

NOT TOURISM WORLDMAKING: A CRITICAL DIALOGUE WITH HOLLINSHEAD AND VELLAH ON POST-COVID-19 SENSIBLE ENTANGLEMENTS

RODANTHI TZANELLI

University of Leeds, Leeds, UK

Hollinshead proclaimed tourism worldmaking as the creative/imaginative and often false/faux processes that management agencies and mediating bodies use to favor particular representations of places and people. While this remains valid at an organizational level, the COVID-19 pandemic has radically (and maybe also *hopefully*) changed the very regimes of sensory apprehension on which tourism is based, thus also suggesting that we rethink the worldmaking aspects of its postindustrial *creation* (rather than production and consumption chains). Considering some recent discussions on what may happen to tourism after the end of the pandemic I claim that: 1) we should begin by reassessing the realm of the sensible, 2) talk more about “travel worldmaking”, and 3) reconsider the centrality of the traveler’s *emotional work* during world travels. The thesis develops at the intersection of the “must” (urgency to sustain), the “ought” (call to respect), and the “desire” (drive to enjoy). It calls for a reassessment of worldmaking agency as a *structured form of action*, which gestures towards a durable change in sensible entanglements between humans and the world. I engage in a critical collegial dialogue with Hollinshead and Vellah’s thesis that tourism as a postcolonial or postindustrial moment *per se* contributes to postidentity. Instead, I argue that after the COVID-19 event (among other viral worldmaking events threatening to eliminate humanity), world travelers resort to what is deemed accessible through their sensory capabilities within structured conditions. Tourism is thus also reimagined at a sensible level separately from the organizational/institutional processes that Hollinshead and Vellah placed center stage in their thesis.

Key words: Entanglements; Epistemology; Sensible traveler; Temporality; Virtuality

Worldmaking, Entanglement, and Temporality

Can we continue to talk about the making of tourism worlds during and after COVID-19 as we used to? If I may narrow down the domain of investigation to academic writing about tourism, it

is worth asking exactly what such making is called upon to rectify amid a disastrous prolonged period of viral infection and death. It is tempting to resort to existentialist elaborations, but this is far from my objective here. Instead, I want to argue that the quick production of problem-solving scholarship

Address correspondence to Rodanthi Tzanelli, Associate Professor of Cultural Sociology, University of Leeds, 12.04 Social Sciences, Woodhouse Lane, Leeds, Yorkshire, LS2 9JT UK. E-mail: r.tzanelli@leeds.ac.uk

regarding material stasis might have missed the qualities of the contextual momentum as well as the emergist gist of the activity it tries to restore in the now-time. The activity—namely *travel rather than tourism*—adheres to the immediacy of our haphazard now—what Walter Benjamin (2003, p. 395) called our *Jetzzeit* (now-time). This is the time of experience, which in physical restriction and mobility surveillance contexts always precedes that of industrial consumption in tourism.

Although the undeniable disruption of tourism since the beginning of 2020 did not affect the quality of academic contributions in the subject area, the raging pandemic altered their epistemological content. Without dismissing the spatial qualities of their craft (tourism and placemaking or special configurations of culture and power go hand-in-hand in critical analysis), critical tourism scholars began to unconsciously favor a new style of temporal mobility in their writing. Especially journal publications became more forward-looking and speculative. The production of new special issues on *the future of tourism* (Cheer et al., 2021) is telling of both the pragmatic needs of the industry (Yang et al., 2020) and the sociophilosophical concerns raised by the prevalence of material immobilities due to COVID-19. Without focusing on COVID-19, the present special issue's theme splits the development of tourism scholarship on tourism entanglements into a “before” and “after” the pandemic. Its lateral temporal logistics are predicated on action, agency, and spatiotemporal configurations of what we may call the “tourist event.” The “event” already involves a temporal assemblage, including preparations and the organization of travel to the chosen destination, the experience of holidaying (the “being there, done that”) but also all the moments of recording, storing, and sharing these memories with others (the “after”). Such is the driving conjuncture behind the selected articles, whether this involves histories of place, landscapes, or particular organized mobilities their authors find entangled in other processes or sociocultural and political problems.

My understanding of entanglement refers to the ways phenomena of political and cultural nature are self-organized on the basis of groups of activities (overlapping) and their consequences (clashes, mergers, hybridizations) *in time-warps*. To make sense of both, social scientists point to the

specificity of vanguard modernist or postmodernity styles in which such entanglements develop—the “events” that produce them. Such a definition considers variations of systems theory from Maturana to Habermas and Urry (2007), but also beyond (Barad, 2007; Tsing, 2015) without discarding classical theorists who considered modernities as spatiotemporal configurations of human creativity and civilizational achievement (Eisenstadt, 2003; Therborn, 2003). Events such as a pandemic can act as cosmological turning points even in late modern (or postmodern) contexts, triggering variations of worldmaking as forms of conceptual interlacing of what is real, as well as what is possible and desirable in our lives. They produce processes of world-viewing as world-building (Mannheim, 1936/1968) even in organized domains of leisure mobilities, including tourism. Simply put, the assemblage of memories and activities comprising the tourist event is disrupted by the virus and need rethinking.

