

The Conceptual Anatomy of the 21st Century Tourist

Sofia Xanthakou

Final Research Paper

Harvard Graduate School of Design

9644_Research Methods in Landscape Architecture

Instructor: Edward Eigen

Spring 2018

Abstract

This research paper is an attempt to provide a definition for the subject type tourist as situated in the 21st century. In order to define the tourist and his/her profile, I synthesize six categories that in my view and according to several authors theoretical analyses have shown to be perceived in a unique way when it comes to the tourist. Starting with the conventional definition provided by UN's World Tourism Organization I develop the categories in the following order: (1) *"Play"*, (2) *"Authenticity"*, (3) *"Consumption"*, (4) *"Gaze"*, (5) *"Tourist and Place"*, (6) *"Temporality: Or, when does tourism end?"*. The hope is to provide an understanding of how tourists tend to understand signs, conceive concepts and utilize space in a specific way that marks them as different from other subject types.

INTRODUCTION

This year I spent my Christmas Eve in Atacama desert, a remote location at the southern-most tip of Bolivia bordering Chile. This location was far from any communications infrastructure (e.g. WiFi or Cellular Data), thick urban development, or even any significant social interaction, as the presence of local community was negligible. Similarly, last summer I travelled to Uganda, where I spent a couple of days hiking in the Bwindi rainforest. In both cases, I was exposed to a place that many would consider pure nature. However, reflecting on these adventures, I am struck by the fact that there were these moments where I felt almost entirely at-home in the anonymity of the various highways, chain hotels, familiar signs, and even the occasional gas stations.¹ This raises the question: was there anything unique about those distant geographical environments; or was it all merely an illusion? In order to answer such a question, I think what is called for is an understanding both of what it means to travel today and, more generally, what the conditions are that define the specificity of the 21st century tourist.

According to the UN's World Tourism Organization (UNWTO), Tourism comprises the activities of persons traveling to and staying in places outside their usual environment for not more than one consecutive year for leisure, business, and other purposes. A visitor (domestic, inbound or outbound) is classified as a tourist (or overnight visitor), if his/her trip includes an overnight stay.² Tourists are therefore differentiated by other subject types by their ability to transfer from a place they call "their home" i.e. residence and work to a place that is "outside" their home. Additionally, tourism occurs within a specific timeframe, and therefore, includes an irreducible temporal dimension. Once the tourist experience has ended, the only product left is a memory, whether mental (in the form of thoughts and emotions) or physical (in the form of souvenirs, artifacts, or social media posts). These objects enable a distinctly touristic type of gaze to be replicated, and restructured over time and across space.³ Schematically, then, we might start by saying that tourism is defined as a leisure activity that occurs in a particular geographic locale (*viz.* in a place that is not one's native milieu), and for a limited length of time. But such a definition is obviously unsatisfying in its lack of granularity. As such, in what follows, I aim to explicate in detail the too general elements identified above.

PLAY

If leisure is a necessary component of our concept of the tourist, in what way does tourism uniquely instantiate leisure? That is, how does tourism engage in leisure in a way that is more or less distinct from other, non-tourist activities of leisure. I believe one possible clue is to be found in the relation of leisure to the concept of play.

¹ Augé, Marc. *Non-places: Introduction to an Anthropology of Supermodernity*. London: Verso, 2006: 106.

² World Tourism Organization UNWTO. Definition | World Tourism Organization UNWTO. Accessed April 17, 2018. <http://www2.unwto.org/content/about-us-5>

³ Urry, John and Jonas Larsen. *The Tourist Gaze 3.0*. London: SAGE Publications, 2011: 4.

Today, there is a strong tendency to frame play as the contrary of seriousness.⁴ This is evidenced by the fact that today's professionalized competition in the workplace doesn't allow much room for leisure and enjoyment. However, against this fetishization of the serious over the playful, Aristotle identifies laughter as a unique characteristic to humanity and that as human beings, we play the same way animals play, confirming that both rationality as well as irrationality are essential features of we, the *anthropos*.⁵ Extending from Aristotle's identification of play as an essential part of our humanity, we must also recognize the inherently social dimension of play, an activity marked by the creative manipulation of socially-constructed images, and the back and forth movement of images between reality and our imagination, seemingly for no immediate practical benefit or gain.

