Tourism, Culture & Communication, Vol. 25, pp. 417–430
Printed in the USA.

1943-4146/25 $60.00 + .00
DOI: https://doi.org/10.3727/194341425X17536604190348
www.cognizantcommunication.com

Worldmaking & Worldmakers: In Memory of Keith Hollinshead

Rodanthi Tzanelli* and Claudia Melis†

*School of Sociology & Social Policy, University of Leeds, Yorkshire, UK
†Liverpool Business School, Liverpool John Moores, Liverpool, UK

In this article, we provide a comprehensive genealogy of Keith Hollinshead's thesis of "worldmaking" in tourism, as this appeared and developed in his individual and collaboratively published work (S1). We then proceed to present some research that was influenced by this thesis in critical tourism analysis and in cognate areas (S2). Our discussion in these two sections (S1 & S2) allows us to identify the presence of "worldmakers" in tourism analysis, both as "ideal types" (tourism experts working with state institutions and tourism business) but also as critical tourism scholars developing methodological, epistemological, and ethnographic/netnographic agendas in the academic field. The article concludes with an organized presentation of individual full-length article contributions to this special issue.

Key words: Critical tourism studies; Enunciation; Identification; Methodology; Paradigms in tourism; Worldmaking

Strong Concepts Do Not Die

The news of Keith Hollinshead's death in early Autumn 2022 spread fast across international networks in tourism studies. However common or formulaic such news-sharing practices may be, their performative iteration serves to assert the presence of a "community" that claims the one who passes as its member. Reiterating the death event itself entangles individual and collective itineraries, integrating the passing scholar's biographical traces into said community's collective affective and ontological fabric. Today, Keith Hollinshead's passing features in several professional association newsletters, academic journal tributes, but also digital vigils that remember him as a scholar and a friend. The present special issue adds to this growing and stylistically diverse memorial legacy, as a celebration of Hollinshead the scholar, the keen communicator of ideas, and a continuous connector of researchers and research groups. The special issue's flagship terms are "worldmaking," Hollinshead's paradigmatic innovation in critical tourism studies, and "worldmakers," our own extrapolated reading from his paradigmatic innovation.

We invited prospective contributors to situate their submissions across two critical axes: the first focuses on the interpersonal making of worlds of

Address correspondence to Professor Rodanthi Tzanelli, School of Sociology & Social Policy, University of Leeds, 12.04 Social Sciences Building, Yorkshire, UK LS2 9JT. E-mail: r.tzanelli@leeds.ac.uk

friendship between them and Hollinshead, encouraging them to reflect upon him as a person as well as the friendship's generative intellectual qualities. In the second axis we invited more conventional article length elaborations on worldmaking and actual worldmakers in tourism (tourism designers, organizations, anarchic groups, and more)—hence, novel conceptual "worldmaking" propositions. Both axes are meant to produce a "diary" or account of the broad reach of Hollinshead's own conceptual and methodological portfolio. In tandem, we wanted to demonstrate in a meaningful polyphonic style that this portfolio supports further independent creativity and innovation in the fields of critical tourism thinking and interdisciplinary cultural analysis at large (Melis & Panayiotopoulos, 2024). Such fields inform *Tourism, Culture & Communication*'s emphasis on intersections between cultural specificity, mobility, and communicability of ideas in a world (or "worlds") defined by complexity, conflict, and endless creative potentiality. We understand "worldmaking" and its "worldmakers" not in "black and white" frames, but as multifaceted processes and actors partaking in generative projects with variable outcomes.

Excluding this section, this article is divided into three sections, each clarifying core epistemological matters in the ways that we organized this special issue. In the following ("first") section we discuss the birth and genealogical development of Hollinshead's primary concept and thesis on "worldmaking," which shaped a new paradigm in critical tourism studies. In the second section we discuss how this evolving thesis was received and reshaped in critical tourism analysis and cognate subject areas, elucidating the nature and textures of further conceptual, epistemological, and methodological innovations to which it led. Together, sections one and two justify the special issue's focus, organizational logic, and institutional affiliation with *Tourism, Culture & Communication*'s programmatic objectives. In the final section we proceed to introduce individual contributions to the special issue, highlighting their topical and collective significance.

S1: Genealogies and Conceptual Rhizomes

It is ostensibly difficult to summarize Keith Hollinshead's contribution to critical tourism studies in its breadth and depth. His thesis on the worldmaking powers of tourism as an institutional and agential force (Hollinshead, 1999a, 2009a; Hollinshead et al., 2009) was later refined by him and colleagues to consider less organized and central power-driven forms of subjective becoming in tourist contexts and through travel sojourns (Hollinshead et al., 2015; Hollinshead & Suleman, 2018a). An analytical constant in his work has been the generative role of "enunciation" and "identification" in scalar research: on the making of the tourist subject (Hollinshead & Vellah, 2020), the tourist state (Hollinshead 2009b), and the populations hosting tourists/tourism (Hollinshead, 1999b). In the time frame between his first major collaborative interventions on these issues and his last epistemological/methodological trilogy on worldmaking in tourism (Hollinshead, Suleman, & Nair, 2021; Hollinshead, Suleman, & Vellah, 2021; Hollinshead, Suleman, & Yu Lo, 2021), he forged both a unique transdisciplinary tourism paradigm and an intellectual community. This community continues to grow rhizomatically across institutional and beyond national borders, challenging conventional thinking and writing in the inherently a-disciplinary (or, for other postdisciplinary, interdisciplinary, and/or transdisciplinary) area of critical tourism and travel studies. But where does this story begin? For us, the conception of the master term/thesis commences while Hollinshead is writing an unconventional doctoral project. We are in awe of his creative forces but also sympathize with his supervisors who had to read some 900 pages of quite complex discourse on the remaking of Texan heritage in tourism contexts (see both Brian King's and John Crompton's tributes in this special issue).

Many scholars continue to "replay" in their postdoctoral publications some breakthrough moments from the years that they spent conceptualizing their doctoral thesis, to calibrate their personal intellectual signature. Hollinshead's (1993) legendary tripartite "The Truth About Texas: A Naturalistic Study of the Construction of Heritage" was long, complex and rich enough (see tribute by Hollinshead's supervisor John Crompton in this special issue) to suggest to its author multiple developmental pathways: ontological, epistemological, methodological, empirical, and axiological. Hollinshead opted to draw primarily on two affiliate interdisciplinary

areas, which thematically covered postcolonial and decolonial approaches to power and domination on the one hand and poststructuralism, critical theory, and early critical transdisciplinary elaborations on the normalization and construction of collective self-assignations on the other. Both portfolios were filtered through diverse disciplinary *coda* (in political science, history, sociology, philosophy, and business studies). He used these bodies of knowledge to take apart what appeared in his "hard" (i.e., administrative and business documentation) and "soft" (i.e., pictures, own participant notes) data as coherent and unchallenged mechanisms of faithful reproduction of local Texan histories, when in fact were techniques of ideological airbrushing of dissonant pasts.