Therborn's (2003) thesis on entanglements helps me to explain why nothing during the pandemic escaped sociocultural engineering, and why such engineering produces its own nemeses. Therborn's understanding of entanglements places human communities on grand temporal schemes and events but allows us to examine the particular and the individual in society beyond the specificity of the phenomena that structure them (e.g., colonialism or capitalism). Because the pandemic's sociocultural engineering sabotaged what the tourists are supposed to be and do, I argue it is time to redefine them. One may ask what makes my line of thinking truthful and real—a question asked by sociologists of practice, such as Boltanski and Thévenot (2006), who proposed a series of truth and reality tests to stabilize what is real. Alongside Goodman's (1996) philosophical thesis, I have been using in this essay these scholars' methodology to reevaluate the tourist as a real “sensible traveler.”

Heretofore I produce an objectual rather than objective version of novel forms of tourist movement as a precondition of becoming. Objectual conclusions focus on the object of study rather than its reliable existence as such: the certainty that they are just so is “excessive” or beyond absolute proof (Schaeffer, 1996), like any speculation about the futures of becoming. This is very different from the Deleuzean naturalist certainty displayed

in Hollinshead and Vellah's (2020) inspiring essay on forward dreaming in tourist becoming. I create an entirely different "constellation" of variables on how things are in our current and futural conjunc-tions by taking viral crises as a constant and specu-lating on their implications for tourist subjectivity and identity (Goodman, 1996). The key variables, which supplant or even replace their previous counter-parts, involve spatial configurations (instead of place), the travel mindset (instead of tourist activi-ty), and the sensory body (in lieu of the biomediated subject: the subsumption of life itself into "capital" explored by Gilles Deleuze). Heretofore, I use the "traveling subject" conspicuously in the place of the "tourist subject." My constellation allows me to explore the assumption that even if the tourist system of services does not return to its previous functional modus operandi, the tourist will revert to as they were and acted before the pandemic.

I do not claim that the virus has rendered debates on the tourist system/industry obsolete or that researching it matters less than before. Instead, I change the field's investigative perspective of travel in the now-time: what happens when an analytically taken-for-granted "tourism worldmaking" is subjected to a virus-induced state of control? I find celebrations of the reopening of borders and the validation of vaccine passports immature for reasons exceeding but incorporating a biopolitical view of tourism labor and cultural citizenship: this virus is here to stay—so much so, that elsewhere I pronounce the existence of an unexplored "Virocene" (Tzanelli, 2021), an era that coexists with the Anthropocene in more episodic ways (e.g., whenever infections and deaths are at their peak). I take Hollinshead and Vellah (2020) as a structural starting point to adjust established considerations of tourism as a worldmaking force in our pandemic context. Intended as a critical dialogue with two esteemed scholars (one of whom has been one of my mentors in the last few years), my analysis begins by stripping their concept(ion) of world-making off its industrial and (post)colonial clothing so that I consider instead industry as a creative human force driving material and phenomenal mobility. Evidently, the dialogue is a step towards building a different conceptual scaffolding because my context is different. My traveling subject, who can also become a tourist, is in the context of this

and any other pandemics a novel structured agent, who thinks and acts in ways that make new worlds. The more they worldmake in their combined virtual (digital, cognitive) and physical (embodied, automobile) traveling ventures, the more they map entanglements of material and imaginative contexts in which travel movements take place—as well as the political, social, and cultural conditions under which they should take place. Only for this reason, I clarify that tourism as a form of capitalist micro-fascism happens when personal affective journeys begin to be structured industrially and travel as a mundane activity solidifies into emotional narra-tives of consumption with an intensity qualified by tourism markets. This solidification, which occu-pies Deleuze (2005, p. 39) with regards to artistic creativity, is mentioned in Hollinshead and Vellah's (2020) article, but its affective stage is not as well explored. Instead, emphasis is placed on the conjuncture of tourismification and (post)colonization as vectors of identity, rather than subjectivity build-ing (Hollinshead & Vellah, 2020, p. 11)—and thus, the biopolitical stage of becoming.

It is understandable why we now consider more the structural constrictions impeding tourism sys-tems of services than the carefree routines of the traveler, but this shift does not help scholars to con-template potential changes in the nature of the latter or envisage their engineered permanence. In fact, there are already observations that we will never return to business as usual after such a traumatic "événement" (Brouder, 2020; Cheer, 2020). We can adopt a hopeful attitude in the face of an array of new COVID-19 variants, which threaten to extend humanity's "stage of siege," but such theses will not explain what is happening to our travel *Jetztzeit*. It is common rhetoric in the field of tourism that trav-eler as individual pilgrims and neotribal members constantly produce new imaginary worlds (Duits et al., 2014; Ziakas et al., 2022), but it is also indica-tive of the current state of the field that relevant published cases dependent on embodied mobilities (researched in the current context) have ceased. Unlike Hollinshead and Vellah (2020), I hypothe-size not from an institutional perspective (that of industries), but a subject/individual/community one to speculate on the process of emergence of mobile subjectivity by replacing "tourism" with "travel." Not only is COVID-19 a major *événement*, but it

also shapes the eventful nature of travel. Here it is pertinent to adapt Žižek's (2014) aporia: "What is really happening when something happens?" To kick-start the analysis: "What are really travelers worldmaking when a pandemic happens?"

The Travel Mindset and Event Entanglements

Hollinshead's adaptation of the philosophical concept of "worldmaking" in tourism analysis sits among some contemporary canonical theses in critical tourism analysis. Through a synthesis of conceptions of power, structure, agency, and subjectivity as well as enunciation and ontology that we find in Louis Althusser (interpellation), Michel Foucault (discipline and power), Michel Pêcheux (identification/disidentification), Homi Bhabha (enunciation), and Nelson Goodman (worldmaking/starmaking), Hollinshead produced a fresh critical framework to understand what tourism does to the cultural and social worlds to which it is introduced structurally and organizationally. Aligned with the critical paradigms of European social thought, Hollinshead's (2009) "worldmaking" suggested the presence of fictional and creative processes in the promotion of places and cultures or "worlds" by "management agencies and other mediating bodies" (p. 643) in particular ways that privilege particular dominant/favored representations of peoples/places/pasts.

