

Tourism in the dark days of neo-
liberalism: fear as a commodity,
pleasure as a right.

Maximiliano E Korstanje

Tourism in the dark days of neo-liberalism: fear as a commodity, pleasure as a right.

Maximiliano E Korstanje¹

Abstract

Although neoliberalism emerged after World War II, its core propositions are not fundamentally new. As previously discussed, imperial structures extended their hegemony by developing plans to integrate distant economies. In doing so, they promoted an open discourse to simulate free trade while exploiting peripheral regions. Neoliberalism continues this legacy, dividing the world into the global (developed) North and the perpetually unstable South. Many critics highlight the profound asymmetries and contradictions between these regions. While first-world tourists are legally encouraged to visit new destinations, refugees and asylum-seekers are systematically rejected, often facing imprisonment or prosecution. Clearly, the benefits of globalization are neither homogenized nor standardized across all economic sectors in both developed and developing nations. As Z. Bauman observes, the maturation and expansion of capitalism have produced a paradoxical situation that combines a liberal economic doctrine with increasingly repressive instruments of control and surveillance. Echoing Pilar Calveiro, we argue that neoliberalism enforces the idea of free trade for developing economies while simultaneously adopting restrictive anti-migration policies. Within the neoliberal agenda, tourism occupies a central role—not only for its economic benefits but also for its purported "democratic nature." This chapter critically examines the intersection of tourism consumption and terrorism, laying the groundwork for a new understanding of tourism security.

Keywords: Neoliberalism, Globalization, Consumption, Tourism, Tourism Security.

¹ University of Palermo, Argentina. mkorst@palermo.edu

Introduction

In view of the contemporary events it is safe to say that Donald Trump reached the US presidency promising the construction of a Wall between the US and Mexico border. While a globalized process has flattened the earth, no less true seems to be that a counter-force, which is based on ethnocentrism and racism, has recently surfaced. These nationalist discourses are oriented to demonize the “foreigner” as an undesired “Other”. The question of whether hospitality consists of accepting the Other as a part of society, echoing Selwyn (2019), a much deeper sentiment of hostility has been empowered in Europe and the US. This suggests that there are two types of mobilities. One is strictly reserved for rich tourists who are legally enthralled to travel across the world, while the other signals the surveillance and controls over forced-migrants, asylum seekers and refugees. The triumph of Trump appears not to be different from Jair Bolsonaro or Viktor Orban, without mentioning Brexit and other separatist movements in Europe. In the past, the Western empires adventured to colonize the world. In so doing, they imposed Western hospitality as a mainstream cultural value. Today, the law of hospitality sets the pace for resistance to the “non-Western Other” (Ansari 2018). The rise of neo-fascism, as well as Islamophobia -if not the tourist-phobia- places the problem of racism into the foreground (Slavin 2017). As David Altheide puts it, the sentiment of terror generated by terrorism not only allowed the emergence of long-dormant discourses programmed to revitalize the most recalcitrant chauvinism but also affected the democratic institutions as never before. The legitimacy of Trump, as Altheide notes, is not given by the fear of strangers, which was embedded in the American character, but in the urgency of enhancing homeland security (Altheide 2006; 2017). Equally important, terrorism not only shocked the US and the World but also reminded us that anyone and anytime can be a victim. This idea woke up a sentiment of living with the enemy within (Ansari 2018), which is the symbolic core of Islamophobia (Farer 2016; Korstanje 2018). As Selwyn (2019) brilliantly writes, England in particular and Europe, in general, are coming across a sentiment of anti-hospitality, which consists in expelling some ethnic minorities that have been part of society for decades to the borders of the system (Windrush Scandal). At the bottom, hospitality reflects the human reciprocity exhibiting a logic of giving-while-receiving. Such solidarity forms the social institutions and the norms that the in-group members often obey. However, one might speculate that

the term is strictly associated with hostility. The acts of hospitality denote the articulation of durable social relationships, giving symbolic frames to move inside or outside groups once consolidated. One of the anthropological functions of hospitality is to transform enemies into friends, strangers in neighbours. A hostile environment, broadly speaking, does the opposite: the neighbour who may be suspected of being a potential terrorist is monitored, jailed or deported with some reasonable argument. In view of this, as Selwyn observes, Brexit and the Windrush Scandal are two sides of the same coin for the UK. Nevertheless, this should not be limited to England. General observations about anti-tourist manifestations or anti-Islam parades speak readers of the rise and expanse of an anti-hospitality discourse.