In concert with this view, J. Huizinga contends that play is an essential cultural factor of life. More specifically, in *Homo Ludens*, J. Huizinga parallels play with myth arguing that myth is a mental transformation of the external world, where humans seek to explain phenomena by reference to a divine principle or the like. Thus, for Huizinga, play takes place in the movement between the divine and the mortal.⁶ This further implies that language is itself is capable of being utilized in play. While language often serves as a mere instrument of communication, it also provides humanity with the means to ground mental concepts in Spirit, in an interplay between matter and incorporeal mind. Every expression, for example, relies on metaphor; and behind a metaphor is in Huizinga's words, "a play upon words".⁷

But while culture and language are, in a very general way, present in the phenomenon of play, play also includes a much wider spectrum of activities: from visiting an art gallery; to a picnic in the park; an outing to the mall; as well as various forms of sports-oriented leisure activities. Is it the case, then, that recreational travel is something altogether different from play? Or is tourism a kind of recreative enjoyment that embodies play? It seems to me that if play is a manifestation of creative experimentation but without an immediately practical goal (apart, perhaps, from the production of delight), then tourism must be included as species of play. This is because it is at once voluntary (i.e. non-necessary) and superfluous (i.e. beyond what is immediately necessary for survival).

Thus while it is clear that tourism is itself a type of play, what is still needed is an account of the spatiality peculiar to it. In other words, we need to understand how it is that tourism is an activity in which the tourist engages in a kind of consumption of "other" spaces. This necessarily requires an understanding of what spaces count as "other" as well as those to which a given person is said to belong. In short, we need an account of the relationship space, identity, and authenticity.

AUTHENTICITY

⁴ Huizinga, Johan H. *Homo Ludens*. London, Routledge, 1980: 5.

⁵ *Ibid.* 6.

⁶ *Ibid.* 5.

⁷ *Ibid.* 4-5.

As it is today commonly understood, authenticity is the state of being in alignment with one's essence; or as it is perhaps more colloquially characterized, authenticity means something like "being true to your nature."⁸ This conception of authenticity as being in alignment with reality structures the logic by which we see the world – and it is this structuration applied to the subject type of the tourist that I refer to as the *touristic gaze*. Implicated in the touristic mode of looking is the tendency of tourists to build-up an anticipation about a specific reality, or what is an idealized authentic essence of a place – whether such an essence even exists. As such, this hyperreal, "authentic" space appears to the tourist to be more real than the actual condition of the place they desire to see.⁹

This anticipation often results in a blurring of the boundary between what is authentic and what is staged. This is because, as John Urry and Jonas Larsen suggest in *The Tourist Gaze 3.0*, any genuine insight into the real lives of the locals of a particular place can often only be found "backstage," i.e. behind the façade constructed according to the tourist's anticipation. Such realities are often not immediately evident, and a view into them is largely only possible on the basis of an intrusion into personal lives of the locals.¹⁰ Indeed, a look into the reality of local life is often avoided since the everydayness of the other is likely to be just as normal or "boring" as the life of the tourist. This is why it is so often the case that locals construct an authenticity to be gazed upon and consumed, a staged authenticity, as it were.

But interestingly, today we are seeing a reaction against this staged authenticity on the part of the tourist. This is readily made evident by the trend of travelers shifting away from traditional Hotel accommodations in favor of spaces available through services like Airbnb. The motivation on the part of tourists today is the assumption that living in the residential neighborhood where the so-called "real action" is taking place dissolves the boundaries between local and other, thereby providing the traveler with access to the authentic experience of the backstage. However, this is only a reactionary response of the tourists in an effort to deny the nature of his own identity as an outsider. These "Post-tourists", as this new wave of tourists has been called, are drastically affecting the neighborhoods where they are being hosted, turning such spaces into commodified, gentrified services, yet again solely for the traveler's consumption. In essence, neighborhoods transform their local character to please the tourist for economic benefit.

This phenomenon of the construction of a staged authenticity raises the question of whether there ever was an authentic nature of a place to begin with. For example, when I was in the Bwindi forest in Uganda, I believe that part (if not all) of the experience was completely staged. Was it by chance, for example, that at the entrance of a national park where tourists inevitable pass by, a traditional village exists that just so happens to demonstrate traditional rituals and sell traditional artifacts? Similarly, when in Paris tourists tend to buy an Eiffel tower souvenir, typically fabricated in China, are they not consuming a false reality? What does this tells us about the nature of tourism? Does tourism rely on the construction of a fictional relationship between the touristic gaze and the

⁸ Weiner, E. S. C., and J. A. Simpson. *The Oxford English Dictionary*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1989.