This definition developed during the last decade to include conceptions of: "tourism authority" and the "mythomoteur" as fusions (à la Foucault and Althusser) of the discursive-institutional management of those cultural representational regimes that define tourism production and consumption; and "instillation" (Hollinshead & Suleman, 2018), which inflects (but does not draw upon) Bourdieuian processes of "inculcation," only this time those educated into catering for tourism are whole societies and cultures. Peculiarly, in Hollinshead's recent work, there is hardly a reference to Pêcheux's (1995) revision of Althusser and Saussure's social semantics, especially his argument that formalized distinctions between institutional and informal regimes of language (i.e., *langue* and *parole*) are misleading. Behind this one may find the thesis that all human beings that enunciate—and thus all those who travel in any capacity, regardless of status—may

simultaneously reproduce, contest, and modify core values of travel mobility and stasis. The absence makes sense, given that, much like Urry's (1990; Urry & Larsen, 2011) "tourist gaze," Hollinshead's work errs on the power of tourism *experts* to manufacture destination concepts. Pêcheux's decision to see continuities between formal speech (power, center) and informal deviations (margins, periphery) does not match his discursive take on the world, which is at odds with Goodman's promise to respect different world versions: different visions of place, culture and tourismification or not.

The unruly nature of worldmaking was progressively more deliberated in Hollinshead's work, which in its present form considers more structured worldviews and the systemic management of travel. This aligns him with the antihumanist stance of poststructuralist scholarship that has guided critical tourism analysis over the last three decades. His latest collaboration with Vellah is deceptively different. In this work (Hollinshead & Vellah, 2020), they venture into Deleuzean conceptions of becoming, whereby the tourist and the tourist destinations are interlocked in a dynamic relationship with the "tourist industry/ies" that can potentially strengthen cultural interpellations, or alternatively empower localities to produce and project felicitous self-presentations (Hollinshead & Vellah, 2020, p. 9). Hollinshead and Vellah read Deleuze's conception of the "virtual" through particular published research that draws on the complexity of postcolonial memory, transmodernism, and critical black thought (Hollinshead & Vellah, 2020, pp. 9–10). Their key references are mostly derivative of the post-Marxist and Foucaultian paradigms, so analytically, they continue to peregrinate the academic fields of structure and power.

The moot point in this approach is not that the empowerment of tourismified places and cultures is (im)possible within a capitalist system. Both tourist industries and (post)colonial systems of thought are treated by Hollinshead and Vellah (2020) as part of this structuration, regardless of the different ways capitalism and (post)colonialism structure worldviews. However, is it sensible to assume that tourist and postcolonial systems of thought are the only domains in which interplays between power and agency take place, or are processes of (in)felicitous and (un)desirable becomings products of much

more complex entanglements of past, present, and future events and situations (on process-driven becomings of this complexity see Tzanelli, 2020)?

My travel(ling) subject appears at this crucial intersection of mobilities and immobilities, as these are shaped by a force more massive and immediate than industrial or colonial pasts: a virus, which resides in the now-time of experience and enmeshes all past and future becomings, threatening the lives of travelers and thus travel as an activity. How do prospective travelers, who are not permitted to travel or do so only under particular rules, make “worlds of tourism”? The tourist expert would be wiser if they tapped into their competencies and new imaginaries of mobility. It may be presumptuous to claim that this pandemic changed nothing in the travel mindset, and instead explore perceptions of travel. For the theoretical underpinnings of such a problematic, we must remember that Pêcheux endorsed the democratization of perception in line with other Althusserians but actually proceeded to explain that ideological domination makes this impossible. Hollinshead and Vellah’s (2020, p. 18) adoption of rhizomatic Deleuzean interrelationality tried to resolve this, but in fact offers little clarification on what tourist becoming involves in futural terms: their elaborations look to past structures and their dissolution or reassembling in more recent decades, but there is no discussion about what they call “forward dreaming” as such. To transcend the description of process and the backwards-looking gaze, I challenge Hollinshead and Vellah’s structural parameters and temporal limitations, by asking who the traveler of the pandemic is (or, for some “was” at a time tourism industries would struggle to stay in business). I offer a more nuanced answer than Hollinshead and Vellah, pointing to the qualities of the new “travel sensibility” COVID-19 produced and its futural potentialities as a force of becoming.

New Travel Sensibilities and Alternative Starmakings

In 2020, travel restrictions around the world prompted many to seek alternative (to organized tourism) forms of leisurely mobilities. The kinetic principles of well-being were challenged, and we learned to select from a limited range of travel-related leisure options. As borders now begin to

reopen in countries like the UK, people overcompensate or plan travel in more complex ways and with extra caution. The spontaneity of leisure planning one could find among some groups has given way to intense self-organization (Miller & Rose, 2010): in 2021 in the face of uncertainty some even double-booked holidays in their home country and abroad to avoid disappointment due to potential viral spikes and subsequent tightening of international and national restrictions (Smith, 2021). During times of less severe restrictions, the management of movement, which is handled not by tourist industries but regional administrations and the nation-state, introduced new forms of biopolitical sorting within prospective mobile subject groups: the tourists. The self-identity Giddens (1991, pp. 57–59) explored over two decades ago in relation to self-care regimes has now mutated to a hybrid form of eudemonic self-surveillance because of the risks imposed by a viral “without.” Incidentally, for post-humanist political theorists, the very consideration of a virus as an “outside” is the result of the human subject’s alienation from multispecies ecologies (Bennett, 2010). The tourist body has mutated into molecular social variants, which are now governed more harmoniously between statist biopower and the self-controlled subject (à la Foucault, 1997), through a shared objective that supersedes all other objectives (i.e., self-preservation), including that of desire to become whole.