In a seminal book entitled *Clash of Barbarisms*, Gilbert Achcar (2015) coins the term narcissist commiseration to express empathy for the peripheral South, which was historically relegated from the prosperity of the North, for the US just after 9/11. Terrorism nourished an ideological narrative oriented to strengthen the center-periphery dependency. The present chapter interrogates furtherly the dichotomies between modern tourism and migration in an ever-changing world. The liberal discourse emphasizes on the needs of free trade to achieve higher levels of development in the domestic economy. However, this openness is accompanied by a repressive mechanism of discipline disposed to control and reject immigrants. To some extent, the liberalization of capital does not adjust to the restrictions of human movements (Sassen, 2013). In this vein, Korstanje (2018) toys with the belief that the inconsistencies of liberal discourse as well as its contradictions, remain untouched for scholars and academicians. We are educated to think that democracy is the best form of government. However, at a closer look, the Hobbesian doctrine shows not only how the liberal nation-state is founded under a primordial terror, but also that some disciplinary instruments are legally monopolized by the ruling elite. While the nationhood attracts citizens to belong to a shared project, others are systematically rejected or exiled. The success of the nation-state lies in its efficient capacity to regulate mobilities (some nomad groups) insofar a false notion of mobility is offered (Guidotti-Hernandez 2011). In the current chapter, we discuss the role of globalization and mobilities as forces that expand the terror, laying the foundations to a new, fresh insight into tourism security. The first introductory section ignites a hot debate regarding American exceptionalism and the Mass

Migration that populated the most important cities in the US for the past centuries. Liberalism starts from a traumatic experience a blood legacy left by British Empire- which ushers in two opposing fears: the fear of tyranny and the fear of strangers. While the capitalist system was exported as a successful project, these two fears arrived to stay. The second section, complementarily, focuses on the epistemological and historical origin of liberalism and of course, neoliberalism. This section articulates different theories and explanations about the term, as well as the idea of Homeland Security. The third section explains, though partially, the intersection of tourism and mobilities in a global world where the conception of Self and Alterity has been radically altered.

Preliminary Debate

In *Why Nations Fail*, Acemoglu and Robinson analyze why some nations achieve economic prosperity while others remain impoverished. They argue that countries embracing liberal institutions are more likely to develop democracy and competitive economies. Poverty, they contend, is often the result of "extractive institutions" that channel surplus from the colony to the imperial center. England's spirit of liberty paved the way for capitalism and a decentralized economy (Acemoglu & Robinson 2013). Donald Pease (1987) explores the paradoxes of the American Renaissance, noting that after independence, the US oscillated between breaking from British tradition and adopting freedom as its foundational value. At the same time, Americans struggled to forge a strong social consensus. The paradox is that social order requires tradition to survive. In distancing themselves from the British Empire, Americans experienced a philosophical void filled by a romanticized past, aligning civic culture with imperial objectives. The sentiment of exceptionalism shaped a fluid interplay between internal democracy and territorial conquest in foreign policy (Lipset 1997; Tyrrell 1991; Madsen 1998). Being "exceptional" engenders a primordial fear. Bernard Bailyn observes that the US mirrored the strategy of the British Empire: fostering internal liberalism in imperial centers, while extracting resources and exerting violence in the periphery. Today, American liberalism is shaped by two competing impulses: rejecting the British legacy as oppressive and pursuing liberty to reinvent the

nation (Bailyn 1968). Between 1880 and 1950, the US welcomed countless ethnic groups and nationalities. Despite some nativist sentiment, most migrants were eventually assimilated (Sanchez 1997; Guidotti Hernandez 2011). Paradoxically, while Europeans and Asians joined the “melting pot,” African descendants remained segregated for decades (Higham 2002; Wise 2013). Once established as a superpower, the US sought to export democracy and capitalism globally. Assimilation of the stranger became a moral virtue, reinforcing the image of American success. The peaceful coexistence of diverse ethnicities was touted as proof of the capitalist system’s effectiveness. Liberal discourse thus proclaimed the necessity—and urgency—of exporting American culture worldwide (Korstanje 2018). Rooted in mobility, the Puritan spirit valorized sacrifice and hard work, giving rise to an enterprise culture that defined the nation’s destiny. As Maldwyn Allen Jones explains,

“Yet in going to America, the Puritans were not turning their backs on the deprivations of Europe. They believed the essential purpose of their errand in the wilderness to be the redemption of Europe; the polity they went to perfect would not only ensure their own salvation but would serve as a model for imitation by those they had left behind. In this conception, more than any other may be seen the germ of the idea to which Jefferson and John Adams were to give eloquent expression, namely, that America was designed by the Providence as a beacon and an example to the rest of mankind” (Jones 1992: 13).

