



Deposited via The University of Leeds.

White Rose Research Online URL for this paper:

<https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/id/eprint/241881/>

Version: Accepted Version

Article:

Tzanelli, R. and Molz, J.G. (2026) Life in the age of extremes: Reconsidering biopolitical imaginaries in hospitality and tourism. *Hospitality & Society*, 16. pp. 3-12. ISSN: 2042-7913

https://doi.org/10.1386/hosp_00104_7

This is an author produced version of an article published in *Hospitality & Society*, made available via the University of Leeds Research Outputs Policy under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (CC-BY), which permits unrestricted use, distribution and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

Reuse

This article is distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) licence. This licence allows you to distribute, remix, tweak, and build upon the work, even commercially, as long as you credit the authors for the original work. More information and the full terms of the licence here:

<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/>

Takedown

If you consider content in White Rose Research Online to be in breach of UK law, please notify us by emailing eprints@whiterose.ac.uk including the URL of the record and the reason for the withdrawal request.

Article title: Life in the Age of Extremes: Reconsidering Biopolitical Imaginaries in Hospitality and Tourism (special issue theoretical statement)

Authors: Rodanthi Tzanelli and Jennie Germann Molz.

Authors contact details:

Rodanthi Tzanelli

Address: 12.04 Social Sciences Building, FSSG, University of Leeds, Woodhouse Lane, Yorkshire, LS2 9JT, United Kingdom.

Email: r.tzanelli@leeds.ac.uk

Tel no: ++44 113 343 8746

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5765-9856>

Rodanthi Tzanelli is Professor of Sociology of Culture and Deputy Director of the Bauman Institute at the University of Leeds. Her work focuses on the new mobilities paradigm, particularly in relation to tourism, technology, and social crises such as climate change. She serves on the executive board of the ISA's RC50 (International tourism) and the editorial boards of *Hospitality & Society* and *Tourism, Culture & Communication*. A prolific author, she has published numerous critical articles and eighteen monographs, including her latest, *Planetary biostyles: Community-making and futures design in the age of extremes* (Edward Elgar, 2025).

Jennie Germann Molz

Address: Department of Sociology and Anthropology, College of the Holy Cross, 1 College Street, Worcester, MA 01610, United States

Email: jmolz@holycross.edu

Tel no: +1 508 793 3596

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6858-8144>

Jennie Germann Molz is Professor of Sociology at College of the Holy Cross in Worcester, Massachusetts, USA. Her research focuses on tourism mobilities, network

hospitality and hospitality ethics, digital nomadism, and mobile lifestyles. She is the author of *Travel Connections: Tourism, Technology, and Togetherness in a Mobile World* (Routledge) and *The World is Our Classroom: Extreme Parenting and the Rise of Worldschooled* (NYU Press) and a co-editor of *Mobilizing Hospitality: The Ethics of Social Relations in a Mobile World* (Ashgate, with Sarah Gibson) and *Affect and Emotion in Tourism* (Routledge, with Dorina-Maria Buda). She is editor emerita of *Hospitality & Society*.

Abstract:

The introduction maps the trajectory of this special issue's key concepts, beginning with the theoretical embeddedness of biopolitics in contexts of crisis. Taking Hannah Arendt's critical biopolitical reflections as a starting point, the article explores how, in more recent years, different schools of critical thought have approached the governance and protection of various human and nonhuman lifeforms. These evolving axiologies of life have expanded understandings of hospitality—both as an ethic of care and as a situated practice.

The contemporary institutional and organisational management of human and nonhuman populations, along with their habitats, corresponds to particular styles of designing planetary futures. In the governance of migration and tourism especially, these styles materialise as imaginaries: blueprints for harmonious planetary existence in an age marked by the polycrises of political extremism, climate change, and coerced migration. The article concludes by introducing the individual contributions to the special issue and their affiliations with distinct critical schools of thought. Each article offers a perspectival insight into transformations of the biopolitical across the past two centuries, illuminating its entanglements with hospitality, tourism, and the politics of life.

keywords: Anthropocene; biopolitical imaginaries; crisis; hospitality; critical theory paradigms; tourism; theories of hope.