When outbound international tourism ceases, a modest destratification of such holidaying groups begins to take place, with more citizens, including working class citizens, gaining access to localized and thus more affordable leisure in international tourism’s absence. The tourist turns into a “sensible traveler,” who wants to shed the pain of traditional pilgrimage (travel comes from *travail* or “to labor” or to engage in pilgrimage embracing hardship) to endorse instead the “art of the possible,” as Rich (2001) termed practical forms of action. Such practical action enforces a felicitous politics of distance that includes digital distance. Note however that the possible here communicates with the sensible as both practical and emotional territory. Scribano and Sánchez Aguirre (2018), who explored the politics of emotions in contexts of digital labor, stressed how hardship targets the worker’s inner world. To some extent then, the art

of the possible is biomediated by institutions that impose lockdowns and social distancing rules. However, the necessary development of a new life politics allowing even such labor to safely travail and enjoy life during a pandemic is not about biomediation. Unlike Scribano and Sánchez Aguirre's (2018) focus on social inequality, the present article considers sensibility as an entanglement of affect, cognition, and embodied action in the desired journey. Jacques Rancière (2011), an Althusserian fellow like Pêcheux, developed the concept of the "sensible" as a key human quality not recognized equitably/equally or "distributed" across all social and cultural groups. There is the risk that scholars may fall into the same trap: by assuming that in the pandemic context the traveling subject is always already structured by tourist systems, they may end up enacting an Althusserian misrecognition of *travel subjects* as de facto hegemonic slaves.

The pragmatic tradition found excellent followers in critical tourism analysis. Scholars such as Caton (2012), who drew on Rorty's (1989) celebrated pragmatism, discussed how, when confronted with a choice between observing the rigid rules of justice and achieving personal fulfilment, the tourist subject absconds moralist frameworks to survive the pressures of everyday life (Caton, 2012, pp. 1918–1919). One does not endorse social apathy and disengagement by acknowledging that caring for the other cannot always be placed before caring for oneself so as to survive. An obstacle in providing a dispassionate definition of the new sensible traveler is the heavy moralistic frameworks that inform post-COVID-19 tourist recovery. The pandemic's traveler has to be pragmatic before being an "ethical consumer," but current scholarship wants them to be virtuous first and unconditionally. In short, to consider the realms of the possible and the desirable, one must take seriously the formats of mobility realistically available to us: to consider the very nature of the mobility and stasis that the new viral situation generated and the worlds it allows us to generate. Taking over from where Hollinshead and Vellah concluded their temporal journey, I proceed to explore the *types of becoming* in the "Virocene," which are dominated by concerns over the preservation of life. The emergence of new constraints is followed by the development of new forms of creativity and new liberating imaginaries

of self-care, not always an even tighter iron cage we cannot escape. I cannot avoid a spoiler here: the rhizomes of such becomings are not always inter-relational in the way these two scholars assumed (i.e., anthropocentric) and the physical and cultural environments in which they occur may both reinforce and revise traditional understandings of tourism as a form of cosmopolitan citizenship.

I too cannot avoid a temporal division between before, during, and after the global viral outbreak. This is integral to the Deleuze's understanding of bodily affect affecting the "virtual." The virtual is a temporal pathway to becoming something somehow, depending on the situations in which we find ourselves. Open to possibilities, the "virtual" autonomises affect, granting the body an openness to participate in them (Massumi, 2002, p. 37). Much like Hollinshead and Vellah's (2020) focus on post-colonial temporalities, this affective/bodily indeterminacy is not presocial, but endowed with memory that can bifurcate, mutate, and even change the conditions of virtual movement (Massumi, 2002, p. 9). The way the sensory traveling body chooses to move resides in a domain outside the biopolitical as this is crafted in tourism scholarship on COVID-19. In this scholarship, the "before" is narrated in cryptonormative styles through attitudes such as consumerist gluttony without consideration for host cultures (Korstanje & George, 2021) as well as a hubris of mobility damaging to the built and natural environments in tourist destinations (Everingham & Chassagne, 2020). Such narratives intensify during the prolonged COVID-19 crisis, which I consider as the "now-time" of the pandemic for such writers. They are also complemented with an additional guilt burden in the proof of consequences: the virus is also seen as the result of human excess and lack of care (for nature, the earth, our disposed fellow humans, and so forth). The "now-time" arc also circulates in more popular cultural styles through our only indestructible during the pandemic window to the world: various media platforms (e.g., new social media) and forms (e.g., digital, audio-visual, or even blended in XR or extended reality representational styles; Andrei et al., 2021). This argument resembles Hansen's (2004) elaboration on the relationship between bodily affect and digitization: the body begins to frame informational flows, thus becoming hostage to the conscious flux of time in which

industrial tourism happens or not (the “now-time” of COVID-19). For some tourism studies scholars the latter may be part of the original problem—the “sin” of human excess and carelessness assumes the mantle of “technology” that destroys human relations, environments, and the joy of travel movement. Such scholarly groups often take it upon themselves to search for solutions—and this is how we arrive at the “not yet” time of policy experiments, which are speculative by necessity and nature (clearly, a/the “future” is not here yet).

