

MAXIMILIANO E. KORSTANJE
Doctor Honoris Causa (Tourism) de la Universidad
Skibbereen Turk and Caicos, Reino Unido. Docente de la
Universidad de Palermo. Facultad de Ciencias Económicas
y de CENCAP, Centro de Ciencias de la Administración
Profesional, Argentina [maxikorstanje@arnet.com.ar].



THE SOCIOLOGY OF TOURISM IN JOST KRIPPENDORF¹

LA SOCIOLOGÍA DEL TURISMO EN JOST KRIPPENDORF

¹ Fecha de recepción: 26 de julio de 2013.
Fecha de modificación: 12 de noviembre de 2013.
Fecha de aceptación: 20 de noviembre de 2013.

Para citar el artículo: Korstanje, M. (2013). "The Sociology of Tourism in Jost Frippendorf", in *Anuario Turismo y Sociedad*, vol. xiv, pp. 171-183.

Abstract

The present essay review focuses on the work of Jost Krippendorf, his problems to understand an all encompassing model which would be self-explanatory. Although his project was ambitious, he undermined some basic points at time of formulating a theory of tourist motivation. To unearth the Krippendorf's contributions, is a valid way of honoring his geniality. To date the world of tourism owes too much from the sociology of Jost Krippendorf. Analyzing the pastime as he proposes is the best way to understand many older forms of tourism existed before us. Our ethnocentrism leads us to think ours is the only way of making things.

Keywords: Sociology of Tourism, Hydraulic press, Krippendorf, Theory of touristic motivation, Sustainability.

Resumen

El siguiente ensayo centra su foco en el trabajo de Jost Krippendorf, sus principales problemas a la hora de comprender el turismo pero también en sus contribuciones. Aun cuando su proyecto ha sido ambicioso desde su orígenes, se le critica haber obviado ciertos fundamentos psicológicos a la hora de formular su tesis sobre las motivaciones humanas. Para poder vislumbrar su legado, lo cual se constituye en la mejor forma de honrar su genio académico, es necesario mencionar que el mundo del turismo debe mucho a la sociología de Jost Krippendorf. Examinar el pasado como él proponía, es la mejor manera de poder comprender otras formas de turismo, anteriores a las nuestras. Nuestro propio etnocentrismo nos lleva a pensar que lo que hacemos es exclusivo de nuestra civilización.

Palabras clave: Sociología del turismo; Prensa hidráulica; Krippendorf; Teoría de las motivaciones; Sustentabilidad.

Introduction

Over years, tourism-related research has advanced as a valid option at universities and congress. Reasons why tourism is important for many countries are manifold, but principally state encourages tourism simply because it revitalizes economy. Governments worldwide began to see in tourism a strategic resource to generate profits and gains. Many sociologists, anthropologists not only contributed to pose tourism as an academic discipline in the best universities of the world, but also alarmed on the problems of considering the industry only in economic terms. Born in Switzerland in 1938, JOST KRIPPENDORF devoted his life in understanding the social nature of tourism and travels. He developed a model to understand tourism as a liminoid travel that changes the status of traveler. From his view, turn-around trips would work as rites of passage, as Victor Turner put it. Since people do not birth as tourist, they become tourist in the lifespan. It is truth tourists often are benefited by a temporal protection, which means that Turner was right respecting to his theory of liminarity. The concept of familiarity was the backbone in tourism motivation. What KRIPPENDORF wants to discuss in his masterful book, *the holiday-makers*, is to what extent tourism is based on the psychological need of escapement, a point which complement with Malinowski's theory of basic needs. Aside the economic interests of this industry, KRIPPENDORF acknowledges that one of the social roots of tourism depends on its logic of recreation. Tourists need to escape from humdrum routine of daily life, not only to rest, but also to validate the rules of their society. As economist, he warns on the ecology of tourism that exploits not only cultures but also whole communities by maximizing profits. As some commentators put it, PANOSSO NETTO and MARGARITA BARRETTO, his account leads to scholars to think in sustainable tourism earlier than others.

In this essay review, we will explore the contradictions, contributions and conceptual problems of Krippendorf's sociology to expand the existent understanding of the epistemology of tourism. Accessing to his work in a book translated originally to Portuguese, we devoted considerable time in working with two foreign languages. However, results were worth our time and efforts. Unfortunately one might speculate that JOST KRIPPENDORF has not gained the fame and recognition in Anglo-world than others scholars such as JOHN URRY and DEAN MACCANNELL. Besides his contributions are not clearly understood. Employing the existent ITCS, if we consult Google scholars, for example, the book the tourist authored by MACCANNELL obtained 4.809 cites while the *Tourist Gaze*, as a bestseller book has almost 6.200 cites. To compare these ciphers to the acceptance of our economist, Krippendorf's book *The Holiday Makers* has 866 cites. In English speaking countries the popularity of KRIPPENDORF was in decline respecting to other exponents. That is the main goal to write a full-length review base on his work, written entirely in English. While the acceptance of KRIPPENDORF in Brazil exploded in 1990, in US and England his covered legacy must be unearthed.