All ethnicities that arrived in the US accepted this maxim, even to the extent of internalising their so-called inferiority. The same economic crisis that shocked Europe empowered some peripheral nations, which were selected as a target for the impoverished peasantry (Jones 1992). Needless to say that the economic forces of production and migration are inextricably intertwined. As Saskia Sassen (2013) clarifies, the modern process of globalization is based on decentralized forces which are ideologically centralized in the global cities. Those material asymmetries produced by capitalism, far from being resolved, are concentrated and potentiated by globalization. While the global cities erected as exemplary centers of consumption other zones and areas are degraded or in danger of disappearance. In a seminal book, *The Mobilities Paradox*, Korstanje (2018a) punctuates that Western civilization expanded historically, indexing peripheral economies which were

adapted and formatted according to the Western lifestyle, as well as the Greek conception of desire. Europeans colonized the world imposed the idea of hospitality. Paradoxically, the state legitimized its supremacy over some nomad groups by the imposition of a false sense of mobility. The WWII end marked the zenith of mass migration when millions of impoverished Europeans travelled to the Americas in search of better opportunities. This mass migration, as discussed, formed a powerful discourse oriented to stress the need to adopt liberalism as the main ideology worldwide. But, in so doing, post-Westphalian states passively accepted the controversies revolving around the doctrine of security, which remains in the core of Western imaginaries.

Neoliberalism and Homeland Security

Neoliberalism is a buzzword which today is very hard to grasp. The term was originally used by the economist Alexander Rustow to differentiate the doctrine of traditional liberalism from the rise of a pro-collectivist liberal “ethos”. In 1947, Von Hayek invited a group of selected intellectuals to discuss the future of liberalism in view of the crises that democracies faced. This group is known as the Mont Pelerin Society (MPS), devoted to preserving democracy and liberalism as the touchstone of the West. The liberal rationality, so to speak, is based on a minimum intervention of the state in society; however, a closer look suggests that there were substantial discrepancies between Von Hayek and Mises with respect to the role of the state. While the former signalled to the idea state may promote the necessary legal background towards economic maturation, the latter demonized any type of political intervention in the market (Parker 2008). From that moment onwards, much has been written on neoliberalism. Nonetheless, the main problem seems to be that the term took countless interpretations and meanings in the different disciplines that appropriated it as an object of study (Scribano, Timmermann Lopez & Korstanje 2018). To put the same in other terms, economists define neoliberalism as the set of theories and practices aimed at liberalizing the economy through the promotion and stimulation of free-trade (in egalitarian conditions) while international political analysts signal to a school which holds that nation-states move in a state of anarchy where the needs of maximizing the relative gains prevail.

What is clear seems to be that neoliberalism is sharply opposed to neo-pragmatism (Turner 2008; Hall 2011; Tan 2012). As Stuart Hall eloquently observes, the neoliberal model overvalorizes individual freedom, not only subordinating the collective well-being to individualism but also governing society through a deregulated market. Since the state should never intervene in society, forcing individuals nor regulating the forces of the market, neoliberals overlook –beyond their pretention of objectivity- that under some conditions the market, left controlled- creates different material inequalities (Hall 2011). Hall attempts to unravel the origins of neoliberal discourse, arguing convincingly that liberal economists early envisioned a society where philosophically men dispose of their properties and produce wealth at their discretion. Pitted against the monarchy and the monarchical order, liberals enthusiastically embraced the idea of progress, which is based on free trade, as a sign towards a more tolerable (and civilized) government. In his book, *Development and Social Change*, Phillip McMichael (2012) calls attention to the role played by colonialism, as well as the exploitation of European powers, in the conception of free trade and development. Once the end of WWII, the former overseas territories claimed the adoption of democratic forms of government, accelerating not only their independence but also the withdrawal of the imperial powers. To continue with the center-periphery dependency, the theory of development was installed as an ideological narrative aimed at filling the gap left by “the decolonization process”. As a result of this, the theory of development not only introduced “a need” in the developing nations but also politically divided the world in two: developed and under-developed economies. Although much of the ideology came from the liberals of eighteenth century who believed that uncivilized nations may prosper with direct trade with European metropolis, no less true was that the financial aid and the development-related programs which were disposed to help poor nations have not crystallized into a fairer distribution of wealth for the third world economies. Contrariwise, McMichael agrees that the theory of development, as it was formulated in the Global North, was thought to reinforce control over the South. Mauro Guillen (2001) highlights some of the prejudices and misconceptions revolving around the process of globalization. As he puts it, globalization has its limits in the convergence with local organizational cultures. Though globalization centers on the needs of adopting economic development, its effects vary on country, economy and culture -insofar as