There are a number of postulates that academic scholarship does not question along the way of this mapmaking activity. Incidentally, talking about “mapmaking” should not be conflated with the pathways of the travel subject’s bodily movement. Instead, I refer to what Goodman (1996) presented as the preconditions of worldmaking, or “starmaking,” which made him ask: “are the criteria of rightness [of the proposition] themselves relative?” (p. 143). Otherwise put, “stars” are not invented, but placing them in a “constellation” is the task of the astronomer. By analogy, the tourism studies scholars make various “constellations,” one of which is Hollinshead et al.’s and another the one I am about to outline now. The first postulate in the discourse of “sin” involves mapping the nature of the contemporary tourist subject, which scholars “entangle” with the native, the tourist worker and the host. This may result in exploring *frameworks of hospitality* instead of focusing on who the tourist is. The second contests the idea of immobility, which for the business of tourism involves the inability for prospective tourists to visit other countries and for automobile complexes to use their technological assets (cars, aircrafts, boats, and the like) to enable such travels. Often, exploring the interrelational becoming of the tourist subject becomes dependent upon unmediated engagement with these places and their cultures—this is not dissimilar to Hollinshead and Vellah’s (2020) take on interrelationality. Logically, if such embodied engagements produce the tourist, then when they cease, we must assume that *tourism disappears as a force of being*. The train of thought eventually derails, confounding analytical differences between entanglement and interrelationality as well as self-awareness, knowledge, and agency. Ritzer and Liska (1997) and MacCannell (2001) warned us a long time ago that tourists are knowing

subjects, who can identify and enjoy variations of inauthenticity. If this is still a valid thesis (as I think it is), then embodied engagement with the other (in the form of destinations, native groups, and ideas) is only one possible form of becoming. However, another authentic becoming of sensible travel can be achieved in physical stasis or outside established consumerist regimes during the pandemic. It all depends on the paradigm we follow (i.e., from a Goodmanian perspective, any geocentric point will not only relativize the durability of movement but also produce qualitatively different experiences and perspectives). Jokingly one may argue that if the academic assumed a heliocentric standpoint (they inspect everything from the sun’s perspective), they would have had to claim that both the immobile tourist of the pandemic and the earth they cannot freely traverse due to COVID-19 are indeed in constant motion (McCormick, 1996).

From the “now time” we can also extrapolate ways to anticipate the “not yet” (Levitas, 2013). However, assuming that even if the tourist system of services does not return to its previous functional modus operandi, the tourist will revert to as they were and acted before the pandemic may not be a good starting point. Such statements can gain traction by providing examples (“facts”) of bad tourist behaviors in zones of exception, where luxury consumption is allowed even during the pandemic. In any case, when we use them as factual examples, we end up talking about who the tourist is today without interrogating effectively their dynamic sociocultural features or attempting to change them. Regardless of their truthfulness, which I will not contest, most of such examples describe behaviors and do not delve into the collective effects of a global pandemic on the travel mindset, rather than behavior. Unfortunately, their “truthfulness” chimes with established approaches to tourism analysis, which lump seamless human motivational drives together with big structures of action, ignoring the complexity involved in the production of reality (“truthmaking”).

Let me alter the rules of the analytical game then and consider some societal constants in the crisis, which I will avoid calling “facts.” Such constants are *not behaviorist* in psychological terms *but habitual* in a sociological sense that we associate with Bourdieu’s (1984) work on habitus and Bourdieu

and Wacquant's landmark dialogue on reflexivity (1992, pp. 20, 39). In this respect, I will not assume a moralistic framework concerning allegedly universal rights and duties, but an ethical one, which tackles problems in possible ways. In my new constellation, the pandemic's traveling subject (re)discovers different forms of movement and respite demoted to paratourist routines in postindustrial modernity: variations of fellow and distance walking, sports such as amateur running and climbing, and collective leisure activities such as picnics and outdoor celebrations during periods of lockdown easing; or more organized forms of staycation and regional travel by private automobiles and equipment allowing social distancing or shielding (e.g., camping). "Paratourism" refers here to activities that have become auxiliary to the organization of tourism or inform specific niches but alone are not considered sufficient to be recognized as tourism. I use such observations as a portal to the future (i.e., to discuss the nature of the postpandemic tourist subject), for reasons that become clearer below.

Note that the aforementioned and largely older variations of travel-related leisure fed into organizations of contemporary tourism niches but almost disappeared as activities outside postindustrial leisure regimes. From their stance, when it comes to leisure options the new travelers of the Virocne *disentangle the postindustrial entanglements of late modernity*. This decomplication could be seen as a reaction to what process-driven sociologist Norbert Elias (1996) called "decivilization" (p. 66) to describe the ways societal development endorses violence monopolies. In our case, disentanglement informs the development of creative agency outside industrial organizations of leisure, so it is a response to the forms of necessary violence (e.g., mobility surveillance) emerging during a pandemic. The thesis also challenges one of Hollinshead's (Hollinshead et al., 2009) basic premises of world-making, which is based on an inviolable interplay between tourist authority with tourist agency. The dyad does not address the agency of the traveler outside such fields of power, so it needs refining in this article. But such a redefinition becomes conditional upon the paradigmatic tools adopted, which in my case remove the human subjects from structures and place them in environments not dominated by human "ecologies." At least when

sensible travelers communicate with nature in the Virocne, they participate in an alternative form of "cosmopolitan" belonging. This belonging casts a "parliament of things and humans" as a demolition of the "partition of the sensible," not just in terms of class inequalities (i.e., Rancière, 2011), but the separation and promotion of human actors to tyrants of multispecies environments (Bennett, 2010, pp. 102–109).