⁹ Urry, John and Jonas Larsen. *The Tourist Gaze 3.0*. London: SAGE Publications, 2011: 10.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*: 10.

landscape? Such is the question that the philosopher Martin Heidegger asks in his travel journal, *Sojourn: The Journey to Greece*, when he writes:

Can Greece still speak what is proper to it and claim us the people of today, as listeners to its language, we, the people of an age whose world is throughout pervaded by the force and artificiality of the ramifications of the enframing (*Ge-Stell*). The concern about the age does not take us away from the point, i.e. from the direction of the journey to Greece, does not hinder the immediate experience; on the contrary, the latter opens itself for the first time to the expected, insofar as it is maintained in the reference to the world of today, instead of being appraised only in relation to the experiences of the individual.¹¹

Here, Heidegger asks if the original essence of Greece is able to survive the objectification demanded by the presentiments of tourists from other parts of the world. That is, it seems that Heidegger is of the view that the very idea of an authentic Greece is only possible on the basis of a mass belief in there being such a thing as an authentic Greece. Thus, the immediacy of the experience, according to Heidegger, is to be located in the fact that despite the objectified nature of the image of Greece today, there is still a desire for a journey that would culminate in the experience of authenticity. However, it seems to me that Heidegger struggles here to protect himself from the reality of the degree to which cultural identities have themselves become yet another object for consumption. Thus if we are to avoid Heidegger's error here, we must endeavor to unpack the relationship between identity and consumption.

CONSUMPTION

As French philosopher Henri Lefebvre argues that everyday life is today little more than the residuum of the various activities of capitalist production, which are made possible by technology and human labor. As a colonized space of consumption, everyday life, for Lefebvre, is marked by an incessant mood of boredom.¹² Tourists thus become a kind of capital within this condition of everydayness, and tourist spaces become sites for the consumption of the cultural life of the other. As a commodified activity, then, tourism thrives on the illusion that it is somehow a break from the everydayness brought on by capitalism.

This constructed break is therefore a kind of commodified freedom. As such, tourism is actually an activity of labor, a tool for production. While in pure play there is no end product, in tourism the end product is the consumption of commodified services, locations, and cultural identities. In other words, capitalism relies on the fact that the experience of the tourist is in fact a break from the tourist's ordinary everyday regime. Vacations, holidays, festivals, even weekends, are merely short periods of respite (though still consumptive and productive) serving as little more than ways to make us more productive in the workforce. Thus we see today that the fabric of our urban environments

¹¹ Heidegger, Martin. *Sojourns: The Journey to Greece*. Albany: State University of New York Press, 2005: 9-10.

¹² Elden, Stuart. *Understanding Henri Lefebvre: Theory and the Possible*. London: Continuum, 2006: 110-126.

as well as our forms of labor have been drastically reconfigured, and that the travel industry is just another driver of this capitalist reconfiguration.

But in order to understand how the commodification of all aspects of our everyday lives structures the identity of the tourist today, we need to view the world in the way the tourist does. In other words, we need an account of the *touristic gaze*.

GAZE

If tourism is an activity whereby the tourist experiences a world other than her normal everyday environment, then there must also occur a kind of transposition of the tourist into a space of temporary activity wherein the rules of recreation and play coexist alongside the “ordinary” life of the local.¹³ But while the activity of the tourist and the local often occur in the same spatio-temporal location, it is not true that both tourist and local experience that location in the same way. The source of this experiential fissure is the tourist’s way of seeing the world – i.e. the *touristic gaze*.

The touristic gaze is a kind of mechanism, an abstract principle, or a logic which structures both the way we absorb and interpret signs as well as which signs we recognize at all. The tourist’s gaze allows her to filter and distinguish between signs and symbols, allowing for the valuation of certain images at the expense or ignorance of others. The result is a kind of hierarchy of seeing which turns space-time itself into an extraordinary experience. In short, tourism turns the tourist into a kind of lay semiotician; with space itself being turned into a field of predetermined signs and signifiers upon which only the traveler can gaze.¹⁴ Thus, a tourist is an individual who adopts the role of transcultural spectator; consequently, the perceptual field which constitutes the matter of her (the tourist’s) gaze is nothing other than a series of spectacular images, mythological *phantasmata* that bear only superficial relation to the lifeworld of the local people and culture.