Life in the Age of Extremes: Reconsidering Biopolitical Imaginaries in Hospitality and Tourism

Re-imagining ‘life’: new post-biopolitical propositions in critical mobilities

To state that these days academic discourse is haunted by the phantom of the Anthropocene, a hypothesis according to which the human species features as the main force on planet earth, is to produce a metonymy for the present special issue’s analytical and ethical focus. The metonymy replaces practical concerns about the social, political and ecological management of all ‘life’ on earth with an acknowledgment of the exercise of human violence on its current functioning and malfunctioning ecosystems. In Fuller’s terms (Fuller, 2011, 2012) a new ‘Humanity 2.0’ governs our planet promoting its own interests across three organisational domains: the biopolitical, the cybernetic and the ecological. However, across the humanities, the social and life sciences, the semantics of ‘life’ still remain open to negotiation. Life and living are granted with different meanings, depending on our discursive jargon and epistemic affiliations. We use some terms to describe our passive orientation toward the outer environments, and the social and cultural worlds that we reside, and different terms to clarify how we choose to engage with the same worlds. Some jargon may intentionally reduce us to manifestations of earthly flows rather than sovereign beings (*zōé* is life stripped of its externally defined qualities and potentialities – Agamben, 1998, 2009), and other terms may grant us with dignified identities and missions (the Greek *biopáli* or toiling-living is a biproduct of *bíos* as the communally endowed social biography human subjects acquire through their social activities – Arendt, 1958).

It is impossible to address all possible concatenations of life in such a compact special issue – this is not among our intentions, anyway. But it goes without saying that when ‘life’ becomes a surrogate *problématique* for multi-scalar associations of humans with their various others (other humans, other cultures, other species, other ecosystems and bioregions - Bird Rose 2004), it transforms into an active, relational condition. For human and social science scholars, such relationalities point to intersubjective development and the recognition of our worth by other humans (i.e., Honneth, 1995). Scaled up but within our own species domains only, this condition addresses collective

flourishing and cross-cultural conviviality; scaled down but across human and nonhuman species, it reminds us that, microscopic worlds, such as those of bugs, speak a language that we still struggle to decipher (Bird Rose, 2017; Pyyhtinen, 2022). Scaled across temporal domains of planetary activity, such as the ones discussed by the theorists of an impending ‘sixth extinction’, it brings into focus the human tendency to progress while destroying. Overall, planet earth’s multispecies domains are also fields in which humans exercise their physical, symbolic and cognitive force. Such ‘forces’ allow humans to decide which planetary species are protected or condemned to death by pollution, neglect or active institutional abuse. Enclosing understandings of the social, cultural, ecological and ethico-political management of life in the dawn of our new century, the exercise of this force equips the present *Hospitality & Society* special issue with an intentionally loose conceptualisation of **biopolitics**.

The suggestion that the twenty first century is the age of unfolding **poly-crises** has flooded the contemporary public cultures of the internet, the academia and the global terrestrial commons. An earlier messenger of doom in the academic discipline of history, Eric Hobsbawm, provided a comprehensive map of some of these crises in the acclaimed *The Age of Extremes* (1994). Writing at the end of an equally turbulent century, Hobsbawm was more interested in outlining the disastrous outcomes of state socialism, capitalism, and nationalism, than those of climate change denial or mismanagement. In his bleak account he does not spend much time on prognoses; rather, he diagnoses already existing ‘failures’ in human political organisation and cultural expression, including the various populist designs of different global regimes, and their commercialised (demagogic) counterparts in popular cultural expressions. We endeavour to look past Hobsbawm’s dystopia, without discarding his astute analysis. We prefer to wear the hat of a scholar, rather than a public culture speaker. If anything, an alternative assessment of the current global state of affairs could easily subsume his catastrophist biopic into interdisciplinary discussions about a much earlier planetary Armageddon: the Columbian Exchange. Establishing the first world-wide network of economic mobilities across Europe, China, the Americas and Africa, Columbus’s journeys would also entangle various modernising techniques of mobility, with novel technologies of governing indigenous life. This early style of governance concentrated