Hollinshead and Vellah's (2020) use of Deleuze would not explain how the embodied traveling subject of the pandemic "becomes" in their local travails, because it precludes a discussion on how they encounter the world in immediate ways (pretechnologically). The objectual nature of my futural (post-COVID-19) traveling subject is also characterized by a sensibility surpassing the debates on "common sense." There have been various arguments concerning the impact of pandemic policies on human psychology and social (re)actions, ranging from considerations of collective trauma to an opportunity for new hopeful beginnings in travel (Tzanelli, 2021). I am not interested in endorsing either end of the spectrum and focus instead on the constant that guides such theses: the poetics and politics of sensibility.

Philosophically, sensibilities are the end-product of the ways we apprehend our social world and physical environments: they are fully worked-out emotions directed towards objects and subjects. In this respect, Hollinshead and Vellah's (2020) discussion of tourist becoming as the product of interrelationality is generally correct. However, the realm in which the poetics of sensibilities develops in the pandemic also allows for an engagement with what we used to take for granted in ways that may preclude traditional intersubjective frameworks. I refer to nature and the unity of the environment, which at (lockdown) times becomes inaccessible to the sensible traveler, who is supposed to be part of this invisible unity, but often remains accessible for "exercise and walking time." The affective travel body is also a sensory body with "supraempirical" potentialities allowing to step out of industrial framings, while on the move. Consider the environmental sublime, which guided early travel pilgrimages, inducing in travelers awe, love for natural purity, and serenity (Robinson, 2012). There is a clear connection between feelings and values to consider (Scheler, 1992, p. 173), especially because

the contexts in which local leisurely peregrinators find themselves are different from those in which we find traditional pilgrims. At the stage of poetics, the travel sensibility endorses entanglements with the environmental sublime that defy articulation and intersubjective becoming—thus, they are “virtual” but not “informational.” Being in nature heals the reality of being vulnerable as a monad before considering sociation, but in some cases while considering posthuman immersion (being part of nature). To conclude then, the sensible travelers of the pandemic can be “starmade” as posthumanist subjects, in lieu of the moralist “worldmaking” frameworks.

Let us follow this trail for a while: enforced isolation is also a sign of decivilization with its own merits. When put back in contexts of sociation with a “parliament of things,” posthuman values dethrone human needs from our planet, thus clashing with the unsustainable agenda of several types of postindustrial leisure and tourism (Sheller, 2014, 2021). We transition to a *politics of sensibilities*, which may also address postcolonial or industrial concerns. So far, my objectual context, namely pandemic crises, produces different results from Hollinshead and Vellah’s (2020) analysis with different starmaking tools. First, it is not injudicious to observe that the pandemic triggered not a straightforward reversal of mobility status (as explored in Urry’s, 1990, celebrated “tourist gaze”), whereby the locally mobile (destratified) subject assumes the role of the romantic traveler/pilgrim and the international traveler (during periods of eased travel restrictions) becomes the ubiquitous mass tourist, regardless of their plans, motivations, or even social status. Local wayfarers become declassed to join a movement of survivalist pleasure, which turns them into socially unframed travelers for a while. Contrariwise, the industrial massification of shielded elite tourism clashes with the personalism of the new local sensible traveler, promoting a peculiar status reversal. The protected from the virus elite traveler has to work more with national and international sets of rules and restrictions on what they can or cannot do to ensure that new viral outbreaks are minimized in tourist destinations. Such biopolitical organization is only extended to less affluent travelers during viral remissions, but with the persistence of coronavirus outbreaks around the world it is probable that we have entered

a new era of altered mobilities and sensibilities. In short, the pandemic has produced at least two new forms of leisurely mobility, which started their life in contexts of social stratification, class habitus, and economic capital, but during the pandemic instigated a reorganization of who is biomediated, and thus how different groups are subjectivized as “tourists” or “travelers.”

Such new sociocultural formations continue to entwine class, status, and regional/national power networks in the politics of travel movement by intensifying the politicization of bodily metaphors (Cresswell, 2021; Korstanje & George, 2021; Tzanelli, 2021). *However*, we may have to address a conceptual and cultural rewiring of the politics of sensibility, which far exceeds the observations on “digital labor” proffered by Scribano and Sánchez Aguirre (2018). This happens at a crucial moment in the obstruction of physical human movement, which *enforces the disappearance of the physical body and the ascension of biopolitics*. I caution against adopting a dark futurist framework, which incapacitates the human mind and soul alongside the body. So, one may just acknowledge that we deal with global complexities that need more plural thinking—an action framework transcending postcolonial concerns and contexts to explore how different ways of becoming can be preserved and supported (Urry, 2016). This new version of pluriversality (Escobar, 2018) addresses concerns about planetary survival, which views those of postcolonialism as only one of the many loci of (im)mobility and unhappiness.