The Sociology of Tourism

Although he was criticized to formulate abstract generalizations, KRIPPENDORF argues convincingly that any travel initiates with a previous infrastructure which not only facilitate the displacement but encourages new forms of relationships. Following this explanation, tourism is perceived as a mobile activity based on leisure. Almost all cultures of the planet have historically built their own practices of leisure. It represents a universal institution. If people work to survive, leisure balances their psychological frustrations to

bearable conditions. In this vein, the free-will whereby the decision making process starts, seems to be the stepping stone of tourism. The dichotomy between work/leisure keeps present in his whole studies. In view of that, the discovery should be understood as a sublimated expression of frustration and oppression. The needs of knowing for something different prevail over other drives. This issue, though obvious, is of paramount importance to understand how tourism works. KRIPPENDORF was the first scholars to refer not tourism as a simple activity, anchored in industrial logic, but as a form of consciousness. The acts we commit in our holidays are determined by the previous cultural values of society whereby we are educated. Therefore tourism transcends not only the boundaries of geographies, but also of economies. Tourism seems to be an all-encompassing social institution. Without tourism, society would run serious risk of decline and disintegration.

As the previous argument given, two concerns arise in Krippendorf's sociology. The first and most important is the decline of happiness in Western societies at time of working. People undermined their commitment respecting to their jobs. Secondly, there are coming ciphers of unemployment that threatens the dream of capitalist societies. These are two key factors explains why tourism still is important for social imaginary. At a closer look, the bad conditions to work have accompanied humankind from immemorial times, but now citizenry is subject to the exploitation of capital. This logic not only generates an unabated sentiment of frustration, but also posed some mechanisms (where tourism is vital) to regulate the potential resentment generated by capitalism. Of course, this does not mean (as MACCANELL precluded) that tourism is a result of capitalism. At some extent, Krippendorf's originality inspired scholars as JOHN URRY (2007) or PAUL VIRILIO (1996; 2007; 2010) who envisaged the prevailing rule of exploitation brought by capitalism.

It is hypothesized that tourism emulates not only a founding paradise, but also to the romantic need to recover the mother's womb. Elites build their homes recreating the atmosphere of farms. While the urban's life is viewed as sign of social alienation, the farm is posed as an idyllic sacred space where the force of industrialism has not influence. As we have noted, this tension between local/global, authenticity/falsehood, urban/rural are alienated in a conceptual framework that defines tourism as an activity enrooted in the leisure. But defining what tourism is, leads KRIPPENDORF to the needs to examine the connection of travels and economy. And here, he saw a big problem for humankind. At time tourism is enlarging throughout the world, cultures are commoditized according to capitalist-gaze, communities face serious imbalances in their economies because the unplanned growth of tourism, peripheral nations strength their dependency from an imperial centre which limits only to delivery tourist while their investors draw a bubble to repatriate the capital to homeland. All these social problems brilliantly formulated almost 20 years earlier than sustainable tourism surfaced as a paradigm, make from Krippendorf's contributions a visionary legacy.

The ecological problems in Krippendorf's work

Tourism is not good or bad, it depends on how it is employed. KRIPPENDORF considers that scholars, who criticize tourism as an instrument of alienation and domination, preclude the real nature of the industry. Even, there are some many benefits of industrialism such as the alleviation of poverty, the sense of progress and new applications of technology that makes of our world a safer place. At some extent, the tourist economy is not fulfilling the requirements of subjects. The lobbies and the great business corporations are monopolizing the industry minimizing their costs, and

affecting seriously the quality of life in local communities. Unless otherwise resolved, tourism industry will lead humankind to a serious disaster.