on perfecting the mechanisms of thinning colonised lands by genocide and a natural but deadly mixing of ‘previously separate biotas’ (Lewis and Maslin, 2015, p.176). A discourse on risks produced by multiple physical and symbolic hybridisations of biotas recalls the complexity of a more recent crisis induced by the coronavirus global pandemic. The conflation of physical with symbolic and political purities in this discourse led to the institution of new regimes of controlling different social identities. New regimes of control coordinated and were coordinated by institutional and market redefinitions of citizenship and the right to move across borders (Tzanelli, 2021; Korstanje and George 2021; Coulter and Lapointe, 2023; Minca and Roelofsen 2023).

Mobility and the hybridisation of distinctive biotas bring into focus another aspect of this special issue: the entanglement of contemporary crises with **mobility styles and regimes** alike, such as those of travel, tourism, migration and new digital technological communication. Disparate movements of people, viruses, technologies, ideas, lifelines, professions and money invite us to replace Hobsbawm’s perspective on the ‘**age of extremes**’ with more precise epochal conceptual scaffoldings. An ‘age’ of poly-crises invites the accommodation of temporal plurality (i.e., times experienced and organised differently across our planet – Fabian, 1983). Alternatively, it opens a side door to hypothesising the coexistence of more than one ages, and even a more bespoke design (object and activity-orientated) of epochal frameworks (Chakrabarty, 2014, 2021). Such concerns are currently inflected through new epochal conceptualisations, such as those of the ‘Technosphere’ (Nancy, 2002), the ‘Eurocene’ (Sloterdijk, 2015; Mirzoeff, 2018), the ‘Anthropocene’ (Crutzen, 2002), the ‘Capitalocene’ (Moore, 2016), the ‘Plantationcene’, and the ‘Cthulhucene’ (Haraway, 2015). Be that as it may, the most prevalent tragic feature in such classifications of planetary memory and history is how all the big crisis events that we experience *now* connect to past human decisions. The study of such connections brings to the fore a more organic relationality between humans, land and nature, that is either suppressed or cultivated through various forms of mobility, such as travel. We commonly place this under the third key concern of the special issue, which is summarised under the umbrella term of ‘**hospitality**’.

All global crises involve the intensification of risks. However, it is easier to speak about extreme conditions that threaten multispecies existence and human societies alike, and far more difficult to identify particular extreme events and turning points that delineate ‘this moment’ in the history of humanity and the earth as an ‘age of extremes’. If anything, for two social scientists with anthropological education, the notion of hospitality point to webs of relationships. The very notion of relationship was properly codified in the classical registers of world cosmologies (ancient Greek, Chinese, Mesopotamian, Amerindian and more) as a ‘system of interlocking correspondences’ or ‘sympathies’ (Campion, 2012, pp.14-15). It is not injudicious to see in this early ‘Great Change of Being’ (as per Lovejoy, 1936), the origins of current critical planetary thought, which reminds us that all living beings partake in the making and constant refinement of complex and often fragile neural networks (Clark and Szerszynski, 2021). These networks can be human, and drive physical and ideological flows across borders, as is the case with human migrations; transhuman, as is the case with the facilitation of human connectivities through mobile technologies (Germann Molz, 2006, 2018); or posthuman, as is the case with the interlacing of human with nonhuman sentient life in specific bioregions under new regimes of mobility, such as tourism (Lapointe and Sarrasin, 2017).

The special issue’s contributors address scholarly assessments of some of these networks’ input in new biopolitical designs. We invited them to both geolocate and temporalize their study of specific biopolitical designs, addressing extreme manifestations of (in)hospitality in context. Given the prevalence of one or more crises in the submitted full-length studies, the emphasis on **extremes** is conceptually and methodologically significant. We refer to the semantics of ‘extremophilia’ as the love of and for the precipice, geophysical and figurative ‘ends’. Not only is extremophilia and its affective antonym (extremophobia) immanent in scientific discussions of catastrophe (i.e., extreme geological and meteorological shifts), but they also organise stylistically the institutional and informal accounts of extreme events as forms of collective trauma. Such stylistic organisation may also politically and culturally condition perspectives on events even informing policies on the management of collective trauma (Morton, 2013; Eyerman, 2019; Kohso, 2020).

