore, and attractions of difference ought to be thereby deemed to be *molecular* (thus related to influences of flow and flux) rather than “molar” (and thus be heavily and concretely structured).

Following Deleuze, this manuscript is predicated upon the view that primacy should be given not to “identity” per se, then, but rather to the interpretation of influences of or acts of “becoming”, that is, to matters of association and aspiration that are continually being created and thus never reaching a or any state of completeness. Hence to Deleuze, matters of becoming are always *in process*, and social scientists thereby need new vistas for registering how people actually belong, where, and to and with whom, when. In this Nietzschean regard, such Deleuzian vistas compose not only new ways of seeing life and the world, but new ways of thinking about life and the world, and thereby importantly help discover and invent *new possibilities of life* (Deleuze^[7]), especially under the new connectivities of postcolonial/neo-colonial existence.

Such new vistas of and for thinking consonantly tend to refuse fixity, and are *rhizomatic* in that they seek to register the associations and connections that “people” have, that “things” have, and that even “ideas” have, which crop up randomly and uncertainly, but which have no readily-traceable origin cum beginning and no readily-predictable goal cum endpoint. Rhizomatic understandings built upon changeable molecular frames of reference thus tend to admit multiple connections of belonging from a variety of Deleuzian perspectives of becoming (May^[8]). And while it is difficult and somewhat

unwise to try and develop comprehensive understanding about these nuanced matters of “difference” under the vicissitudes of life after the suzerainty of colonialism, it is healthy and productive to cultivate richer and deeper thought about them per medium of increasingly-relevant (but again, never absolute nor complete) *palpation* about them. Under Deleuzian thoughtlines, it is “palpation” rather than dogmatic comprehension we require where our efforts to understand any matter of being or becoming inevitably touches upon that which cannot be directly perceived nor promptly discerned. Palpation is thus the serious effort to gradually gain suspected or subtle insight into angles or aspects of difference which might have eluded the theoretical grasp of our existing registers of knowing (May ^[9]).

Hence, these Deleuzian interpretations of identity - or rather, these insights into our changeable molecular ties of “belonging” and “becoming” - are both Guattarian and Nietzschean in spirit. But they also Spinozean in character is that they seek to account for the ways in which the differences between people (and the differences between things, and the differences between ideas) importantly “fold”, “unfold”, and “refold”. Thus, such differences may then be seen to be “substantive” in the Spinozean sense where substance is not that which is fixed/concrete/transcendent in the normal meaning of the term but that which is labile/expressive/immanent (see the Deleuzian and Spinozean concept of “immanence” in Deleuze ^[10]). Consonantly, the Deleuzian ascription of difference composes an ontology that celebrates not only *the real* (i.e., what loosely could be termed “the really-real”) it also celebrates *the possible* (i.e., what loosely could be termed “the possibly-real”). Put another way, the real is *the actual* to Deleuze, and the possible is *the virtual* to him where it exists in terms of its potential effects. Hence, while the virtual is not actual (or it would be “actual”), it can itself be actualised in order to changeably fold, unfold or refold via its molecular connectivities into something (or into somethings) expressive and immanent.

To recap, Deleuze’s commitment was to the teeming immanence of folded/unfolded/refolded “changing things” in opposition to orthodox views on the elemental substance and secure transcendence of “constant things” (Deleuze ^[11]). To him what counts is not so much the known factuality of heralded subjects and objects but the fresh/fecund/fertile *possibility* of new and unheralded relations between fluid and fluctuating forces whatever they are rhizomatically, wherever they have come from rhizomatically, and wherever they are folding towards rhizomatically. Thus Deleuze may be interpreted as an observer of inconstancy, an imaginative thinker about

oscillation. He is a philosopher of the shifts and swings of not mere “relationality” perhaps (for that might take us back too strongly towards substance and transcendence), but to the hesitating and vacillating *interrelationality* of the dynamic rhizomatic forces in and of life between “people”, “things”, and “ideas”. His interest is not so much in stable entities but in the rich potency of life and of the momentum that might occur consequent to a particular (but not so predictable) “event” or molecular “confluence” at any moment. And so, to Deleuze, the postcolonial period is no singular age divorced from colonialism or from a or any much later era of “after-colonialism”. To him, it is something of a flaccid and scarcely discernable rhizomatic “event” that is interrelational both with that supposed past and that supposed future. Such is Deleuzian temporality, where he prefers to see time not as something linear and predictable, but something rhizomatic: and he labels this version of dynamic time as “duration”.

2.1 Rumination upon Tourism: Deleuzian Ontologies of / about the Responsive / Creative (Generative) Agency of Tourism

And so, under the vicissitudes of postcolonialism/neo-colonialism, how connective is a found or encountered population with other populations, how multidirectional is its culture/its spirituality/its environmental-awareness with those of other populations? And so, in the past-impressed-present and in the future-incited-present, what role does or can tourism play in either promoting richer interrelationality between populations, or in otherwise enabling an inflow of fresh and empowering imagination as to how life might indeed be lived “there”? Such is Deleuzian ontology: an ontology of and about the process of continual creation - an interpretation of “how might life [connectively] go” and “how one might [fruitfully] live” (May ^[12]). It is thus an important role for those who work in tourism to reveal/to present/to project the different durations of different peoples, and under the strengthening posthumanist impulses of “today”, the durations of particular landscapes/particular ideas. While Aldo Leopold ^[13] might famously have wanted us to learn to “think like a mountain” in order to gauge our connective place in the world, Deleuze appears to want us to know where a mountain may be rhizomatically journeying to and in molecular association with whom and what.

3. Background: The Discourse of Colonialism and Its Aftermath

So far in this manuscript, Deleuzian understandings have

been introduced about the discursive articulations of belonging and becoming which are gaining ascendancy in the social sciences/humanities over older orthodoxies of identity and being. Having thereby accounted (per medium of Deleuze) for the states of nomadic flux that characterises so much emergent subjectivity today, it is now helpful to specifically inspect what tends to be hailed with the postcolonial/neo-colonial (or “after-colonialism”) discourses of our moment. This endeavour will be approached by means of the provision of:

(1) a short depiction of some of the principal issues involved in postcolonial attempts to escape from the infections of colonialism, duly catalysed by the work Gandhi^[14], and,

(2) a short distillation of some of the principal fresh (?) and liberated (?) futures which are seemingly on the horizon for so called “postcolonial populations”, duly catalysed by the work of Venn^[15].