The vicious of modern society is originated in the following allegory: we think that growth and progress are inevitably intertwined to consumption. The major consumption, more probability to strengthen the economy. The economic production not only gives jobs, and alleviates the conditions of work-force but needs from more resources. More production, inversely, requires further consumption. In this debate, he insists that the economy has invaded all spheres of public life, in our globalized world, everything is commercialized, commoditized, circulated according to a trade-off value. The society should be defined as a total system, formed by four subsystems, which are below explained:

- a) Economic subsystem signals to two forms, centralized and decentralized. Both appeal to much broader structures of production that impact not only on travels, which are adjusted to prices and fleet rates, but on the workforce.
- b) Socio-cultural subsystem refers to the possibility to educate people according to certain values, discarding others. In view of this, society is based on the dichotomy between being or possessing. If the former archetype is prioritized, travels would be forms of discovery of otherness, but if the latter one is adopted, tourist travels are considered as acts of expropriation of others.
- c) Politics subsystem employs the monopoly of force to regulate the harmony of system all.
- d) Ecological subsystem is very important because it provides with the resources to the system may function. One of the most

troubling aspects of capitalist ideology is to assume natural resources are removable and unlimited.

Unfortunately, the exaggerated interests of status quo in economic factors have broken the equilibrium of system. The sense of happiness, KRIPPENDORF adds, is equaled to consumption, but this generates an un contemplated cost for the planet.

The Tourist system

The human psychology learns that subject are moving based on contradictory needs of such as working, resting, duties, escapement, safety, risks, and so forth. Like the system, the ego should find the own equilibrium to get happiness. However, KRIPPENDORF alerts there is a point of dissatisfaction, of rupture, where the equilibrium breaks. Naturally, the needs are satisfied in temporal terms to restore the lost order. The influences of S. Freud and the principle of homeostasis were of paramount importance at time of drawing the studies of KRIPPENDORF. Even, he writes, we “the psychologists” in many excerpts of *The Holiday Makers*.

Similarly to this, the possibility of traveling elsewhere, outside home, represents a basic need of ego. In so doing, the world not only is appreciated in another way, some creative forces pave the ways for the mind not to collapse. Therefore, holidays are popular and very accepted in almost all cultures of world.

The second point in importance seems to be the encounter between hosts and guests, although the author does not use these terms. What is important to discuss here is the role of social forces in shaping individual behavior. KRIPPENDORF recognizes that holidays, as social construes, exert considerable influence at time of shaping the tourist consciousness. If travelers rest beyond the boundaries of ho-

me, this represents a tri-partite fragmentation among the following three axioms: working there, dwelling on here, and rest in another place. The act of traveling emulates the psychological need of extolling the responsibility toward the boundaries of self. That way, the own decision is determined by the social consciousness imposed by the society. In third place, the possibility of traveling opens the doors to social recognition and a higher status. Those people, whatever the case may be, who are restricted to make holidays or travel abroad are less important for cultural values than mobile subjects. The social forces not only reify but frame the psychological drives to be systematically fulfilled. We may have the drive of escapement, but social mandate gives sense to holidays. The tourist-drive is set on a stage that seeks emulating a perfect life free of suffering and problems but he adds, this industry, anyway, has a dark-side when commoditizes people as object of consumption. Nonetheless, it is very hard to establish what the reasons to plan a trip are. From 60s on, the psychology of tourism attempted to classify the tourist behavior but one reason remained in almost all studies, the psychological hygiene.

The motives of sightseeing associate to the following points:

- a. To rest and recover energy.
- b. To bolster new social abilities or relations with others.
- c. To discover new places and customs.
- d. To be happy.
- e. To escape of duties and compromise.
- f. Intra-perception and inner learning.
- g. Educational purposes.

To get some distance from his colleagues, KRIPPENDORF argues convincingly that we travel for these motives all combined. This demonstrates how problematic turns to harmonize tourist experience. Since tourist behavior not always is moved by egocentrism or egoism, he poses his hope in a tourism that helps changing the world, the value of material world. With the benefits of hindsight, he does not ignore the first contradictory idea on this, if tourists look for peace and calm, why tourist ghettos are fraught of traffic jams, vicious, prostitutions, and so forth. Tourists would replicate, even in the need of evasion, the whole urban practices in the tourist destination. We, as tourists, pretend to become in another person, although we have to admit our acts are based on the cultural value forged into a prevailing civilization.

In a review published more than two decades ago, J. GOODRICH (1988) establishes that ideal beliefs of KRIPPENDORF are in fact utopian, but necessary to revitalize the values of tourism. The concept of harmonized development as well as the rate of "gross happiness" it almost impossible to reach. Nonetheless, our Swiss economist stimulates the debate on the needs of shift, toward a more just society.

Epistemologically, this is the bridge between the world of leisure and work. Much of the written works on this issue, academicians discuss today in conferences resulted from Krippendorf's curiosity. To understand tourism as a social fact, it is important to delve into the ethical order of work, which is validated on holidays. Most certainly, problems and conflict among tourist and locals depend upon the economic interest of stakeholders. To here, we tried to describe the backbone of his thought as objective as possible. Although KRIPPENDORF illuminates the ways for many coming scholars concerned by the socio-economic effects of tourism, there are some points which should be revised. Firstly, the epistemology of how KRIPPENDORF constructs

his idea on tourism. Next, we situate his account under the lens of scrutiny.