The styles of criticality employed in this special issue by its four internationally renowned contributors inflect the critical biopolitics of hope adopted by anthropologist Janet Roitman (2013) and sociologist Mimi Sheller (2018). Roitman (2013) promotes an activist epistemology of hope. Her symbolic and practical techniques of sabotaging representational and institutional inequalities are based on the proposition that when you change the organisation of a story you may actually affect the material outcomes. Sheller explores the role of critical multitudes in alleviating the multiple crises and challenges posited by extreme urbanization and climate change. Such fraught urban ecologies correspond with the breakdown of social order in regions of the Global South and North, a rise in fundamentalist anti-immigration sentiment and the capitalist destruction of ecospheres and socio-spheres. Yet, Sheller (2020) sees hope for a better future (or better futures) in the ways scholars, artistic communities and grassroots networks address current problems through tacit forms of activism but also the cultivation of non-violent critical pedagogies. Such communities are mobile in physical and virtual styles; against the technophobic attitude of some critical theorists, Sheller sees in different types of travel, the progressive cosmopolitanisation of outlooks and a response to extremism and passive pessimism alike. Her thesis positions her as a planetary social theorist in Clark and Szerszynski's (2021) terms.

Sheller and Roitman's approaches posit broader questions regarding two and at times competing interpretations of biopolitics: one addressing the management and institutional control of populations and thus human and non-human life (which may produce inhospitable conditions – as also explored by Minca, 2007, 2010); and another proclaiming the formation of collaborative socialities driving viable future-orientated projects (Tzanelli, 2022a, 2022b; Salazar, 2022). Such projects can both challenge harmful regimes controlling migration mobility (Salazar and Glick Schiller, 2016) and tourism alike (Lapointe et al., 2019; Lapointe et al., 2020) and propose new forms of 'network hospitality' (Germann Molz, 2014) and togetherness.

The metonymical emplacement of life through hospitality is an interdisciplinary and transdisciplinary project in its own right. As explained above, this intertwinement also

provides the special issue that we curate with a primary focus. It goes without saying that as both an absolute norm (what Derrida, 2000 sees as the unwritten law of providing safety and nourishment to strangers; see also Germann Molz and Gibson, 2007) and a context-based practice (what relational sociologist Pyyhtinen, 2020 calls ‘practical hospitality’), hospitality has evolved into a field within a network of other scholarly fields, including those of tourism and migration. This networking across particular fields acts as the secondary focus of the current special issue.

The special issue at a glance

The issue comprises four full-length articles, authored by internationally renowned scholars in cognate disciplines (anthropology, geography and sociology) and fields (migration, tourism, critical mobilities theory, social theory and decolonial studies). These contributions are complemented by a reflective panorama on the genealogies and futures of biopolitical hospitality, which is provided by an expert in social theory (Dr Jack Palmer, Director of Bauman Institute, Leeds). The special issue’s central objective is to deliberate on the meaning and value of life-forms within hospitality theory in an age dominated by extreme events. To that end, the contributors address the role of the biopolitical in current hospitality and tourism contexts, with an emphasis on entanglements of tourism, travel and hospitality as a norm and/or a practice. They address questions of collective futures within their own expertise, with a view to setting new blended agendas on critical mobility studies, with an emphasis on new hospitality themes and arguments.

The first two articles map the biopolitical in particular geographical contexts. In the first article, Claudio Minca offers a series of ethnographic vignettes that transport us to the Balkan Route, a corridor that connects Greece to Western Europe and along which tourist and migrant mobilities overlap. Minca describes the everyday biopolitical practices and *dispositifs* that categorize otherwise indistinguishable travellers into tourists, who are generally welcomed and granted mobility, and migrants, whose mobility is blocked or whose presence is deemed unwelcome, often based on arbitrary and racialized judgments. Lapointe and Blain-Tremblay’s contribution focuses on Quebec, Canada and two of the tourism development strategies intended to transform

