Cultural literacy, cosmopolitanism and tourism research

Patricia Claudette Johnson *

University of Newcastle, Australia

A B S T R A C T

Cosmopolitanism has been approached from a multitude of perspectives yet it continues to pose theoretical challenges in application. This paper assumes a post-disciplinary approach to critique these writings and analyse the intersections of tourism/cosmopolitanism/worldmaking. Through these means a philosophical platform is built that advances *cultural literacy* as the defining principle of cosmopolitanism. Cosmopolitanism encompasses the *both-and*, and has much to do with cosmopolitics, worldview, cultural orientations and compossibilities of tourism populations. Tourism is at the coalface of inter- and intra-cultural exchange and cultural literacy provides an innovative tool to operationalize worldmaking and address the complexities of an increasingly cosmopolitanized world. These ideas constitute an ontological shift in thinking about tourism and its many contexts.

© 2013 Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved.

Introduction

> Travel has never been so urgent, even necessary, as it is today... Travel is how we put a face and voice to the Other and step a little beyond our secondhand images of the alien...we all live in the same neighbourhood now, even if the differences and distances between us remain as great as ever. (Pico Iyer *The Necessity of Travel* 2002:80)

In early writings about tourism as a social science, Bruner (1991:246) said travel is broadening because it "leads to a more cosmopolitan perspective". Thinking about cosmopolitanism and tourism has largely stayed in that space and only recently has the concept re-emerged in tourism research. This paper creates a philosophical platform to advance *cultural literacy* as an interpretive analytical

* Corresponding author. Address: Newcastle Business School, Faculty of Business and Law, University of Newcastle, Callaghan Campus, University Drive, NSW, Australia. Tel.: +61 249215546; fax: +61 249216911.
  E-mail address: Patricia.Johnson@newcastle.edu.au

tool, originating in tourism studies, to study cosmopolitanism. A focus is placed on the social, cultural and political prisms of the concept and, while a wide range of literature is reviewed from a variety of disciplinary perspectives, which is by no means exhaustive, it is indicative of how the term has been applied in political science, sociology, cultural studies, comparative literature, anthropology, and how these perspectives inform tourism studies. A critical analysis of this literature formulates a case for cultural literacy as an analytical tool for tourism research applications. The aim is to provide a fresh perspective, in the form of a new ontological approach, to address an age-old concept. In this, it is the theme of cosmopolitanism that is important, not the discipline from which the ideas originate. Thus, the approach taken here is post-disciplinary to reflect "flexible modes of knowledge production, plurality, synthesis and synergy" (Coles, Hall, & Duval, 2006:293) by adhering to the axiom that social worlds and tourism worlds cannot be separated.

What emerges from this literature at first glance is that a conundrum exists in positioning cosmopolitanism as a social theory with practical application for tourism research. For example, Beck (2002b:25) views cosmopolitanism as a "large, ancient, rich and controversial set of political ideas, philosophies and ideologies", an abstract "kingdom of the air". In these terms the concept lacks materiality and, although researchers have applied the concept in various ways, there is little agreement on measurement (Skrbis, Kendall, & Woodward, 2004; Swain, 2009). Robbins (1998:2) once said, "situating cosmopolitanism means taking a risk"—the term may be easy to define if you look it up in the dictionary, as an adjective it means 'belonging to the world' and as a noun 'citizen of the world', but as an scholarly concept it is a politically charged idea, notion, ideology, process, condition of globalisation, a disposition—to name a few. Clifford (1998:363) sees it as a site of academic contestation: "before we even begin to speak of 'cosmopolitanisms' we are caught up in the unmanageable, risky work of translation", not unsurprisingly, because of the array of abstractions and disciplinary perspectives used to conceptualize it. A post-disciplinary perspective discards rigid disciplinary perspectives to focus on a theme and bring it to a logical conclusion. This approach transcends disciplinary boundaries to provide a space to better understand 'the complex interconnections between the natural and social worlds' (Jessop & Sum, 2010:89). This is a process of knowledge building; a process that Coles, Hall, and Duval (2009) consider should be a requisite to study tourism, and its contexts, in the twenty-first century.

From a tourism perspective, critics have "called for a more material analysis of the way cosmopolitanism is performed in people's everyday lives" (Germann Molz, 2006:2; Swain, 2009), and this paper addresses these concerns by positioning the "understudied" concept of worldmaking as multi-operational in the makings of culture and place (Hollinshead, 2007:185). Cosmopolitanism maintains salience in a globalized world, where increased mobility and global flows replace monocultures with hybrids. Citizenship is now a cultural intersection of the inter- and intra-domestic and/or inter- and intra-national. *Multiple cosmopolitanisms* (Robbins, 1998) may be a way of providing political, historical and geographical contexts, but the term remains vague, unwieldy and abstract. Thus, we need to formulate ways to unpack the concept, and *cultural literacy* is key to the process.

Cultural literacy has traditionally been used to define a mono-culture to locate the parameters of nationalism. The discussion which follows departs from the traditional usage to reposition the term as multicultural and central to locating the "reality of attachments, multiple-attachments, or attachments from a distance" (Robbins, 1998:3). Cosmopolitanism is defined here as an embodiment of one's identity: a composition of literacies including background (ethnic, national, cultural) and accumulated cultural capital through experience (travel, kindred/ethnic ties, and historical ties) that can explain processes of knowledge transfer and provide insight into cultural positioning (and cultural distance). This reformulation of the term positions cultural literacy as a fundamental principle of cosmopolitanism—to refer to a composition of literacies that reflect compossibility (or -ies) of identity, cultural locatedness, and reflexivity. Compossibility recognizes the diversities and contradictions of individuals, human relations and the pluralities of the world we live in (Venn, 2006), it takes all properties, alternatives, and futures into account concerning an entity's existence (which could come in a variety of forms such as an individual, a society, and so on). Cultural literacy has the potential to deepen understanding of the cultural compossibilities that characterize cosmopolitanisms in a globalized world.

To begin, this paper explores how cultural literacy has been used in the past to advance a case for its reformulation. The discussion moves on to discuss how tourism and cosmopolitanism intersect

with the politics of culture through linkages that take into account one's cosmos, cosmopolitical and cultural affiliations. Tourism, as a consciousness industry (Kirshenblatt-Gimblett, 1998:170), has much to do with cosmopolitanism in that it provides a mediating vision between peoples and places (Hollinshead, 2009) and "acts as a mode of orientation to the world (worldview)" (Swain, 2009:522). Travel to other places to collect experiences of difference is its basis, and "mastering otherness" (MacCannell 1989:xv) its practice. In Li's (2000:877) view, "geographical consciousness manifests in the tourism experience as the spatial and temporal bond of person-place between tourists and destinations" and worldview is central to this bond. This relationship has much to do with cosmopolitics and cultural locatedness because people carry their cultural baggage when they travel—their political views, their social/cultural foibles, and their emotional state (De Botton, 2002).

Tourism is a socio-cultural and geographical condition of globalisation, "a barometer" and "an instrument of local and national self-understanding" (Kirshenblatt-Gimblett, 1998:141). As a dynamic agent of change (Hollinshead, 2009), it plays a powerful role in worldmaking with utility expanding beyond locating, dislocating, and relocating people—to negotiating multiple worlds as they are enacted, embodied and expressed through intercultural socialisation, education and communication. Cosmopolitanism, like tourism, is a socio-cultural condition of globalisation and cultural literacy assists to understand compossibility in this dynamic environment.