Criticism to Krippendorf

First and foremost, in Krippendorf's view tourism is only a direct result of holidays. It is not possible, although the scholar does not precise why, to speak of tourism beyond the conceptual dichotomy between leisure vs. labor. Besides, he does not delve into the etymological nature of the word, *feriae* originally coined by Romans to denote leave. In Roman Empire, of course the term *feriae* (lat.) were temporal licenses given to citizens to visit relatives and friends, most of them, located at the peripheries of larger roman cities (PAOLI, 2007). This begs a more than interesting question. Why tourism-led scholars think roman leisure was the prerequisite of modern tourism?

No need to say the concept of leisure was not linked to *feriae* in ancient times. Even, Roman citizens had no liberty to practice leisure or making a trip. Freedom was a concept introduced by the industrial revolution to mobilize the workforce from one to another point of Europe. Rome built a wonderful infrastructure to connect the Italian Peninsula with its colonies. In peace-times, thousand of travellers and tourists stranded through the Empire. Traveling and visiting other places were not only a political sign of distinction, but an expression of superiority over other tribes. Banquets and other spectacles were often offered to Gods. Therefore, citizens had no chance to reject their attendance. The leisure in ancient times has nothing to do with the modern freedom as we know today. Industrialism has brought many social changes. One of them has been the adoption of free-will as the key of decision making process. Until the appearance of industrial-mind the work-force keep attached to a specific territory. The logic of industrialism not only broke the bonds of

workers with their families, but also generated a mobile horde which traveled throughout Europe in quest of new opportunities. To put this in another way, the mobility was a sad result of the precarity of labor.

The other most important issue to take in mind was the imposition of boundaries between home and work-place. Secondly, the possibilities to travel only when the worker to be on leave. This does not mean that tourism was not possible earlier in Europe than industrialism. Even, as Paoli put it, Romans developed a similarly-minded idea of tourism in ancient times. Many non western cultures conducted travels to visit relatives in other clans or other exotic places. Even if KRIPPENDORF has right to say, people need to discover unknown places, he closes the discussion understanding that tourism should not be encompassed beyond leisure. Since one is a tourist and worker at the same time, this means that only the modern concept of tourism prevails over others. Even, KRIPPENDORF does not realize on the fact that tourism, in other ways, existed time ago than industrialism. Cultures have historically determined by travels.

CITING OBERG, RACHEL IRWIN (2007) alludes to the encounter among ethnicities as a culture shock, which ranges from a stage of understanding to a profound crisis –honeymoon, crisis, recovery and adjustment. While tourists generally are embedded into a honeymoon phase, where the other native is exacerbated as a polite and gorgeous friend, explorers, anthropologists and aid-workers face another more disappointing facet. The radical crisis of identity may take some months. When this arrives, the foreigner has serious problems to cope with native. Depending on how this is resolved, the visitor will return to home or stay. The process of recovery consists in the feeding of all information, customs and practices to survive in this new society. If this stage successfully is ended, the adjustment

will take place. Depending on how the guest is negotiating with natives, the knowledge has further value for others. Tourists for example are subject to peripheral and superfluous meeting with natives while anthropologists produce another kind of knowledge. However, may we accept tourism is a staged authentic activity?.

Other un contemplated problem in Krippendorf's account lies in his ignorance on the role played by hospitality to make tourism possible. Hospitality exhibits an ancient need, which is not fully assessed by KRIPPENDORF. Any trip generates a serious problem not only for hosts but for guests. The act of abandoning home augments the uncertainty of traveler because its perceived safety is not warranted. However, the same happens with tourist receiving societies. The hosting community has no reference of the traveler. In the encounter, hospitality would exhibit the mechanism by means both compromise not to attack the other. In ancient times, hospitality not only paved the ways for trade in peacetimes, but also to align militarily to other tribes if necessary. Hospitality reduces the risks in the encounter of tourists and locals. To put this in bluntly, tourism does not work without hospitality (KORSTANJE, 2008; KORSTANJE, 2010).

As the previous argument given, KORSTANJE (2008; 2009; 2010) and KORSTANJE & BUSBY (2010) establish that holidays should be traced to the Bible when God creates the world. Tourism is determined by the physical displacement legalized by Western state. If we take the necessary attention to founding Christian myths, we will realize the leisure is explained by divine mandate. God rested on seven day because it was fine. From this tale onwards, Christians venerate the rest as a primary sacred value given by the Bible. The symbolic cycle of destruction vs. construction are alternated as the vacation and labour. What would be interesting to discuss here is that holidays

represent a sacred-space of ruling reformulation (KORSTANJE & BUSBY, 2010).

