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Introduction: Gazemaking: Le Regard – Do You Hear Me?

Omar Moufakkir and Yvette Reisinger

Introduction

This book is based on the notion that analysis similar to that of the tourist gaze (Urry, 1990, 2002) can be applied to the host gaze. We can use our understanding of the gaze to make sense of the wider society. In Urry’s words, to consider how host communities construct their gaze upon tourists is a ‘good way of getting at just what is happening in the “normal society”’ (Urry, 2002, p. 2). We gaze at what we encounter, and this gaze is socially and culturally organized (Foucault, [1963] 1973). The concept of Foucault’s medical gaze can help us to grasp tiny anomalies in our globalized world. For the purpose of this book, the gaze of the medic can help us to gaze systematically upon the gazes of the host. The host gaze involves looking at the host–guest encounter with interest and curiosity. There is the gaze of the gazer and the gaze of the gazee or the object of the initial gaze. Both gazes are subject to change with changing economic, demographic, social, political, cultural and other societal phenomena (MacCannell, 2001; Urry, 2002). Just as the tourist gaze is dynamic (Urry, 2002), the host gaze is also changing, depending on who is the tourist and who is the host (Moufakkir, 2011). Just as there is no single tourist gaze, the host gaze must also vary by society, social group and historical period. Host gazes are constructed through cultural similarities and dissimilarities (Moufakkir, 2011). Surely, there must be different gazes from the same gazer upon different gazees. Thus, to speak of a ‘general gaze’ (Foucault, [1963] 1973, p. 156) would be not only confusing but also misleading.

The purpose of this volume is to cover at least a few aspects of the host gaze: How is the host gaze constructed and reinforced? How has it changed and developed? How does the host gaze vary? What are its consequences for the tourists who are its object? What are the aspects of the host gaze that distinguish it from the tourist gaze and from conventional gazes encountered in everyday life? What determines the host gaze? Are there any pre-existing cultural images of the host gaze? How do hosts gaze upon or view different tourists? How do different nations construct their host gazes? What are the differences in the host gaze across regions and nations? What are the socio-cultural and economic aspects of the host gazes? What are the elements of the host gaze in the changing global economy of the tourism industry? How do the tourism development and its particular industries/sectors influence the host gaze? What helps in constructing and developing our gaze as hosts? How is the host gaze...
constructed and reinforced? What are the consequences of this gaze for the places that are its object and tourists who are its subject? These and questions similar to those concerning the tourist gaze have partially been addressed in this volume.

It is thus hoped that this compilation of host gaze cases and theoretical perspectives will stir up a new wave of host gaze studies. Such an endeavour can lead us to move on from the ‘conventional gaze’ (MacCannell, 2001; Urry, 2002) or the obvious in host–guest encounters (Moufakkir, 2011) towards a decortication and deconstruction of the gaze in tourism. A critical analysis can shed more light not only on ‘gazemaking’ in tourism but also on the making of the world.

The gaze

One of the characteristics of Foucault’s language is his repeated use of certain key words. Many of these present no difficulty to the translator. Others, however, have no normal equivalent... I have used the unusual ‘gaze’ for the common ‘regard’. (Foucault, [1963] 1973, A.S. Sheridan, translator’s note, p. vii.)

It is common for those who speak French to use ‘voir’ and ‘regarder’ interchangeably for the English words ‘to look’ or ‘to see’. However, there is a degree of confusion but also a sense of consciousness about the proper use of both terms. For example, a Google search for ‘difference entre voir et regarder’ (difference between voir and regarder) resulted in 13,200,000 entries. The richness of the found synonyms attests to the difficulty of defining the term ‘le regard’ and the complexity of using it. Le regard has about 27 synonyms. Generally, dictionaries agree on defining the English gaze as an intentional and steady look at something that excites admiration, curiosity or interest.