Cosmopolitanism is unpacked in its various forms—as a political force, a social condition and a cultural orientation. Latour (2004) once asked *Whose Cosmos, Which Cosmopolitics?* to explain how one regards the world is influenced by personal politics guided by the local, which include national citizenship, religion and narrow attachments. He considers the debate so far has been "an argument among friends working together on a puzzle that has defeated, so far, everyone everywhere" (Latour, 2004:450). Skrbis et al. (2004:132) concur when they say the concept is "heading for a crisis unless we develop a sense of agreement on its analytical dimensions"; and, as it is argued here, agreement on methods of measurement. Thus, it is time to put these concerns firmly on the agenda and a reformulation of cultural literacy is proposed as a malleable tool for researchers to analyse cosmopolitanism in tourism contexts.

This, very theoretical discussion, conforms to Appiah's (1998) notion of *rooted cosmopolitan* by resisting the commonly held belief that national cultural belonging is absolute and taking the position "we are all cosmopolitans" (Rabinow, 1986:258). By engaging *actually existing cosmopolitanisms* (Malcomson 1998:238), this argument works to reduce the abstraction and render the term material—by advancing cultural literacy as a mechanism to locate cultural orientation(s). Actually existing cosmopolitanism is a situated concept that "exists in habits of thought and feeling" (Robbins, 1998:2). There are three dimensions of cultural literacy (cognitive, behavioural and affective) and, as a socially, culturally and geographically situated concept, cosmopolitanism figuratively embodies the tourist (Germann Molz, 2005, 2006; 2008; Swain, 2009), tourism workers (Jonasson & Scherl,e 2012; Notar, 2008; Salazar, 2010a; Scherle & Nonnenmann, 2008), the toured and tourism researchers (Tucker, 2009). By introducing cultural literacy, as a fundamental principle of cosmopolitanism, the discussion illustrates how subject positions characterize cultural engagement and influence the ways spaces, places and peoples are interpreted, represented and performed.

Cultural literacy is useful to analyse social dynamics in a changing world by providing the researcher with a multi-dimensional perspective that assists to clarify some of the conflicting, confusing notions in writings about the term—among them cosmopolitan consciousness (Hannerz, 1992; Vertovec & Cohen, 2002), progressive cosmopolitanism (Swain, 2009), the cosmopolitan project (Held, 2002), and cosmopolitan citizenship (Germann Molz, 2005; Reilly, 2007:182). Ultimately, the premise here is that cosmopolitanism is a human condition that is situated and, embodied. This condition can be conceptualized as a paradigm of cultural literacies that locates social, cultural, political and geographic orientations, takes the local into consideration, and indicates involvement in global citizenship.

By assuming a post-disciplinary perspective, the discussion below seeks to integrate a range of ideas drawn from scholarly literature and general writings about cosmopolitanism, mobility and tourism in a lucid and thematic way. Through these means, an ontological platform is developed to position cultural literacy as a tool for tourism research. To progress the argument the genesis of cultural literacy is explained. As cosmopolitanism is a politically charged notion, the cosmopolitics

of tourism are explored to explain how tourism and social worlds are not mutually exclusive. This involves situating *worldview* to demonstrate how cultural literacy helps to shape this view. The role tourism plays in the production of cosmopolitanism is a focal point to advance a case for cultural literacy as a conceptual tool, with assignations of measurement and practical applications. This paper concludes by illustrating its usefulness in the enterprise of worldmaking.

The geneaology of cultural literacy

Scholars broadly agree that key dimensions of cosmopolitanism involve the essence of tourism: cultural exchange involving mobility, a stance of openness, international travel and a sense of global interconnectedness (Hannerz, 1990, 1992; Urry, 1995; Vertovec & Cohen, 2002). As a condition of globalisation, it indicates sociocultural orientation in a historical moment: a worldview, which positions one in the world, and informs our understanding of global citizenry. Aerts et al. (2007:9) define cosmopolitanism as "a system of co-ordinates or a frame of reference in which everything presented to us by our diverse experiences can be placed", "a symbolic system of representation that allows us to integrate everything we know about the world and ourselves into a global picture" and, a framework "that illuminates reality as it is presented to us within a certain culture"—ideas that reflect the underpinnings of worldmaking. Worldview informs global literacy and provides substance to global citizenry as a perception based on experience and knowledge: the ways one interprets and interacts with the world. This conforms to Leo Apostel's view that worldview is an interdisciplinary fragmented and "tentative fingerprint of a culture at a given historical instant" (Broekaert, 1999:235), a temporal and spatial perspective of being in the world.

As a framework of ideas and beliefs by which one interprets and interacts with the world, worldview has roots in German philosophy as *Weltanschauung*. Spengler (1932 [1918]) dealt with the idea of determining the cultural boundaries of nationalism in his treatise *Decline of the West*—an influential text of its time that discussed the limitations and decline of (European) civilisations through cultural decay. His work inspired the Nazi party to appropriate the idea to define who and what is German (see Hitler's *Mein Kampf*). Thus the term *cultural literacy* has cosmopolitical overtones and refers to cultural monism serving to protect nationalism—and, relatively recently, to define what is decently/properly/ supposedly 'American'. Hirsch's (1988) *Cultural Literacy: What every American needs to know* along with Bloom's (1987) *The Closing of the American Mind* triggered scholarly debates (particularly in education circles) that criticized its prescriptive nature, the authors' authority, the notion of foundational knowledge, and the assumption that everyone has access to it (Bizzell ,1990; Hovey, 1988). At the time, the idea of a U.S. *National Cultural Literacy* program took hold and Linda Cheney (Chair of the National Endowment for the Humanities) championed its implementation in the United States. Cheney's reasoning discounted the inclusion of "accidents of class, race and gender" to focus on "truths… that speak to us all" (Cheney, 1988:A20). Anti-foundationalists debunked the scheme as elitist as Stanley Fish explains: "Once you have subtracted from the accidents of class, race, gender and political circumstance, what is it you have left?" (Green, 1988:A16). Indeed, as Iyer (2002:60) reminds us, the "human reality that is the true America" is a complexity with many truths.

Thus, the term cultural literacy has foundations in Western nationalism. As it has been traditionally understood, cultural literacy can be formulaically expressed to indicate parameters of national literacy $N = CL$ $(n \sim 1)$: nationalism = in the order of monistic cultural literacy, a discrete function of *either-or*. While this discussion appropriates the term, extends the meaning beyond the West to account for the compossibility of cultural positions of cosmopolitanism and provide a tool to address alternative, multiplicative or subjugated views on the world, which is compossibility (Venn, 2006). The expression $Cos = \sum_{i=1}^{n} CL_i$ $(n > 1)$ cosmopolitanism = the sum of more than one cultural literacy is a continuous function that accounts for *both-and*. Please note: these expressions are figurative, and the intent of their inclusion is to illustrate how cultural literacy can be conceptualized as a dimension of cosmopolitanism; and, this approach conforms to Scherle and Nonnenmann's (2008) view that intercultural competence is a continuous process. Notar (2008) considers cultural diversity in the *borderland cosmopolitanism* of Yunnan to involve multiple cultural literacies, the both-and. This is the sum of a selected some, or all, cultural literacies emanating from Myanmar, Laos, Vietnam and Tibet and the

compossibilities thereof. Furthermore, Ong's (1998) *flexible citizenship*, seen in terms of regimes of kinship, state and marketplace can also be explained in these terms.