One may argue closer to Hollinshead and Vellah’s (2020) Deleuzean thesis that the effects of such progressive disentanglements in viral contexts can also endorse disembodied becomings (Tzanelli, 2020, reading 2). Studies of travel and tourism before the pandemic suggest that technology can facilitate and enhance travel mobility (Germann Molz, 2004). Pandemics repurpose this function, turning it into an agential tool, which facilitates the emergence of communities of interests, or the reconstitution of existing terrestrial communities in virtual domains. This can be understood as a rendition of Deleuze’s virtuality-as-actuality, but it is a different worldmaking event from the ones Hollinshead and Vellah explored. I specifically refer to online communities sharing the same interests on tourism and travel and whose members can travel together the

world online. Germann Molz (2006) discussed this in a different context of physical round-the-world travelers using online technologies to keep in touch with others. I see in such loose tie interest-based communities (Granovetter, 1973) an opportunity to achieve becoming first in the digital domain, where the body is replaced with a rich positive poetics of affect that focuses on shared interests—a temporary resilience mechanism. In terms of community-building, loose ties create (auto)biographies that defy connections of territorialization and Foucaultian biopolitics: as acts of being and becoming, the production of self-identity and biography through imaginary and embodied travel, as argued by Desforges (2000). But as Hansen (2004) would argue, because physical movements always exist even within periods of viral siege, such virtual becomings would not substitute embodied togetherness; they may even recalibrate traditional biopolitical control over the family and socialization into a new biopoetics of local travel and mobility.

Concluding Observations

By clarifying what new creative actions (making) are possible and urgent in a potential “Virocene,” I endeavored to explain how we may imagine the future of humanity with particular reference to a form of non-essential mobility: leisurely travel. Such imaginings are actually also interconnected with *scholarly imaginaries of mobility*, each of them with a different forward, middle, or backwards looking arc. To demystify such time-arrows I pointed to objectual (possible) travel-related movements during the global COVID-19 crisis to show a change in the practical human mindset and the complexities in which this is placed. I believe that global viral outbreaks will become more prevalent in the future, producing clusters of events. Such clusters will display the qualities of an epochal span that overlaps with the Anthropocene (Tzanelli, 2021), so the pronouncement of a new era for tourism mobilities may not be that outlandish. In this article I tried to speculate such a possibility and “dream forward” with Hollinshead and Vellah (2020). My thesis is based merely on the idea that states of emergency prompt structural and systemic rearrangements of what is possible and what is real. Because they prompt us to rethink both what the

worlds in which we can move are like and how they can be modified to address our desires, they set off a journey into “virtuality,” which may transcend the constrictions of surveillance, even for a while.

I would conclude that the new travel sensibilities of the “Virocene” are constitutive of new hybrid “traveling subjects,” who find themselves entangled in shifting combinations of physical/embodied, affective, emotional, and cognitive/virtual mobilities, here managed by institutions and organizations (Hollinshead’s “authority”), there escaping them to produce new solitary becomings in natural and virtual environments. At other times, they may revise Urry’s “romantic gaze/tourist” as a classed subject (which deviates from Hollinshead’s “tourist agency”)—but this is possible only if we do not pay attention to the posthumanist paradigm of tourism/travel mobility. Such fluctuating sociocultural positionalities challenge the very elitist definitions of alleged “serious” tourism with a strong ecoromantic dimension. These new travel sensibilities can be biopolitical (producing surveyed mobile subjects), but they can also be biopoetic (producing autonomous travel biographies). As territorial specificity is challenged in novel ways in the “Virocene,” the new traveling subject may progressively replace the postindustrial tourist to articulate new arts of the possible under variations of hardship. I would conclude with an observation, which can serve as the theme of another article: in any pandemic context a traveler’s becoming may become entangled with *imaginaries* of travel that exceed the disabled realities of postindustrial tourist structuration, actualizing a fulfilling sociocultural life through hybrid movements that are not structured by leisure industries.

Acknowledgment

The author wishes to thank the anonymous reviewers for their useful comments.

References

Andrei, O. J., Kwok, J., & Koh, G. M. (2021). COVID-19 and extended reality (XR). *Current Issues in Tourism*, 24(14), 1935–1940. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13683500.2020.1798896>

Barad, K. (2007). *Meeting the universe halfway*. Duke University Press.

Benjamin, W. (2003). *Selected writings* (Vol. VI, pp. 389–400). Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.

Bennett, J. (2010). *Vibrant matter*. Duke University Press.

Boltanski, L., & Thévenot, L. (2006). *On justification*. Princeton University Press.

Bourdieu, P. (1984). *Distinction*. Harvard University Press.

Bourdieu, P., & Wacquant, L. (1992). *An invitation to reflexive sociology*. University of Chicago Press.

Brouder, P. (2020). Reset redux: Possible evolutionary pathways towards the transformation of tourism in a COVID-19 world. *Tourism Geographies*, 22(3), 484–490.

Caton, K. (2012). Taking the moral turn in tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 39(4), 1906–1928.

Cheer, J. M. (2020). Human flourishing, tourism transformation and COVID-19: A conceptual touchstone. *Tourism Geographies*, 22(3), 514–524.

Cheer, J. M., Lapointe, D., Mostafanezhad, M., & Jamal, T. (2021). Global tourism in crisis: Conceptual frameworks for research and practice. *Journal of Tourism Futures*, 7(3), 278–294.

Cresswell, T. (2021). Valuing mobility in a post COVID-19 world. *Mobilities*, 16(1), 51–65.

Deleuze, G. (2005). *Francis Bacon*. University of Minnesota.

Desforges, L. (2000). Traveling the world: Identity and travel biography. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 27(4), 926–945.