Definitions of the gaze do not capture its complexity. For a proper understanding of the gaze, its utility and usage, one has to, naturally, immerse oneself in Foucault’s The Birth of the Clinic. His gaze takes place in the clinic, a place where the medic looks at the solid and visible body of the patient with insistence and penetration. Since the patient’s illness is articulated on the body, a passive gaze, he says, only reduces illness to what is visible. Yet, what is visible is only the symptoms of what is invisible to the eye. Foucault explains:

the strange character of the medical gaze; it is caught up in an endless reciprocity. It is directed upon that which is visible in the disease – but on the basis of the patient, who hides this visible element even as he shows it; consequently, in order to know, he must recognize, while already being in possession of the knowledge that will lend support to this recognition. And as it moves forward, this gaze is really retreating, since it reaches the truth of the disease only by allowing it to win the struggle and to fulfil, in all its phenomena, its true nature. (Foucault, [1963] 1973, p. 9.)

The nature of a disease is manifested in its apparent symptoms; its true nature, however, is hidden in the invisible, which is there to be dug out and brought to the surface to decipher for a better diagnosis. It is this depth of perceptual exploration that makes the gaze an agent of epidermic discovery. This discovery of the “invisible visibility” (p. 204) represents the triumph of the gaze. A revealing and transparent gaze conducting the autopsy to uncover the hidden content of the disease denudes the disease by removing the layers of opacity that lead to confusion around its diagnosis. While Foucault talks about the patient in a clinic, social theorists have adopted the analogy of the clinical gaze to explain other societal phenomena. Ours is encounters in tourism, analogous to a medical examination of host gaze encounters through the gaze. Like the gaze of the medic, ours is that of the tourism academic, which has been cast upon tourism environments with a particular interest in understanding why host communities gaze. The analogy between the clinic and the tourism environment lends a closer look at tourist–guest encounters, similar to that of the medic. After all, our prognoses could even be helpful in curing certain gaze pathologies, preventing some from taking root, and developing, prescribing and promoting cures for a healthier tourism.
This book is about host–guest encounters in tourism; ‘it is about the act of seeing, the gaze’ (Foucault, [1963] 1973), gazers gazing at the gaze of the host community gazing at tourists. It is about anatomy of the host gaze. This anatomy discloses the gaze of the host, making it open to the academic, the host and the tourist. In other words, the host gaze opens up the space of host–guest encounters to the gaze of the tourism academic, who can see beyond the symptoms of the gaze – the constructed gaze of the gazer and gazee, and analyse the gaze of the gazer host in order to hear what that particular gaze is about. The clinical gaze recognizes that signs and symptoms are of different orders. The tourism academic gaze recognizes that as there are multiple tourism environments, tourism histories, types of tourists and host communities, there are, too, multiple perceptions and subsequently different gazes. This book presents case studies on the host gaze from Thailand, Panama, Turkey, Israel, Gambia, Tibet and the Netherlands. This limitation underscores the complexity of host gaze studies and their popularity.

**Host gaze studies**

Studies of the host gaze in tourism have just begun to describe tourism encounters that have for a long time remained at the threshold of the visible and expressible in host–guest relations. As the medical gaze needs to become attentive to the construction of the gaze, so must the academic gaze. The purpose of this volume is to bring depth to perceptual explorations that have resulted from resident attitude surveys. Host gaze studies have been confused with residents' attitudes surveys, where locals' perceptions are quantified, and simplistically (though not simplified) examined. Not to say that such analyses of resident opinions have no merit, but by analogy to Foucault's gaze, perception studies tend to reduce the reality of the gaze to what is visible; yet we know that what is visible is not the whole truth, for, as Foucault explains: ‘The eye becomes the depository and source of clarity; it has the power to bring a truth to light that it receives only to the extent that it has brought it to light; as it opens, the eye first opens the truth’ (Foucault, [1963] 1973, p. xiii).