Third, KRIPPENDORF draws too much attention to the principle of hydraulic press, coined by the first psychoanalyst and economist of consumption. It is widely known that drives and needs not only are not the same but sometimes cannot be explained following the principle of homeostasis. Fourth, he alludes to turnerian concept of rite of passage to explain how tourism works. The problem precisely is that TURNER envisaged that rites of passage as an event that marks the transition (without reversibility) of a person. After that, the status of initiated people changes forever. RATHER, MIRCEA ELIADE proposed a more illustrative definition of rite that can be adjusted to what happens with tourism. The tourist does not alter its status after the trip. One must confess, TURNER was not wrong in his diagnosis, but it was aimed at describing the role of hunters in non western tribes. The error was to extrapolate that to tourist practices. If tourism delineates the logic of labor in the workforce, in order for the society not to face serious problems, it is at least contradictory to define tourism is a rite of passage. We agree modern citizens need to escape from the humdrum routine of urban life, but their holidays do not alter their situation. They do not come back in other status, as KRIPPENDORF precludes.

Last but not least, KRIPPENDORF puts the cart before the horse. On one hand, tourism is viewed in accordance to a powerful basic need, evasion. However, this drive has been induced by capitalism in recent times. Following this reasoning, a perfect dialectic relationship is created. Tourism is based on the need of evasion, which is coined by modernity. Also, tourism is only a modern activity, unknown for ancient tribes. Thousand of years of making religious travels in aboriginal cultures, other ways of tourism practiced by disappeared civilizations are silenced on only the voice of modern tourism. Unwittingly,

formulating this leads KRIPPENDORF to be conducive to the ideology of Anglo-empires. As it has been noted by many scholars, peripheral cultures sometimes adopt modern European tourism as a temporal financial aid to improve their situation. Unfortunately, these communities not only do not better their condition of life, but also aggravate the problem strengthening a strong dependency respecting to tourist-delivering societies. As a growing industry in all globe, tourism triggers the unnecessary financial loans, which are almost impossible to pay later. The patrimonialization of places, and the construction of heritage helps international organism of credit as WB or IMF, to control the world by means of financial assistance. In so doing, the capitalist ideology has success in creating the theory of needs. The psychological needs have been disposed in parallel with the industrial-ideology. To create the desire entails to offer the resources to fulfill that gap. The theory of needs precludes human motivation is based on the satisfaction of psychology desires, which receive the name of needs. Medieval workers were successfully convinced they needed to work and travel, far way of their family units. If the need opens the wish of subject to accept a lack, it should be necessary to channel that lack toward well-defined forms of consumptions. It is important not to lose the sight that official policies are validated by specific ideologies, some of them supported involuntarily by Krippendorf's sociologism:

- a) Tourism if exploited in sustainable basis is good for community.
- b) Aboriginal groups should adopt tourism as a valid resource of surviving.
- c) Sustainability balances the forces and interest of stakeholders.
- d) Work is bad, and tourism is good.

Although he struggled to fight against West's ethnocentric discourse, some points should be revised. Tourism should be possible even beyond the theory of needs. In these terms, evasion does not become in the necessary reason, but the consequence of the form how work is planned and organized in urban societies. On another, tourism is here analyzed based on the function conferred by KRIPPENDORF alone. In doing so, one runs the risk to fall in an ideology that legitimates the mass-consumption since situates the axiom *people need tourism to be happy*. Of course, he acknowledges, tourism is nor good neither bad, but fulfill a basic need, evasion. Indeed, much broader exploration is needed here. This viewpoint generates a vicious circle, which can be only resolved by the introduction of a utopia. How may the instrument to indoctrinate worker, breaks the values it encourages?

To our end, we rest preferably on the idea tourism helps in revitalizing the ruptures and frustrations surfaced in the work-time enhancing the legitimacy of elite on workforce. As social scientists we should limit only to describe and explain the connection of tourism with other sub-system of society. The communities can be understood by a coherent diagnosis without any personal valoration. The contradictory view of KRIPPENDORF, leads us to think capitalism is not good, but at the same time, its values, which are painstakingly discussed in this essay-review, are overtly accepted. This means that instead of focusing on the needs as a result of frustrations (the encounter between self and environment), as MALINOWSKI put it, KRIPPENDORF over-valorizes needs of escapement as a taken for granted value. This seems to be the main limitation of his model. Whether epistemological basis to create an all encompassing science were so clear, why now we consider tourism as a modern issue alone?. Next, we will discuss this hot point in further detail.