Duits, L., Zwaan, K., & Reijnders, S. (2014). *The Ashgate research companion to fan cultures*. Ashgate.

Eisenstadt, S. N. (2003). *Comparative civilizations and multiple modernities* (Vols. I–II). Columbia University Press.

Elias, N. (1996). *The Germans*. Columbia University Press.

Escobar, A. (2018). *Designs for the pluriverse*. Duke University Press.

Everingham, P., & Chassagne, N. (2020). Post COVID-19 ecological and social reset: Moving away from capitalist growth models towards tourism as *buen vivir*. *Tourism Geographies*, 22(3), 555–566.

Foucault, M. (1997). The birth of biopolitics. In P. Rabinow (Ed.), *Michel Foucault: Ethics*. New Press.

Germann Molz, J. (2004). Playing online and between the lines: Round-the-world websites as virtual places to play. In M. Sheller & J. Urry, (Eds.), *Tourism mobilities* (pp. 167–180). Routledge.

Germann Molz, J. (2006). Getting a “flexible eye”: Round-the-world travel and scales of cosmopolitan citizenship. *Citizenship Studies*, 9(5), 517–531.

Giddens, A. (1991). *Modernity and self-identity*. Polity.

Goodman, N. (1996). On starmaking. In P. J. McCormick (Ed.), *Starmaking* (pp. 143–150). MIT Press.

Granovetter, M. S. (1973). The strength of weak ties. *American Journal of Sociology*, 78(6), 1360–1380.

Hansen, M. (2004). *New philosophy for new media*. MIT Press.

Hollinshead, K. (2009). Tourism and the social production of culture and place: Critical conceptualizations on the projection of location. *Tourism Analysis*, 13, 639–660.

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

Hollinshead, K., & Vellah, A. B. (2020). Dreaming forward: Postidentity and the generative thresholds of tourism. *Journal of Geographical Research*, 3(4), 8–21. <https://doi.org/10.30564/jgr.v3i4.2299>

Hollinshead, K., Ateljevic, I., & Ali, N. (2009). Worldmaking agency-worldmaking authority: The sovereign constitutive role of tourism. *Tourism Geographies*, 11(4), 427–443.

Korstanje, M., & George, B. (2021). *Mobilities and globalisation in the aftermath of COVID19*. Palgrave Macmillan.

Levitas, R. (2013). *Utopia as method*. Palgrave Macmillan.

MacCannell, D. (2001). Tourist agency. *Tourist Studies*, 1(1), 23–37.

Mannheim, K. ([1936] 1968). *Ideology and utopia*. Harcourt, Brace & World.

Massumi, B. (2002). *Parables of the virtual*. Duke University Press.

McCormick, P. J. (1996). Introduction. In P. J. McCormick (Ed.), *Starmaking* (pp. xii–xix). MIT Press.

Miller, P., & Rose, N. (2010). *Governing the present*. Polity.

Pêcheux, M. (1995). *Automatic discourse analysis*. Rodopi.

Rancière, J. (2011). *The politics of aesthetics*. Verso.

Rich, A. (2001). *Arts of the possible*. W.W. Norton.

Ritzer, G., & Liska, A. (1997). “McDisneyization” and “post-tourism”: Complementary approaches on contemporary tourism. In C. Rojek & J. Urry (Eds.), *Touring cultures* (pp. 96–112). Routledge.

Robinson, M. (2012). The emotional tourist. In D. Picard & M. Robinson (Eds.), *Emotion in motion* (pp. 21–46). Routledge.

Rorty, R. (1989). *Contingency, irony, and solidarity*. Cambridge University Press.

Schaeffer, I. (1996). Epistemology of objectivity. In P. J. McCormick (Ed.), *Starmaking* (pp. 29–60). MIT Press.

Scheler, M. (1992). *On feeling, knowing and valuing*. University of Chicago Press.

Scribano, A., & Sánchez Aguirre, R. (2018). Remarks on the social study of sensibilities through creative practices. In A. Scribano (Ed.), *Politics and emotions* (pp. 143–170). Studium Press LLC.

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

Sheller, M. (2021). Reconstructing tourism in the Caribbean: Connecting pandemic recovery, climate resilience and sustainable tourism through mobility justice. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 29(9), 1436–1449.

Smith, C. (2021, May 18). *Holidaymakers booking twice to hedge against Covid rules*. BBC. <https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/business-57155307>

Therborn, G. (2003). Entangled modernities. *European Journal of Social Theory*, 6(3), 293–305.

Tsing, A. (2015). *The mushroom at the end of the world*. Princeton University Press.

Tzanelli, R. (2020). *Magical realist sociologies of belonging and becoming*. Routledge.

Tzanelli, R. (2021). *Cultural (im)mobilities and the Virocene*. Edward Elgar.

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

Urry, J. (2007). *Mobilities*. Polity.

Urry, J. (2016). *What is the future?* Polity.

Urry, J., & Larsen, J. (2011). *The tourist gaze 3.0*. SAGE.

Yang, Y., Zhang, H., & Chenc, X. (2020). Coronavirus pandemic and tourism: Dynamic stochastic general equilibrium modeling of infectious disease outbreak (Curated collection: Coronavirus). *Annals of Tourism Research*, 83, 102913.

Ziakas, V., Lundberg, C., & Sakkas, G. (2022). "Out of the black, into the big blue" on a single breath: Sport event value co-creation as symbolic world-making. *Journal of Sport Management*, 36(1), 25–44.

Žižek, S. (2014). *Event: Philosophy in transit*. Penguin.