different are the reactions of actors even within the same society- (Guillen 2001). Parker (2008) puts the role of private property and the position of man and his freedom above the values of collectivism as the two chief factors that form the ideology of neoliberalism. She goes on to write,

“Liberalism as a series of traditions had followed established patterns of thought stemming from thinkers such as Locke, Kant and Mill. It has affirmed the moral sovereignty of individuals, highlighted the rational basis of self-determination leading to self-development, and stressed the importance of responsible power as the main institutional corollary of liberty” (Parker 2008: 43).

Parker speaks to us of two types of liberalism. The first was born in the eighteenth century in the UK, while a rebirth emerged in the core of the US in view of the moral disaster Nazi Germany represented for humanity. European nations –by the WWII end- bear witness not only how Fascism ushered the old continent into a dark age of destruction and pain but also how two superpowers –dotted with different ideologies- start a new “cold” War that slices the world in two. Eric Hobsbawm (1994) calls attention to the fact that the history of the twentieth century was fraught with rivalries between two opposite poles: capitalism and Marxism. Beyond the primacy of capitalism in the US and Marxism in Russia, he toys with the belief that both ideologies alternated according to its capacity to ensure a durable political and economic stability. Just upon the stock and market crash that whipped Europe, Capitalism was underestimated as a valid option in view of the advance of Marxism, which successfully articulated the necessary steps for forging a materialist and collective rationality. Once the Soviet Union collapsed, Marxism was undervalued as the residual ideology of an undemocratic nation. Hobsbawm’s text is fruitful in showing the ebbs and flows of ideologies, even neoliberalism, to explain reality, adjusting the social demands to the interests of the status quo. The 2000s witnessed the resurgence of political violence, terrorism and radicalized ideologies in view of an economic crisis that threatens the democratic institutions in Europe and the US (Skoll 2016; Altheide 2017; Korstanje 2018a; 2018b).

It is strange that while neoliberals emphasize on the need of receding the state’s intervention (in the local economy), further demands are crystallized for the state to take

direct intervention when some minorities impede the cycle of production, such as union strikes, the rise of inter-ethnic conflicts or any other disputes. Today's neoliberalism ponders the notion of security as the precondition to avoid a state of anarchy. This suggests two important aspects. On one hand, the liberal economic policies which valorize the action of free trade are inevitably accompanied by more repressive forms of discipline. On another, there is a certain suspicion of the figure of strangers –as carriers of sickness, potential terrorists or simply erratic workers who threaten to get a local job.

As the previous argument is given, Pilar Calveiro (2012) reminds us how the neoliberal agenda combines innovative –but more repressive- forms of violence over lay-citizens who struggle against the dream of a liberal market. In fact, the invention of external risks as terrorism or delinquency appears to be prone to the introduction of new, stricter laws aimed at disciplining “the Other”. As a result of this, some populist demands, echoed by journalism and the mass media, start a process of securitization aimed at hiding the political dissidence, while at the bottom, the neoliberal programs are widely adopted by Western governments. In the same line, Susana Murillo alerts on the transformations of the IMF and World Bank, as well as other financial corporations just after the failures of neoliberalism in Latin America through the 90s decade. Neoliberals –in spite of the tremendous collapse of Latin American economies- never fled to exile as the millions of migrants that arrived in Europe and the US. Rather, they re-embellished the content of their ideology by introducing the needs of security, as well as the incapacity of the state, to show the urgency of a laissez-faire doctrine. Terrorism and many other derived dangers, following their cosmology, are the product of a lack of democracy. The totalitarian regimes not only developed fewer margins to deal with terrorism but also promoted terrorism. The free-trade, associated with democracy and development are exemplary forces that pacify entire regions, neoliberal scholars assert. The failure of the West to expand its successful project (now in the shape of the development theory) can be explained by the cultural background of non-Western nations. This exhibits the needs of leading a cultural revolution, which implies “a change” towards sustainable growth and progress. The term governance was the touchstone of neoliberal thinking in the years that followed 9/11 (Murillo, 2008).