3.1 The Discourse of Postcolonialism: Gandhi and the Colonial Aftermath

To Gandhi^[16], postcolonialism is something of a transitional and transitory moment in which groups/communities and organisations/states seek to escape the universalising geography of empire and the representational violence of colonial discourse. Under colonialism, a contiguity had seemingly existed between Western forms of knowledge and colonial power, and if a brief reification is permitted, *colonialism expected everything to come from itself* (Gandhi^[17]). To her, under the new rhetorics of futurity of postcolonialism, attempts are made here and there across the world nowadays to engage in many new sorts of negotiation as the values of the non-West are more pointedly addressed and new-old and new-new knowledge systems and counter-narratives of the colonised are correctively or remedially encouraged. The suzerainty of (largely) Western hierarchies of understanding are under ongoing challenge.

To Gandhi^[18], then, postcolonialism is an era where bodies and institutions of many sorts have to allow for more complex understandings about being and seeing as the touchy politics of “knowing the other” is increasingly turned to. Under postcolonialism, the positional superiority of Western consciousness is growingly challenged via new-old and new-new imaginative anxieties, and as various attempts are made across the continents to imagine particular counter-textualities to the sorts of eurocentrisms experienced under colonialism. But postcolonialism is proving-to-be a difficult psychic and discursive time according to Gandhi, for supposedly enfranchised groups and communities find it impossible to return to what could

have been their pre-colonial contours and conditions, and ruling bodies within supposedly liberated states face all kinds of turmoil to legitimate reclaimed or unraveled fictions of nationhood or recaptured visions of tribalhood / peoplehood.

Generally, Gandhi considers that postcolonialism is ostensibly a celebrated moment of “arrival” for many populations who profess or exhibit a postcolonial amnesia and a strong desire to escape from “their” colonial past and largely denounce “European” myths of progress and humanism as they recover “their” own sense of being. But Gandhi judges that the sought therapeutic retrieval of old customary ways and the new-state self-invention of a historically informed en groupe identity are both very difficult things to secure, and most postcolonial settings are typified by the confusing noise of an often unpleasant babel of loudly contending voices (Gandhi^[19]). In this regards, the so called postcolonial period may readily be interpreted by many as just “a disappointing colonial aftermath” in which many ties of “unfreedom” persist, in which much “dreadful secondariness” (after Said^[20]) is still experienced, and in which many residual traces of neo-colonial subordination indeed endure. Thus, to Gandhi, the so called postcolonial era proves to a continued time of stress for many supposedly disenthralled peoples, who cannot fast escape the perverse mutualities of colonialism, nor the spectrum of many kinds of ambivalent relationships with former colonising countries and organisations. And all too commonly, in her view, some of the emergent national “governing classes” who hold new power in postcolonial states are seen to act as self-interested and hardline “associated sector” elites who decidedly favour their own economic and material *sectional advancement* with dubious regard to the concerns and benefits of those overall peoples whom they come to govern.

In Gandhi’s assessment, considerable debate exists around the world as to whether, after-colonialism, colonised territories can readily effectively restyle themselves as postcolonial nation states, and indeed whether such “national” effort is even desirable. Here and there across the world, dispersed and dislocated populations still exist (after many of the ties of colonialism have fragmented). But these peoples/these subjects resist ready enclosure within the ideological apparatuses that colonialism has bequeathed/is bequeathing to the world. To Gandhi, the inspirations and the impairments of nationalism and of nation-ness are Western-cum-European hand-me-downs, yet many supposedly liberated populations (after-colonialism) adopt a mimetic articulation towards such erstwhile European concepts of civility and

the reputedly anti-colonial character of group and communal belonging often slides or stutters into fanatical but equivocal versions of the disliked/detested European-style *nationalist* legacy. To Gandhi ^[21], then - following Fanon ^[22] - there is not only “an imaginative lethargy” within the sterile conformities of so many of these new “national” governments, there is also (drawing from Soyinka ^[23]) a similar academic shortfall of conceptuality across the social sciences in characterising the new state assemblages of our time.

3.2 Rumination upon Tourism: Ghandhian Ontologies of / about the Continued Eurocentric Dogmatisms of Tourism

To Gandhi ^[24], then, the overriding danger is that theory about postcolonialism has too comfortably arisen within Western formulations of culture and being. Like Ashcroft et al. ^[25], she recognises that all postcolonial projections and inscriptions are unavoidably complex: they are ineluctably hybridised. In tourism - following her entreaties - we just therefore need much more sustained rigorous reflection upon these situationally-idiosyncratic transmogrified aspirations and transmuted affinities which tourism bodies and organisations necessarily have to project, propel, and perform in everyday but cumulative fashion. In her vision, such is the current state of the half-visible dynamics of our contemporary ruptured processes of becoming. And in all of this, how eurocentric is the tourism industry today? Is it still a field replete with “powerful professional ethnocentrics” who tend to be blind to (and rather uninterested in) the deeper cultural warrants of other/distant/remote populations, as Hollinshead ^[26-29] has so often claimed?

3.3 The Discourse of Postcolonialism: Venn and Compossible Action

Venn ^[30] is another social scientist who has reflected generally upon the vicissitudes of the so called aftermath of colonialism. Gandhi had drawn out salient connections between understandings about postcolonialism and intellectual debates about poststructuralism, postmodernism, Marxism and feminism, and had covered the subject by substantive reference to lead thinkers such as Said, Spivak, Bhabha and Fanon (Gandhi ^[31]). In contrast, Venn was inclined to search for *liberated forms of collaborative thinking and action* that may-have-evolved/may-be-evolving under the postcolonialism. Like Gandhi, Venn has welcomed the attention given at the start of the twenty-first century to concerns of “identity” as an object of conceptual consideration, and as a site of new grounds for

imagining within and via fresh non-eurocentric forms of enlightenment. In examining the dissonances / reconfigurations / limitations / usurpations of postcolonialism, Venn has sought to craft a deep and critical “postcolonality” which potently theorises about the role and function of the self, and which inspects the late performativities of post-colonialism.