From Krippendorf to a new theory of tourism

Once created, human beings started to go everywhere. This was the reason why, a plenty of mythologies referred to the first travel, as the main act of creation. The first travel of founding parents starts the civilization and of course, gives some additional explanations how the problems should be solved by the next generations. Our culture, we are taught, stems from Colon’s discovery travel, which prompted the arrival of Spanish Empire. The social structures does not facilitate travels, they are previously determined by them. Travel, in consequence, may be understood as a founding act for all human existence. In the threshold of time, the archetype of the first travel is emulated in all every-day practices legalized by the societal order (KORSTANJE, 2007). This means that there is some mobility which are allowed, which others are repressed. For example, going on vacation to a beach is a legal activity encouraged by state, while the prisoner escapes from jail are constrained. Over centuries, human beings have launched to unknown spaces in conquests, trips, expeditions, and Diasporas, (moved by economic or pleasure goals). Starting from the premise that travel experiences and writing were of paramount importance for social science, the present review-study is oriented to describe and examine the value of testimonies for scientific paradigm. Being there was a significant value for social scientists. RALPH LINTON, a psychologist alerts that everyone is interested for discovering exotic cultures and places, as well as the stories this displacement generates. The originality of those narratives is the main aspect one valorises from travellers. These sources not only are secondary forms of creating knowledge but also paved the ways for the creation of a new literature genre, the travel writing. To what extent, social sciences have taken this as object of study is what we want to discover in this es-

say-review. Travels beyond the familiarity of home validate previous beliefs, assumptions or hypothesis in the empirical fields. Based on this, one might speculate that science moves in the same direction of travel industry.

Unlike American sociology, which sees in tourism a mechanism of alienation, KRIPPENDORF considers that it represents the reaction of basic needs enrooted in thousand of years of sedentary societies. The problem with American and French sociology is their focus on modern tourism, which validates the idea that people are commoditized to be consumable. For example, what MACCANNELL cautioned in his book *The Tourist*, seems not to be tourism, but the tourist destination. Thanks to KRIPPENDORF, a hope is given to the configuration of a science of tourism in the next decades. One of the fathers of social anthropology, BRONISLAW MALINOWSKI, the culture was a counter-response of the frustrations imposed by the environment. Social institutions not only exhibited the human prone to survive, but a valid attempt of adaptation to a hostile world. Seven basic needs were identified by MALINOWSKI to almost all cultures, a) metabolism, b) reproduction, c) bodily comforts, d) safety, e) movement, f) growth, and g) health.

TABLE 1. Malinowski’s basic need model

<i>Basic Needs</i>	<i>Cultural Responses</i>
Metabolism	Commissariat
Reproduction	Kinship
Bodily Comforts	Shelter-Games
Safety	Protection
Movement	Activities
Growth	Training
Health	Hygiene

Source: Malinowski (1944:91)

Each need resulted from a cultural response, which is originated to make the life more stable and predictable. No matter than the ethnicity, human beings employ technology to cover their lacks. The needs of health pave the ways to the introduction of hygiene, while safety signals to the conformation of a system of protection which ranges from military-forces to magicians. The fields of “bodily comforts, as MALINOWSKI put it, encompasses not only the question of shelters, but also games, and other aspects that form relax, rest and playful logic of culture. He understood that cultures need to constructs their own forms of escapement so that rules can be validated cyclically. It is unfortunate that MALINOWSKI did not deepen in the role played by escapement and bodily comfort in his model of cultures, nor was this point continued by other anthropologists. Though institutions are for MALINOWSKI reactions to fulfil frustrations, needs, and lacks, no further attention to curiosity and rest was given by anthropology. What would be more than important to discuss here, is the ways KRIPPENDORF legacy can be complemented to Malinowski’s theory of needs. Tourism should be defined as social fact, institutionalized by the imposition of holidays, but not limited to. We need to create a new epistemology of tourism, employing the legacy of KRIPPENDORF.

The alienatory function of tourism

Nonetheless, travels are not tourism in the strict sense of the word. Some experts envisage self-ethnographies as a valid instrument of research (BORM, 2000; MILLER, 2008; TRIBE, XIAO, & CHAMBERS, 2012; WHITE & WHITE, 2007), while others cuts the difference between ethnological travels and tourism. While the former is a real movement where traveller looks to meet the other, tourism seems to be an alienated activity that keeps a great psychological distance between guests and hosts (MACCANNELL, 2003; URRY, 2002).