Adrian Scribano is right when he writes that in the days of liberalism, the role of the modern state conveys in intervening directly only when the interests of capital owners are placed in jeopardy. In consequence, a new “neo-authoritarian political structure” emerges to guide the electoral process. To put the same in other terms, democracy allows the creation of the primordial political fact, the formation of authoritarian institutions –even within a democracy- that protect the neoliberal agenda. Starting from the premise that the electoral process corrects the asymmetries created by populism, Scribano argues that

“Neoliberalism is compatible with the democratic political regime but depends on authoritarian institutions to implement its program measures. The electoral process itself loses value because neoliberal politicians always campaign for an actual policy program and even promise to correct the abuses of populism. Once elected, they proceed to deepen and extend the process of privatization. Thus, there is a really wide gap between what happens during the election campaign and what neoliberalism practices when in power. The absolute lack of correspondence between election campaigns and the elected government encourages voter apathy and rejection of electoral politics, fostering political strategies of the clientelist type” (Scribano 2018:5)

In fact, Paulo Henrique Martins holds the polemic thesis that neoliberalism effaces the traditional basis of liberalism by the normalization of economic authority over other institutions. The post-Westphalia state is organized according to the sovereignty in a certain territory, which is given by the authority of the law and constitution. Neoliberalism erodes the bureaucratic and administrative system towards undemocratic practices proper of oligarchic elites. Not surprisingly, as G. Skoll (2016) remarks, beyond the promises of a decentralized market, which supposedly encourages more egalitarian conditions of existence, belies the expansion of a culture of fear destined to discipline the “non-western Other”. The profit maximization of international companies is accompanied by the presence of military forces that ensure the supply of local resources. The recent US-led invasion to Iraq and Afghanistan are understood not only as a broad action aimed at controlling the necessary hydrocarbon resources but also as an attempt to expand the American fear culture to the margins of the world. This raises a thorny question: what is the role and challenges of tourism and mobilities in this climate of instability?

Tourism and Mobilities

This section contains a theoretical debate which is inscribed in the constellations of the sociology of tourism. The geography of mobilities, some scholars reached consensus, is primarily marked by the binomial stable-instable or secure-insecure places. The economic process of globalization has emptied -if not cannibalized- some cultures, transforming them into exchanged signs (Lash & Urry, 1993; MacCannell, 2002; Korstanje 2018a; 2018b). The digital technology disposed to buy “virtual tours” coupled to the appearance of global risks changed essentially the nature and evolution of tourism. In this context, the notion of mobilities should be at least reconsidered (Gale 2009; Hannam, Butler, & Paris, 2014). Some studies have indicated that fear not always is predicated in an unilineal dynamic. To wit, dark sites -i.e cities whipped by terrorism or disasters- can be embellished as dark heritage sites (Cohen & Cohen 2012; Sather-Wagstaff 2016; Tzanelli 2016). The fear factor may be an key force in the destination management (Seraphin 2019). In a landmark paper, Raoul Bianchi brings some reflection on the role of fear and attractiveness in the postmodern world. Per his viewpoint, tourism which exhibits “the apotheosis of capitalist consumption” orchestrates an interplay between the right of free movement and capital exchange. Today’s insecurities such as the expansion of terrorism and the political instability produced by the US-led interventions mediates between citizens and their institutions. The right to travel, which is based on the western rationality, can be performed only through the articulation of risk conception and security. In this vein, Bianchi holds two important axioms. On one hand, the liberal market, as well as tourism allows the expansion of the neoliberal program. On another, the same movement frames the ontology of tourism security re-drawing the original borders of mobilities (Bianchi 2006). To some extent, the right to travel, insecurity and mobilities are inevitably entwined. A whole portion of the Academy strongly believes that the tourism industry needs from security to function. Bianchi not only exerts a radical criticism on this belief but also gives an interesting insight the helps understanding how hegemony works. As he goes on to write,

“In contrast to the ‘ crisis management ’ school of tourism studies which views the state as a ‘ neutral ’ entity whose role it is to ensure the safety of tourists, I will argue that state power and hegemonic practices, as well as tourism, shape the discourses of global (in)security and

contribute to the very conditions of global instability which ostensibly pose a threat to tourism itself' (Bianchi 2006: 64).