From his doctoral thesis Hollinshead would produce a multifaceted repertoire of scholarly "enunciative" tools. A key term in his conceptual universe of diagrams, dictionaries, and methodological directories (i.e., Hollinshead, 2004), "enunciation" is a term he borrowed from Homi Bhabha's (1994) postcolonial analysis in *The Location of Culture*. Bhabha used enunciation to explain how inevitable conflicts between the postcolonial subject's performative allegiance with community-biding traditions and the necessity of its negation in the articulation of new strategies and political demands are practically resolved (Bhabha, 1994, pp. 34–36). But for Hollinshead, Bhabha's thesis alone could not explain how heritage is tourismified in context, so his "enunciation" would venture into European social–theoretical domains to also borrow from other compatible paradigms. Thus, he borrowed from Michel Foucault's (1979, p. 248, pp. 298–300) understanding of carceral power as an internalized condition that turns individual coercion into social normalization (i.e., the tourismified postcolonial subject adopts Western tourist storylines about their own culture) and Michel Pêcheux's (1975/1982, p. 157) thesis on "modalities of subjective operation" that formalize knowledge (i.e., strategies involved in turning heritage/culture into a decent enterprise through "identification," "counteridentification," and "disidentification" with workable or nonworkable models of discursive presentation to publics). In its first iteration, "worldmaking" inspects structural–institutional productions of culture in international markets.

However, inevitably, these fusions would promote a particular onto-methodological objective: to equip tourism studies scholars with testable ways of how "truth" emerges in sociopolitical contexts populated by stakeholders with conflicting interests. Against hasty readings of "worldmaking" as a project derived from Nelson Goodman's (1978) radical revisions of phenomenology in artistic community-making, we clarify that Hollinshead's master thesis remained rooted in Eurasian critical theory's fusions of phenomenology with post-Marxist and decolonial/postcolonial theories. In fact, "The Truth About Texas" is based more on fusions of symbolic realism with constructivism interspersed with phenomenologies of ethnographic travel writing (à la Jafar Jafari and Nelson Graburn). On page 1 of his thesis, Hollinshead explained that he wants to explore tourism narratives as a "form of iconological public culture on the macro-cosmic plane" (Hollinshead, 1993).

Goodman's (1996b) methodological oeuvre accepts all cosmic versions (of publicness) as realities-in-themselves and does not address the dynamics of power and domination. Contrariwise, Hollinshead's methodological design was informed by poststructuralist critiques of any reasoning models with a mission to eliminate versions of truth-making, custom-making, and living that radically challenge Western science and system thought. Where for Goodman (1996a) the latter is not an issue (for him, all world-versions will be addressed by the methodologist in their conceptual laboratories as pure categories), for Hollinshead *this is the issue*: some world-versions become the victims of institutional–organizational amnesia, so they must be prioritized in the critical tourism scholar's *agenda*. Hollinshead's research design seems to mirror that of the policymakers' near-authoritarian prioritization of one version of heritage, one world-version and thus one version of cultural storytelling. However, we should not confuse structural appearances with homological identifications. Where Goodman (1951/1977) focused on the possibility to provide an "objectual" account of "phenomenalist" situations, stand-alone renderings of study objects and situations as they appear in-themselves for others, Hollinshead's methodological heroes are social scientists such as Norman Denzin, who focus on the plight and untenability of objectivity.

For Hollinshead the researcher has the responsibility to lodge their methodological tools between processes of self-making and other-making (for influences see Taylor's, 1989, *Sources of the Self*, which Bhabha, 1994, pp. 213–214, also discussed. This dialogical building of criticality suggests that whenever Hollinshead refers to "transdisciplinarity" in his worldmaking thesis he does not "do" what we call "pure" methodology; he constructs an account on the ethics of equitable and fair human development as a researcher. Indeed, his collaboratively crafted vision of postdisciplinary analysis aims to equip the subject area with tools that are perhaps located in less used epistemic domains, waiting for researchers to restore the broken links (Hollinshead & Ivanova, 2013; see also Rodanthi Tzanelli's tribute in this special issue on arpeggios). In this respect, Hollinshead's "worldmaking" is far from a watertight "realist" or "objectivist" project. Indeed, his understanding of "truth" remains lodged between the ways individual and/as collective actors interpret social environments and how such interpretations are constantly *remade* (rather than merely reproduced) in particular geopolitical intersections of power, contingency, genealogical mythmaking and selective amnesia.

Hollinshead's work also owes much to Gilles Deleuze's emergist theory (Deleuze, 1968/2004): an explanation of how phenomena, identities, and situations can potentially manifest their presence in any context. But his first conception of emergence combined two apparently conflicting methods (for critical tourism researchers) and strategies (for stakeholders in tourism): "discourse" and "naturalism." At the time he had finished his thesis, this resembled conventional dialectic frames of investigating social interactions through critiques of binary oppositions between "objectivity" versus "subjectivity" *qua* "quantitative" versus "qualitative" toolmaking in research. Overall, this methodological scaffolding debated validity, reliability, and credibility in the communication of research results in public fora. As poststructuralists, Deleuze and Foucault refute such rigid oppositional scaffoldings. However, for Hollinshead what truly matters is how heritage emerges out of the "secondary elaborations" that take place between the idealized aesthetic categories (of tourism) crafted by the state and the heavily iconophilic urban cultures molded by global human mobilities. In its first iteration, this onto-epistemic design is not exactly Fredric Jameson's (1991) approach to postmodernism as the cultural logic of capitalism. However, it comes close to it, thus further departing from Goodman's claim on the researcher's/theorist's neutrality in *what* they study, in lieu of equity in *how* they study it.

Hollinshead's interest in the ways tourism simulations of local culture are produced by creative designers (what he dubs tourism "agents" or "experts") in a loose collaboration with the "tourist state" place his "worldmaking" among the ocular epistemologies (i.e., see Hollinshead, 2009a, 2009b). By the beginning of the 21st century, his earlier interrogations on the fabrication of local heritage in simulacra of entertainment for the tourist gaze (as per Urry, 1990; see Hollinshead, 1999a) and in technocorporate markets of tourism commodities (as per Fjellman, 1992, and later also Meethan, 2001; see Hollinshead, 1998, 2007) had been combined with a call to re-examine foundationalist divisions between constructivist and positivist/neopositivist paradigms (the latter often also coming under the umbrella of "naturalism" in his work). The primary aim was to address what he termed together with Tazim Jamal "Critical issues and concepts in interpretive tourism research" (Jamal & Hollinshead, 2001, p. 70). In these methodological interventions, "emergist" analysis features only laterally and often in conjunction with borrowings from pragmatism (sense-making progressively occupies more space in his work; Hollinshead, 2010) and critiques of commodity aesthetics. But it is unclear whether such poststructuralist analyses of tourism worldmaking picture the industry as a creative–destructive force à la Schumpeter, or they side with the regenerative argument of the Academy of Hope, which discusses the possibility of elevating tourism as an industry and an ethic of mobility and cosmopolitan pedagogy to a positive development force. There are significant differences between the professional pedagogical curricula promised in the works of Morgan (2013), Ateljevic's (2009, 2013) transformation of "transmodernity" from a theology of liberation to a pragmatist pedagogy, and Hollinshead's (2007) continuous focus on the iconological decolonization of tourism as an industry.