Problems why tourism is today viewed as an unauthentic travel should be charged to Dean Maccannell’s sociology. Somehow, in a way which cannot be explained, MACCANNELL precludes that heritage and identity are often articulated to mould the tourist experience. The concept of staged authenticity is more than an illusory dream; this represents the encounter between subjective expectances and social structures. Travellers and tourists gain their consciousness once they return to home. MACCANNELL insists that the tourist travel not only is far of being real, but engenders serious problems of dependency and vulnerability for the peripheral nations. MACCANNELL rejects the argument of URRY because his simplification about tourism. The goals of tourism not necessarily consist in leaving the routine as URRY (or KRIPPENDORF) put it. The influence of Foucault in Urry seems to be evident, but this does not mean we face a singular tourist gaze. RATHER, in tourist practices, there are two types of gazes. The first was installed in the commercialization of tourism while the second one signals to the past of time, to the idea that something is being missed:

The second gaze is always aware that something is being concealed from it; that there is something missing from every picture, from every look or glance. This is no less true on tour than it is in everyday life. The second gaze knows that seeing is not believing. Some things will remain hidden from it. Even things with which it is intimately familiar. It cannot be satisfied simply by taking leave of the ordinary. The second gaze turns back onto the gazing subject an ethical responsibility for the construction of its own existence. It refuses to leave this construction to the corporation, the state, and the apparatus of touristic representation. In possession of the second gaze, the human subject knows that it is a work in progress; knows that it can never fulfill the ego’s demands for wholeness, completeness and self-sufficiency (MACCANNELL, 2001: 36).

As URRY, MACCANNELL sees tourism as a commoditized travel, where the meeting with the other is not authentic. This view-stance opens a bridge between American and German sociology respecting to tourism.

In *Empty Meeting Grounds* he radicalizes the thesis arguing market has invaded all spheres of public life. The social bond has been dehumanized because of mobility and globalization. In fact, the local communities that in past inspired the books of explorers and travellers, today are reduced to be mere products for consumption. They are visually exploited by white-tourists which are delivered from central countries. Maccannell adds, this happens because we are witnessing the end of history:

critical theory, even those branches of it, which want to stand outside of, even beyond history, is fully historical. It was deployed at exactly the same moment in history as the double movement of tourists to the periphery and formerly marginal peoples to the centers. In this double movement and deployment, the human community has been rhetorically reduced to nothing more than a territorial entity with a unified economy, as in the European Community, and perhaps a single race" (MACCANNELL: 2).

The paradox lies in the fact that modern travellers (tourists) demand an authenticity which not only does not exist, but also needs from a copy to persist. This means that tourism as a staged-industry may be replicated day by day through the imposition of an ideal that valorizes authenticity over other values. The discovery that characterized the travels in former centuries set the pace to the needs of experiencing original spectacles (MACCANNELL, 2007). One of the main famous contributions of MACCANNELL to tourism research is the differentiation between the sacred, and profane space. Although, he was responsible for the negative view today many social scientists

have developed on tourism (NOGUES PEDREGAL, 2009; KORSTANJE, 2012), many scholars have adopted his models to understand tourist destinations. The problem was essentially that what MACCANNELL observed was the dynamic of modern tourist destination. He received much criticism because the confusion between tourism as an industry, which is based on the exchange of capital and persons, with the tourism as a social fact. KRIPPENDORF initiated a first step in the configuration of an organic and epistemological science that examines tourism from an interdisciplinary view, but taking into account the history.

Conclusion

We have explored in the contributions, problems and contradictories of the sociology of JOST KRIPPENDORF. First of all, we consider our Swiss economist was a pioneer who envisaged not only the trends of tourism but also the discussion on the exploitation of non-renewable resources. Due to the lack of popularity, he has in English speaking countries, we opt to make a full review of his legacy and work. Unfortunately, KRIPPENDORF falls in some flaws at time of drawing a general model of tourism. Formulating the theory that tourism only derives from the needs of escapement, which is very illustrative but need further work, he starts a new way of making sociology. His studies innovates not only in the needs of understand tourism but also in applying the theory of hydraulic press to human motivations. With the goal of providing with an all-encompassing theory that explains human micro-sociological motivation with greater structures, he envisages in the following thesis. Tourism is an industry which is growing year by year because our conditions of work are deplorable. The precarity in the urban style of life leads people to employ symbolic forms of evasion. Quite aside from his conceptual flaws, the world of tourism and academicians, for that, should gi-

ve gratitude to KRIPPENDORF for his views and recognize his geniality as a master-scholar who fought for the creation of a finely-grained disciplinary method to study the tourist-consciousness.

References

AUGÉ, M. (1998). *El viaje imposible: el turismo y sus imágenes*. Barcelona: Editorial Gedisa.