In probing the changing knowledge hegemonies of and under postcolonialism, Venn’s theorisations explore the governmentalities that string-pull local and international action nowadays after the ontological, epistemological, and ethical violences of Western-cum-European structures and values have conceivably or expectantly begun to be slowly dismantled *after-colonialism* (although he too does not use this specific term). In probing the degree to which the iron-cage of received north-atlantic / eurocentric mindsets still hang over so called postcolonial settings today, Venn ^[32] addresses the extent to which that closed colonial thinking eliminated/is-still-denying *alternative ways of life* under the aftermath of colonialism. He searches for postcolonial scenarios where the presence or the shadow of the national, unitary, solipsistic subject still lingers “there” in the found place. He compares such scenarios to those other sites and settings where both the old legitimations of *precolonial* being and the entrant legitimations of *colonial-being* have crumbled, and thereby where there conceivably is today a relative absence of ruling “traditionality”.

In all of this distillation of the changing ways of being and belonging, Venn’s distinct contribution to knowledge about the aftermath of colonialism and for postcolonialism revolves around issues of *coarticulated development*. In condemning the failure of theorists of culture and identity to generally appreciate the potential for both the co-articulated material development of things *and* the coarticulated projected communication for things, Venn suggests that Western / eurocentric thinking in the academy still submits itself almost ubiquitously to the protracted paramountcy of positivism. He bemoans the commonplace attention accorded to the distinct/separate/singular entity with its own supposed agency or influence. Hence, Venn is substantively alert to the logic of the new economical orders that might appear in postcolonial/decolonised settings where fresh interlocking networks of the economy with different dynamisms of “the social”, “the cultural”, “the political”, et cetera, might interactively arise (Venn ^[33]). In evaluating such new intersubjective reticulations of action and/or communication, Venn celebrates not just the under-realised possibilities of intertwinement but the veritable *compossibilities* of such strategic meshwork. To Venn, those on the ground who recognise the value and

even the necessity of such compossible activity tend to invest consciously and interactively in substantively-embodied “relations” and in hopefully mutually-rewarding “experiences” with important other bodies/interest groups/populations (Venn^[34]). And thus, to him, *scheming through compossibility* is a set of deliberate actions that are predicated for such bodies upon a diagrammatic representation of possible future worlds duly translated into and via the cultivation of manifest-to-latent strategic “relationships”.

3.4 Rumination upon tourism: Vennian Ontologies of / about the Regular Failure in and through Tourism of Industry-leaders to Recognise the Alternative and the Compossible Visions of so Called “other” People and their Cherished Places

Although, Venn scarcely mentions the word “tourism” in his critique, his insights on the under-recognised potential of compossible action are very tall for the industry and field. To some degree, tourism is a misrecognised domain, a field that is too frequently over-labelled by many outside observers as just an inconsequential realm of travel and leisure. Interest groups and institutions in tourism can fruitfully deploy Venn’s encouragement towards “alternative possible futures” and towards “compossible multiplicative relationships” to link the tourisms they cover in more deliberately and concertedly with other industries and with other registers of being and becoming. Tourism can play fresh and large roles in the emplotment of new storylines of aspiration and becoming, and in new Vennian configurations, deconfigurations, and reconfigurations of identificatory being or Deleuzian trajectories of becoming. One could readily argue that there are too many veils of ignorance about what is achievable through the development of tourism opportunities and through the related broadcast of corrective narratives of unexercised storylines. Just as in the arts, in film, in television, and in the media, tourism can invoke that which is locally fresh, that which is locally untapped or inactive, and that which is locally abeyance or unconsumed.

Thus, in worldmaking terms (after Hollinshead^[35,36] and Hollinshead and Suleman^[37]), tourism potentially constitutes what (Venn^[38]) might call as an immense metaphoric site of “presentation”, a site or space where the already-oriented eye of potential inbound travellers and existing locals/residents can be strategically or tactically “reoriented”. It thus has a sizeable “alternative possible futures” productive role in meaning-making and in legitimising old-old/new-old narratives. And it has powerful and responsible capacities to inscribe and project new

sorts of understanding about that which has been othered under colonialism, and/or which is still-othered under its aftermath. And, in the domain of Tourism Studies, Bertella, Fumagalli, and Williams-Grey^[39] have indeed got this message. See their recent article in Tourism Recreation Research on such target reciprocities where wild animals are envisioned as “co-creators” in wildlife tourism. This set of authors do not seem to have read Venn ipso facto, though, having taken their own stimulus on collaborative action and compossible “development” from Ind and Coates^[40], instead.

4. Matters of Voice: Emergent Indigenous Intellectuals Speak Across Australia

Having provided foundational coverage of paramount “colonial” and “neo-colonial” / “postcolonial” outlooks on matters of identity and being/becoming today, it is now useful to concentrate more certainly upon substantive issues of decolonisation and after-colonisation as they are experienced in a particular place. For this purpose, attention will now be turned to the nation cum continent of Australia and to Grossman’s^[41] edited text *Blacklines: Contemporary Critical Writing by Indigenous Australians* ... hereafter called *Blacklines*. In this sixteen chapter Melbourne University work, Grossman attempts to assemble for the first time a pool of leading Indigenous intellectuals - that is, a virtual cohort of well-respected Aboriginal thinkers who are highly-saluted internally within Aboriginal communities and institutions across Australia - in order to capture their present-day views on Indigenous concerns of history, identity, and representation. The Grossman collation is consonantly an attempt to corral what a number of Indigenous intellectuals say about the culture and knowledge of Aboriginal populations across Australia per both national and global outlooks. As its coordinating editor (Michele Grossman, herself) suggests, the very width of it presents a critical mass of Indigenous voices that mark a definitive or otherwise significant moment of “production” for Indigenous people (♦ Grossman^[42]). [*Nota Bene*: Chapters from the individual contributors to the *Blacklines* collection, itself, are hereafter marked as ♦ within this manuscript here in the *Journal of Geographical Research*.]

