



ROUTLEDGE CONTEMPORARY GEOGRAPHIES
OF LEISURE, TOURISM AND MOBILITY

S AND SPACE

TIM COLES AND DALLEN J. TIMOTHY
TOURISM, DIASPORAS AND SPACE

TIM COLES AND DALLEN J. TIMOTHY

TOURISM, DIASPORAS AND SPACE

TIM COLES AND DALLEN J. TIMOTHY

TOURISM, DIASPORAS AND SPACE

TIM COLES AND DALLEN J. TIMOTHY

TOURISM, DIASPORAS AND SPACE

TIM COLES AND DALLEN J. TIMOTHY

TOURISM, DIASPORAS AND SPACE

TIM COLES AND DALLEN J. TIMOTHY

TOURISM, DIASPORAS AND SPACE

TIM COLES AND DALLEN J. TIMOTHY

TOURISM, DIASPORAS AND SPACE

TIM COLES AND DALLEN J. TIMOTHY

TOURISM, DIASPORAS AND SPACE

TIM COLES AND DALLEN J. TIMOTHY

**Also available as a printed book
see title verso for ISBN details**

Tourism, Diasporas and Space

Diasporas result from the scattering of populations and cultures across geographical space and time. Transnational in nature and unbounded by space, they cut across the static, territorial boundaries more usually deployed to govern tourism. *Tourism, Diasporas and Space* explores the new challenges that diasporas pose to tourism discourse.

This book introduces the main features and constructs of diasporas, and explores their implications for the consumption, production and practices of tourism. Three sets of mutually reinforcing relationships are explored: experiences of diaspora tourists, the settings and spaces of diaspora tourism, and the production of diaspora tourism. Examples are drawn from a wide spectrum of diasporic groups including the Chinese, Jewish, Southeast Asian, Croatian, Dutch and Welsh.

In a vibrant inter-disciplinary collection of essays from leading scholars in the field, *Tourism, Diasporas and Space* provides a unique navigation of the nature of the connections between tourism and diasporic populations and networks.

Tim Coles is Lecturer in Human Geography and University Business Research Fellow at the University of Exeter, and **Dallen J. Timothy** is Associate Professor at Arizona State University and Visiting Professor of Heritage Tourism at the University of Sunderland.

Contemporary Geographies of Leisure, Tourism and Mobility

Series Editor: Michael Hall

Professor at the Department of Tourism, University of Otago, New Zealand

The aim of this series is to explore and communicate the intersections and relationships between leisure, tourism and human mobility within the social sciences.

It will incorporate both traditional and new perspectives on leisure and tourism from contemporary geography, e.g. notions of identity, representation and culture, while also providing for perspectives from cognate areas such as anthropology, cultural studies, gastronomy and food studies, marketing, policy studies and political economy, regional and urban planning, and sociology, within the development of an integrated field of leisure and tourism studies.

Also, increasingly, tourism and leisure are regarded as steps in a continuum of human mobility. Inclusion of mobility in the series offers the prospect to examine the relationship between tourism and migration, the sojourner, educational travel, and second home and retirement travel phenomena.

The series comprises two strands:

Contemporary Geographies of Leisure, Tourism and Mobility aims to address the needs of students and academics, and the titles will be published in hardback and paperback. Titles include:

The Moralisation of Tourism

Sun, sand . . . and saving the world?

Jim Butcher

The Ethics of Tourism Development

Mick Smith and Rosaleen Duffy

Tourism in the Caribbean

Trends, development, prospects

Edited by David Timothy Duval

Qualitative Research in Tourism

Ontologies, Epistemologies and Methodologies

Edited by Jenny Phillimore and Lisa Goodson

Routledge Studies in Contemporary Geographies of Leisure, Tourism and Mobility is a forum for innovative new research intended for research students and academics, and the titles will be available in hardback only. Titles include:

1. Living with Tourism

Negotiating identities in a Turkish village

Hazel Tucker

2. Tourism, Diasporas and Space

Tim Coles and Dallen J. Timothy

Tourism, Diasporas and Space

Edited by
Tim Coles and Dallen J. Timothy

First published 2004

by Routledge

11 New Fetter Lane, London EC4P 4EE

Simultaneously published in the USA and Canada

by Routledge

29 West 35th Street, New York, NY 10001

Routledge is an imprint of the Taylor & Francis Group

This edition published in the Taylor & Francis e-Library, 2004.

© 2004 Selection and editorial matter, Tim Coles, Dallen J. Timothy;
individual chapters, the authors.

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reprinted or reproduced
or utilised in any form or by any electronic, mechanical, or other means, now
known or hereafter invented, including photocopying and recording, or in any
information storage or retrieval system, without permission in writing from the
publishers.