BARRETTO, M. (2009). “Prefacio a edicao comemorativa”, en *Sociología do turismo. Para uma nova comprensao do lazer e das viagens*. Sao Paulo, El Aleph, pp. XV-XXIV.

BORM, J. (2000). “In-Betweeners?—on the travel book and ethnographies”, in *Studies in travel writing*, 4(1), 78-105.

BOORSTIN, D. (1962). “From traveler to tourist: The lost art of travel”, in *The image: Or what happened to the American dream*, 77-117.

ELIADE, M. (1968). *Mito y Realidad*. Madrid: Guadarrama.

ELIADE, M. (2006). *El Mito del Eterno Retorno*. Buenos Aires: Eméce Editores.

GOODRICH, J (1988). “Review on the Holiday Makers: understanding the impact of leisure and travel”, in *Journal of Travel Research*. vol. 1 (27): 55-56

IRWIN, R. (2007). “The Culture Shock, negotiating feeling in the field”, in *Anthropology Matters*. vol. 9 (1) 1-11

KORSTANJE, M. (2007). “The Origin and meaning of Tourism: an ethimological study”, in *E- Review of Tourism Research*, vol. 5 (5): 100-108

KORSTANJE, M. (2008). “Formas de Ocio en la Antigua Roma: desde la dinastía Julio-Claudia (Octavio Augusto) hasta la Flavia (tito Flavio

Domiciano) ”, en *El Periplo Sustentable*, 15 (1): 27-76.

KORSTANJE, M. (2009). “Interpretando el Génesis del descanso, una aproximación a los mitos y rituales en el turismo”, en *Pasos. Revista de Turismo y Patrimonio Cultural*, 7 (1): 99-113.

KORSTANJE, M. (2010). “Las Formas Elementales de la Hospitalidad”, en *Revista Brasileira de Pesquisa em turismo*, 4 (2): 86-111.

KORSTANJE, M. (2012). “Maccannell Revisited, a critical approach to Structuralism”, in *Enlightening Tourism, a pathmaking journal*. vol. 2(2): 47-71

KORSTANJE, M. & BUSBY, G. (2010). “Understanding the Bible, as the roots of Physical displacement: the origin of Tourism”, in *E-Review of Tourism Research*, 8 (3): 95-111.

KRIPPENDORF, J. (2009). *Sociología do turismo. Para uma nova comprensao do lazer e das viagens*. Sao Paulo.

LINTON, R. (1989). *Cultura y Personalidad*. México: Fondo de Cultura Económica.

MACCANNELL, D. (2001). “Tourist Agency”, in *Tourist Studies*. vol. 1 (1): 23-37.

MACCANNELL, D. (2003). *El Turista: una nueva teoría de la clase ociosa*. Barcelona: Melusina Ed.

MACCANNELL, D. (2007) *Empty Meeting Grounds*. Barcelona: Melusina.

MALINOWSKI, B. (1944). *A Scientific Theory of Culture, and Other Essays*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.

MILLER, D. S. (2008). “Disaster tourism and disaster landscape attractions after Hurricane Katrina: An auto-ethnographic journey”, in *International Journal of Culture, Tourism and Hospitality Research*, 2(2), 115-131.

- NOGUES PEDREGAL, A. M. (2009). *Genealogy of troublesome relationship between anthropology and tourism*. Pasos. vol. 7, 1, pp. 43-56.
- PANOSSO-NETTO, A (2009). “Nota á edicao comemorativa”, en *Sociología do turismo. Para uma nova comprensao do lazer e das viagens*. Sao Paulo: El Aleph pp IX-XII.
- PAOLI, H.E. (2007). *Vida Cotidiana en la Antigua Roma*. La Plata: Terramar.
- TRIBE, J.; XIAO, H., & CHAMBERS, D. (2012). “The reflexive journal: Inside the black box”, in *Annals of Tourism Research*, 39(1), 7-35.
- URRY, J (2002). *The Tourist Gaze*. London: Sage.
- URRY, J. (2007). “Introducción, Culturas Móviles”, en *Viajes y Geografías*. ZUSMAN, P. LOIS, C y CASTRO H, (comps.). Buenos Aires: Prometeo, pp. 17-31.
- VIRILIO, P. (1996). *El Arte del Motor: aceleración y realidad*. Buenos Aires. Ediciones El Manantial.
- VIRILIO, P. (2007). *Ciudad Pánico: el afuera comienza aquí*. Buenos Aires: Libros el Zorzal.
- VIRILIO, P. (2010) *The University of Disaster*. Oxford, Polity Press.
- WHITE, N. R. & WHITE, P. B. (2007). “Home and away: Tourists in a connected world”, in *Annals of Tourism Research*, 34(1), 88-104.