The *Blacklines* text, itself, makes no claims to be fully representative of the perspectives of all Indigenous people in Australia. It does, however, comprise a collective work of sapient Indigenous commentators who have been selected *domestically* to help non-Indigenous Australians (and to help non-Indigenous outsiders in-

ternationally) recognise many of the ways in which the Indigenous peoples of Australia have been misperceived and misrepresented over the last two centuries or more. They were also selected to help stimulate the restoration of Indigenous agency in effective declarations of seeing and being. The publication is a large collective testimony to the kaleidoscope of contemporary “postcolonial” responses of and amongst intellectual Indigenous “Australians”. As ♦ Sonja Kurtzer^[43] points out, it has generally been the colonial oppressor who has even defined *Aboriginality*, itself, and the bodyweight of hegemonic views that tend to name it under these succeeding years of protracted-colonial power and neo-colonial impulse continue to largely encapsulate the fears and desires of such “outside oppressors” rather than of “Aboriginal” peoples, themselves.

The sixteen chapters of *Blacklines* were not specifically commissioned up-front to comprise a or any fresh volume (but they rather compose a pool of Indigenous essays each of which had already appeared in a specialist journal or other, elsewhere). They are envisioned by ♦ Philip Morrissey^[44], however - in his “Afterword” to the book - as providing something of a unity in terms of cardinal “hypostases of difference, distinction, and disagreement” as they sing-the-place of Indigenous “Australians” today, and as they thereby shake the firmament of fixed extrinsic representations of and about Indigeneity. But how that term “*nation-status bestowing*” term “Australian” is a difficult (and inherently “political”) word to deploy vis-à-vis the concerns of the primal populations of the dry continent!

Thus, one may perceive the Grossman text as a finely interweaved collection that critically voices up/voices out Indigenous worldviews today vis-a-vis issues of identity, history, and knowledge. Any non-Indigenous individual or non-Indigenous institution that wishes to know what contemporary Indigenous intellectuals think about such concerns of inheritance and aspiration should note that the Indigenous intellectuals who contribute to *Blacklines* tend to argue that:

(1) Aboriginality, itself, is no firm and totally stabilised entity;

(2) hegemonic “Western” textual representations are still inclined to define (in mainstream society) what is taken to be *authentically Aboriginal*;

(3) considerable care needs to be taken in terms of who can speak when and where on Indigenous matters;

(4) there is never any single “Aboriginal view” on any subject;

(5) the right to creatively de- or re-project Aboriginal being or becoming must be self-defined;

(6) the emergent conventions of art production - a very important sphere of spiritual and associative activity for Indigenous Australians - are much more flexuous and pliant than most non-Indigenous people would currently imagine;

(7) many strong external misrepresentations of Aboriginality today were not just monumental in the past, but actually remain “towering misapprehensions” today;

(8) many strong *external* projections of Aboriginality today remain fixated only upon what is perceived to be “strange and alien” to such outside observers yet also “enchancing and tantalizing” to them: they do not so much attend upon what is “ordinary” to them or what is similar to the life of such mainstream non-Aboriginal persons;

(9) many of the genuine and veritable Indigenous ways of seeing and celebrating the world remain some distance beyond the received scope and current discernment of so many influential non-Indigenous individuals and institutions; and that

(10) Aboriginality, itself, is not (to Indigenous “Australians”) restrictively and exhaustively a matter of *physical* heredity nor impeccable *ancestral* consanguinity.

Such is what ♦ Philip Morrissey^[45] considers to be the interweaved critical grasp cum collective sense of the *Blacklines* compilation. The Grossman text is a work which shows how non-Indigenous observers who deal with Indigenous groups and communities will face on-going difficulties if they do not come to terms with the acute contextualities by and through which Aboriginal populations and organisations proclaim themselves. He notes that they might sometimes wish to speak via a “One Mob/One Voice/One Land” singular perspective (as is for instance conveyed via the embrace-all logo of the national Aboriginal newspaper *Land Rights News* (see Central Land Council,^[46]). But he immediately reminds that (at other times), they might wish to fashion in new *highly-particular* en groupe “communal” fragmented ways and *highly-differential* fragmented means the received but variegated Aboriginal songlines and inheritances (♦ Lin Onus^[47]) where there is evidentially no such felt “absolute cosmological unity” across the nation (i.e., across *Indigenous humanity* over the continent).

All told, the fifteen Indigenous intellectuals who were brought virtually together in *Blacklines* provide a litany of compelling arguments around the historical and contemporary concerns facing Indigenous Australians today. As ♦ Michael Dodson^[48] neatly summarises it for this supposedly postcolonial moment, Aboriginal people seek to engage in “the repossession of our past [and thereby indulge in] the repossession of ourselves”. The contributions to *Blacklines* thereby are advocations of steady

transition built upon informed but exhilarative notions of tradition. As ♦ Michael Dodson [49, emphasis added] usefully states it: “Our peoples [in the past] have left us deep roots of survival, *but not of constriction*. They are the roots from which all growth is possible.” Accordingly, none of the *Blacklines* contributors appears to be close-minded sustainers of hardline cultural or adamant cosmological insularity. Indeed ♦ Hetti Perkins bemoans the fact that - in her view, especially within art - non-Indigenous observers all-too-regularly fail to appreciate the interactivity which Aboriginal people actually seek to have with others (i.e., with non-Aboriginal people). She cites Stratton’s^[50] view of “the ethnocidal tendencies of colonialist capitalism [which inherently appears to seek] the destruction of Indigenous cultures through Western impact [as it] excludes ... the recognition of [Indigenous] culture as dynamic and [of] the transformation of cultures through [collaborative] *interaction*” (Perkins [51, emphasis added]).