The iconological deconstruction of the ways tourism works as a network (our designation) of

institutions and independent organizations persists between 2007 and ca. 2018, when Hollinshead coauthors a slightly revised thesis on worldmaking. Hollinshead and Suleman (2018a) began to call attention to the fraught agential possibilities "instilled" in tourism worlds, which may be the product of ordinary everyday acts that carry the signature of power. Although "instillation," and elsewhere in the same article "inculcation," are widely recognized terms in Pierre Bourdieu's (1977) theory of practice, the authors prefer to discuss their argument via media and tourist/tourist studies works such as those of Meethan (2001; also, Hollinshead, 2007) and notably, Nünning and Nünning's (2010) emphasis on the role of media in acts of worldmaking. Despite some obvious conceptual reproductions from earlier publications, discussions of new mediatized designs of tourism suggest a shift toward a different focus on what institutions (i.e., media) construct and how this is released in the public spheres of tourism.

In line with this addition to the worldmaking portfolio, closer to his passing, Hollinshead's compositions began to "gesture" towards the possibility of imaginary designs of tourism futures. Despite his engagement with Deleuze and Guattari's (1988) nomadism, he was never a scholar of utopia as such. His work is often connected to tacit problems, workings, and possibilities lifted out of carefully abstracted sociocultural contexts, situations, and experiments. Evidence to this difference from other social theorists who influenced critical tourism studies, such as Bauman (2007, 2016), whom he occasionally cites, are Hollinshead and colleagues' (Hollinshead, Suleman, & Yu Lo, 2021) methodological use of concepts such as "dreamagining" and "delinking." Such concepts are forward looking in terms of social design, while staying true to Hollinshead's special hybrid brand of European critical thought and decolonial and postcolonial structuralism (Hollinshead & Suleman, 2018b). Unlike the negative critical outlook of Bauman's (2016) utopia as a de facto problematic commercialized production of futures from past repositories, Hollinshead and coauthors get their hands dirty with real-life attempts to make futures, with all the bad and good consequences these may bear.

Much like some of his coauthors, such as Ateljevic (2009, 2013), Hollinshead split his entire career between consultancy and theorizing, with the latter taking a life of its own independently from any applied work he did. His international scholarly networks have advanced criticality in directions that are not to everyone's taste—again, an example is the engagement of Academy of Hope academics with regenerative tourism entrepreneurship. Be as it may, when Hollinshead's worldmaking thesis taps into the sister paradigm of tourism/tourist imaginaries, it encourages friends to engage in radical experimentation. We may remember Cornelius Castoriadis's (1975/1987) warning that endorsed social visions ("the social imaginary") emerge from radical propositions upheld by social rebels ("the radical imaginary"), which are corralled by institutions to fix the problematic aspects of structured worldviews. Overall, Hollinshead's "worldmaking compositions" intercept "contrapuntal" arrangements with "arpeggiated" situations, thus demanding a resolution in the ways tourism is made, delivered and experienced (see Tzanelli's tribute in this special issue).

S2: Ethnographic Applications and Theoretical Interjections/Modifications

Whether worldmaking is adopted as a central analytical concept or just used as an argument among other arguments, its uses and applications are important contributions in the multifield of tourism studies. We are inclined to believe that Keith Hollinshead himself wanted to cultivate this breadth, versality, and adaptability of the concept in terms of application, as a homage to Deleuze's style of engagement with social and political life. From personal communiques we know that for him worldmaking should be developed as a methodological tool amenable to respond to the needs of the present (Melis, 2024). Hence, it is appropriate to delve into some of the many thematic articulations and "lines of flight" in which, since 2009, worldmaking has "drifted" critical tourism analysis. Please stay "attuned" to these "Keith journeys" with us.

The thesis' most immediate applications involve an engagement with the representation of peoples, places, pasts, and presents (Hollinshead et al., 2015—see for instance: Hunter, 2011; Jayathilaka, 2020; Li et al., 2019; Melis & Chambers, 2021; C. X. Zhang et al., 2015)—and thus, broadly speaking,

with processes of **placemaking** (Everett, 2012; Hultman & Hall, 2012; Lundberg et al., 2018; Sofield et al., 2017). Equally abundant has been the thesis' mobilization in **postcolonial and decolonial analyses** of tourist encounters and relations (Adu-Ampong, 2023; Adu-Ampong & Berg, 2025; Ormond, & Vietti, 2022; Stinson, 2024; Vanden Boer, 2016)—a research area in which it still has much to contribute. Given Hollinshead's inspiration from Frankfurt School deliberations on the effects of capitalism on social life, subjectivity, and civic engagement, it is not surprising that, recently, the concept has also found application in analyses of **intersections between the economic production of inequalities** (Altamirano, 2022; Büscher, & Fletcher, 2017; Lapointe et al., 2018; Lorente, & Tupas, 2013), **the niche marketing of tourism and geopolitical alliances** (Huang, & Liu, 2024; Huang & Suliman, 2023; Pfoser, & Yusupova, 2022). The concept is increasingly employed to underpin theory and **paradigmatic considerations**, including, notably, recent explorations of the relationship between posthumanism and tourism (Grimwood et al., 2019; Guia & Jamal, 2025; Ivanova & Buda, 2020; Stinson, 2024; Tzanelli, 2023).

In the thematic area of cultural representation and placemaking, Hunter (2011) looks at a community in Taiwan, where Indigenous tourism has evolved to a significant but not trouble-free industry. The study aims at discussing the origins, mechanisms, and effects of Indigenous tourism from the perspective of the area's residents. Worldmaking features as an active force exceeding the mere identification of what is going on superficially at the destination. Instead, emphasis is placed on the mundane discursive construction and deconstruction of Indigenous people and their worlds and its consequences. Likewise, Hultman and Hall (2012) used worldmaking to explain how "locality" and the "local" are produced in Southern Sweden concomitantly with the development of destinations through different stakeholder negotiations. C. X. Zhang et al. (2015) took a step further, to debate worldmaking as a form of authoritative mythmaking in Hong Kong destination image management. They stressed that strategic uses of myth from Hong Kong's colonial past allow it to project a hybrid identity, which stands between "local Chinese-ness" and "Western-ness." The study illuminated the ideological and political qualities of worldmaking, as a process of selective representation that enables tourists to "become impressing colonizers with the power to homogenize and transform the destination" (C. X. Zhang et al., 2015, p. 158). Li et al.'s (2019) study of the rural ethnic community of Jiabang in Southwest China contemplated all the potential benefits that could be reaped by marginalized communities from the destabilization of dominant discourses that contribute to their marginalization. Thus, they highlighted tourism's power to stereotype culturally distinct groups in contemporary China, reiterating in this case the country's urban–rural divide and thus reinforcing power inequalities between tourists and the toured communities.

Such studies regard the dynamics of postcolonial worldmaking and the ways colonial systems have now become intertwined with capitalist networks and tourist markets. Some of them maintain that tourism worldmaking is characterized by complexity in the messages it releases, especially when it comes to the impact dark tourism and the heritage of slavery have on marginalized groups today (see Adu-Ampong, 2023). Adu- Ampong and Berg's (2024) relevant research in Amsterdam proposed that guided tours, guidebooks, and maps can also contribute to countermapping such contested forms of heritage, releasing more progressive propositions about minority cultures. Ormond and Vietti (2022) also explored the discursive and performative worldmaking power of tourism in debates pertaining to the exploitation of the "immigrants' bodies, labor and heritages," suggesting that tourism can also encourage cross-cultural understanding and multiperspectivity (Ormond &Vietti, 2022, p. 207). In a similar vein, Vanden Boer (2016) looks at the practices of settler colonialism in Palestine. There, tourism has transformed into a mechanism perpetrating colonial violence, which is then normalized at an international level by the tourismification of heritage territories. However, the study also explores the opportunity to use the same means to achieve decolonization, not only of tourism but also of the ways native cultures are understood.