the province's peripheries into tourist destinations. The policies the authors examine apply a biopolitical logic to territories and local ways of life, treating them as resources to be categorized, commodified and eventually consumed by the tourists who will circulate through these newly developed 'pleasure peripheries.' Against both articles' geopolitical specificity, their authors plot different paradigmatic propositions, with Minca's emphasising the material power of institutional apparatuses to sort and discard human life, and Lapointe and Blain-Tremblay's addressing the diffusive effect of discourse on the ways regions and locales are categorised as 'pleasure-orientated' tourist destinations. Thus, Minca's Agambenesque proposition is succeeded by Lapointe and Blain-Tremblay's more transitional take on Foucault's governmentality in the articles' respective regional foci.

The differences between the first two articles become more pronounced at such theoretical transitions. For Lapointe and Blain-Tremblay what is at stake in the policies they analyse is not just the biopolitical governance of people, but the definition, and thus enforced rooting of a 'population in place' where human lifeways, environments, and territories are interwoven. Hence, their interrogation is more bioregional in spirit, where Minca's is political as a form of praxis that moves through regions together with different mobile human actors. Minca gestures towards an analysis of the sovereign beyond an 'institutions only' control of life, a more agential and networked agency, which can nevertheless be as cruel or indifferent to those in need. This shifts the focus of biopolitics from a sovereign's power to determine who is or is not welcome to a more unevenly and arbitrarily distributed power that operates in encounters between tourists, migrants, bus drivers, train conductors, taxi drivers, and border agents. In many respects, instead of appealing to sovereign power, Minca outlines a practice of on-the-ground biopolitics, or what, in the vein of Pyhtinen's (2020) 'practical hospitality,' we might call 'practical biopolitics.'

The next two articles 'peregrinate' planetary areas and conclude with a global outlook on biopolitical futures in an age of extremes, which threatens the value of hospitality and the practice of hospitableness. In her contribution, Jennie Germann Molz explores the digital and physical contexts of online hospitality platforms and mobile

neighbouring. Her analysis of Airbnb and alternative forms of dwelling illustrate how digital biopolitical governance operates through the erasure of the host, which can either signal the conflation of bodies and practices with capitalist logics or gesture toward mutual and collaborative hospitalities. Lastly, Noel Salazar invites us to ‘restory’ hospitality with new narratives that transcend the Anthropocenic bias that commonly frames debates about this age of extremes. By applying a multiscalar and more-than-human perspective, his article illuminates the interdependent web of hospitality that emerges among humans and other life forms in a planetary context.

Unlike the first two contributions, Germann Molz and Salazar’s propositions draw on disparate places and contexts mostly to rethink hospitality as global ethic fostering planetary conviviality. Germann Molz’s critical reading of Foucault lifts his ‘governmentality’ out of its original epistemic greenhouse, to discuss how it is experienced today in progressively more transhuman networks of communication, which can also foster dehumanising techniques of mobility. Taking over from Lapointe and Blain-Tremblay’s critique, she argues that in a world of absent hosts, technologies sterilise tourism vacationing, turning living places into spaces of play for strangers. Subsequently, Salazar’s focus on ‘life’ further widens the biopolitical lens, moving from transhuman to posthuman paradigms. His proposition focuses not on infrastructures or human groups but the earth’s terrestrial and aquatic environment and all of the living organisms within it. From this broader perspective, he explores moments of hospitality across multiple scales: transspecies, humans and animals; bacteria and viruses; and the planet as a whole. He calls for a more-than-human biopolitics of hospitality that reimagines governance not as tightly managing human life, but as a kind of ‘planetary conviviality’ that fosters the entanglement of all forms of life, even – or especially – in the face of Anthropocenic extremes and polycrisis.

Overall, where the first two articles highlight biopolitical management and hierarchization, the following two attempt to rethink the conditions under which more collaborative socialities across human and more-than-human hospitalities can be materialised. In this respect, they engage with Roitman (2013) and Sheller’s (2018) critical biopics of hope. Each of them illustrates the messiness and fluidity of human

and more-than-human lives, mobilities, and relationalities. We leave readers to ponder on being questions that do not have straightforward answers, but which are worth asking and deliberating upon. We can sum key aspects of them by asking again whether biopolitical governance techniques will come in to tidy up the inevitable chaos of life (see Veijola, et al., 2014) or whether there is an alternative conceptualization of biopolitics that will foster the power generated by that defines our planet's vital messiness.