It is safe to say overtly that tourism equates a democratic force which makes citizens equal. For some reason which is very hard to define in this section, undemocratic governments have some problems in adopting tourism as the main economic source of production. Tourism needs from liberal institutions to survive, as Bianchi adheres. However, a closer look suggests that the liberal discourse conceives tourism as a vehicle towards freedom, which equates to say that this freedom is based on the access to consume resources. However, the expropriation of resources, which legally is supported by the nation-state and the free-market, does not mean political autonomy. Once the system expands further instability is created. To put the same in an example, we feel the needs of travel but at the same time, we are pray of our innermost fears in so doing. Tourists travel to any geographical point while they are victims of terrorism and other political violence (Bianchi 2006). Hence risks of suffering a terrorist attack is not given entirely by the action of terrorism, as Bianchi admits, but by my own decision to travel. Under some conditions, tourism even degradesthe environment disposing of the local resources which leads the community towards a sentiment of hostility. To all appearances, tourists are portrayed as innocent victims of external threats -ie terrorism- or the dark implications of geopolitics. The fact is that political instability is created by much deeper material asymmetries which are often generated by the adoption of tourism as a primary form of production. Paradoxically, the notion of security helps reducing anxieties drawing the World in two: secure vs. insecure destinations. Bianchi alerts while tourism expands, consuming all local resources in its paths, further risks loom the industry in the not-too-distant future. In his book, authored jointly with Markus Stephenson, Bianchi (2014) places the neoliberal discourse under the critical lens of scrutiny. Tourism -far from being a motor of prosperity and peace- creates global asymmetries in the ways people move. While millions of tourists travel to gaze at exotic landscapes or meet interesting people, a great portion of mankind is subject to an immutable immobility. The genesis of tourism as a modern activity is conducive to imperial expansions. On one hand, the industry enhanced not only the social cohesion but also the legitimacy of nation-states over the past century. The national loyalties, as well as the shared identity, were cemented the action of tourism consumption

in many western cities. However, tourism generated material inequalities in the core of first world economies. Stephenson & Bianchi criticizes the thesis that tourism serves as a democratic mechanism which assists the local economies to reach a state of development. Rather, those underdeveloped economies where tourism operates are fertile ground for terrorism and other radical expressions. Locals and their resources are commoditized, controlled and packaged according to the desire of the guests. This increases the center-periphery dependency. While the figure of noble savage characterized the position of the ethnographers during the colonial rule, today, managerial disciplines such as marketing or management mould the cultural values of the visited tribal cultures. Beyond the fear of terrorism lies a rational instrumentality where the “Other” seems to be subject to cynical exploitation (cannibalization) (Bianchi & Stephenson, 2013; Stephenson & Bianchi 2014). This observation coincides with the outcomes obtained by Rodanthi Tzanelli in her theoretical approach. The notion of risk and dark-consumption can be explained only by the myopia of European citizens who ignore or decide to overlook the role of European states in the colonization process. Behind the curiosity for the Other’s pain, which is the precondition of thana-tourism, lies an ideological discourse that distorts the real reasons of the colonial trauma (Tzanelli 2016).

As the previous argument is given, the French ethnologist Marc Augè (1994) draws attention of a radical transformation of the city. Over the past centuries, anthropologists and fieldworkers launched to overseas territories to be in direct contact with the non-Western Other. These travels not only shed light on the lifestyle of natives as well as the formation of their hierarchies and institutions, but reactivated a tradition based on travel writing as a main literary genre. Nowadays, natives live in our cities, and the notion of alterity has been radically transformed. The borders of the city have been enlarged, while the fear of strangers was incorporated as a mediation between lay-citizens. As Selwyn (2019) brilliantly observes, the corruption of hospitality consists of dropping the in-group members to the outside. Citing Korstanje (2018), terrorists not only hate the society where they were educated, but they are also native from the community they attack. Rather, tourists are foreigners who are culturally accepted as con-nationals in a global culture. In some terms, there is a national hierarchy where English speaking travellers are over-valorized in comparison to other nationalities. Korstanje & Olsen (2011) and Korstanje &

Tarlow (2012) have reviewed more than a dozen horror movie plots. Per their findings, terrorism not only is gradually transforming human hospitality, which was historically rooted in Western rationality, but also recreating the conditions of a new pyramid where Anglo-Saxons are on the top. After 9/11, the political discourse aims to depict the rogue - not as a monster- but as an enemy living within the community.