Where colonialism and its replacement discourses have a moderate use in scholarly applications of worldmaking, the economic exploitation of marginalized populations appears center stage in many publications using Hollinshead's work. Such works

range from those focusing on digital capitalism and linguistic competence among foreign workers (see Lorente & Tupas, 2013 on marketing English language training courses to Filipinos and the evident exploitation of third world labor needed to teach it), to the systematic production of inequalities, waste, and spaces of exception in South African and Latin American tourism settings, which perpetrate uneven capitalist development "of which it is part and parcel" (Büscher & Fletcher 2017, p. 659). Such connections tend to appear in studies that prioritize theoretical development of Hollinshead's argument. These include lateral connections to worldmaking, as is the case with Lapointe et al.'s (2018) focus on the neoliberalization in which tourism is profoundly embedded as a significant player. For them, policies of sustainable development are used to propagate the neoliberal and imperialist logics that are supported by deterritorialized institutions such as the International Monetary Fund. Likewise, Keul and Eisenauer (2019) discussed the cultural and social understandings of worldmaking in the ways tourism functions in situ. In such arguments, worldmaking is regarded as a geopolitical force, which is embedded "in multi-scale, multi-level, and multi-subject political processes, such as globalization, national transformation, local development, and individual subjectification, [in the] making tourism [as] more than a national strategy and economic industry: [as] a personal daily practice" (Huang & Liu, 2024, p. 4). But there are yet other innovative contributions in this cluster of analyses, which filter worldmaking through a critical feminist take on economic performance and resilience. Such is Bakas' (2017) use of worldmaking to debate the role gender has in entrepreneurial adaptation and sustainable business practices that combat social exclusion and promote rural development. Similarly, Zhang and Hitchcock (2017) suggested that for Chinese women travelers traveling is a feminine way of worldmaking, which produces status as it consolidates the traveler's self-identity.

Because of their Marxian analytical underpinnings, such studies also suggest theoretical connections between Hollinhead's hybrid postmodern epistemology and classical takes on the imaginary institution of society and the globe (see also S1). In fact, the "geopolitical" is viewed in such applications as a gateway into global memory (see Pfoser & Yusupova's, 2022, study of Russian tourism to post-Soviet cities) and its strategic territorialization in markets (see Huang & Suliman's, 2023, study of tourism in the Xisha chain of islands in the Paracel archipelago, where tourism acts as a territorial agency to accommodate the state's geopolitical objectives in the South China Sea). But it is worth noting that, as much as such studies wish to integrate economic objectives in a theoretical framework that prioritizes the making of cultural worlds, they are not equipped with epistemological and ontological mechanisms to assess cultural agency and creativity beyond economic imperatives. Rare contributions to this "critique of critique" are provided in the studies of mega-events and their international policy coordination frameworks by Tzanelli (see work on Rio 2016, Tzanelli, 2017, and Tokyo 2020/2021, Tzanelli, 2022a, Olympic Games), who suggests that we must also learn to separate our geopolitical adulations of economic imperatives from the cultural worlds that tourism generates. In this thesis, "worldmaking" possesses aleatory qualities, which should be assessed contextually on the understanding that in the multiple capitalist assemblages of mega-events different actors (from dignitaries to ceremonial directors, volunteers, Olympic audiences/tourists, and anti-Olympic activists) are assigned and/or assign themselves with different forms and qualities of agency. Thus, simply lumping them together under a uniform systems theory to study capitalist imperatives obscures the nuanced power of human agency and now also posthuman collectivities to draft better planetary futures. Another such example is provided by Ivanova and Buda's (2020) look at communist heritage as a multidirectional rhizomatic network to explore attitudes and ambivalences towards heritage practice in Central Eastern Europe through tourism. Here worldmaking is used to underpin the argument of tourism as a form of discursive ordering: a worldmaking force that territorializes and reconfigures pasts and presents, in Deleuze and Guattari's terms.

Applications of Hollinshead's thesis on the mechanisms that secure the systemic (i.e., capitalist, national, and nationalist) disempowerment of Indigenous and minority communities are ubiquitous in the worldmaking paradigm, but they are not the only worthy approach to mention here.

A different group of scholars prefers to focus specifically on the formation of counterdiscourses leveled at such concerted destination image management strategies, which are controlled either by the nation-state or by international markets. Sofield and colleagues (Sofield et al., 2017) explored five cases in Tasmania in which placemaking is organically driven. By this they mean that, whereas it does not have "tourism" as its priority, such placemaking has allowed localities to benefit from tourism. Worldmaking is understood as a process that allows local stakeholders to "sell difference" for their community's benefit (Sofield et al., 2017, p. 20). They argued that a continuous commitment by the community to pursue its own goals in tourism markets while simultaneously safeguarding its heritage benefits them: ensuring they are not exploited by tourism markets, they also manage to achieve a degree of visibility nationally and internationally.

Similarly, Jayathilaka (2020) exposed (this time from the perspective of the native traveler/tourist subject) the activist outlook of Sri Lankan travel bloggers, who refuse to romanticize their country for the tourist gaze. Their worldmaking contribution rests on their tendency to debate in their posts matters of inequality, human rights, or wildlife conservation in destinations particularly vulnerable to exploitative tourismification (Jayathilaka, 2020). Ren and colleagues (Ren et al., 2024) made a similar argument when they suggested that tour guides possess worldmaking power and therefore are potential agents of change. And the same thesis can be applied to the "conscious tourist": Hayes and Lovelock (2017) explained that worldmaking projections of New Zealand as a 100% pure, clean, and green destination are not accepted uncritically by all tourists. Their study revealed that particular, ecologically aware groups of visitors reject such false ("*faux*"—Hollinshead, 2009) worldmaking projections in advertising, stressing instead the presence of pressing environmental issues such as water pollution, species extinction, and ecosystemic deterioration. Questioning such manufactured branding that aims to attract international tourist clientele, responsible tourist behavior can help locals to adopt policies of wiser environmental resource use.

The question of acting responsibly has broader pedagogical applications in critical tourism analysis that proposes new intersections between decolonial theory and epistemological inquiry into humanism, humanitarianism, and posthumanism. In fact, we want to propose that the roots of relevant current debates that engage with Hollinshead's worldmaking thesis cannot be *sensibly* disconnected from the spirit of his early collaborative publications with Tanzim Jamal on postcolonial methodologies of discourse and postmodern epistemologies of power and knowledge (Jamal & Hollinshead, 2001). By "sensibly" we refer to his discussion of tourism as a form of contemporary sensibility—what he calls "the new sense" (Hollinshead, 2010). This new sense challenges the old restrictive disciplinary imaginaries in tourism management, so as to foster a fresh critical look at the normalizing power of tourism: its ability to both fix and liberate populations and identities. Below we also proceed to explain that although Hollinshead never extended this take on pragmatism to study the place of emotions, affects and atmospheres in tourism, his current critical readers do.