References

- Agamben, G., 1998. *Homo sacer: Sovereign power and bare life*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Agamben, G., 2009. *What is an apparatus? and other essays*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9781503600041>
- Arendt, H., 1958. *The human condition*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Bird Rose, D., 2004. *Reports from a wild country: Ethics for decolonisation*. Kensington, NSW: University of New South Wales Press.
- Bird Rose, D., 2017. Shimmer: All you love is being thrashed. In: A. Tsing, H. Swanson, E. Gan and N. Bubandt, eds. *Arts of living on a damaged planet: Ghosts and monsters of the Anthropocene*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, pp. 51–64.
- Chakrabarty, D., 2014. Climate and capital: Conjoined histories. *Critical Inquiry*, 41(1), pp.1–23. <https://doi.org/10.1086/678154>
- Chakrabarty, D., 2021. *The climate of history in a planetary age*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press. <https://doi.org/10.7208/9780226733050>
- Clark, N. and Szerszynski, B., 2021. *Planetary social thought: The Anthropocene challenge to the social sciences*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Coulter, M. and Lapointe, D., 2023. Between threat and privilege: Narratives of tourism in crisis. In: C. Minca and M. Roelofsen, eds. *Tourism and biopolitics in pandemic times*. Cham: Springer Nature, pp. 47–64. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-46399-0_3
- Davis, J., Moulton, A.M., Van Sant, L. and Williams, B., 2019. Anthropocene, Capitalocene ... Plantationocene? A manifesto for ecological justice in an age of global crises. *Geography Compass*, 13(5), e12438. <https://doi.org/10.1111/gec3.12438>
- Derrida, J. and Dufourmantelle, A., 2000. *Of hospitality*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Derrida, J., 2000. Hostipitality. *Angelaki: Journal of the Theoretical Humanities*, 5(3), pp. 3–18. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09697250020034706>
- Fabian, J., 1983. *Time and the other: How anthropology makes its object*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Foucault, M., 1978. *The history of sexuality: Volume 1, An introduction*. New York: Pantheon Books.

- Foucault, M., 2003 [1976]. *Society must be defended: Lectures at the Collège de France, 1975–76*. New York: Picador.
- Fuller, S., 2011. *Humanity 2.0: What it means to be human past, present and future*. London: Palgrave Macmillan. <https://doi.org/10.1057/9780230316720>
- Fuller, S., 2012. The art of being human: A project for general philosophy of science. *Journal of General Philosophy of Science*, 43(1), pp.113–123. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10838-012-9181-5>
- Germann Molz, J. and Gibson, S., 2007. Mobilizing and mooring hospitality. In: J. Germann Molz and S. Gibson, eds. *Mobilizing hospitality: The ethics of social relations in a mobile world*. Aldershot: Ashgate, pp.1–28.
- Germann Molz, J., 2006. Getting a ‘flexible eye’: Round-the-world travel and scales of cosmopolitan citizenship. *Citizenship Studies*, 9(5), pp.517–531. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13621020500301288>
- Germann Molz, J., 2014. Toward a network hospitality. *First Monday*, 19(3). <https://doi.org/10.5210/fm.v19i3.4824>
- Germann Molz, J., 2018. Discourses of scale in network hospitality: From the Airbnb home to the global imaginary of ‘belong anywhere’. *Hospitality & Society*, 8(3), pp.229–251. https://doi.org/10.1386/hosp.8.3.229_1
- Haraway, D., 2015. Anthropocene, Capitalocene, Plantationocene, Chthulucene: Making kin. *Environmental Humanities*, 6(1), pp.159–165. <https://doi.org/10.1215/22011919-3615934>
- Hobsbawm, E., 1994. *The age of extremes: The short twentieth century, 1914–1991*. London: Abacus.
- Honneth, A., 1995. *The struggle for recognition: The moral grammar of social conflicts*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Korstanje, M.E. and George, B., 2021. *Mobility and globalization in the aftermath of COVID-19: Emerging new geographies in a locked world*. Cham: Springer Nature.
- Lapointe, D. and Sarrasin, B., 2017. (Re)production of resilient tourism space in the context of climate change in coastal Quebec, Canada. In: A.A. Lew and J.M. Cheer, eds. *Tourism resilience and adaptation to environmental change*. London: Routledge, pp.141–156.