In Appiah's (1998) view, everyone is a *rooted cosmopolitan*; an idea that lies at the very heart of tourism:

> . . .we can entertain the possibility of a world in which *everyone* is a rooted cosmopolitan, attached to a home of his or her own, with its own cultural particularities, but taking pleasure from the presence of other, different, places that are home to other, different, people. (Appiah, 1998:91 original emphasis)

Thus, one can be attached to a mixture of cultures simultaneously. Your heart may be in one culture (affectation), your feet in another (situation, behavioural) and your mind in yet a third (cognitive). When you view cosmopolitanism in this way, it is more than a disposition but an embodiment of who you are: a composition of literacies influenced by situation and gender, and informed through processes of socialisation, education and experience. This includes things such as one's background (ethnic, national, cultural), accumulated cultural and social capital (travel, kindred ties, professional ties) to explain processes of knowledge transfer and cultural distance. Compossibility explains the positional possibilities individuals bring to the cosmopolitan project we call the human condition, as it conforms to the notion that "cosmopolitanisms are experienced, embodied, situated, performed and imagined in tourism [both] by consumers and the toured" (Swain, 2009:505). In worldmaking, tourism is a highly mediated act where peoples, places and pasts go through processes of making, de-making and re-making and cultural literacy can provide insight into these processes. Thus, tourism is an ideal environment to study cultural compossibilities in the four populations of tourism: tourists, tourism workers, the toured, and tourism researchers.

Cultural literacy takes account of an individual's cognitive (thoughtfulness, ideology, beliefs), behavioural (actions) and affective (feelings, emotions) dimensions to characterize cosmopolitan orientation. This tool provides insight into manifestations of culture shock and the problems thereof when tourism worlds collide. Culture shock is disorientation of the physical (i.e. personal and environment), orientation (i.e. spatial, temporal, geographic) and cultural (i.e. rules, norms, language) (Pearce, 2005). The condition indicates difficulty of adjusting to, or operating in, unfamiliar cultural contexts (Kirshenblatt-Gimblett, 1998). Controlling it is to manage meaning in cross-cultural interactions and build cosmopolitan capital through knowledge transfer—by learning about verbal and non-verbal behaviour, social situations (relationships), emotional reactions, responsibilities, and obligations. Cultural literacy is a useful tool to analyse the manifestation, and to treat the condition as cultural shock involves cognitive, behavioural and affective dimensions in adapting to, and being accepting of, difference.

On a personal note, the behavioural and affective elements of cultural literacy can be illustrated by an encounter I had with a merchant in the Tehran Bazaar when carrying out research in Iran (Johnson, 2001). He asked (in English) where I worked and how long I had lived in Iran, and I explained I was a tourist. He persisted with the question and got the same answer until he stamped his foot and declared 'but you don't *walk* like a tourist'. He was not to know that I felt very comfortable there, as a child I lived and was schooled in Iran so was returning 'home' so to speak (albeit as a tourist). Cultural literacy is an embodied idea because it provides the facility to account for behaviour, responses, and mannerisms—how one walks the walk. But also, how one talks the talk as literacy traditionally assumes language proficiency. Anthropologist Franz Boas (1986 [1928]) saw culture and life-ways of people reflected in language; his work informed the Sapir-Whorf hypothesis that poses language to determine worldview (Brown, 1976). Language may be an important element of cultural literacy as it allows one to converse and think outside one's cultural context, but other elements also come into play. Cultural literacy (through language and cultural conversancy) forms cosmopolitan capital regardless of mobility.

Cultural literacy, as cosmopolitan capital, provides agency to negotiate cultures. In a tourism context, scholars found local tourism workers skilled in using this capital to produce cosmopolitanism. The tour guide engages cultural literacy to interpret and mediate culture, behaviour that enhances status and compossibility through "cosmopolitan comprehension" (Salazar, 2010a:61). Notar (2008)

identifies cosmopolitan competency in tourism workers—bilingualism may provide entry to the industry, but cultural conversancy sustains and extends cosmopolitan capital. In other tourism contexts, hotel employees are chosen for particular duties, say the front desk, because of their cultural literacy (the ability to communicate, understand, anticipate, and respond appropriately in a variety of cultural contexts to meet customer needs). Similarly, airlines rely on the cultural literacy of their employees, and one could extend this to other jobs in tourism as Notar (2008) found.

In a tour-guiding context, Scherle and Nonnenmann (2008:121) found workers with the "ability to reconcile cultures, to adapt rapidly to different cultural settings and cultural change, and to overcome the unsettling nature of constantly being in cultural flux". These competencies characterize cultural literacy as it is the guide's job to interpret and negotiate cultures. Jonasson and Scherle's (2013:55) more recent work found "performative aspects of guiding tourists [to] involve interpretations, mediations and translations through verbal and bodily communication". Tucker's (2009:458) study of the toured in tourist-local interactions in Turkey also found gender differences in cultural competency: Göreme men were conversant in mediating tourist cultures, while women lacked the skill to negotiate these "declarative" or "worldmaking" encounters.

Hannerz (2004:74) once said, "tourism and tourists have ineffective links to cosmopolitanism" considering, at a stretch, tourists perhaps, but tourism workers decidedly not. Hannerz is wrong, and to refute this, a number of linkages can be located to connect tourists, tourism workers, the toured and tourism researchers with cosmopolitanism. Cultural literacy forms cosmopolitan capital, influences intercultural comprehension and structures cosmopolitan compossibility—regardless of mobility. Swain's (2009) view that cosmopolitanism is situated, embodied, performed and imagined demonstrates how cultural literacy involves cognitive, behavioural and affective dimensions. For the researcher of tourism, it adds to the conceptual toolbox and provides a mechanism for reflectivity and reflexivity. Cultural literacy takes into account agency, affectation, embodiment, and the performance of producing and co-producing cosmopolitanisms. It is not about *either-or*, but about *both-and*: the sum of cultural and positional orientations as cosmopolitan compossibility. One could argue that cultural literacy flags an ontological shift in positioning (actually existing) cosmopolitanisms in tourism research.

Humanism and the cosmopolitics of tourism

Cosmopolitanism is not a new concept; ancient Greeks positioned one without a clan or hearth as being out, *in* the world. Similar to the ancients' notion of outsider, the early 20th century meaning held a reactionary edge, a slur "against minority immigrant and diaspora groups . . . those without a homeland" to be distrusted and vilified for their foreignness (Wollen, 1994:190). This is a conception that involves the politics *of* culture. Cosmopolitanism extends beyond the elite by recognising the diversity of cultural literacies of denied, silenced and/or supressed individuals/groups—and the compossibilities thereof. In a Chinese context, Notar (2008:629) mentions Mao's suspicion of *rootless cosmopolitans* that "might refuse to declare absolute allegiance to his nationalist ideology". Clifford's (1992) *discrepant cosmopolitan*, forced out for reasons of survival or work, epitomizes cosmopolitics—those who have little or no choice and are vilified for their accident of existence. Worldmaking assumes that differentiation in power is inherent where unequal relationships are normalized and naturalized and indeed, the politics of mobility guide circulating discourses of (so called) illegal migration in the service of border protection. The discussion here reviews the democratisation of tourism by recognising mobility as a problem of cosmopolitics—when social worlds collide with the tourism system.

Some see the global elite (arguably the heaviest users of tourism systems) through a similar framework: as undermining nationhood with "little need for national loyalty, view national boundaries as obstacles . . . [and] whose only useful function is to facilitate the elite's global operations" (Ash, 2005:np). *Frequent-flyer cosmopolitans* (Calhoun, 2002) that work on accruing points, *cosmocrats* that develop their CVs (Micklethwait & Wooldridge, 2000:229), and Huntington's (2004) *Davos Man* fit into this category. However, Dore (2003) warns that while Davos Man (in particular) may be culturally engaged in shaping opinion about others in their respective countries, it is wrong to generalize them because these figures are culturally, socially and geographically located. The politics of culture can be

wielded in two ways: as enabling mobility for the global elite, or disabling it for others with little or no privilege or power as a process of de-democratisation in tourism.