More recently published methodological discussions continue to recognize his thesis as a significant contribution to postmodern thinking in tourism (see a relevant "trialogue" in Tribe et al., 2015). Importantly, these discussions lead us to the presentation of a remarkably diverse group of scholarly reworkings of Hollinshead's analysis. A primary categorization of them is based on their humanist and posthumanist ethos, on the understanding that this refers to who and/or what partakes in the making of worlds of tourism: humans, animals, landscapes, lands, digital software and hardware, platformized communication networks, and so forth. A secondary categorization involves an understanding of how action and agency are assembled in a Deleuzean and Latourian sense. Is it technology that drives such developments? Is it a human understanding and appreciation of the ways nonhuman life is and acts on the world?

From this basic scaffolding follow different onto-methodological statements and propositions. More classical humanists regress their analysis to a cosmopolitan model (Swain, 2009) of tolerant and open vistas that we associate with critical cosmopolitanism (i.e., Delanty, 2009). Methodologically, this uses worldmaking as "an operational cosmopolitan construct" involving cultural literacy in tourism research (Johnson 2014, p. 267). Such

literacy is a response to representational engagements with the world from particular viewpoints in an increasingly globalized society. The premise is that everyone is a cosmopolitan, embodying a compossibility of cultural literacies that include behavioral, cognitive, and affective forces. Here worldmaking intersects with the concept of compossibility (after Venn, 2006), a concept possessing and developing methodological nuances in Hollinshead's work on inter-, post- and extradisciplinarity in tourism (see also S1). Even Guia and Jamal's (2023) recent argument on the cosmopolitanization of hospitality, which has been circulating for decades in critical hospitality studies (see reviews and revisions/critiques in Germann Molz & Gibson, 2007; Tzanelli, 2023) is not a clear posthuman statement on the affective turn to which we referred above.

However, some humanists are also closer to environmental humanist discussions (a.k.a. tourism worldmaking) than postmodern scholars in the field of critical tourism. These contributions range from Caton's (2013) engagement with pragmatism in tourism agency, to clear deliberations on the need to adopt a posthuman ethics in tourism, as currently, the worlds that die due to climate change are more than human (Grimwood et al., 2018; Höckert, & Rantala, 2024). At times, indigeneity and the environment form clear, if complex, connections in such arguments, but at other times they filter worldmaking through analyses of urban design and genealogical accounts of urban development that favor tourism mobilities (i.e., Tzanelli, 2023). Examples of the former are Stinson et al.'s (2021) suggestion that scholars need to work through experiential narrative moments to inform critical tourism research. Their field is comprised of the Indigenous–settler relations in Canada, and their task is to illuminate how "becoming common plantain works to foster Settler accountability for colonization . . . place Settlers in relation (e.g., to land, identity, Indigeneity); and augment conceptualizations of justice as healing" (Stinson et al., 2021, p. 234). Also starting from the premise of performance and phenomenology studies that tourism narratives circulating via research contribute to the propagation of colonial values, Grimwood et al. (2019) proposed a decolonizing story through the narration of a settlers' story. The focus is on the Łutsel K'e Dene First Nation and their connections to the Thelon River watershed in sub-Arctic Canada; the narrative involves settlers taking responsibility for colonial resistance, learning from Indigenous peoples, and shedding desires and entitlements to knowledge. Similarly, Stinson's (2024) more than representational analysis of atmospheric embodiment in the city of Niagara Falls discusses how settler colonialism emerges through a range of tourism worldmaking practices. Furthermore, Grimwood and Höckert's (2023) aim is to "vegetalize" tourism research, addressing ways of knowing about nonhuman worlds by ontologically engaging with them. Broadly speaking, a nonhuman entity's action on environments and within mixed animate and inanimate ecologies challenges worldmaking's original anthropocentrism, while also extending its engagement with non-Western worldviews in tourism analysis. Environmental humanist contributions to the paradigm borrow from classical storytelling methodologies to engage in the posthumanist affirmative ethics that we find in collaborations, such as those by Guia and Jamal (2023). Indeed, the last two examples introduce new axiological, ontological, and methodological portfolios in tourism analysis, but also new ways of thinking about academic communities of affirmative action.

Such novel "kinmakings" inform new "critico-relational dispositions" in critical tourism analysis, revising the subject's old Eurocentric models of engagement with planetary matters (Pernecky, 2023, p. 562). But where contributors such as Pernecky (2023) focus on rectifications of a lack of radical relationality for transitioning into more-than-tourism studies, sociologists such as Tzanelli (2022b), prefer to assess the very affective qualities of such paradigmatic communities. Closer to the new mobilities paradigm's (Sheller, 2014; Tzanelli, 2018, 2025) fusion of critical theory with a bifurcated interpretation of posthumanism (i.e., as a study of both relational assemblages of technologies and humans, and environmental ecologies and humans), Tzanelli (2022b) enacted an alternative "critique of critique" exploring the biopolitical content of scholarly affective action in the face of climate disasters and planetary annihilation.

The double focus of posthumanist analysis on technology and nonhuman life affords a fresh perspective of mediation and media forms as

pedagogical tools. Again, the focus may vary. Harril et al. (2024) explored the paradigmatic methodological and pedagogical potential of postcolonial cinema to encourage critical tourism education. Tzanelli (2023) focused on the postindustrial networks in which such movies are inserted to reinforce stereotypes, produce new tourism, and enhance the informational assemblages that disseminate such messages to prospective cinematic tourists. Drawing on Sheller's (2018) call for "mobility justice," Hutnyk's (2004) critique of "bad Marxism," a light fashionable engagement with inequality, and Jensen's (2019, 2020) work on design and technology, Tzanelli explained that such networks of production and consumption of stereotypes, polluting infrastructures and cultures of exception, herald the "Techno-Anthropocene": "an era in which processes of making community are filtered through organizational design—or rather, *designing*" (Tzanelli, 2023, p. 131). This audiovisual design of new tourist/tourism worlds (her own interpretation of Hollinshead's thesis) can remain dark and inhospitable for those populations in most need of both representational empowerment and institutional support.

Critical onto-epistemological uses of the worldmaking paradigm attempt to integrate such audiovisual analyses into phenomenological and postphenomenological studies of tourism and by extension travel as a phenomenological mobility. Thus, Tucker and Shelton (2018) emphasized how worldmaking can become profoundly enmeshed and entangled with unconscious affective feelings and atmospheres during one's travels. Employing Ahmed's (2004) and Buda's (2015) work on affective mobilities, Edelheim's (2015) narratorial methodology and Hollinshead's worldmaking they study through embodied and visual ethnographies of how visitors to postearthquake sites in New Zealand experience place in more visceral ways than those afforded by discursive analyses. More philosophically, but in the same spirit, Doering and Zhang (2018) reviewed Hollinshead's pararealist constructivism through a cinematic mediation of Jean-Luc Nancy's philosophy of the world. Nancy's "sense of the world," as always already in creation through the mobile subject's immanent relations with one another, casts worldmaking as an ongoing process of movement.