- Lapointe, D., Lebon, C. and Guillemard, A., 2020. Space in transformation: Public versus private climate change adaptation in peripheral coastal tourism areas—Case studies from Quebec, Canada. *International Journal of Tourism Research*, 22(2), pp.238–251. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jtr.2332>
- Lapointe, D., Sarrasin, B. and Lagueux, J., 2020. Management, biopolitics and foresight: What looks for the future of the world? *Téoros* [online], 39(3). Available at: <http://journals.openedition.org/teoros/8407> [Accessed 1 Feb. 2022]. <https://doi.org/10.7202/1075019ar>
- Minca, C. and Roelofsen, M., 2023. Exploring biopolitical tourism spatialities in pandemic times. In: C. Minca and M. Roelofsen, eds. *Tourism and biopolitics in pandemic times*. Cham: Springer Nature, pp.2–16.
- Minca, C., 2007. Agamben's geographies of modernity. *Political Geography*, 26(1), pp.78–97. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.polgeo.2006.08.010>
- Minca, C., 2010. The island: Work, tourism and the biopolitical. *Tourist Studies*, 9(2), pp.88–108. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1468797609360599>
- Mirzoeff, N., 2018. It's not the Anthropocene, it's the white supremacy scene, or the geological color line. In: R. Grusin, ed. *After extinction*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press, pp.123–149.
- Moore, J.W., ed., 2016. *Anthropocene or Capitalocene? Nature, history, and the crisis of capitalism*. Oakland, CA: PM Press.
- Morton, T., 2013. *Hyperobjects: Philosophy and ecology after the end of the world*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- Nancy, J.-L., 2015. *After Fukushima: The equivalence of catastrophes*. New York: Fordham University Press.
- Pyyhtinen, O., 2020. Friends of relational sociology? The relational current as a space of hospitality. *Digithum*, 26, pp.1–12. <https://doi.org/10.7238/d.v0i26.3199>
- Pyyhtinen, O., 2022. Lines that do not speak: Multispecies hospitality and bug-writing. *Hospitality & Society*, 12(3), pp.343–359. https://doi.org/10.1386/hosp_00056_1
- Roitman, J., 2013. *Anti-crisis*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Salazar, N.B. and Schiller, N.G., 2013. Regimes of mobility across the globe. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 39(2), pp.183–200. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1369183X.2013.723253>

- Salazar, N.B., 2022. Anthropologies of the present and the presence of anthropology. *Etnografia*, 16(2), pp.6–24. [https://doi.org/10.31250/2618-8600-2022-2\(16\)-6-24](https://doi.org/10.31250/2618-8600-2022-2(16)-6-24)
- Sheller, M., 2018. *Mobility justice: The politics of movement in an age of extremes*. London: Verso.
- Sheller, M., 2020. *Island futures: Caribbean survival in the Anthropocene*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Sloterdijk, P., 2015. The Anthropocene: A process-state at the edge of geohistory? In: H. Davis and E. Turpin, eds. *Art in the Anthropocene: Encounters among aesthetics, politics, environments and epistemologies*. London: Open Humanities Press, pp.327–340.
- Tzanelli, R., 2021. *Cultural (im)mobilities and the Virocene: Mutating the crisis*. Cheltenham, UK and Northampton, MA: Edward Elgar.
- Tzanelli, R., 2022a. 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., 2022b. *Space, mobility and crisis in mega-event organisation: Tokyo Olympics 2020's atmospheric irradiations*. New York: Routledge.
- Veijola, S., Germann Molz, J., Pyhtinen, O., Höckert, E. and Grit, A., 2014. *Disruptive tourism and its untidy guests: Alternative ontologies for future hospitalities*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.