In significant ways, then, the conglomerate contributors to *Blacklines* here and there echo some of the ideas about postcolonial / neocolonial discourse that have already been raised in this manuscript in the *Journal of Geographical Research*. When ♦ Philip Morrissey^[52] queries whether the knowledge of settler populations and Indigenous People can harmoniously and proactively ever anywhere inhabit the same fields at study or consiliently and fruitfully grace the same arenas of activity together, one is reminded of the accent that Deleuze puts on “events” which rhizomatically mesh together different ideas/different forces/different people. One is reminded of the Deleuzian uncovering of scenarios where what might have previously seemed to be quite dissimilar ontologies can actually entangle to generate new forms of admixed being-in-the-making (i.e., new “becomings”) and new possibilities for experiencing life. And to Deleuze, these new beings-in-the-making might flourish upon not only different but unanticipated plateaus of sensation (see Deleuze and Guattari^[53]), here, on the infinite plateaus of our time, and indeed of any time). Thus, Philip Morrissey could be deemed to be rather Deleuzian in his call for richer dialogue by Aboriginal people with “others” (i.e., with non-Aboriginal people) and thereby through such not always predictable fresh events of folded/refolded engagement.

When ♦ Marcia Langton^[54] laments the fact that so many non-Indigenous people who come into contact with “Aboriginal affairs” find it difficult to deal with Aboriginal people (generally finding the communications to be just too hard, confusing, on disorientating), one is reminded of Gandhi’s^[55] search for “postcolonial” mod-

els for living. Gandhi’s quest was for cominglings which empower different peoples to flourish alongside each other more respectfully where they might indeed have had the opportunity to get to “know” respective cultural difference rather more deferentially. In ♦ Marcia Langton’s [56, emphasis added] view “the central problem [under this so called postcolonial age] is the failure of non-Aboriginals to comprehend us Aboriginal people, or to find the grounds for a [mutual] understanding. Each policy - [for instance, policies of] protection, assimilation, integration, self- management, self-determination, and perhaps reconciliation - can be [such kneejerk] *ways of avoiding understanding*.” And this reverberates with Gandhi’s^[57] call for postnational readings of the colonial encounter which privilege “the global amalgam of cultures”. It tallies with those interpretations which positively celebrate “the mutual contagion and subtle intimacies between coloniser and colonised” rather than continually cultivating imposed bureaucratic regimes/patriarchal policies which force “the colonised world” of suppressed populations to perpetually submit to forms of cultural transformation and to the broad momentum of *nationalist* (i.e., oh dear, that troublesome “nation-making” word, again!!) governance.

Rumination upon Tourism: Indigenous Ontologies of / about the Received Traditional Inheritances and the Experienced Transitional Experiences - as Faithfully / Potentially Captured (or not) through the Projections of Tourism

*And tourism will clearly be imbricated in and across all of these sensibilities over the other and the hyphen regarding Indigenous “Australia” (see Huggan^[58] on tourism and hyphenated “being”, today). In such zones of precious and life-sustaining sensibility, the inscriptive/projective agency of tourism is an important powerful tool, and one which clearly needs considerable creative thought-processing behind its deployment. Given the identifiatory vicissitudes underlined in *Blacklines*, those who work in a vivid representational field like tourism (Salazar^[59]) must be ever-vigilant to not only assimilative and exploitative traditions of the industry, but to those of research institutions too. What the collective commentators of the *Grossman enchiridion* (or *chrestomathy*) on decolonisation implicitly instructs those in *tourism/Tourism Studies* - who wade into the wildlands and the murky waters of global-postcolonial identification - is that each and every industry (like tourism) and each and every research domain (like *Tourism Studies*) can never be a neutral force for unmediated knowing. The pool of Indigenous commentators in *Blacklines**

collectively suggests that currently such industries fast-function as potent handmaidens of mainstream knowledge and/or heavily-commodified ideation.

Tourism has its structures, its codes, its heritages, its industrial predilections, and its research-fold disruptions, and all of them are loaded with the potentials for mis-identification and misrepresentation (Kishenblatt-Gimblett^[60]; Hollinshead^[61]; McKay^[62]; Hollinshead and Suleman^[63]). But tourism and Tourism Studies also stand as a mighty vehicle (or as mighty vehicles, plural) for the articulation of new and unthought Vennian possibilities for previously-colonised/still-colonised peoples and their revered places and spaces. In reading what the Blacklines commentators say about the meditative role of industries and services in the connective or emergent declaration of populations and their honoured territories, one may judge that tourism indeed has a crucial role to play in the representational mediations and the de-mediations of the twenty-first century. As the sixteen Indigenous contributions to Grossman make clear, no one can ever map out a step-by-step process to guide these society-declaring/society-destroying dialectical relations, but they will conceivably be representationally-pivotal as they will be for other inscriptive or enunciatory industries (refer, here, to Fine, Tuck, and Zeller-Berkman^[64] on the power of “awakening” via dialectical others).

5. Caveat: Indigeneity and the Complex Processes of Becoming

In recent years, Hollinshead has defined compossibility for the field of Tourism Studies and related subjects in a number of workshop presentations across the continents for The International Critical Tourism Studies “Network”, but not too many researchers nor practitioners have yet run far with the concept. Perhaps the nearest other co-creationist which the domain of Tourism Studies has spawned (other than the aforementioned Bertella, Fumagalli, and Williams-Grey) comes with the special issue of the *Journal of Teaching in Travel and Tourism* in early 2019. In their editorial for this volume, Paddison, Hockert, and Crossley^[65] address the worldmaking function of tourism - refer to Hollinshead^[66-68] on “worldmaking”, ipso facto - and they pointedly call for enhanced co-creative activity in both Tourism “Studies” and Tourism “Practice”. While their focus is pitched within the relatively contained arena of “storytelling” in and through tourism, Paddison, Hockert, and Crossley do recognise the need for those involved in tourism to sincerely and strategically engage with “the experiences of [relevant/situational] others”. They acknowledge the

longterm gains which can accrue from co-creating “new alternative stories” with other interest groups, other sanctioning institutions, and other aroused populations. Leibniz - the late seventeenth century German advocate of and for compossibility - would clearly be pleased to note their recommended sallies into such complicitous action (even if, in their 2019 editorial, they offer no explicit references to “God” that his own philosophical orientation would have demanded!). And Deleuze would clearly be laudatory about their efforts to think beyond the bounds of the organisations/the ontologies/the over-stories which are resident within their own life and work purlieux (see Deleuze and Guattari^[69]). As Deleuze and Guattari^[70] state it - where Deleuze was himself an ardent interpreter of Leibniz’s compossibilist notion of the problem of “future contingency” - philosophy only begins “to think” and life can only really be amply “lived” once it (philosophy) and it (life) can each step away from received and ultra-orthodox images of mind, reason, and humanity.