A cosmopolitical perspective is not about location or mobility but about agency (Clifford, 1998) and intersubjectivity. The concept of *worldism* speaks to the notion of cultural literacy as compossibility by recognising that multi- and trans-subjectivities characterize actually existing cosmopolitanisms. Worldism recognizes the "physical and material specificities such a race, class, gender, and sexuality on the production of knowledge and its political implications" (Agathangelou & Ling, 2009:98). By bringing the local into the global and recognising indigenous cosmopolitanism, the frameworks of Salazar (2010a, 2010b) and Notar (2008) correspond with underlying principles of worldism by taking account of "the agency of all parties to co-produce our worlds" (Agathangelou & Ling, 2009:134). Cultural literacy contributes to this line of thinking by providing the scaffolding to structure the messy texts of cosmopolitan compossibilities.

Global citizenship and ways of living in the world is a topic repeatedly addressed by scholars as humanistic questions of ethics and morals. In Nussbaum's (1997:7) view, "the accident of where one is born is just that, an accident; any human being might have been born in any nation … wherever he [sic] lives, he [sic] lives as a citizen of the world" (assuming a figurative pronoun); a sentiment shared by Chiang Yee (1937), author of the fascinating, and extensive, *Silent Traveller* series. Yee articulates his *Chinese Eye* (or gaze) over the Lakeland District (UK) in words and drawings decades before Urry (1990) ventured forth. Describing himself as a universal man, Yee finds affinities between foreign and Chinese wherever he goes. In Edinburgh, he thought Robbie Burns must have been born in China: "surely the only difference between this [Chinese] old folk song and the songs of Burns lies in the language… perhaps he was brought back as a baby from China by some Scottish missionary named Burns" (Yee, 1948:124).

Yee's (1948:1) touchstone is universal values, he explains his writings as "not Chinese in any typical sense: they are the personal impressions of *one* Chinese, not of all Chinese" (original emphasis). Sufi poet Hafez reflects this value system in his writings and twelfth century Persian poet Sa'adi's *The Manners of Kings* positioned it as a universal cosmopolitical concern, little known in the West his prose forms the motto of the United Nations:

> The sons of Adam are limbs of each other having been created of one essence
>
> When the calamity of time affects one limb the other limbs cannot remain at rest
>
> If thou hast no sympathy for the troubles of others
>
> Thou art unworthy to be called by the name of human.
>
> (From *The Gulistan* by Sa'adi [1258] translated by Richard Burton 1928:ix)

As an ethos, cosmopolitanism works towards the same humanistic ideal as the Golden Rule—which perhaps informs tourism's cosmopolitan 'hope' (see Ateljevic, Morgan, & Pritchard, 2007). However, Appiah (1998) has reservations about the compatibility between altruism and humanism's desire for global homogeneity. This argument is not that humanism and cosmopolitanism are mutually exclusive, but that they are not synonymous. And, the logic follows as cosmopolitan villainy makes regular appearances in popular fiction and cosmopolitan wars do the same in news headlines. For example, Charles Sobhraj's cosmopolitanism, evident in his multi-cultural fluency, provided him the means and access to prey upon foreign tourists (BBC, 2004).

We may all work towards an ideal world where humanism prevails, but this world does not yet exist. Indeed, Yee's (1948:3) writings of his tourist experience in the Lakeland received rave reviews by some because it was written from a Chinese point of view, while others "refuse to cast a glance at my work … they consider it absurd that the British scene should be depicted by a Chinese". In studying cosmopolitanism, cultural literacy can tease out intricacies of cultural conversancy—which includes humanistic imperfections evident in values and beliefs systems that give rise to stereotypes, prejudices and unequal power relationships. These notions intersect with the political perspective of worldmaking to reveal that fragile links exist between cosmopolitanism and humanism. Compossible worlds (Venn, 2006), and the intersections thereof, exist on micro and macro scales and can be understood through the cognitive, behavioural and affective elements of cultural literacy.

Discourse, praxis and the cosmopolitics of tourism

Cosmopolitan perspective takes into account one's cosmos and one's cosmopolitical and cultural affiliations, a perspective that is not fixed, often fragmented and always shifting. Edward Said once commented "where you're really from is attached also to ideological issues, it's not just a matter of saying I am from Middletown, Connecticut. It's not that simple" (Katz & Smith, 2003:647). The term cosmopolitics, a concept linked to worldview, requires clarification at this point. Robbins (1998:12) decouples cosmopolitics from universal reason "as one on a series of scales, as an area both within and beyond the nation (and yet falling short of humanity)". This discussion adds that cosmopolitics is shaped through ideology (beliefs and values) to denote how one frames self in the world and how the foreign is positioned within this framework. Cultural literacy can assist to deconstruct these positions.

Worldview takes on cognitive, affective and behavioural dimensions as people take their politics with them when they travel. Cosmopolitics was paramount to the *political witnesses* Hollander (1981) and Porter (1991) studied. These tourists engaged in "politically purposeful travel" to compare "notions of good *and* bad society, social justice *and* injustice" (Hollander, 1981:4 original emphasis). But, just because one travels does not mean that they are more accepting of other places and peoples, travel may confirm what they already believe to be true (Johnson, 2010b) and, in some cases it merely produces better-informed xenophobes. Twain's (1872) "consummate ass" in *Innocents Abroad,* was caustic criticism of those who travelled for the pleasure of returning home unchanged by the experience.

The bedfellows of cosmopolitanism and tourism are commonly used as political tools to improve international relationships—a political perspective of worldmaking. An illustrative case is when Iran's former President Khatami proposed an international rapprochement initiative as a call for *Dialogue between Civilisations* to introduce Iran abroad. This was done with the recognition that there may be an extensive literature on Persian civilisation known (and lauded) in the West, but this history does not transfer to a modern Iran as a tourist destination (Vafadari & Cooper, 2010). The United Nations World Tourism Organisation (UNWTO) approved the initiative and the *Tehran Times* (2/12/98) reported 2001 as the *Year of Tourism, Dialogue of Civilisations* because "tourists are the main factors for cultural exchanges among nations". The goal was complicated by cosmopolitics as the 9/11 bombings of the same year derailed the initiative—to evoke unprecedented fear and galvanize worldviews. This talk resulted in praxis on a macro scale in the stiffening of a range of policies and rules that concerned inter- and intra-national mobility.

The notion of the Islamic other as dangerous became of manifest importance; metaphors became guiding paradigms and accepted as legitimate. Metaphors of this type demonstrate that perceptions of other are heavily influenced by discourses of the past and they illustrate how these discourses continue to shape Western geographical and geopolitical imagination (Said, 1979). The UNWTO initiative prompted global discussions from the Islamic Summit to the European Parliament. Patrick Cox (2002) (former President of the European Parliament), expressed an urgent need to engage in cultural self-analysis to share imagination and learning through dialogue. At the time, Cox's call coupled with the *Tehran Times* (02/12/98) headline *Tourists in the Vanguard of Dialogue between Civilisations* raises questions about the idea of cosmopolitanism, how news travels fast, how discourse circulates around it, and how tourism assumes a position in this discourse. Indeed, the case in point illustrates caveats of worldmaking in action—the political perspective, the mediated act, the representational force, and a constructed storyline (Hollinshead, 2009).

Tellingly, Germann Molz (2005:526) found independent US tourists who visited Iran as cultural mediators, a "kind of grassroots move towards improving international relations" forging "panhuman relationships within the rhetoric of *inter*national relations" (original emphasis). Such an exchange denotes the behavioural aspect of cultural literacy—when tourist/local actions break through communication blockages to improve cultural understanding and influence worldviews on a micro scale. Critical reflection and shared imagination adjust the actually existing cosmopolitanism of both parties as intercultural knowledge is gained (cognitive), fear of the other is lessened (affective), and camaraderie enacted (behavioural) through intercultural communication. Travel, as Iyer (2002:80) explains,

is "how we learn about the world and come to terms (and sometimes peace) with it" as the media "cannot covey the feel and smell, the human truth, of another culture".