Furthermore, the gaze in tourism has been criticized on many fronts (Holloway et al., 2011). It has been, for example, critiqued as being gendered (MacCannell and MacCannell, 2001), limited to the visual (Chambers, 2007) or myopic (Moufakkir, 2011). Academics who have specifically written about the host gaze in tourism (e.g. Chan, 2006; Maoz, 2006; Moufakkir, 2011) agree about the limited literature on the host gaze compared with that of the tourist gaze. That is, despite a few attempts to deconstruct the host gaze a la Foucault, the host gaze in tourism remains covered by resident's attitudes surveys; whereas a gaze study a la Foucault must go beyond the hows to uncover the whys of attitudes and perceptions. Taking the example of Foucault's Pomme and Bayle, the host gaze starts where perceptions surveys stop:

Between Pomme, who carried the old myths of nervous pathology to their ultimate form, and Bayle, who described the encephalic lesions of general paralysis for an era from which we have not yet emerged, the difference is both tiny and total. For us, it is total, because each of Bayle's words, with its qualitative precision, directs our gaze into a world of constant visibility, while Pomme, lacking any perceptual base, speaks to us in the language of fantasy. But by what fundamental experience can we establish such an obvious difference below the level of our certainties, in that region from which they emerge? How can we be sure that an eighteenth-century doctor did not see what he saw, but that it needed several decades before the fantastic figures were dissipated to reveal, in the space they vacated, the shapes of lungs as they really are? (Foucault, [1963] 1973, p. xi.)

Analogically, gaze studies need not be preoccupied with the surface of the gaze, a gaze that is ‘passive’ and ‘reductive’ (Foucault, [1963] 1973). The medical gaze, Foucault asserts needs to become attentive to the
construction of the gaze. Bayle made the gaze legible to the gazer and object of the gaze through his ‘meticulous’, ‘constant’, ‘anatomical’, ‘penetrating’ and ‘revealing gaze’ (Foucault, [1963] 1973), an invitation that has also challenged the contributing authors of this book. Many phenomena, even when deciphered, still remain at the threshold of the visible and expressible in host–guest encounters.

By gazing at the gaze of the gazer upon the gazee, new theories must arise for several reasons. First, most of the social and cultural theories of tourism have been developed from the experiences of Western tourists and consequently some may not be directly applicable to non-Western tourists, such as the Asian, the African or the Middle Eastern. Second, most theories of tourism encounters are based on the Anglo-American experience and mostly focus on the interplay between the culture of the host in a developing country and that of the guest from a developed country. Third, an examination of tourism literature shows little cross-cultural research. Fourth, much of the existing host–guest literature is outdated. Fifth, information about the host gaze is negligible compared with that on the tourist gaze. Hence, there is no doubt that more ground is needed to cover for the host gaze to match our understanding of the tourist gaze. Our presumption here, which also underlines the importance of this book, is that our understanding of the host gaze will also reinforce our understanding of the tourist gaze.

**Content Previews**

The opening chapter by Hollingshead and Kuon focuses on the foundational concept of the tourist gaze. This foundation offers the reader a concentrated overview of the complexity not only of Foucault’s philosophical world, but also the complexity of borrowing from this world to inform our understanding of the host gaze. In the chapter, the gaze is taken to be the institutionalized form of power. Thus, the chapter explains that under Foucauldian light, the gaze is not so much an act of seeing, but an act of knowing. In order to help practitioners and researchers in tourism management/tourism studies gain a richer understanding of Foucault’s concept of the gaze, the chapter provides a glossarial depiction of what ten key Foucauldian constructions on the governmentality of things (such as ‘discourse’, ‘panopticism’ and ‘self-regulation’) actually mean, and a table is provided that gives examples of what the discourse of institutions/organizations/agencies conceivably constitutes in range and commonality.

In Chapter 2, Canziani and Francioni examine host perspectives of the tourist gaze from the viewpoint of occupational and resident roles in the destination. Role-taking and role behavioural compliance are seen as a form of internalization of the tourist gaze that can lead to emotional outcomes, host defensive tactics and shifts in host self-concept.