Along these lines, cultural and national identity is a particularly important element structuring the touristic gaze. Indeed, the anticipation of another’s identity intensifies the touristic gaze, and as a result, our desire for travel. Otherness becomes a commodity when a culture is different from your own. Museums, vernacular architecture, local culinary habits, traditional customs, *etc.*, are some of the means by which cultural identities are typically manifest. Today, nationalism is a reemerging phenomenon across the globe and has in many ways become just another way to spark the tourist’s desire. However, nationalism is often accompanied by an intolerance to non-citizens, and many feel as though present-day governments are sacrificing the needs of their citizens to those of outsiders.¹⁵

¹³ Urry, John and Jonas Larsen. *The Tourist Gaze 3.0*. London: SAGE Publications, 2011: 15.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*: 16.

¹⁵ Ulansky, Elena, and William Witenberg. *Is Nationalism on the Rise Globally?* The Huffington Post. December 07, 2017. Accessed April 18, 2018. https://www.huffingtonpost.com/elena-ulansky/is-nationalism-on-the-ris_b_10224712.html.

This shift in perception has led to the widespread view that individual countries should do what's best for their autonomy rather than building sympathetic relations with other countries.¹⁶ But with respect to tourism, this has generated a certain paradox. While borders become more tightly controlled in order to slow or stop the waves of unwanted migration, at the very same time governments continue to promote tourism as a key form of national income. This sharpening of national borders paradoxically intensifies touristic activity, since it enhances both the desire to cross the border and see these tightly controlled spaces. This is driven by the fact that people today believe that to truly experience a place, it needs to be seen and experienced corporeally. There is a particular thrill to seeing, hearing, touching, and even smelling a place.¹⁷ This corporeal tension between places and people is what makes the tourist feel that his or her experience is a unique and socially worthwhile adventure; a physical break from the normal in favor of the extraordinary; a physical engagement with the other, whether or not that engagement culminates in a genuine encounter with the other, or is merely the reflection of his or her gaze.

Ultimately, then, while it is true that all people possess a culturally-structured gaze, tourists gaze in a specific way. It is the unique *telos* of the touristic gaze to seek a vision of cultural authenticity which aims to dissolve the barrier between the tourist and the other. But in order to understand the connection of the touristic *telos* to that of the touristic *topos*, we need to see the connection between place and identity.

TOURIST and PLACE

In *Non-Places: An introduction to Supermodernity*, Marc Augé defines anthropological places as those occupied by the indigenous people who live, cultivate, and mark their boundaries.¹⁸ Ethnologists, though like tourists, tend to see a place as outsiders, giving their own interpretation to a culture.¹⁹ As Augé suggests, on the basis of these outsider-interpretations, a “double invention” emerges, where place is defined by the outsider's fantasy of the native, or what is the illusion of the ethnographer.²⁰ This tension between the native and the other is a main characteristic of tourism. As a result, contradictory conditions emerge – a key feature of modernity – the tendencies to push history into the background.²¹ In *Mythologies*, literary critic and semiotician Roland Barthes describes this phenomenon and its relation to tourism in a very compelling manner:

The road becomes very picturesque (tunnels): it matters little that one no longer sees anything, since the tunnel here has become the sufficient sign of the mountain; [...] Just as hilliness is overstressed to such an extent as to eliminate all other types of scenery, the human life of a country disappears to the exclusive benefit of its monuments. For the Blue Guide, men exist

¹⁶ Ulansky, Elena, and William Witenberg. *Is Nationalism on the Rise Globally?* The Huffington Post. December 07, 2017. Accessed April 18, 2018. https://www.huffingtonpost.com/elena-ulansky/is-nationalism-on-the-rise_b_10224712.html.

¹⁷ Urry, John and Jonas Larsen. *The Tourist Gaze 3.0*. London: SAGE Publications, 2011: 14.

¹⁸ Augé, Marc. *Non-places: Introduction to an Anthropology of Supermodernity*. London: Verso, 2006: 42.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*: 43.

²⁰ *Ibid.*: 44.