Kant's (1957 [1795]:20) cosmopolitan 'rights' sees world citizenship as limited to Universal Hospitality: a stranger should not be treated with hostility, cannot claim the right of guest (residence) but is permitted "right of resort" as a visitor. Tourism scholars often view freedom to travel a human right (Richter & Matthews, 1991), and the right to travel a cosmopolitan predisposition (Szerszynski & Urry, 2006) but, as such, the notion presupposes that the right is only available to those with the means. While means may ensure the right to travel for pleasure is limited to some but not others, nationality is problematic. As Dikeç (2002:238) points out, the sign *Britain Welcomes You* at Heathrow is misleading and should read *Britain welcomes you if*—you are able to get a visa depending on citizenship and other criteria. In Germann Molz's (2005) view, Western elité round-the-world travellers who claim their right to travel are cosmopolitan citizens. This citizenship is perhaps a citation of experience that can be explained through cultural literacy. The politics of power and culture appear when considering rights and citizenship where one holds cosmopolitical advantage over the other.

When pondering cosmopolitan citizenship, tourism as a form of imperialism (Nash, 1989) is relevant as travellers take their cosmopolitics along as cultural baggage. Phipps (1999:75) considers the 'right to travel' a cosmopolitical conundrum:

> The stridency with which many tourists have been willing to assert, or just assume, their right to experience the Other at any time and place resonates with an imperiousness that is almost militant. . .

When tourists claim the right of hospitality, whether they are welcomed or not, it is an imperious act that denotes lack of cultural sensitivity. Din (1989:553) argues that in Muslim countries, it is often tourist attitude that offends: "a good proportion of the tourists arrive with a *Sahib* mentality . . .with little regard for the sensitivity of the locals". To know how to negotiate the foreign when one are not welcome, and how to respond accordingly, denotes cultural literacy (cognitive, behavioural and affective) of both the touring and toured. While travel provides the discursive space for self/other reflexivity and the experience provides benefits of learning about other cultures, it can also confirm what the traveller already knows or wants to believe—or takes what they think they are owed.

Facilitating intercultural understanding and tolerance is a directive of the UNWTO (2011) for sustainable tourism development, and this section speaks to this concern by exploring the ways in which tourism and cosmopolitanism intersect within the politics of state, culture, power and position. Cosmopolitanism is politically charged, and characterising this perspective must take into account the micro: one's cosmos, cosmopolitical and cultural affiliations. Cosmopolitics informs worldview, which in turn, maintains cognitive, behavioural and affective dimensions of cultural literacy—what one believes is shaped by circulating discourses of the time, and how one behaves and feels is guided by these discourses. Discourse and praxis go hand in hand as talk influences public opinion, informs cultural literacy and is invariably linked to social realities of the micro and the macro. As Shumer-Smith and Hannam (1994:4) explain, the way people think about the world has "very real repercussions for the way it is".

A conundrum: measuring cosmopolitansim

Global travel markets and visitor expectations are changing and this poses challenges to tourism futures. The UNWTO (2012) forecast towards 2030 predicts substantial growth in Asian, Middle Eastern and African markets, which heralds a shift away from the traditional markets of Europe and North America. A UNWTO (2011:25) directive for sustainable tourism development is "to facilitate intercultural understanding and tolerance" which requires engagement and respect within and between stakeholders in the four populations of tourism. To meet the demands of tourism futures, tourism research needs to innovate to keep up with change—and this paper represents a concerted effort to devise a fresh perspective to approach/understand the complexities of culture in an increasingly cosmopolitanized world.

Cosmopolitanism involves one or more conceptual schemes, which may be paradigmatically different, often overlap, and pose challenges in testing, measuring, proving or disproving. Recently this

author peer reviewed a research proposal that included a question that measured cosmopolitanism in business travellers. But, this question had to be removed because at the time it stood as an empty signifier. Its intangibility renders it difficult to measure and, according to Skrbis et al. (2004:132), scholars need "a sense of agreement on its analytical dimensions". When Vertovec and Cohen (2002:21) commented that while there is "much scope for conceiving cosmopolitanism theoretically" and, it should "be welcomed for its socially and politically transformative potential", they also warned:

> ... practically all the recent writings on the topic remain in the realm of rhetoric. There is little description or analysis of how contemporary cosmopolitan philosophies, political projects, outlooks or practices can be formed, instilled or bolstered.

Or indeed, measured. One may consider that it is the abstractions that complicate, rather than clarify, pinning down its substance.

From a sociological perspective, it is "the political in opposition to the social" with little or no emphasis on the individual and, as such, fails to account for intersections of culture and multiple cosmopolitanisms (Delanty, 2006:27), or compossibilities. Indeed, the discursive reveals social reality on two levels: the micro is a socially constructed reality that indicates the macro. In a tourism example, the cultural connoisseur is a valid cultural orientation because it reveals much about one's social reality and points to the macro: consumerism in a world "irredeemably locked into globalized cycles of production and consumption" (Beck, 2002b:28). One can also apply this to the cosmocrat's social reality in terms of markets and employment systems and it applies to other forms of tourism as a practice of consumption. Thus, discourse analysis is a powerful tool but the argument here is that discursive positions are formulated through cultural literacy. It is discourse and praxis on an individual level that influence those of wider society.

In contemporary society, banal cosmopolitanism is part of the social fabric (Woodward & Skrbis, 2005). Commercial cosmopolitanism is buying a destination from the travel agent's shelf for its aesthetic appeal and cultural literacy plays an interpretive role in this process of consumption. One doesn't have to leave home to consume, or appreciate, such things as Thai food, Balinese home wares or Indian clothes because, in part, the media teaches us by crafting representations of culture. Urry's (1995) aesthetic cosmopolitans are mobile travellers with cognitive and semiotic skills of interpretation: connoisseurs that compare places and judge authenticity (Crawshaw & Urry, 1997). The traveller, as consumer and connoisseur, refers to discourses of, for instance, art, fashion, literature and politics to engage in, and/or with, other cultures (Urry, 1995, 2005). Bourdieu's (1972) concept of cultural capital has been used in tourism research as a ciphering device for cultural consumption, travellers are skilled in "reading [the] cultural significance" of what they see, do and experience (Mowforth & Munt, 1998:120). They hold ability to know what, why, and how to appreciate *x, y* or *z* because of accumulated cultural capital. Cultural capital enriched by worldly knowledge accumulated through experience, travel and education (Fullagar, 2002) is built by amassing cultural literacy.

Scholars agree that when individuals experience, and discriminate between, different cultures they do so in different ways (Hannerz, 1990, 1992; Urry, 1995). Some maintain that openness to others based on acceptance and understanding of difference occurs on levels (Hannerz, 1990, 1992). For instance, Hutnyk (1996), Beck (1998, 2000, 2002a, 2002b) and others view cosmopolitan consciences as not restricted to one national or cultural loyalty but combinations of loyalties which, presumably reveal certain levels. Similarly, Vertovec and Cohen (2002:8) find it obvious that "dabbling in, or desire for, elements of cultural otherness in itself does not indicate a very deep 'level' of cosmopolitanism". They use the term loosely to say that interest in other peoples and places is not 'real' cosmopolitanism but a veneer, or shallow (aesthetic) level. While the term 'level' is debated by scholars, it is regularly applied to cosmopolitanism. This discussion follows Skrbis et al. (2004:117) who consider level an "empty signifier"—vague and problematic to measure. However, cultural literacy denotes cultural competence, fluency, awareness and reflexivity, elements that provide meaning and structure to level as a standard of measurement. In saying this, the notion of level is hierarchical (where one is better than another) and this discussion refutes that cultural compossibilities should ever be compared in this way.