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

Library of Congress Cataloguing in Publication Data

Coles, Tim Edward, 1970–

Tourism, diasporas and space / Tim Edward Coles.

p. cm.—(Contemporary geographies of leisure, tourism, and mobility; 6)

Includes bibliographical references (p.).

ISBN 0–415–31124–1 (hardback: alk. paper)

1. Tourism—Social aspects. 2. Travelers—Attitudes. 3. Ethnicity.

4. Identity (Psychology) 5. Emigration and immigration. I. Title.

II. Series: Routledge/contemporary geographies of leisure, tourism,
and mobility; 6

G155.A1C5128 2004

306.4'8—dc22

2003023380

ISBN 0-203-45838-9 Master e-book ISBN

ISBN 0-203-33730-1 (Adobe eReader Format)

ISBN 0–415–31124–1 (Print Edition)

Contents

<i>List of illustrations</i>	vii
<i>List of contributors</i>	ix
<i>Preface</i>	xi
<i>Acknowledgements</i>	xiii
1 'My field is the world': conceptualizing diasporas, travel and tourism	1
TIM COLES AND DALLEN J. TIMOTHY	
PART I	
Diasporic experiences of tourism	31
2 Tourism and third space populations: the restless motion of diaspora peoples	33
KEITH HOLLINSHEAD	
3 Conceptualizing return visits: a transnational perspective	50
DAVID TIMOTHY DUVAL	
4 Tourism, racism and the UK Afro-Caribbean diaspora	62
MARCUS L. STEPHENSON	
5 Linking diasporas and tourism: transnational mobilities of Pacific Islanders resident in New Zealand	78
C. MICHAEL HALL AND DAVID TIMOTHY DUVAL	
6 Jewish past as a 'foreign country': the travel experiences of American Jews	95
DIMITRI IOANNIDES AND MARA COHEN IOANNIDES	
7 American children of the African diaspora: journeys to the motherland	111
DALLEN J. TIMOTHY AND VICTOR B. TEYE	
8 Preparation, simulation and the creation of community: Exodus and the case of diaspora education tourism	124
ERIK H. COHEN	

- 9 'To stand in the shoes of my ancestors': tourism and genealogy 139
KEVIN MEETHAN

PART II

Settings and spaces for diaspora tourism 151

- 10 The 'isle of home' is always on your mind: subjectivity and space
at Ellis Island Immigration Museum 153
JOANNE MADDERN
- 11 The culture of tourism in the diaspora: the case of the Vietnamese
community in Australia 172
THU-HUONG NGUYEN AND BRIAN KING
- 12 Mobilizing *Hrvatsko*: tourism and politics in the Croatian diaspora 188
SEAN CARTER
- 13 Sojourners, *guanxi* and clan associations: social capital and
overseas Chinese tourism to China 202
ALAN A. LEW AND ALAN WONG

PART III

Mobilizing diasporas for tourism 215

- 14 Diaspora, cultural capital and the production of tourism: lessons
from enticing Jewish-Americans to Germany 217
TIM COLES
- 15 *Mae'n Bryd I ddod Adref – It's Time to Come Home*: exploring
the contested emotional geographies of Wales 233
NIGEL MORGAN AND ANNETTE PRITCHARD
- 16 India and the ambivalences of diaspora tourism 246
KEVIN HANNAM
- 17 Reinventing Tulip Time: evolving diasporic Dutch heritage celebration
in Holland (Michigan) 261
DEBORAH CHE
- 18 Selling diaspora: producing and segmenting the Jewish diaspora
tourism market 279
NOGA COLLINS-KREINER AND DAN OLSEN
- 19 Tourism and diasporas: current issues and future opportunities 291
DALLEN J. TIMOTHY AND TIM COLES

Illustrations

Plates

10.1	The imposing façade of the Ellis Island Immigration Museum in New York harbour	158
10.2	The poignant display of replica immigrant baggage and luggage at the Ellis Island Immigration Museum	159
10.3	The ‘American Immigrant Wall of Honor’ in the grounds of the Ellis Island Immigration Museum	159
10.4	The ‘Millions on the Move. Worldwide Migration’ exhibit at the Ellis Island Immigration Museum	164
17.1	‘Street scrubbing’ as part of the People’s Parade at Tulip Time	267
17.2	When the Dutch met the Americans: <i>klompen</i> dancers pause for a moment in front of the bleachers and the assorted kiosks selling candy floss and fajitas	274