In Chapter 3, Morrison argues that through developing an understanding of the perceptions and experiences of the Thai host in the tourist space, the Thai–tourist encounter, in general, and the recent measures to govern visitors and the image of Thailand, in particular, should be seen as embedded in particular relations of alterity.

In Chapter 4, Reisinger, Kozak and Visser examine the Turkish hoteliers’ gaze at Russian tourists visiting the south coast of Turkey. The gaze of the owners, managers and employees of all-inclusive resorts and hotels in the holiday districts of Antalya is analysed. The reasons for the specific host gaze are explained by focusing on cultural identity of Russian tourists and cultural underpinning of their behaviour. The chapter shows how cultural misperceptions and misunderstandings between hosts and tourists can upset the hosts and create a negative gaze. The chapter concludes by discussing the implications and relating to the cultural relativism theory.

In Chapter 5, Savener explains that the history of the Kuna people of Panamá is constituted of resistance to outsiders – and that tradition continues today with tourists.
Although the Kuna are known worldwide for their hand-sewn mola panels, they remain an elusive mystery to the tourists who come to their islands.

In Chapter 6, Gelbman and Collins-Kreiner discuss how tour guides in Israel gaze upon the groups of Christian pilgrims that they lead in light of their familiarity and cumulative experience with them. The Holy Land has always been a main destination for Christian pilgrims from around the world, and also today religious tourism remains the main market segment of tourism to Israel. The gaze is a way people view the world, and when it is focused, it may include both visual and non-visual elements. Their findings contribute to the current literature by understanding the host gaze: how tour guides view different types of Christian pilgrims, their behaviour and their worldview.

In Chapter 7, Pattison highlights the conceptual value of approaching and understanding host gazes through engaging with alternative, non-Western discourses and knowledge communities. Her case study of a community-based tourism initiative in Gambia demonstrates how respondent-led photography captures host gazes as hosts reflect upon representations and meanings of self, community and tourism.

Chapter 8 by Bunten deconstructs elements of the host gaze within the context of Indigenous tourism, demonstrating its utility as an analytic tool. The host gaze can be a valuable mechanism that helps hosts to better accommodate guests, resist stereotyping, define themselves and enjoy the positive aspects of working in tourism.

In Chapter 9, Wu and Pearce explore how young Tibetans view the future of the tourism sector in the context of Lhasa. It pursues three notable themes – a non-Western setting, a location with a rapid evolution of tourism and a focus on the future – to continue the exploration of the gaze concept.

In Chapter 10, Lee and Gretzel’s case focuses on Thai and Cambodian locals’ gazes as perceived by US and South Korean short-term mission travellers. The authors try to understand differences in perceptions. The findings suggest a diverse set of cultural values needs to be considered in this context and illustrate the complexities emerging from encounters with Christian and non-Christian hosts.

In Chapter 11, O’Regan looks at the reflexive practice of hospitality exchange, enabled by the site, couchsurfing.com, an apparatus that enables individuals to seek new solidarities, encounters, relations and feelings, through and with others. By asking who are guests and hosts in the age of mobility, networks and flow, the chapter argues that the standardized classification and binary model of host–guest blurs once transformative changes are individually realized through and with human and non-human others. The framework of the chapter offers a theoretical approach that moves beyond presumed oppositions between host and guest.

In Chapter 12, Ankor and Wearing consider the development of the concept of ‘gaze’ in Western cultural and critical theory. They then examine the flâneur as a gazer and introduce the concept of the choraster, as the relationship of visitor and host in the space of the ‘other’ and self. The notion of gaze is thus expanded from one of disassociation to emphasize a more engaged set of experiences that can reflect the imagined-real of both the traveller space and the host community. It draws on philosophy for an understanding of the response to gaze in the touristic encounter and leads to a framework able to deal with the complexity of contemporary tourism experiences. This chapter contributes to an understanding of tourism that is subject-centred, dynamic and capable of dealing with the host’s role in developing tourist cultures. It contributes to the building of theory that enables the gaze to be constructed from the diverse and unpredictable interactions that occur and make up the encounter – the space, the host community’s values and the tourist’s experience.