When cosmopolitanism is used as an analytical tool anomalies become evident. For instance, Szerszynski's and Urry (2006) study of two groups in the UK (a professional group [with no mention of gender] and a working class group of women) concluded that the latter were less cosmopolitan noting "irreconcilable tensions" between the groups and pointing to a need to explore the localities of cosmopolitics. While their study found higher levels of education and increased mobility increased levels of cosmopolitanism, a study by Robinson and Zill (1997:np) found the opposite. They controlled education to find women scored higher than men in cosmopolitanism—and the difference was larger after factoring in older age and lower education, in this study higher income meant less cosmopolitanism. While it is debatable whether one could reasonably compare these two works as the criteria of measurement, data collected, the context and research aims of each case differs, the comparison illustrates the conundrum of measuring cosmopolitanism: a danger exists in comparing apples to oranges.

Scheuth and O'Loughlin's (2008:926) ambitious project mined data from the World Values Surveys (1995–1997) to measure cosmopolitanism "as a sense of belonging to 'the world as a whole'". Ambitious, because measuring something so broad is problematic in its abstraction that brings Beck's (2002b:25) "kingdom of the air" to mind. Tellingly, the Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS) of Belarus, Ukraine, Russia, Georgia, Armenia and Azerbaijan ranked highest—perhaps not unsurprisingly because of sweeping political changes of the years preceding the survey. The breakdown of the USSR saw a sudden opening of borders, state commitment to democratisation, citizen rights and freedoms that were previously unimaginable. And, it is also not surprising that respondents were more youthful and optimistic about the future because for the first time they were free to travel abroad and interact with different cultures. Their study reveals more about the culture *of* politics, impact on citizenry and the effect of expanding cultural horizons than it does about measuring cosmopolitanism. This discussion is not meant to critique the relevance or gravity of the studies but to position the conundrum of measuring of cosmopolitanism and to advance cultural literacy as a framework for research. In this, cultural literacy constitutes an ontological shift in tourism/cosmopolitan research by adhering to the axiom that social worlds and tourism worlds cannot be separated.

As semioticians, tourists put cosmopolitan capital to work by reading spaces "for signifiers of certain pre-established notions or signs" (Urry, 1998:12); an idea that can be understood through cultural literacy. The aesthetic cosmopolitan holds semiotic skill to interpret and map cultures Szerszynski & Urry, 2006. Mapping, a cultural studies tool, not only takes into account social worlds and kindred ties, but discourses that circulate within these worlds—akin to the "cosmopolitical rubric" of discourses discussed by this author in a previous work (Johnson, 2010a). By mapping discourse in travel writing, the study revealed how the cosmopolitan gaze is focused through articulations of the cosmopolitical informed by cultural literacy (Johnson 2010a, 2010b). Geographical imaginings of this type can be troublesome because these descriptions may only reproduce the apparently real when authors speak through currently circulating discourses of their time to primed audiences. Discourses are shaped through cultural literacy and inform the mapping process.

A common thread found in the literature is that the cosmopolitan sees the world from a sociocultural vantage point that orients their worldview. To understand this vantage point we can position it in terms of cultural literacy involving affective, behavioural and cognitive elements which are influenced by gender, education, income and cultural orientation: where you are from, ethnic background, cultural/political socialisation and tourism/travel experience. These elements configure cultural literacy; they are active in shaping discourse and, by extension, influence praxis in micro and macro contexts. Cultural literacy in terms of $Cos = \sum_{i=1}^{n} CL_i$ (n > 1) is a continuous formula that has the facility to factor in education, gender, income and so on to account for the *both-and* characteristics of cosmopolitanism. For example, gender (male, female) can be factored in as $Cos = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{g=M,F} CL_{ig}$ (n > 1) as could an infinite number of variables. *Please note that the formulas presented in this paper are intended to graphically illustrate the argument by positioning cultural literacy as central to the concept of cosmopolitanism.* Cultural literacy is a worldist methodology of relational materialism because it "recognizes the impact of physical and material specificities such as race, class, gender, and sexuality" as it grants that "people interact with what they know and seek to know [by] actively [participating] in and (re)producing it" (Agathangelou & Ling, 2009:97, 98).

Conclusion

This paper takes a post-disciplinary approach to situate cosmopolitanism as an area of academic concern and a complex problem. Drawing from a plurality of disciplinary perspectives, a platform is built to situate cultural literacy at the intersections of cosmopolitanism and worldmaking to deal with "the messiness, unpredictability, hybridity of the contemporary world in which tourism takes place and which tourism reflexively helps to mediate" (Coles et al., 2006:313). Cultural literacy, as compossibility, recognizes the multi- and trans-subjectivities of cosmopolitanism, and the diversity of positionalities, which give rise to a polyglot of discourses that inform worldviews. Diversity in cultural orientations characterizes compossibility as the reality of (re)attachment, multiple attachments, or

Table 1
Axioms of cultural literacy as ontology in the intersections of worldmaking and cosmopolitanism (*informed by Hollinshead, 2009).

*Worldmaking is…….…...	*Worldmaking assumes………	*Cultural literacy* as ontology can ………
A representational force (Caveat 1)	… that the world is viewed from particular standpoints.	Locate the intersections of cosmopolitanism(s). To provide an analytical framework that characterizes the duplicities, multiplicities and hybridities of cultural standpoint(s) that guide the formation of worldview(s) in an increasingly globalized society. *Axiom 1: Everyone is a cosmopolitan embodying a compossibility of cultural literacies that include behavioural, cognitive and affective dimensions*
A highly mediated act (Caveat 2)	… that imaginaries are platformed upon received narratives that individuals associate with, or seek affiliation with	Sort the messy text of cosmopolitanism(s). To provide an analytical framework through which deconstruction of representations of people, places and pasts, and the embodiment thereof, guide individual/ collective positionality, acculturation and affiliate desire(s). *Axiom 2: Cultural literacy, as cosmopolitan capital, is dynamic in shaping worlds and a facilitator of knowledge transfer*
An incorporation of other/ borrowed storylines and symbolisations (Caveat 3)	… that these narratives are selective and adaptive by nature. The storylines and content exist as a response and/or reaction to a dynamic environment	Map the locatedness of cosmopolitanism(s) and the influences that may position, sustain and/or entertain them. To provide a framework to position narratives of people, places and pasts by factoring in the spatial, temporal, historical, traditional, personal and interpersonal contexts within which they occur and the configuration of relationships. *Axiom 3: Cultural literacy as cosmopolitan capital provides the agency to negotiate worlds in people making, place making and past making capacities*
An inherently political perspective (Caveat 4)	… that differentiation in power is inherent. Unequal relationships may be normalized to the extent that those who raise voice to them may or may not be alert to their implications.	Situate cosmopolitanism(s) as they exist within political economy(s). From this angle one can scrutinise the operative discursive positions in the making, de-making, and re-making of the local/global and the power relationships thereof. Situate the individual, as a cosmopolitan figure, regardless of his/ her background in this/these context(s). *Axiom 4: Cultural literacy provides the cosmopolitical scaffolding at the intersections of social worlds and tourism systems*

attachments at a distance that are cosmopolitanisms. The table below summarizes the contribution of cultural literacy as ontology to investigate the intersections of cosmopolitanism and worldmaking (Table 1).

This paper summarizes how cultural literacy can be applied to compossibilities as emergent forms of sociality in tourism worlds and social worlds—an idea that is indelibly linked to Hollinshead's (2009) worldmaking enterprise. Worldmaking, as an operational cosmopolitan construct, holds a sturdy framework to advance a case for cultural literacy. Hollinshead (2009) set out a research agenda on worldmaking by identifying caveats as areas of critical analysis. The table above responds to them in an annotated format to summarize the ways in which cultural literacy contributes to this framework. Revisiting the scholarly literature on cosmopolitanism provides weight to this argument to position cultural literacy as an ontological shift in tourism research. And, applications of cultural literacy can assist to further understanding of the intersections of worldmaking and cosmopolitanism in the academy.