In order to critique the operational practicalities of being seriously collaborative and manifestly compossible - and thereby render the subject contextually germane for this manuscript - attention will now be turned to Dibley and Turner’s^[71] inspection of the cultural production and consumption of “Indigeneity”. They focus upon the act of compossibility vis-a-vis *the everyday nationing of Australia*: see Rowe, Turner and Waterton^[72] for an explanation of “nationing” in terms of the banalities of nation-formation/nation-building/cultural nationalism, per se. One may regard the Dibley and Turner depiction of the travails of the National Indigenous Television Network as a Vennian attempt to secure *alternative possibilities and modernities* in the scripting and projection of Indigenous culture via partner agencies and other implicated bodies. But, as Dibley and Turner inherently reveal, such Vennian acts of compossibility (i.e., such Deleuzean acts of live and continued “responsive” thinking) are troublesome and prospectively contestable on the ground, within such mundane realworld settings. Dibley and Turner show how in the contemporary climate of schematised nationing across “postcolonial-Australia”, a satiety of interest-group imperatives and a plethora of commercial motives have to be negotiated. They maintain that this requirement for vigilance applies “even within the context of a publically-funded broadcasting organisation, [and] can frustrate and complicate what are self-evidently worthwhile initiatives [of collaborative action]” (see Rowe, Turner, and Waterton’s^[73] introduction to the work of Dibley and Turner on the projection of Indigeneity vis-à-vis the cultivation of *na-*

tionness). Thus the critique of Dibley and Turner shows how efforts to develop an Indigenous television network that is replete with a sufficiency of Indigenous content but which also reflects both Aboriginal and broad mainstream-Australian interests, is confronted by a host of operational challenges, some of which are generally edificial or architectural within-the-industry and others of which are particular-to-each-involved-institution.

Thus, in the development of the National Indigenous Television Network in Australia under the postcolonial moment, the positioning of the fledgling Indigenous Network in television is a complex cultural and political matter. The task of providing an identifiable service for Indigenous groups and communities rubs up against the coterminous task of fulfilling wider “nationing” responsibilities. Representational decisions over “inclusion” chafe against the accountabilities faced by the-particular-partner/other-bodies. The imperative to faithfully and consistently produce programmes which richly reflect the Indigenous inheritance (or inheritances) grates against the governing remit for all television companies to maintain high audience numbers across the whole nation (refer Dibley and Turner ^[74]).

5.1 Rumination upon Tourism: Emergent Deleuzian Ontologies of / about the Role of Tourism in Echoing Other Projective Industries in Making and Maintaining “Nations”, per se

Just as difficulties exist in the media industries between the local scale of the communication requirements of Indigenous populations and national/international policy-making scale in Australia, so problems have occurred between the smaller level interests of the cultural politics of Indigenous tourism and broader “nationing” interests. Drawing on Whitford and Ruhanen ^[75], Gibson notes that government policies continue to position cultural tourism as an instrument for sustaining Indigenous communities [across Australia and as] a panacea for socio-economic disadvantage in remote communities. Yet, they invariably rest on [mere] rhetoric rather than [concrete] substance - [that is, upon] policies that lack the rigour and depth to realise any legitimate moves towards achieving sustainable tourism development for Indigenous peoples. ^[76]

It seems that under our continuing postcolonial/neo-colonial moment, the tourism industry of Australia indeed mirrors the television and media industry with its commonplace breaches of service as it seeks to admix its regard for “due cultural care” with its “commercial nous” while endeavours to decently pitch and properly position what Altman ^[77] calls its hybrid economic institutions.

6. Summary: Negative Capability on and Around Postidentity

In this manuscript, no attempt has been made to provide any macro-theory on postcolonialism/neo-colonialism, nor any effort to yield any grand-theory on the representation of Indigeneity via tourism under the apparent moment of after-colonialism. In principally working via a Deleuzian ontology, the aim has *not* been to provide full and dangerously-dogmatic answers to who is doing what to whom during our conceivable postcolonial moment. It has rather been to unsettle some held commonplaces about the role and function of tourism as an industrial inscriptive force which is entrusted with the task of revealing this and that about (at the end of this paper) the projection of Indigenous “Australia” under the nomadic logic of “our time”. Hence, the Deleuzian ideas in this paper offer a view of both tourism⁷⁸ / “Tourism Studies” and of “Indigenous Australia” as living and fluid things which each fold, de-fold, and re-fold in increasingly unpredictable ways while being buffeted by other rhizomatic forces of many different sorts. This article has thereby not explicitly been an account of Aboriginal being as projected through tourism, it is more a flirtation with matters of *Aboriginal becoming* as Indigenous “Australians” dream forward (under their own agency/agencies) but also as they have much dreaming done for them under proxy by the powerbrokers of tourism. Thus, this manuscript (on both the generative thresholds of tourism and on the debilitating hindrances of tourism) is not so much a clean and clear designatory assessment of Indigenous identity today. It stands more as a nuanced Deleuzian text on the foggy lines of flight which may be commonly encountered in-our-time both within Indigenous “Australia” and through the governmentalities of tourism and its related inscriptive industries. Hence, the manuscript has its lacunae as one might expect as it traverses Gandhian uncertainties as to whether there is indeed any bona fide postcolonial age as such, and as it peregrinates round and about Vennian ideas on alternative (com)possible futures. It has thereby been a text on Deleuzian ambiguities and ambivalences rather than one on precise field or disciplinary pellucidity.