Alternatively, Tzanelli (2016, 2018) created a bridge between such phenomenological and postphenomenological revisions of Hollinshead's work, the mobilities paradigm, and a posthuman analysis of technologically produced travel and tourism. In her approach to thanatourist journeys on the big screen as postphenomenological mobilities embedded in the cultures and natural environments that cinema adulates and exoticizes (Tzanelli, 2016, 2018), she sees worldmaking as a process. This process develops on a fragile and shifting rift between the privileged artists who aspire to tell these stories in responsible ways, but are trapped in the machines of capitalist representation, and the memories, landscapes, cultures, and peoples who end up serving as mobile objects in networks of production, consumption, and simulation. The "worlds" of tourism are here both fictional and infrastructurally emergent through the mobilities of distinguished creative labor, artists, and technicians, and the immobilities of the landscaped native communities. The affective capitals of the former and the reactive responses of the latter often inform a mesh of multitudinal actions, which may fail to target the real sources of inequality. Tzanelli suggested that we may also have to learn to assess certain actions and activities that inform artistic creativity caught in these justice battles for their aesthetic qualities as travel movements. A more refined categorization of worldmaking into different "generative" action/creation types allows us to appreciate, for example, the making of leisure and popular culture. This cautionary note (i.e., to avoid conflations) guides another interpretation of "world-making" (intentionally hyphenated, but still citing Hollinshead's work) into a representational repertoire of sites, subjects, and storylines, informing fan tourist journeys. The so-called "world-making imaginary" of these popular cultural journeys comprises everyday rather than extra-ordinary activities and is mediated via new and old technologies but also embodied tourist mobilities (Ziakas et al., 2024, pp. 4–6).

S3: Retune, Attune—Make Worlds

We will not list more published research that institutes dialogues with Hollinshead's paradigmatic interventions in critical tourism studies. In this section we explain how the present special issue's

original articles (the last three articles) "attune" or "retune" his arpeggiated and contrapuntal ideas, to suggest new "musicalities" in the academic worlds of tourism. The three articles are new compossibilities, here generating links to "arpeggiated Hollinshead," there rooting for the classical Said/Hollinshead musical duo of unequal contrapuntalisms between tourists and locals, guests and hosts. We have divided these compossibilities according to their mood tonalities (Deleuze, again). Notably, all tonalities draw on the darkness of inequalities, as these featured in and informed music genres. Thus, Korstanje and George compose blues, or south American *saudade* melodies, whereas Ziakas and Jayathilaka "go punk" (Beer, 2014) in a more aggressive mode of subcultural engagement.

"Moody" Korstanje and George mobilize worldmaking to examine how the relationship between tourists and hosts changed when COVID-19 was elevated to a public health crisis. Fostering a genealogical connection between colonial travel cultures' ocular curiosity and search for otherness and the construction of a new medical gaze during the pandemic, which sorts humans into mobile immunized citizens and immobile at-risk/dangerous noncitizens, they propose a paradigmatic shift in what we know and understand as tourism. For them, the emergence of this new medical discourse transforms tourism into a sinister "ambassador" of liberal democracy and economic progress.

"Punk" Ziakas and Jayathilaka explore tourism worldmaking via new forms of performative embodiment and new digital forms of action, respectively. For those who struggle to follow, "punk" scholarship is a recent sociological translation of the original music genre's activist rejection of taken-for-granted conformity into an opportunity to rethink who is really heard, why and whether they are understood as autonomous voices in public contexts of deliberation. Jayathilaka uses the content of You Tube Channel Trip Pisso, which hosts vlogging travel impressions. Her vloggers share their experience of traveling to remote places in Sri Lanka, imparting knowledge about their journeys' extreme physical and natural challenges. She "punks" arpeggiated applications of worldmaking by introducing the technological element to explore the social and technological agency and worldmaking power of these travel vloggers. Messages and performances circulating in the Trip Pisso Channel tell a story of Sri Lanka as a travel destination, which deviates from the dominant discourses of Sri Lankan exotica. What these "travel crazies" post on the Channel reveals less palatable realities—and ultimately produces an alternative to mainstream activism biopics of what comfort tourism ignores. The punk "activist gaze" of these vloggers/travelers/activists undoes the "phantasmatics" of postcolonial comfort tourism (Hollinshead, 2007). Ziakas also "punks" worldmaking to introduce the role of what he calls "civic dramaturgy" in the organization of public events. Complementing Jayathilaka's virtual discourses of placemaking-as-worldmaking with those of collective embodied performances in the spaces of the festival, he looks at enactments of social drama as a semantic, narratological and hermeneutic mode of symbolic action that enables the production of public spheres.

We hope that you will enjoy these contributions as musical homage to "Blue Skies" Keith—his habitual signature during the many digital exchanges he had with international scholars, friends, and colleagues.

Acknowledgment

We appreciate Brian King's reading of a draft of this manuscript.

References

Altamirano, M. E. (2022). Overcoming urban frontiers: Ordering Favela tourism actor-networks. *Tourist Studies*, *22*(2), 200–222.

Adu-Ampong, E. A. (2023). The embodied absence of the past: Slavery heritage and the transformative memory work of tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research, 101*, 103590.

Adu-Ampong, E. A., & Berg, S. (2025). The spatial narratives and representation of slavery and colonial heritage on guided tours in Amsterdam. *Journal of Heritage Tourism*, *20*(1), 59–77.

Ahmed, S. (2014). Not in the mood. *New Formations*, *82*, 13–28

Ateljevic, I. (2009). Transmodernity—remaking our (tourism) world? In J. Tribe (Ed.), *Philosophical issues in tourism* (pp. 278–300). Channel View.

Ateljevic, I., (2013). Transmodernity: Integrating perspectives on societal evolution. *Futures*, *47*(4), 38–48.

Bakas, F.E., (2017). Community resilience through entrepreneurship: The role of gender. *Journal of Enterprising Communities: People and Places in the Global Economy*, *11*(1), 61–77.

Bauman, Z. (2007). *Consuming life*. Polity.