In Chapter 13, Ugelvik compares two different kinds of professional gazes: that of the hotel bellman and that of the prison officer. By using the two as each other’s analytical mirrors, he hopes to give novel insights on both sides. Although different in
many respects, the author argues that the two have in common a bifocal gaze partly focused on the needs of others and partly on the potential problems and dangers these others represent.

In Chapter 14, Moufakkir builds upon MacCannell’s second gaze to propose a third gaze: a gaze that offers a deeper look into the gaze, and this time goes truly beyond the visible to reach the invisible in the unconscious of the host gaze. The third gaze is ingrained in psychoanalysis and psychoanalytical concepts and theories advanced by Freud and Lacan. Similar to Foucault’s gaze of the medic, this gaze is the gaze of the tourism academic upon the gaze of the tourism gaze. The third gaze is defined as the gaze of the gazer upon the gaze of the gazer gazing upon the object of the gaze. The intention of this gaze tries to understand the whys of the host gaze from a psychoanalytical perspective.

In Chapter 15, Hottola discusses the host gaze as a gaze that is culturally and stereotypically maintained and perpetuated in tourism encounters. In his documentation of Western women tourists in India and Sri Lanka, he offers us a deeper understanding on the origins of the male host gaze, a gaze that is rooted in the Indian culture and its gender relations, power, rules, attitudes, behaviour and expectations. Maintaining that morality is situational, he also offers perspectives on how women travellers interpret, understand and negotiate this ‘sexualized’ host gaze. This chapter adds to the understanding of the gendered aspects of the host gaze, the nature of real-and-imagined spaces of intercultural situations and the global production of sociotypic perceptions on ethnicity and culture.

In Chapter 16, Hollinshead and Hou have subjected the gaze to scrutiny, offering the reader a comprehensive analysis of the gaze, the Foucauldian gaze and the gaze in tourism. Building on Hollinshead’s previous work on the gaze and Chapter 1 in this book, the authors locate the gazes of the preceding chapters in Hollinshead’s dimensions of the tourism gaze, and relate the coverage of the contributors to the ten Foucauldian concepts presented in Chapter 1. In doing this, the authors lead us through the past, present and future of tourism gaze studies.
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1 The Scopic Drive of Tourism: Foucault and Eye Dialectics

Keith Hollinshead and Vannsy Kuon

Introduction

This first chapter focuses upon the foundational concept (for the book) of the tourist gaze, identifying it as a recent parallel within Tourism Management/Tourism Studies with the French litero-philosophical term *le regard*, as utilized by Foucault in his examinations of the manner in which humans (and human ‘things’) are divided and governed in and under the complex relations of contestation and resistance in institutional life. In this chapter, and within what Foucault considered to be a society of normalization, the gaze is taken to be the institutionalized form of power or (to Foucault) the power/knowledge edifice through which specific subjects are ruled and regulated or governmentalized. Thus, the chapter explains that under Foucauldian light, the gaze is not so much an act of seeing, but an act (in talk (discourse) and in deed (praxis)) of knowing – indeed, of institutional/interest group/social pre-knowing. In order to help practitioners and researchers in Tourism Management and Tourism Studies gain a richer understanding of how Foucault’s concept of the gaze (be it the clinical gaze, the gaze over madness, the magisterial gaze – and here (after his death) the tourist gaze), the chapter provides a glossarial depiction of what ten key Foucauldian constructions on the governmentality of things (such as ‘discourse’, ‘panopticism’ and ‘self-regulation’) actually mean, and a table is provided that gives examples of what the discourse of institutions, organizations and agencies (that inherit, operate or engage the tourist gaze) conceivably constitute in range and commonality. But the chapter offers no unsullied exaltation of the conceptual genius of Foucault, and a second table is provided that warns readers about a number of lead problematics (or difficulties) that various schools of critical thought have with the ordinary application of Foucauldian inspections of power and knowledge (or with the eye dialectics by and through which institutional circuits of domination and exploitation are exercised).