Tourism is at the coalface of inter- and intra-cultural exchange and the post-disciplinary challenge is to develop innovative research methods to address the complexities of an increasingly cosmopolitanized world. Cultural literacy explains diversity as it writes in and recognizes the local on two dimensions: the individual (micro) position, a socially constructed reality that points to the wider social (macro) reality; these discursive positions are informed by cultural literacy. Cultural literacy is a flexible ontology that can be applied by the qualitative researcher in the effort to gain an in-depth understanding of human behaviour and positionality in tourism in a number of ways, including textual analysis, discourse analysis, situational analysis, case studies and other methods of inquiry. This paper proposes that a reformulation of cultural literacy is of material benefit to tourism researchers because the mechanics of the method structures the messy text that is cosmopolitanism.

Acknowledgement

References

Aerts, D., Apostel, L., De Moor, B., Hellemans, S., Maex, E., Van Belle, H., et al (2007). *World views: From fragmentation to integration*. Brussels: VUB Press.

Agathangelou, A. M., & Ling, L. H. M. (2009). *Transforming world politics: From empire to multiple worlds*. Hoboken: Routledge.

Appiah, K. A. (1998). Cosmopolitan patriots. In P. Cheah & B. Robbins (Eds.), *Cosmopolitics*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Ash, T. G. (2005). 'Davos man's death wish'. *The Guardian*. 3rd Feb. <www.guardian.co.uk/world/2005/feb/03/globalisation.comment> Accessed 07.06.11.

Ateljevic, I., Morgan, N., & Pritchard, A. (2007). Editor's introduction: Promoting an academy of hope in tourism enquiry. In I. Ateljevic, A. Pritchard, & N. Morgan (Eds.), *The critical turn in tourism studies: Innovative research methodologies* (pp. 1–8). Amsterdam: Elsevier.

BBC News Report (2004). *The 'bikini-killer' linked to murders throughout Asia*. <http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/south_asia/3867791.stm> Accessed 18.07.11.

Beck, U. (1998). The cosmopolitan manifesto. *The New Statesman, 127*(4377), 28–30.

Beck, U. (2000). The cosmopolitan perspective: Sociology of the second age of modernity. *British Journal of Sociology, 51*(1), 79–105.

Beck, U. (2002a). The cosmopolitan perspective: Sociology in the second age of modernity (pp 61–85). In S. Vertovec & R. Cohen (Eds.), *Conceiving cosmopolitanism; theory, context and practice*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Beck, U. (2002b). The cosmopolitan society and its enemies. *Theory, Culture & Society, 19*(1–2), 17–44.

Bizzell, P. (1990). Beyond anti-foundationalism to rhetorical authority: Problems defining "cultural literacy". *College English, 52*(6), 661–675.

Bloom, A. (1987). *The closing of the American mind*. New York: Simon & Schuster.

Boas, F. (1986/1928). *Anthropology and modern life*. New York: Dover Publishers.

Bourdieu, P. (1972). *Outline of a theory of practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Broekaert, J. (1999). World views, elements of the apostelian and general approach. *Foundations of Science, 3*, 235–258.

Brown, R. (1976). Reference: In memorial tribute to Eric Lennberg. *Cognition, 4*(2), 125–153.

Bruner, E. (1991). Transformations of self in tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research, 18*, 238–250.

Burton, R. S. (1928). *Tales from the Gulistan or rose garden of the Sheikh Sa'di of Shiraz*. London: Philip Allan & Co..

Calhoun, C. (2002). The class consciousness of frequent travellers: Towards a critique of actually existing cosmopolitanism. In S. Vertovec & R. Cohen (Eds.), *Conceiving cosmopolitanism; theory, context and practice*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Cheney, L. (1988). Humanities in America: A report to the President, the Congress, and the American people. *The Chronicle of Higher Education, 21* Sept. A, 17–23.

Clifford, J. (1992). Travelling Cultures. In L. Grossberg, C. Nelson, & P. Treichler (Eds.), *Cultural Studies*. London: Routledge.

Clifford, J. (1998). Mixed feelings. In P. Cheah & B. Robbins (Eds.), *Cosmopolitics*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Coles, T., Hall, C. M., & Duval, D. (2006). Tourism and post-disciplinary enquiry. *Current Issues in Tourism, 9*(4 & 5), 293–302.

Coles, T., Hall, C. M., & Duval, D. (2009). Post-discipinary tourism. In J. Tribe (Ed.), *Philosophical issues in tourism*. Bristol: Channel View Publications.

Cox, P. (2002). *Intercultural Dialogue*. Session 4 European Commission, Brussels, European Commission. <http://europa.eu/rapid/press-release_IP-02-1783_en.htm> Accessed 07.07.04.

Crawshaw, C., & Urry, J. (1997). Tourism and the photographic eye (pp. 176–195). In C. Rojek & J. Urry (Eds.), *Touring Cultures; Transformations of Travel and Theory*. London: Routledge.

De Botton, A. (2002). *The art of travel*. London: Penguin.

Delanty, G. (2006). The cosmopolitan imagination: critical cosmopolitanism and social theory. *The British Journal of Sociology, 57*(1), 25–47.

Dikeç, M. (2002). Pera peras poros; longings for spaces of hospitality. *Theory, Culture & Society, 19*(1–2), 227–247.

Din, K. H. (1989). Islam and tourism; patterns, issues, and options. *Annals of Tourism Research, 16*, 542–563.

Dore, R. (2003). Global markets and national employment systems. *Work in the global economy; papers and proceedings of an international symposium*. International Institute for Labour Studies Tokyo, 103 Dec.

Fullagar, S. (2002). Narratives of travel: Desire and the movement of feminine subjectivity. *Leisure Studies, 21*, 57–74.

Germann Molz, J. (2005). Getting a 'flexible eye': Round the world travel and scales of cosmopolitan citizenship. *Citizenship Studies, 9*(5), 517–531.

Germann Molz, J. (2006). Cosmopolitan bodies: Fit to travel and travelling to fit. *Body and Society, 12*(3), 1–21.

Germann Molz, J. (2008). Global abode: Home and mobility in narratives of round-the-world travel. *Space and Culture, 11*, 325–342.

Green, E. (1988). Under siege, advocates of a more diverse curriculum prepare for continued struggle in the coming year. *The Chronicle of Higher Education, 28*(Sept.), A13, A16.

Hannerz, U. (1990). Cosmopolitans and locals in world culture (pp. 237–251). In M. Featherstone (Ed.), *Global culture*. London: Sage.

Hannerz, U. (1992). *Cultural complexity; studies in the social organisation of meaning*. New York: Colombia University Press.

Hannerz, U. (2004). Cosmopolitanism (pp. 69–85). In D. Nugent & J. Vincent (Eds.), *A companion to the anthropology of politics*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Held, D. (2002). Culture and the political community: National, global, and cosmopolitan (pp. 48–58). In S. Vertovec & R. Cohen (Eds.), *Conceiving cosmopolitanism – Theory, context and practice*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Hirsch, E. (1988). *Cultural literacy: What every American needs to know*. USA: Vintage.

Hollander, P. (1981). *Political pilgrims; travels of western intellectuals to the Soviet Union, China and Cuba 1928–1978*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Hollinshead, K. (2007). *"Worldmaking" and the transformation of place and culture: The enlargement of Meethan's analysis of tourism and global change. The critical turn in tourism studies: Innovative research methodologies*. Oxford: Elsevier.

Hollinshead, K. (2009). The "worldmaking" prodigy of tourism: The reach and power of tourism in the dynamics of change and transformation. *Tourism Analysis, 14*(1), 139–152.