²¹ *Ibid.*: 76.

only as ‘types’. In Spain, for instance, the Basque is an adventurous sailor, the Levantine a light-hearted gardener, the Catalan a clever tradesman and the Cantabrian a sentimental highlander. We find again here this disease of thinking in essences, which is at the bottom of every bourgeois mythology of man. [...] To select only monuments suppresses at one stroke the reality of the land and that of its people, it accounts for nothing of the present, that is, nothing historical, and as a consequence, the monuments themselves become undecipherable, therefore senseless.²²

In other words, following Barthes, the tourist relies on mythological essences in order to feed the fantasy of the native other. But as Barthes cautions, such fantasies are ultimately meaningless in terms of their ability to decipher the reality of the native culture. Thus, rather than gaining any genuine insight into the cultural space of the other, the tourist achieves little more than a self-reflected image, as though gazing into a mirror.

However, despite the tourist’s lack of comprehension with respect to the cultural space of the other, it is not the case that the tourist is without place, though some scholars contend as much. One example is that of Marc Augè, who in his book *Non-places: Introduction to an Anthropology of Supermodernity*, defines “non-places” this way:

If a place can be defined as relational, historical and concerned with identity, then a space which cannot be defined as relational, or historical, or concerned with identity will be a non-place. The hypothesis advanced here is that supermodernity, produces non-places, meaning spaces which are not themselves anthropological places and which, unlike Baudelairean modernity, do not integrate the earlier places: instead these are listed, classified, promoted to the status of ‘places of memory’ and assigned to a circumscribed and specific position.²³

Augè goes on to argue that these so-called “non-places” epitomize the spaces often designed for traveler’s because such spaces are purely transitory, therefore are without a relation to any real history or identity.²⁴ But against this, I argue that a “non-place,” according to Augè own definition, does not exist. Every place is precisely defined by the specificity of its relations; every place has a history; and every place has a unique identity. Indeed, even if one were to somehow locate or identify a place that somehow exists outside of all relations, history, or positive identity, it would be determinable precisely by its negative relation to each of these conditions. Positive or negative, a relation is always *in relation to*.²⁵ In short, Augè’s conception of “non-places” is as useless as it is absurd. The tourist and the local indeed inhabit the same spatio-temporal locale, but neither experiences that locale from the point of view of their opposite. For the local, it is their familiarity with the place that can never be grasped in equal measure by the tourist. And for the tourist, the unfamiliar is only experienced in the tiniest moments when his or her sense of familiarity is challenged in an unanticipated way.

²² Barthes, Roland. *Mythologies*. Tr. François, Corinne, Rosny: Bréal, 2009: 76.

²³ Augè, Marc. *Non-places: Introduction to an Anthropology of Supermodernity*. London: Verso, 2006: 77-78.

²⁴ *Ibid.*: 79.

²⁵ Technically speaking, the only conceivable “non-place” according to Augè’s definition would be that of nothingness. As such, there could be no *non-places* in the plural.

Thus, this tension between the familiar and the unfamiliar is deeply embedded within the identity of the tourist. While there are tourists that would like to escape their comfort zone completely, there are other tourists that wish to preserve it as much as possible. Both extremes qualify the tourist. I therefore argue that tourist spaces exist everywhere, since any place can be gazed upon through the eyes of the tourist. As such, the backstage authenticity inhabited by locals is always intertwined with the fake locality. In short, all spaces are heterotopic; that is, sites where the multiple layers of social and mental behaviors coexist in moments of both harmony and radical discontinuity.

TEMPORALITY: Or, When Does Tourism End?

By now, it is evident that the chasm between the everyday and the extraordinary is constitutive of the tourist. And that for the tourist, a type of gaze is constructed through the mediation of specific signs, the collection of which constitute the conceptual space of tourism. Further, all tourists engage in a quest for an authentic experience of the other. The difference between the tourist and the local, then, is to be found in the liminal space defining these binaries.

However, by way of conclusion, there is one last element that is crucial in defining the tourist: temporality. As I mentioned earlier, the UN's World Tourism Organization (UNWTO) defines tourists as persons traveling to and staying in places outside their usual environment *for not more than one consecutive year* for leisure, business and other purposes.²⁶ But why a year? Why not a year and one day? Or a year and two? What happens at the end of this year? Does the tourist turn into a local, like a werewolf during a full moon? In short, it seems that the boundary between tourist and local becomes fuzzy upon consideration of temporality.