Conclusion

Although neoliberalism has emerged after the end, what it proposes, in essence, is not new. As discussed, the imperial structures expanded their hegemony through the articulation of a plan to index long distant economies. In the process, they combined an open discourse to simulate the trade while at the bottom exploited the periphery. Neoliberalism today divides the world into two: the global (developed) North and the ever-convulsing South.

Some voices alarm that this is a world of asymmetries and contradictions between the global North and South. Even while first-world tourists are legally encouraged to visit different places and cities, refugees and asylum-seekers are systematically rejected (if not jailed and trialled). What is clear, the benefits of globalization are not homogenized and standardized for all economic sectors in the developed economies nor the developing nations. As Z. Bauman puts it, the maturation and later expansion of capitalism generated a paradoxical situation which combines a liberal doctrine in economics with more repressive disciplinary instruments of control and surveillance. Echoing Pilar Calveiro, we hold the thesis that neoliberalism imposes the notion of free trade for developing economies to trade with developed ones, while restrictive anti-migratory policies are adopted. In the neoliberal agenda, the figure for tourism occupies a central position not only because of its economic benefits but its so-called “democratic nature”. This chapter radically interrogated on the convergence of tourism consumption and terrorism, laying the foundations towards a new understanding of tourism security.

References

- Acemoglu, D., & Robinson, J. A. (2013). *Why nations fail: The origins of power, prosperity, and poverty*. New York, Broadway Business.
- Achcar, G. (2015). *Clash of Barbarisms: The Making of the New World Disorder*. Abingdon, Routledge.
- Altheide, D. L. (2006). "Terrorism and the Politics of Fear. *Cultural Studies?*" *Critical Methodologies*, 6(4), 415-439.
- Altheide, D. L. (2017). *Creating fear: News and the construction of crisis*. Abingdon, Routledge.
- Ansari, H. (2018). " *The infidel within": Muslims in Britain since 1800*. Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- Augé, M. (1994). *Hacia una antropología de los mundos contemporáneos (Towards an Anthropology of contemporary Worlds)*. Barcelona, Editorial Gedisa.
- Bailyn, B (1968) *the Origins of American Politics*. New York, Vintage.
- Baudrillard, J. (1994). *Simulacra and simulation*. Michigan, University of Michigan press.
- Bianchi, R. (2006). Tourism and the globalisation of fear: Analysing the politics of risk and (in) security in global travel. *Tourism and Hospitality Research*, 7(1), 64-74.
- Bianchi, R. V., & Stephenson, M. L. (2013). Deciphering tourism and citizenship in a globalized world. *Tourism Management*, 39, 10-20.
- Calveiro, P. (2012). *Violencias de Estado: la guerra antiterrorista y la guerra contra el crimen como medios de control global*. [Violence of states: the war on Terror and Crime as forms of global control]. Buenos Aires, Siglo veintiuno editores.
- Cohen, E., & Cohen, S. A. (2012). Current sociological theories and issues in tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 39(4), 2177-2202.

- Farer, T. (2016). Mass Migration, Cultural Conflict, and the Fear of Terrorism: Dilemmas of the Democratic West. *Denv. J. Int'l L. & Policy*, 45, 287.
- Gale, T. (2009). Urban beaches, virtual worlds and 'the end of tourism'. *Mobilities*, 4(1), 119-138.
- Guidotti-Hernández, N. M. (2011). *Unspeakable violence: Remapping US and Mexican national imaginaries* (p. 19). Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Guillén, M. F. (2001). *The limits of convergence: Globalization and organizational change in Argentina, South Korea, and Spain*. Princeton, Princeton University Press.
- Hannam, K., Butler, G., & Paris, C. M. (2014). Developments and key issues in tourism mobilities. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 44, 171-185.
- Hall, S. (2011). The neo-liberal revolution. *Cultural studies*, 25(6), 705-728.
- Higham, J. (2002). *Strangers in the land: Patterns of American nativism, 1860-1925*. New Brunswick, Rutgers University Press.
- Hobsbawm, E. (1994). *The age of extremes: A history of the world*. New York, Pantheon.
- Jones, M. A. (1992). *American immigration*. Chicago, University of Chicago Press.
- Korstanje M E (2018a). *The Mobilities Paradox: a critical analysis*. Cheltenham, Edward Elgar.
- Korstanje, M. E. (2018b). *The Challenges of democracy in the War on terror: the liberal state before the advance of terrorism*. Abingdon, Routledge.
- Korstanje, M. E. (2019). Neoliberalism in the Culture of Terror. In *Neoliberalism in Multi-Disciplinary Perspective* (pp. 67-88). Scribano A, Timmermann Lopez F, & Korstanje M. New York, Palgrave Macmillan.
- Korstanje, M. E., & Olsen, D. H. (2011). The discourse of risk in horror movies post 9/11: hospitality and hostility in perspective. *International Journal of Tourism Anthropology*, 1(3), 304-317.