In these regards, this manuscript has been composed with what Keats (in yesteryear, when examining the expressive achievements of Shakespeare) called “Negative Capability” - a phenomenon borrowed by and succinctly explained by (Tim) Smith-Laing ^[78] in his own present-day critique of (Emma) Smith’s ^[79] recent text *This is Shakespeare*. According to Smith-Laing, Keats accorded the brilliance of Shakespeare to his (i.e., to the

dramatist from Stratford-on-Avon) subtle but perduring competency at communicating ideas to think by while still remaining content to deal in uncertainties, enigmas, and perplexities rather than in exact fact and fastidious reasoning. And how Deleuze would applaud such *negative capability*, whether it be within Shakespeare (himself), in Keats (his analyst from yesteryear) or in Smith (his scrutiniser today). Accordingly, then, this paper here in the *Journal of Geographical Research* on the generative thresholds of tourism, has not been adulterated by what (Emma) Smith^[80] might positively call (in her own domain of interest) its “[deliberate] gappiness” it has creatively empowered by that generative concaveness. In this Deleuzian light, in our so called era of after-colonialism, readers in Tourism Studies (and in related fields inspecting acts of projection and agencies of aspiration and belonging) should have much of relevance and provocation to chew and chomp on. One hopes that they can ruminate just where and when hard identities end and soft postidentities start, but they can simultaneously judge why such identities so often *necessarily* do so in ambiguously and ambivalently fashion.

References

- [1] Foucault, M. Governmentality. Ideology and Consciousness, 1979, 6: 5-21.
- [2] Dean, M. Critical and effective histories. London: Routledge, 1994.
- [3] Grossman, M. (Ed.). Blacklines. Melbourne: Melbourne University Press, 2005/A.
- [4] Graham, L.R. & Penny, H.G. (Eds.). Performing Indigeneity. Lincoln, Nebraska: Univ. of Nebraska Press, 2014.
- [5] May, T. Gilles Deleuze: An introduction. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008.
- [6] Dosse, F. Deleuze and structuralism. In D.W.Smith & H.Somers-Hall (Eds.), The Cambridge companion to Deleuze. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 2012: 126-150.
- [7] Deleuze, G. Nietzsche and philosophy (Trans. H.Tomlinson). New York: Columbia Univ. Press, 1983.
- [8] May, T. Gilles Deleuze: An introduction. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008.
- [9] May, T. Gilles Deleuze: An introduction. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008.
- [10] Deleuze, G. The logic of sense (Trans. M.Lester; ed.C.V.Boundas). New York: Columbia Univ. Press, 1990.
- [11] Deleuze, G. Expressionism in philosophy. (Trans. M.Joughin). New York: Zone Books, 1992.
- [12] May, T. Gilles Deleuze: An introduction. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008.
- [13] Leopold, A. A sand county almanac. Oxford. Oxford University Press, 1966.
- [14] Gandhi. L. Postcolonial theory. St. Leonards, Australia: Allen & Unwin, 1998.
- [15] Venn, C. The postcolonial challenge. London: Sage, 2006.
- [16] Gandhi. L. Postcolonial theory. St. Leonards, Australia: Allen & Unwin, 1998.
- [17] Gandhi. L. Postcolonial theory. St. Leonards, Australia: Allen & Unwin, 1998.
- [18] Gandhi. L. Postcolonial theory. St. Leonards, Australia: Allen & Unwin, 1998.
- [19] Gandhi. L. Postcolonial theory. St. Leonards, Australia: Allen & Unwin, 1998.
- [20] Said, E. Orientalism. London: Kegan Paul, 1978.
- [21] Gandhi. L. Postcolonial theory. St. Leonards, Australia: Allen & Unwin, 1998.
- [22] Fanon, F. The wretched of the earth (Trans. Constance Farrington). Harmondsworth, England: Penguin, 1990.
- [23] Soyinka, W. The open sore of a continent. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996.
- [24] Gandhi. L. Postcolonial theory. St. Leonards, Australia: Allen & Unwin, 1998.
- [25] Ashcroft, B., Griffiths, G., & Tiffin H. The empire writes back. London: Routledge, 1989.
- [26] Hollinshead, K. Encounters in tourism. In M.A.Khan, M.D.Olsen, & T.Var (Eds.), VNR's encyclopedia of hospitality and tourism. New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold, 1993|A: 636-651.
- [27] Hollinshead, K. Ethnocentrism in tourism. In M.A.Khan, M.D.Olsen, & T.Var (Eds.), VNR's Encyclopedia of hospitality and tourism. New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold. 652-662, 1993|B.
- [28] Hollinshead, K. Tourism and the restless peoples. Tourism Culture & Communication, 1998, 1(1): 49-77.
- [29] Hollinshead, K. Tourism and new sense. In C.M.Hall and H.Tucker (Eds.), Tourism and postcolonialism. London: Routledge, 2004: 25-42.
- [30] Venn, C. The postcolonial challenge. London: Sage, 2006.
- [31] Gandhi. L. Postcolonial theory. St. Leonards, Australia: Allen & Unwin, 1998.
- [32] Venn, C. The postcolonial challenge. London: Sage, 2006.
- [33] Venn, C. The postcolonial challenge. London: Sage, 2006.
- [34] Venn, C. The postcolonial challenge. London: Sage, 2006.