Bauman, Z. (2016). *Retrotopia*. Polity
Beer, D. (2014). *Punk sociology*. Springer.
Bhabha, H. (1994). *The location of culture*. Routledge.
Bourdieu, P. (1977). *Outline of a theory of practice*. Cambridge University Press.
Buda, D.M. (2015). *Affective tourism: Dark routes in conflict*. Routledge.
Büscher, B., & Fletcher, R. (2017). Destructive creation: Capital accumulation and the structural violence of tourism. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, *25*(5), 651–667.
Castoriadis, C. (1987 [1975]). *The imaginary institution of society*. Polity.
Caton, K. (2013). The risky business of understanding: Philosophical hermeneutics and the knowing subject in worldmaking. *Tourism Analysis*, *18*(3), 341–351.
Delanty, G. (2009) *The cosmopolitan imagination*. Cambridge University Press.
Deleuze, G. (2004 [1968]). *Difference and repetition*. Bloomsbury Academic.
Deleuze, G. & Guattari, F. (1988). *A thousand plateaus: Capitalism and schizophrenia*. Athlone.
Doering, A., & Zhang, J. J. (2018). Critical tourism studies and the world: Sense, praxis, and the politics of creation. *Tourism Analysis*, *23*(2), 227–237.
Edelheim, J. (2015). *Tourist attractions: From object to narrative*. Channel View.
Everett, S. (2012). Production places or consumption spaces? The place-making agency of food tourism in Ireland and Scotland. *Tourism Geographies*, *14*(4), 535–554.
Fjellman, S.M. (1992). *Vinyl leaves: Walt Disney World and America*. Westview Press.
Foucault. M. (1979). *Discipline and punishment*. Vintage.
Germann Molz, J., & Gibson, S. (2007). Mobilizing and mooring hospitality. In J. Germann Molz & S. Gibson (Eds.), *Mobilizing hospitality* (pp. 1–28). Ashgate.
Goodman, N. (1977). *The structure of appearance*. Reidel. (Original publication 1951)
Goodman, N. (1978). *Ways of worldmaking*. Hackett.
Goodman, N. (1996a). The way the world is. In P. J. McCormick (Ed.), *Starmaking: Realism, antirealism and irrealism* (pp. 3–10). MIT.
Goodman, N. (1996b). Words, works, worlds. In P. J. McCormick (Ed.), *Starmaking: Realism, antirealism and irrealism* (pp. 61–77). MIT.
Grimwood, B. S., Caton, K., & Cooke, L. (Eds.). (2018). *New moral natures in tourism*. Routledge.
Grimwood, B. S., & Höckert, E. (2023). Cultivating relations with plant stories. *Annals of Tourism Research*, *103*, 103661.
Grimwood, B. S., Stinson, M. J. & King, L. J. (2019). A decolonizing settler story. *Annals of Tourism Research, 79*, 102763.
Guia, J., & Jamal, T. (2023). An affective and posthumanist cosmopolitan hospitality. *Annals of Tourism Research, 100*, 103569.
Guia, J. & Jamal, T. (2025). Entangled engagements: A posthumanist and affirmative ethics for tourism geographies. *Tourism Geographies*, *27*(3–4), 1–12.
Harrill, R., Cardenas, D. A., Dioko, L. L., & Arhin, A. (2024). Gaze and reflexivity in postcolonial cinema: The pragmatic turn in critical tourism studies. *Tourism Geographies*, *26*(3), 351–372.
Hayes, S., & Lovelock, B. (2017). 'Demystifying' worldmaking: Exploring New Zealand's clean and green imaginary through the lens of angling tourists. *Tourism Recreation Research*, *42*(3), 380–391.
Höckert, E., & Rantala, O. (2024). Multispecies hospitality. In O. Rantala & K. Müller (Eds.), *A research agenda for arctic tourism* (pp. 93–108). Edward Elgar Publishing.
Hollinshead (1993). The truth about Texas. A naturalistic study about the construction of heritage (unpublished doctoral dissertation). https://oaktrust.library.tamu.edu/items/53728770-d62e-448d-ab73-3f3fe8d39231
Hollinshead (1998). Disney and commodity aesthetics: A critique of Fjellman's analysis of "distory" and the "historicide" of the past. *Current Issues in Tourism*, *1*(1), 58–119.
Hollinshead, K. (1999a). Surveillance of the worlds of tourism: Foucault and the eye-of-power. *Tourism Management*, *20*(1), 7–23.
Hollinshead, K. (1999b). Tourism as public culture: Horne's ideological commentary on the legerdemain of tourism. *International Journal of Tourism Research*, *1*(4), 267–292.
Hollinshead, K. (2004). Worldmaking and the enunciative value of tourism. In C. M. Hall & H. Tucker (Eds.), *Tourism and postcolonialism* (pp. 39–56). Routledge.
Hollinshead, K. (2006). The shift to constructivism in social inquiry: Some pointers for tourism studies. *Tourism Recreation Research*, *31*(2), 43–58.
Hollinshead, K. (2007). 'Worldmaking' and the transformation of place and culture: The enlargement of Meethan's analysis of tourism and global change. In A. Ateljevic, A. Pritchard, & N. Morgan (Eds.), *The critical turn in tourism studies* (pp. 165–193). Routledge.
Hollinshead, K. (2009a). The "worldmaking" prodigy of tourism: The reach and power of tourism in the dynamics of change and transformation. *Tourism Analysis*, *14*(1), 139–152.
Hollinshead, K. (2009b). "Tourism state" cultural production: The re-making of Nova Scotia. *Tourism Geographies*, *11*(4), 526–545.
Hollinshead, K. (2010). Tourism studies and confined understanding: The call for a "new sense" postdisciplinary imaginary. *Tourism Analysis*, *15*(4), 499–512.
Hollinshead, K., Ateljevic, I., & Ali, N. (2009). Worldmaking agency–worldmaking authority: The sovereign constitutive role of tourism. *Tourism Geographies*, *11*(4), 427–443.
Hollinshead, K., & Ivanova, M. (2013). The multilogical imagination: Tourism studies and the imperative for postdisciplinary knowing. In M. Smith & G. Richards (Eds.), *The Routledge handbook of cultural tourism* (pp. 53–61). Routledge.
Hollinshead, K., Kuon, V., & Alajmi, M. (2015). Events in the liquid modern world: The call for fluid acumen in the

presentation of peoples, places, pasts, and presents. In O. Moufakkir & T. Pernecky (Eds.), *Ideological, social and cultural aspects of events*, (pp. 12–27). CABI.

Hollinshead, K. & Suleman, R. (2018a). The everyday instillations of worldmaking: New vistas of understanding on the declarative reach of tourism. *Tourism Analysis*, *23*(2), 201–213.

Hollinshead, K., & Suleman, R. (2018b). Tourism studies and the lost mandates of knowing: Matters of epistemology for the inscriptive/projective industry. In P. Mura & C. Khoo-Lattimore (Eds.), *Asian qualitative research in tourism: Ontologies, epistemologies, methodologies, and methods* (pp. 51–79). Springer.

Hollinshead, K., Suleman, R., & Nair, B. B. (2021). Trilogy of strategies of disruption in research methodologies: Article 1 of 3: The unsettlement of tourism studies: Positive decolonization, deep listening, and dethinking today. *Tourism Culture & Communication*, *21*(2), 143–160.

Hollinshead, K., Suleman, R. & Vellah, A. (2021, 2). Trilogy of strategies of disruption in research methodologies: Article 2 of 3: The Reimagination of tourism studies: positive renewal, restoration, and Revival Today. *Tourism Culture & Communication*, *21*(3), 259–276.

Hollinshead, K., Suleman, R., & Yu Lo, C, (2021, 3). Trilogy of strategies of disruption in research methodologies: Article 3 of 3: The evocative power of tourism studies: Positive interruption, interdependence, and imaging forward today. *Tourism Culture & Communication*, *21*(4), 355–373.

Hollinshead, K. & Vellah, A.B. (2020). Dreaming forward: Postidentity and the generative thresholds of tourism. *Journal of Geographical Research*, *3*(4), 8–21.

Huang, Y., & Liu, Y. (2024). A critical reflection on tourism geopolitics: Research progress and future agenda. *Tourism Geographies*, *26*(5), 1–17.

Huang, Y., & Suliman, S. (2023). Geopolitics, (re) territorialisation, and China's patriotic tourism in the South China Sea. *Geopolitics*, *28*(4), 1465–1488.

Hultman, J., & Hall, C.M. (2012). Tourism place-making: Governance of locality in Sweden. *Annals of Tourism Research*, *39*(2), 547–570.

Hunter, W. C. (2011). Rukai indigenous tourism: Representations, cultural identity and Q method. *Tourism Management*, *32*(2), 335–348.

Hutnyk, J. (2004). *Bad Marxism*. Pluto Press.

Ivanova, M., & Buda, D. M. (2020). Thinking rhizomatically about communist heritage tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research*, *84*, 103000.