- Korstanje, M. E., & Tarlow, P. (2012). Being lost: tourism, risk and vulnerability in the post-'9/11' entertainment industry. *Journal of Tourism and Cultural Change*, 10(1), 22-33.
- MacCannell, D. (2002). *Empty meeting grounds: The tourist papers*. London, Routledge.
- Madsen, D. L. (1998). *American exceptionalism*. Jackson, University Press of Mississippi.
- Martins Henrique, P. (2018) "Neoliberalism and Crisis of the Republican Pact". . In *Neoliberalism in Multi-Disciplinary Perspective* (pp. 23-44). Scribano A, Timmermann Lopez F, & Korstanje M. New York, Palgrave Macmillan.
- McMichael, P. (2012). *Development and social change: A global perspective*. London, Sage.
- Murillo, S. (2008). *Colonizar el dolor: la interpelación ideológica del Banco Mundial en América Latina: el caso argentino desde Blumberg a Cromañón*. Buenos Aires, Clacso.
- Lash, S. M., Urry, S. L. J., (1993). *Economies of signs and space* (Vol. 26). London, Sage.
- Lipset, S. M. (1997). *American exceptionalism: A double-edged sword*. New York, WW Norton & Company.
- Pease D. (1987) *Visionary Compacts: American renaissance writings in cultural context*. Madison, University of Wisconsin Press.
- Polanyi, K., Arensberg, C. M., & Pearson, H. W. (1957). *Trade and market in the early empires: Economies in history and theory* (No. 338 (091)). Free Press,.
- Sather-Wagstaff, J. (2016). *Heritage that hurts: Tourists in the memoryscapes of September 11*. Abingdon, Routledge.
- Sassen, S. (Ed.). (2013). *Deciphering the global: its scales, spaces and subjects*. Abingdon, Routledge.
- Sanchez, G. J. (1997). Face the nation: Race, immigration, and the rise of nativism in late twentieth century America. *International Migration Review*, 31(4), 1009-1030.

- Scribano A. (2018) "Introduction: the multiple Janus faces of neoliberalism". In *Neoliberalism in Multidisciplinary Perspective*. (1-20). Scribano, A, Timmermann Lopez F & Korstanje M. New York, Palgrave Macmillan.
- Scribano, A, Timmermann Lopez F & Korstanje M. (2018). *Neoliberalism in Multidisciplinary Perspective*. New York, Palgrave Macmillan.
- Selwyn, T (2019). "Hostility and Hospitality: connecting Brexit, Grenfell and Windrush". In *Experiencing Hospitality*. Rowson B & Lashley C (eds). New York, Nova Science publishers.
- Seraphin, H. (2019). Natural disaster and destination management: the case of the Caribbean and hurricane Irma. *Current Issues in Tourism*, 22(1), 21-28.
- Skoll, G. R. (2016). *Globalization of American fear culture: The empire in the twenty-first century*. Basingstoke, Palgrave Macmillan.
- Slavin, M. O. (2017). Strangers in Our Own Land: Searching for Meaning and Vision on the Cusp of Trump's America. *Psychoanalytic Dialogues*, 27(3), 354-358.
- Stephenson, M. L., & Bianchi, R. (2014). *Tourism and citizenship: Rights, freedoms and responsibilities in the global order*. Abingdon, Routledge.
- Turner, R. S. (2008). *Neo-liberal ideology: history, concepts and policies: history, concepts and policies*. Edinburgh, Edinburgh University Press.
- Tyrrell, I. (1991). American exceptionalism in an age of international history. *The American Historical Review*, 1031-1055.
- Tzanelli, R. (2016). *Thanatourism and Cinematic Representations of Risk: Screening the End of Tourism*. Abingdon, Routledge.
- Wise, A. (2013). Hope in a Land of Strangers. *Identities*, 20(1), 37-45.