Hovey, K. (1988). The great books versus America: The closing of the American mind. *Profession. Modern Languages Association*, 40–45.

Huntington, S. (2004). *Dead souls, The denationalisation of the American elite. The national interest*. Spring.

Hutnyk, J. (1996). *The rumour of Calcutta*. London: Zed Books.

Iyer, P. (2002). The necessity of travel. *Time*. Time Australia, July 27.

Jessop, B., & Sum, Ngai.-Ling. (2010). Pre-disciplinary and post-disciplinary perspectives. *New Political Economy, 6*(1), 89–101.

Johnson, P. (2001). An examination of risk within tourist experiences to the Islamic Republic of Iran. *Annals of Leisure Research, 4*, 38–57.

Johnson, P. (2010a). Deconstructing the cosmopolitan gaze. *Tourism and Hospitality Research, 10*(2), 79–92.

Johnson, P. C. (2010b). Writing liminal landscapes, the cosmopolitical gaze. *Tourism Geographies, 12*(4), 505–524.

Jonasson, M., & Scherle, N. (2012). Performing co-produced guided tours. *Scandinavian Journal of Hospitality and Tourism, 12*(1), 55–73.

Kant, I. ((1957 [1795])). *Perpetual Peace*. New York: The Liberal Arts Press.

Katz, C., & Smith, N. (2003). An interview with Edward said. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space, 21*, 635–651.

Kirshenblatt-Gimblett, B. (1998). *Destination culture*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Latour, B. (2004). Whose cosmos, which cosmopolitics? Comments on the peace terms of Ulrich beck. *Common Knowledge, 10*(3), 450–462.

Li, Y. (2000). Geographical consciousness and tourism experience. *Annals of Tourism Research, 27*(4), 863–883.

MacCannell, D. (1989). *The Tourist, a new theory of the leisure class*. New York: Schocken Books.

Malcomson, S. L. (1998). The varieties of cosmopolitan experience. In P. Cheah & B. Robbins (Eds.), *Cosmopolitics: Thinking and Feeling beyond the Nation*. Minneapolis: University of Minneapolis Press.

Micklethwait, J., & Wooldridge, A. (2000). *A future perfect: The challenge and hidden promise of globalisation*. London: Heinemann.

Mowforth, M., & Munt, I. (1998). *Tourism and sustainability: New tourism in the third world*. London: Routledge.

Nash, D. (1989). Tourism as a form of imperialism (pp. 37–54). In V. Smith (Ed.), *Hosts and guests: The anthropology of tourism*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Notar, B. E. (2008). Producing cosmopolitanism at the borderlands: Lonely planeteers and "local" cosmopolitans in southwest China. *Anthropological Quarterly, 81*(3), 615–650.

Nussbaum, M. (1997). Kant and stoic cosmopolitanism. *The Journal of Political Philosophy, 5*(1), 1–25.

Ong, A. (1998). Flexible citizenship among Chinese cosmopolitans. In P. Cheah & B. Robbins (Eds.), *Cosmopolitics: Thinking and feeling beyond the nation*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Pearce, P. (2005). *Tourist behaviour: Themes and conceptual schemes*. Clevedon: Channel View Publications.

Phipps, P. (1999). Tourists, terrorists, death and value. In R. Kaur & J. Hutnyk (Eds.), *Travel worlds; journeys in contemporary cultural politics*. London: Zed Books.

Porter, D. (1991). *Haunted journeys; desire and transgression in European travel writing*. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press.

Rabinow, P. (1986). Representations are social facts: Modernity and post-modernity in anthropology. In J. Clifford & G. Marcus (Eds.), *Writing culture; the poetics and politics of ethnography*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Reilly, N. (2007). Cosmopolitan feminism and human rights. *Hypatia, 22*(4), 180–198.

Richter, L., & Matthews, H. (1991). Political science and tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research, 18*, 120–135.

Robbins, B. (1998). Actually existing cosmopolitanism. In P. Cheah & B. Robbins (Eds.), *Cosmopolitics*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Robinson, J., & Zill, N. (1997). Matters of culture. *American Demographics, 19*(9).

Said, E. (1979). *Orientalism*. New York: Vintage Books.

Salazar, N. (2010a). Tourism and cosmopolitanism: A view from below. *International Journal of Tourism Anthropology, 1*(1), 55–69.

Salazar, N. (2010b). *Envisioning eden*. New York: Berghahn Books.

Scherle, M. N., & Nonnenmann, A. (2008). Swimming in cultural flows: Conceptualising tour guides as intercultural mediators and cosmopolitans. *Journal of Tourism and Cultural Change, 6*(2), 120–137.

Schueth, S., & O'Loughlin, J. (2008). Belonging to the world: Cosmopolitans in geographic contexts. *Geoforum, 39*(2), 926–941.

Shumer-Smith, P., & Hannam, K. (1994). *Worlds of desire, realms of power: A cultural anthropology*. London: Edward Arnold.

Skrbis, Z., Kendall, G., & Woodward, I. (2004). Locating cosmopolitanism: Between humanist ideal and grounded social theory. *Theory, Culture & Society, 21*(6), 115–136.

Spengler, O. (1918/1932). *The decline of the west*. London: Allen and Unwin.

Swain, M. B. (2009). The cosmopolitan hope of tourism: Critical action and worldmaking vistas. *Tourism Geographies, 11*(4), 505–525.

Szerszynski, B., & Urry, J. (2006). Visuality, mobility and the cosmopolitan: Inhabiting the world from Afar. *The British Journal of Sociology, 57*(1), 113–131.

Tehran Times (1998). *Tourists in the vanguard of dialogue between civilisations*. edition 02/12/98 section: Other News, Tehran Times, Tehran. <tehrantimes.com> Accessed 26.10.99.

Tucker, H. (2009). Recognising emotion an dits postcolonial potentialities: Discomfort and shame in a tourism encounter in Turkey. *Tourism Geographies, 11*(4), 444–461.

Twain, M. (1872). *Innocents abroad*. London: George Routledge and Sons.

UNWTO. (2011). *Annual report* 2010. <http://media.unwto.org/sites/all/files/pdf/finalannualreportpdf.pdf> Accessed 31.10.12.

UNWTO. (2012).*Tourism highlights* 2012. <http://dtxtq4w60xqpw.cloudfront.net/sites/all/files/docpdf/unwtohighlights12enhr_1.pdf> Accessed 28.10.12.

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

Urry, J. (1995). *Consuming places*. London: Routledge.

Urry, J. (1998). *The tourist gaze, leisure and travel in contemporary societies*. London: Sage Publications.

Urry, J. (2005) *Keynote Speech. Sites of Cosmopolitanism*. Griffith University, Brisbane Australia, July 6–8.

Vafadari, K., & Cooper, M. (2010). Japanese tourism in Iran. In N. Scott & J. Jafari (Eds.), *Tourism in the Muslim world*. UK: Emerald.

Venn, C. (2006). *The postcolonial world: Towards alternative worlds*. London: Sage.

Vertovec, S., & Cohen, R. (2002). Introduction: Conceiving cosmopolitanism. In S. Vertovec & R. Cohen (Eds.), *Conceiving cosmopolitanism – Theory, context and practice*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Wollen, P. (1994). The cosmopolitan ideal in the arts. In G. Robertson, M. Mash, & L. Tickneret (Eds.), *Travellers tales; narratives of home and displacement*. London: Routledge.

Woodward, I., & Skrbis, Z. (2005). Investigating the idea of cosmopolitan openness: strategies, repertoires and practices. *In Sites of Cosmopolitanism, Griffith University*. July 6–8-2005.

Yee, C. (1937). *The silent traveller*. London: Country Life Ltd.

Yee, C. (1948). *The silent traveller in Edinburgh*. London: Methuen & Co..