Jamal, T., & Hollinshead, K. (2001). Tourism and the forbidden zone: The underserved power of qualitative inquiry. *Tourism Management*, *22*(1), 63–82.

Jameson, F. (1991). *Postmodernism, or the cultural logic of late capitalism*. Duke University Press.

Jayathilaka, G. K. (2020). Twenty first-century tourism representations of Sri Lanka: Exploring the worldmaking role and implications of local tourism writers. *Social Identities*, *26*(5), 690–704.

Jensen, O. B. (2019). Dark design: Mobility injustice materialized. In N. Cook & D. Butz (Eds.), *Mobilities, mobility justice and social justice* (pp. 116–128). Routledge.

Jensen, O. B. (2020). Atmospheres of rejection: How dark design rejects homeless in the city. In *Proceedings of the 4th International Congress on Ambiences, Ambiences, Alloaesthesia: Senses, Inventions, Worlds* (pp. 326–331). https://hal.science/hal-03220334v1/document

Johnson, P. C. (2014). Cultural literacy, cosmopolitanism and tourism research. *Annals of Tourism Research*, *44*, 255–269.

Keul, A., & Eisenhauer, B. (2019). Making the high country: Cannabis tourism in Colorado USA. *Annals of Leisure Research*, *22*(2), 140–160.

Lapointe, D., Sarrasin, B., & Benjamin, C. (2018). Tourism in the sustained hegemonic neoliberal order. *Revista Latino-Americana de Turismologia*, *4*(1), 16–33.

Li, Y., Zhang, H., Zhang, D., & Abrahams, R. (2019). Mediating urban transition through rural tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research*, *75*, 152–164.

Lorente, B. P., & Tupas, T. R. F. (2013). Emancipatory hybridity: Selling English in an unequal world. In R. Rubdy & L. Alsagoff (Eds.), *The global-local interface and hybridity: Exploring language and identity*, (pp. 66–82). Multilingual Matters.

Lundberg, C., Ziakas, V., & Morgan, N. (2018). Conceptualising on-screen tourism destination development. *Tourist Studies*, *18*(1), 83–104.

Melis, C. (2024). Concepts without image, knowing without representing. Lesson learned from Foucault, Deleuze and Guattari. In C. Melis & A. Panayiotopoulos (Eds.), *Tourism, and partnership fields* [special issue]. *Tourism, Culture & Communication*, *24*(4), 265–274.

Melis, C., & Chambers, D. (2021). The construction of intangible cultural heritage: A Foucauldian critique. *Annals of Tourism Research*, *89*, 103206.

Melis, C., & Panayiotopoulos A., (2024). An introduction to tourism and partnership fields. In C. Melis & A. Panayiotopoulos (Eds.), *Tourism, and partnership fields* [special issue]. *Tourism, Culture and Communication*, *24*(4), 257–263.

Meethan, K. (2001). *Tourism in global society: Place, culture, consumption*. Macmillan.

Morgan, S. T. (2013). Social pedagogy within key worker practice: Community situated support for marginalised youth. *International Journal of Social Pedagogy, 2*(1).

Nünning, A. & Nünning, V. (2010). Ways of worldmaking as a model for the study of culture. In V. Nünning & A. Nünning (Eds.), *Cultural ways of worldmaking: Media and narratives* (pp. 215–244). De Gruyter.

Ormond, M., & Vietti, F. (2022). Beyond multicultural 'tolerance': Guided tours and guidebooks as transformative tools for civic learning. In F. Higgins-Desbiolles, L. A. Blanchard, & Y. Urbain, (Eds), *Peace through tourism* (pp. 207–223). Routledge.

Pêcheux, M. (1982). *Language, semantics and ideology*. St Martin's Press. (Original work published 1975)

Pernecky, T. (2023). Kinmaking: Toward more-than-tourism (studies). *Tourism Recreation Research*, *48*(4), 558–568.

Pfoser, A., & Yusupova, G. (2022). Memory and the everyday geopolitics of tourism: Reworking post-imperial relations in Russian tourism to the 'near abroad'. *Annals of Tourism Research*, *95*, 103437.

Ren, L., Wong, C.U.I., Ma, C., & Feng, Y. (2024). Changing roles of tour guides: From "agent to serve" to "agent of change". *Tourist Studies*, *24*(1), 55–74.

Sheller, M. (2014). The new mobilities paradigm for a live sociology. *Current Sociology*, *62*(6), 789–811.

Sheller, M. (2018). *Mobility justice*. Verso.

Sofield, T., Guia, J., & Specht, J. (2017). Organic 'folkloric 'community driven place making and tourism. *Tourism Management*, *61*, 1–22.

Stinson, M. J. (2024). Tourism, worldmaking, and disquieting settler atmospherics. *Tourism Geographies*, *26*(6), 1033–1051.

Stinson, M. J., Grimwood, B. S., & Caton, K. (2021). Becoming common plantain: Metaphor, settler responsibility, and decolonizing tourism. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism, 29*(2–3), 234–252..

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

Taylor, C. (1989). *Sources of the self: The making of modern identity*. Harvard University Press.

Tribe, J., Dann, G., & Jamal, T. (2015). Paradigms in tourism research: A trialogue. *Tourism Recreation Research*, *40*(1), 28–47.

Tucker, H., & Shelton, E. J. (2018). Tourism, mood and affect: Narratives of loss and hope. *Annals of Tourism Research*, *70*, 66–75.

Tzanelli, R. (2016). *Thanatourism and cinematic representations of risk: Screening the end of tourism*. Routledge.

Tzanelli, R. (2017). *Mega-events as economies of the imagination: Creating atmospheres for Rio 2016 and Tokyo 2020*. Routledge.

Tzanelli, R. (2018). *Cinematic tourist mobilities and the plight of development: On atmospheres, affects, and environments*. Routledge.

Tzanelli, R. (2022a). *Space, mobility, and crisis in mega-event organisation: Tokyo Olympics 2020's atmospheric irradiations*. Routledge.

Tzanelli, R. (2022b). Biopolitics in critical tourism theory: A radical critique of critique' (La biopolitique dans la théorie critique du tourisme: une critique radicale de la critique), *Via Tourism Review*, 21. https://doi.org/10.4000/viatourism.8242

Tzanelli, R. (2023). *The new spirit of hospitality: Designing tourism futures in post-truth worlds*. Emerald.

Tzanelli, R. (2025). *Planetary biostyles: Community-making and futures design in the age of extremes*. Edward Elgar.

Urry, J. (1990). *The tourist gaze* (1st ed.). SAGE.

Vanden Boer, D. (2016). Toward decolonization in tourism: Engaged tourism and the Jerusalem tourism cluster. *Jerusalem Quarterly*, *65*, 9–21.

Venn, C. (2006). *The postcolonial challenge: Towards alternative worlds*. SAGE.

Zhang, C.X., Decosta, P. L. E., & McKercher, B. (2015). Politics and tourism promotion: Hong Kong's myth making. *Annals of Tourism Research*, *54*, 156–171.

Zhang, Y. & Hitchcock, M.J. (2017). The Chinese female tourist gaze: A netnography of young women's blogs on Macao. *Current Issues in Tourism*, *20*(3), 315–330.

Ziakas, V., Lundberg, M.C. & Hexhagen, M. (2024). *Touristic world-making and fan pilgrimage in popular culture destinations*. Channel View Publications.