But while the temporality of the tourist is undoubtedly the most difficult and ambiguous aspect of her or his identity, it is also irreducibly constitutive of that identity as well. As such, no consideration of the meaning of the tourist-as-subject-type in the 21st century can avoid the way that technology and other forms of mass communication have transformed our experience of temporality today. Pulling yet again from Heidegger, we find the following description of the condition:

All distances in time and space are shrinking. Man now reaches overnight, by plane, places which formerly took weeks and months of travel. He now receives instant information, by radio, of events which he formerly learned about only years later, if at all. The germination and growth of plants, which remained hidden through-out the seasons, is now exhibited publicly in a minute, on film. Distant sites of the most ancient cultures are shown on film as if they stood this very moment amidst today's street traffic. Moreover, the film attests to what it shows by presenting also the camera and its operators at work. The peak of this abolition of every possibility of remoteness is reached by television, which will soon pervade and dominate the whole machinery of communication. Man puts the longest distances, behind him in the

²⁶ World Tourism Organization UNWTO. Definition | World Tourism Organization UNWTO. Accessed April 17, 2018. <http://www2.unwto.org/content/about-us-5>

shortest time. He puts the greatest distances behind himself and thus puts everything before himself at the shortest range. Yet the frantic abolition of all distances brings no nearness; for nearness does not consist in shortness of distance. What is least remote from us in point of distance, by virtue of its picture on film or its sound on the radio, can remain far from us. What is incalculably far from us in point of distance can be near to us. Short distance is not in itself nearness. Nor is great distance remoteness.²⁷

What Heidegger's description captures here so clearly is the radical reduction of space to time through speed, which is achieved via the aid of technology. That is, today, even the greatest of distances can be traversed in but an instance. As such, the rate with which a tourist can reach a foreign destination is unprecedented. And yet, Heidegger also keys into something more subtle; namely, the limited-nature of our awareness and attention. So while it may be the case that any earthly distance can be surmounted, and at an incredible speed, no person can achieve a synoptic cognizance of all earthly places.

The implication for our understanding of the temporality of the tourist then is this: today, any person with due means can travel to near any earthly location at an incredible rate; however, it matters not how quickly one can get from one place to another, since the mere movement of bodies across the globe brings no guarantee that a body will register a meaningful awareness or understanding of the places it encounters. Indeed, the very fact that such speed is available to us only raises the likelihood that a body in fast motion will intend even less of those places over which it will pass too quickly. Therefore, the experience of the tourist cannot be measured according to the amount of time she or he spends in a place. Rather, the experience of the tourist can only be made sense of in terms of the quality of her or his engagement with a given place.

²⁷ Heidegger, M. "The Thing" in *Poetry, Language, Thought*. Tr. Alfred Hofstadter. New York, New York, Harper Collins, 1971: 163.

Bibliography

Augé, Marc. *Non-places: Introduction to an Anthropology of Supermodernity*. London: Verso, 2006.

Barthes, Roland. *Mythologies*. Tr. François, Corinne, Rosny: Bréal, 2009.

Elden, Stuart. *Understanding Henri Lefebvre: Theory and the Possible*. London: Continuum, 2006.

Heidegger, Martin. *Sojourns: The Journey to Greece*. Albany: State University of New York Press, 2005.

_____ "The 'Thing'" in *Poetry, Language, Thought*. Tr. Alfred Hofstadter. New York, New York, Harper Collins, 1971.

Huizinga, Johan H. *Homo Ludens*. London, Routledge, 1980.

Urry, John and Jonas Larsen. *The Tourist Gaze 3.0*. London: SAGE Publications, 2011.

Weiner, E. S. C., and J. A. Simpson. *The Oxford English Dictionary*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1989

Internet Resources Cited

Ulansky, Elena, and William Witenberg. *Is Nationalism on the Rise Globally?'* The Huffington Post. December 07, 2017. Accessed April 18, 2018. https://www.huffingtonpost.com/elena-ulansky/is-nationalism-on-the-ris_b_10224712.html.

World Tourism Organization UNWTO. Definition | World Tourism Organization UNWTO. Accessed April 17, 2018. <http://www2.unwto.org/content/about-us-5>