Preamble to the Foucauldian Gaze: Matters of Seeing, Knowing and Pre-Knowing

In a book devoted to studies of the host gaze and the tourist gaze in action, it is crucial that the social science term ‘the gaze’ is first explained and clarified. This is the function of this first chapter in *The Host Gaze in Global Tourism*. Fundamentally, there are two commonplace usages of the term ‘the gaze’ to describe the generative activity of and around cultural entities. While one...
derives largely from the radical film critiques of the 1970s, which were pivotally inspired by Freud’s thinking on *scopophilia* (i.e. the pleasure received in observing screen images) and by Lacan’s insight into those reflected objects with or from which individuals construct their *perfect/united identities* (Mulvey, 1989), the other use centres upon Foucault’s scrutiny of institutional relations of power. This chapter, and indeed this book, is focused upon the latter, that is upon Foucauldian analyses of the way the world is seen and thereby related to and governed by the institution of ‘Tourism Management’ (read, in context hereafter, the institution of ‘Industrial Tourism’, the institution of ‘Tourism Studies’, the institution of ‘Tourism/Travel Research’, the institution of ‘Western Tourism’, the institutions of ‘Whatever’). And, in order to draw pronounced or clarifying attention to these contextual forces of institutional governmentality, such organizations will be given capital letters in both this first chapter on *eye dialectics* (by Hollinshead and Kuon) and later in the book’s closing chapter on *agents of normalcy* (by the same two contributors).

Under Foucauldian thought (emanating from Michel Foucault (1926–1984)), social science researchers who inspect the institutional gaze at work or in force tend to examine the *panopticist* ways in which the world is regulated, where panopticism is a form of visionary (and productive, but potentially malevolent power named after *panoptes*, the all-seeing Argus of the ancient Greek myths (Serres, 1989)). Thus, those who examine the existence of a suspected or conceivable gaze tend to look for the manner through and by which an institution ‘sees’ the world around and about it, or rather relates to and thereby disciplines (seeks to discipline) things. Panopticism is thereby taken to be a type of power (or rather, of power/knowledge in strict Foucauldian terms) that is exercised at a given time and place by that institution’s ‘apparatus’, that is, by its ‘whole set of instruments, techniques, procedures, levels of application, [and] targets’ (Foucault. *Discipline and Punish*, as selected in Rabinow, 1984, p. 206). Thus, panopticist inquiry (research into a or the institutional gaze) tends to constitute an anatomy of power, or rather a study of the technology of power or knowledge of a body or organization that has come to operate with a specialized authority (or governance or governmentalizing influence) on and over a particular field of activity, responsibility or play. Foucauldian inspections of a or the gaze in action therefore are inclined to search for the sorts of vision (for which, read understandings) that specialised authorities, bodies or organizations work with and through in regular organized and reinforcing ways via their internal (and importantly, their internalized (disciplinary) mechanisms of power (power/knowledge, again)). Those who pry into a or the gaze at work thereby generally search for those forms of consciousness by and through which a particular institution or entity does and does not work in its own allocated, designated or claimed area of responsibility in and across society. That area of responsibility, that area of ‘life’, that area of governance is said to be juridically subject to the disciplinary authority (i.e. power (or power/knowledge)) of that panoptic apparatus that is ordinarily in action. And that power/knowledge is seen to work as a regulating power or a codified power particularly through the exercise of its infinitely minute web of panoptic techniques (Foucault, *Discipline and Punish*, Rabinow, 1984, p. 213), as they establish universalizing norms for the ‘world’ (within that specialized area of institutional governance). Hence, one who suspects the presence of a distinct or an actual governmentalizing gaze, then tends to inspect for the force of a juridical system at play in that field (i.e. that force-field), whereby that subjectification takes place through the detailed or petty manner in which the order of things is identified, characterized, classified around these norms. Consequently, that specialized field (i.e. that area of disciplinary or juridical activity) becomes a realm or sphere of accorded or designated ‘specialized responsibility’ where individuals (or individual things, places or entities) are hierarchically ordered. Some such things in that force-field will be duly qualified and validated in some fashion
by that gaze-in-action, and other things will be disqualified and invalidated in some fashion at the same time.