- [35] Hollinshead, K. Tourism and the social production of culture and place. *Tourism Analysis*, 2009/A, 13: 639-660.
- [36] Hollinshead, K. The “worldmaking” prodigy of tourism. *Tourism Analysis*, 2009/B, 14: 139-152.
- [37] Hollinshead, K., Suleman, R. The everyday installations of worldmaking. *Tourism Analysis*, 2018, 23: 201-213.
- [38] Venn, C. *The postcolonial challenge*. London: Sage, 2006.
- [39] Bertella, G., Fumagalli, M., Williams-Grey, V. *Wildlife tourism through the co-creation lens*. Tourism, Recreation Research, 2019.
DOI: 10: 1080/02508281.2019.1606977
- [40] Ind, N. and Coates, N. The meanings of co-creation. *European Business Review*, 2013, 25(1): 86-95.
- [41] Grossman, M. (Ed.), *Blacklines*. Melbourne: Melbourne University Press, 2005/A.
- [42] Grossman, M. After Aboriginalism: Power, knowledge, and Indigenous Australian critical writing. In M.Grossman (Ed.), *Blacklines*. Melbourne: Melbourne University Press, 2005/B: 1-16.
- [43] Kurtzer, S. Wandering girl. In M.Grossman (Ed.), *Blacklines*. Melbourne: Melbourne University Press, 2005: 181-189.
- [44] Morrissey, P. Moving, remembering, singing our place. In M.Grossman (Ed.), *Blacklines*. Melbourne: Melbourne University Press, 2005: 189-193.
- [45] Morrissey, P. Moving, remembering, singing our place. In M.Grossman (Ed.), *Blacklines*. Melbourne: Melbourne University Press, 2005: 189-193.
- [46] Central Land Council. *Land rights news*. Darwin, N.T.: Central Land Council, 1985.
- [47] Onus L. Language and lasers. In M.Grossman (Ed.), *Blacklines*. Melbourne: Melbourne University Press, 2005: 92-96.
- [48] Dodson, M. The end of the beginning. In M.Grossman (Ed.), *Blacklines*. Melbourne: Melbourne University Press, 2005: 25-42.
- [49] Dodson, M. The end of the beginning. In M.Grossman (Ed.), *Blacklines*. Melbourne: Melbourne University Press, 2005: 25-42.
- [50] Stratton, J. Painting the land. *Eyeline* [Special ARX Issue], 1993: 36-47.
- [51] Perkins, H. Seeing and seaming. In M.Grossman (Ed.), *Blacklines*. Melbourne: Melbourne University Press, 2005: 97-103.
- [52] Morrissey, P. Moving, remembering, singing our place. In M.Grossman (Ed.), *Blacklines*. Melbourne: Melbourne University Press, 2005: 189-193.
- [53] Deleuze, G., Guattari, F. A thousand plateaus. [Trans.: B.Massumi]. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1987.
- [54] Langton, M. Aboriginal art and film. In M.Grossman (Ed.), *Blacklines*. Melbourne: Melbourne University Press, 2005: 109-126.
- [55] Gandhi. L. *Postcolonial theory*. St. Leonards, Australia: Allen & Unwin, 1998.
- [56] Langton, M. Aboriginal art and film. In M.Grossman (Ed.), *Blacklines*. Melbourne: Melbourne University Press, 2005: 109-126.
- [57] Gandhi. L. *Postcolonial theory*. St. Leonards, Australia: Allen & Unwin, 1998.
- [58] Huggan, G. *The postcolonial exotic*. London: Routledge, 2001.
- [59] Salazar, N.B. *Envisioning eden*. New York: Berghahn, 2010.
- [60] Kirshenblatt-Gimblett, B. *Destination culture*. Berkeley, Ca.: University of California Press, 1998.
- [61] Hollinshead, K. The underconceptualisation of tourism studies. In I.Ateljevic, N.Morgan, and A.Pritchard (Eds.), *The critical turn in tourism studies*. London: Routledge, 2012: 55-72.
- [62] McKay, I. *Quest of the folk*. Montreal: McGill-Queen’s University Press, 2014.
- [63] Hollinshead, K., Suleman, R. Time for fluid acumen. *Tourism, Culture, and Communication*, 2017, 17(1): 61-74.
- [64] Fine, M., Tuck, E., Zeller-Berkman, S. Do you believe in Geneva? In N.K.Denzin, Y.S.Lincoln, & L.T.Smith (Eds.), *Handbook of critical and Indigenous methodologies*. Los Angeles: Sage, 2008: 157-180.
- [65] Paddison, B., Hockert, E., Crossley, E. Building our studies. [Editorial.] *Journal of Teaching in Travel and Tourism*, 2019.
- [66] Hollinshead, K. Tourism and new sense. In C.M.Hall and H.Tucker (Eds.), *Tourism and postcolonialism*. London: Routledge, 2004: 25-42.
- [67] Hollinshead, K. Tourism and the social production of culture and place. *Tourism Analysis*, 2009/A, 13: 639-660.
- [68] Hollinshead, K. The worldmaking prodigy of tourism. *Tourism Analysis*, 2009/B, 14: 139-152.
- [69] Deleuze, G., Guattari, F. *Anti-oedipus: Capitalism and schizophrenia* (Trans. R.Hurley, et al.). Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1983.
- [70] Deleuze, G., Guattari, F. *What is philosophy?* (Trans. H.Tomlinson and G.Burchell) New York: Columbia University Press, 1994.
- [71] Dibley, B. & Turner, G. Indigeneity, cosmopolitanism, and the nation. In D.Rowe, G.Turner & E.Watterton (Eds.), *Making culture*. London: Routledge,

- 2018: 129-139.
- [72] Rowe, D., Turner, G., Waterton, E. Introduction. In D.Rowe, G.Turner, & E.Waterton (Eds.), *Making culture*. London: Routledge, 2018: 1-12.
- [73] Rowe, D., Turner, G., Waterton, E. Introduction. In D.Rowe, G.Turner, & E.Waterton (Eds.), *Making culture*. London: Routledge, 2018, 1-12.
- [74] Dibley, B., Turner, G. Indigeneity, cosmopolitanism, and the nation. In D.Rowe, G.Turner & E.Waterton (Eds.), *Making culture*. London: Routledge, 2018: 129-139.
- [75] Whitford, M.M., Ruhanen, L.M. Australian Indigenous tourism policy. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 2010, 18: 475-496.
- [76] Gibson, C. Touring nation. In D.Rowe, G.Turner, & E.Waterton (Eds.), *Making culture*. London: Routledge, 2018: 129-139.
- [77] Altman, J. Brokering Aboriginal art. Kenneth Myer lecture. Deakin University, Australia, 2005.
- [78] Smith-Laing, T. Mysteries, doubts, without any irritable readings after the fact. [Review of E.Smith's "This is Shakespeare"]. *Daily Telegraph. Sat.*, 2019, 24.
- [79] Smith, E. *This is Shakespeare*. London: Pelican, 2019.
- [80] Smith, E. *This is Shakespeare*. London: Pelican, 2019.