Cultural tourism has situated as a fertile ground not only for researchers, giving the high degree of mobilities that today connects countries in few days, but also for policy-makers who have found in this segment a rich resource to exploit. Those communities which have been historically relegated from the formal economy, as aborigines and peasants, alleviate their situations appealing to their heritage. A much profound discussion surfaced over the last decades respecting to the role of authenticity in such a process. Tourism allows the encounter of multi-cultural hosts and guests in an ever-mobile world.

Contextually, professors Greg Richard and Xerardo Pereiro presents their book Cultural Tourism, negotiating identities, which was published in 2007. We strongly believe that book review not only should be updated no matter than the book age, but also should provide a constructive criticism that escapes to advertisement and promotion. It is unfortunate, top-tier tourism journals only published reviews of recent book, no older than 2 years, in a very limited way; some of them accept summarized versions of book review in no larger than 1.000 words. Needless to say this is not our goal, when reviewing Cultural Tourism, Negotiating Identities.

The structure of the book can be divided in four volumes, each one formed by chapters authored by a great variety of scholars, coming from different countries, cultures and contexts. Because of time and space, we are unable to address all the chapters with the necessary detail. However, all them share their concern for the vital role played by identity and culture to conform the attractiveness of tourist destinations is widely examined by the first section, which is part of the experience produced by tourism industry. By consuming tourism, a great varies of identities, contexts and politics are negotiated. These chapters will lead authors to the construction of narrative as valid guidelines in order for the tourist to interpret the visited site. Not surprisingly, the role of postmodernity by placing identity as a mediator between peoples and their institutions recreates the needs to return to the roots, to heritage, to the home of ancestors in a way of diaspora. Culture cannot escape to the monopoly of sign, which has become in an important industry. Cultural tourism appeals to “symbolism” of tradition. Rather, those works included in section two focuses on the configuration of heritage drawing the channels to enhance the identity of tourist-receiving countries. The part 3, most likely, the most fascinating of the project, explores how images and produced, disseminated and mediated by a much broader international audience. Based on a set of study-cases, which represent clear examples of what Editors highlight in their introduction, this section discusses the complexity of urban environment in the connection to cultural tourists. Last but not least, readers who like to inspect the pages of four section will find interesting investigations that orchestrates the local, national and global characters that produces the politics of identity. As Korstanje...
puts it, national beings, in a global context, are formed by a great variety of beliefs, stereotypes and narratives that place the concept of nationality under the lens of scrutiny. Tourism, and cultural tourism, not only has alleviated the burden of underdeveloped economies in third world, but also have been accompanied to political changes (Korstanje, 2012). The needs of re-defining what the national is, and the global, beyond or within the territory is one of the most urgent aspects of the sociology of tourism today. To those interested in cultural issues this book offers an answer to the dichotomies of tourism and globalization, which may be incorporated in the legacy of seminal theses that frame tourism as an object of study, the tourist gaze (Urry), the sightseeing (Maccannel), sustainability (Krippendorf), imagined communities (Anderson), mobilities (Vannini), consuming places (Meethan), phantasies in imagining the “Other” (Tzanelli), tourism imaginaries (Salazar) or paradise-revival (Korstanje) among others. It gives an all-encompassing diagnosis on the problem of globalization and tourism, nonetheless its lack of criticism respecting to the concept of cultural tourism poses a dilemma very difficult to overcome.

What does cultural tourism mean?

Starting from the legacy of Weberian tradition, culture may be understood as a social invention; in other terms a western social construe intended to foster the legitimacy of nation-states to keep the control over their workforces. Historically, the notion of culture not only appealed to the formation of us, which is pitted against “they”, but also was conducive to the interests of over-seas empires. Colonialism and anthropology have shared their own concerns for the customs and heritage of colonized others. While anthropology, following its scientific nature was interested in protecting the aboriginal cultures, many of them in bias of extinction, the colonial order used the fieldwork notes, produced by ethnology, to understand their servants, or potential enemies. Unwittingly, the role of anthropology was vital to give information to colonial officers that helped to strengthen the domination of Europe over their colonies.

The first polemic point in this entry in this discussion consists in defining what ethnicities are considered worth to gaze and what are ignored. As Comaroff & Comaroff put it, West has developed an uncanny industry of culture and ethnicity that valorizes the life of aboriginals, and their culture as authentic at the time stimulate the conflict with their central administrations. Not surprisingly, at time the global demand employs tourism to give further autonomy (self-determination) to aboriginal communities, states exerts further violence to keep the control. This situation not only creates an atmosphere of tension, but paves the pathways for ethnic cleansing, genocides to flourish in the underdeveloped countries (Comaroff & Comaroff 2009). Last but not least, in earlier works, M. Korstanje has conducted a considerable criticism over cultural tourism because of two primary reasons. At a first glance, the current frame of studies in cultural tourism are more interested in using “an allegory of culture” to cement the possibilities of destinations to gain further profits than understanding the issue. Secondly, the concept of culture, originally formulated by the philosophy of XVIIIth century, does contemplate the conception of culture according to the interest of nation-states. The collective sentiment of belonging was formed in accordance to a biased (romantic) view of history, an ethnic and linguistic homogenization that gathered scattered human groups into only one, and a shared territory. The elite who were instructed to lead the destiny of nation coined the meaning of culture to enhance a common identity within the boundaries of state. Today, the concept of cultural tourism is ethnocentrically employed to mark the “other-different” while the white-elite is unmarked. The question whether by making cultural tourism means visiting an aboriginal reservoir, or gazing “Others” who are ethnically different, must be re-discussed according to others destinations. Why flying towards New York or Chicago is not considered as “cultural tourism?” (Korstanje 2012b).

Bibliography


*Recibido: 13/03/2015*  
*Aceptado: 08/01/2016*  
*Sometido a evaluación por pares anónimos*