Those who tend to work under Foucauldian light (inspecting panoptic modalities of power (power/knowledge)) in action are inclined to find that the normalizing work of panopticist vision and authority is coercive towards particular forms of consciousness/understanding/awareness, and silences, suppresses or subjugates other ‘knowledges’. Thus, for each institution, or each area of juridical responsibility, for each force-field, there can be a dark side to this specialized governmentality in operation. The disciplinary systems of the classification of the world, and the mundane everyday exercise of the specialized and detailed micropower at work, are not inherently or essentially egalitarian, nor are they inherently or essentially symmetrical. In the given force-field, some consciousnesses and awareness become ‘healthy’ or ‘dominant’, while others are chastised and become ‘outlawed’ or ‘denied’.

Put another way, those who conduct Foucauldian inspections of the gaze in action, commonly look for the consciousnesses about the world which are carried within what the institution says (i.e. via its discourse) and does (i.e. via its praxis). That discourse and that praxis in tandem are conduits for the way in which the world is not only perceived but judged. Thus, Foucault was not so much interested in ‘sight’, per se, but in the held knowledges, the held dominances and the held subjugations that course through the enactments of the gaze. In this sense, the gaze is not a matter of sight, ipso facto, it is a matter of seeing, of not seeing, and thereby of regulating: in this anti-ocular sense, it is a matter of knowing rather than seeing (Brooker, 2003); and it is probably more richly and faithfully understood as a matter of pre-knowing than even of knowing (Hollinshead, 1993). Constantly, one who enquires into the agency or authority of a gaze in action might scrutinize for those things that are classified and rendered by that normalized pre-knowing institutional activity: they tend to inspect for those things that are objectified adventitiously and treated as being ‘wonderful’ or ‘sovereign’, and for those things that are objectified less favourably as casualties in that governmentized (micro-managed) act of pre-knowing. Thus, analysis of a suspected gaze is generally built up in particular settings (or under the sway of organizations, specialist regimes or governing agencies) via the gathering of ‘evidence’ or from the functioning discourse and praxis (rather than the discourse alone) of that target force-field. It is not so much a quest to find what is visible in and under the generation of that suspected panoptic surveillance, but what is invisible there – that is, what are the hitherto undersuspected or underexamined understandings or the formulated/preformulated consciousnesses that are seemingly regularly deployed there.

Consequently, when located in the realm of Tourism Management or in the spectrum of Tourism Studies, inspections of a or the gaze necessarily compose – in Foucauldian hue – an examination of not so much the way thoughtlines about the world’s peoples, places and pasts are organized, but the way they have been pre-organized over time to course through the governing public bodies of tourism, and/or through the techno-corporate empires of the private-for-profit sector, and/or through the other sanctioning interest groups of the third sector (the private-not-for-profit) sphere. As Foucault intoned, the world at the Renaissance was understood (centuries ago) as a kind of volume that God had written out where ‘everything (nature, people’s behaviour, buildings) could be interpreted in terms of a divine code which had to be deciphered’ (Danaher et al., 2000, p. 19). But today, as Foucault also intoned, the modern age is an era of institutionally authorized knowledge (power/knowledge at work) where instead specific and specialized bodies have carried out that governing scriptwork. Following Nietzsche (which Foucault was prone to do), the Foucauldian research agenda is one that not only researches ‘the meaning of things’, but the struggles, the battles and the violent struggles that have yielded it (Danaher et al., 2000, p. 27), notably where the protagonists involved were not necessarily aware of or were scarcely alert to the fact that these struggles over ‘knowledge’ or the