Figures

5.1	New Zealand and the South Pacific Islands	79
6.1	Jewish settlement in the USA before 1830	97
6.2	The Jewish population in the USA in 1930	99
6.3	The Jewish population in the USA in 1986	99
6.4	Major Jewish settlements in the USA in 1986	100
6.5	Jewish resorts in the twentieth century	104
11.1	The relationship between adapted culture and migrant travel behaviour	182
11.2	Migrant consumption model	183
12.1	The Republics of the Former Yugoslavia, 1991	190
12.2	Post-Dayton Croatia	192
13.1	A model of social capital building through tourism	210
17.1	The Dutch settlement (<i>Kolonie</i>) at Holland, Michigan	264
17.2	The location of casinos in Michigan	271
18.1	Niche markets within Jewish diaspora tourism	287

Boxes

1.1	Robin Cohen's nine common features of a diaspora	5
2.1	The Protean character of diasporic self-making: ten major insights from Paul Gilroy on contemporary inscriptions of diasporic identity	37
2.2	The emergent and ambivalent locations of culture: ten concepts based on Bhabha's ideas on cultural hybridity and ambiguity revealed in diasporic settings	43
2.3	Ten Bhabhan diasporic concerns and potential future research questions connected to diaspora tourism which they inspire	44
6.1	Selected sites of interest to Jewish travellers in New York City	107
8.1	Key moments in the voyage of <i>Exodus 1947</i>	126
8.2	Sample itinerary of Exodus Program experience	127
8.3	The use of different media to transmit social memories on the Exodus boat trip	134
14.1	The basic components of Germany and Israel tours offered in 2002	225

Tables

1.1	Judith Shuval's theoretical paradigm of diasporas	6
5.1	New Zealand Census counts in comparison with island population estimates	80
5.2	Tourist arrivals in South Pacific Tourism Organization countries, 1992–1999 (by island destination)	85
5.3	Tourist arrivals in South Pacific Tourism Organization countries, 1992–1999 (by source market)	86
5.4	Annual VFR arrival statistics for Samoa, 1991–1999	87
5.5	Visitor arrivals to the Cook Islands by country of residence, 1994–2000	89
5.6	Cook Islanders living overseas as visitor arrivals in the Cook Islands	90
5.7	Visitor arrivals to the Cook Islands, monthly market shares by country of residence, 1998–2000	91
10.1	Timeline of salient episodes and events in Ellis Island's history	156
11.1	Demographic characteristics of travellers and non-travellers	181
14.1	The commodification of towns and cities for Jewish-(German-) American travellers to Germany in context	226
17.1	Percentage of population claiming Dutch or Mexican ancestry in selected Michigan cities and their surrounding townships	272
18.1	Different types of Jewish tours available on the Internet and indicative URLs	283

Contributors

Sean Carter is Lecturer in Human Geography in the School of Geography, Archaeology and Earth Resources at the University of Exeter, UK.

Deborah Che is Assistant Professor at Western Michigan State University and the Chair of the Recreation, Tourism and Sport speciality group of the Association of American Geographers.

Erik H. Cohen is Lecturer in School of Education, Bar Ilan University, Israel, and the Scientific Director of a group of researchers and consultants at Jerusalem, Israel.

Mara Cohen Ioannides is a Lecturer in the English Department at Southwest Missouri State University, Springfield, Missouri, USA and sits on the Executive Board of the Midwest Jewish Studies Association.

Tim Coles is University Business Research Fellow and Lecturer in Human Geography in the School of Geography, Archaeology and Earth Resources at the University of Exeter, UK. He is also Honorary Secretary of the Geography of Leisure and Tourism Research Group of the Royal Geographical Society (with Institute of British Geographers).

Noga Collins-Kreiner is a Lecturer at the Department of Geography and Research Fellow at the Centre for Tourism, Pilgrimage and Recreation Research at the University of Haifa, Israel.

David Timothy Duval is a Lecturer in the Department of Tourism at the University of Otago, Dunedin, New Zealand.

C. Michael Hall is Professor and Head of Department, Department of Tourism, University of Otago, Dunedin, New Zealand and Honorary Professor, Department of Marketing, University of Stirling, Scotland.

Kevin Hannam is Principal Lecturer in Tourism in the School of Arts, Design, Media and Culture at the University of Sunderland, UK.

Keith Hollinshead is Professor of Public Culture in the Department of Tourism at the Luton Business School (University of Luton, UK).

Dimitri Ioannides is an Associate Professor of Planning in the Department of Geography, Geology and Planning at Southwest Missouri State University, Springfield, Missouri, USA and Senior Research Fellow at the Centre for Tourism and Regional Development, Bornholm, Denmark.

Brian King is Professor and Head of the School of Hospitality, Tourism and Marketing at Victoria University, Melbourne, Australia.

Alan A. Lew is Professor and Chair of the Department of Geography, Planning and Recreation at Northern Arizona University, USA.

Joanne Maddern is Lecturer in Human Geography at the Department of Geography at the University of Dundee, Scotland.

Kevin Meethan is Principal Lecturer in Sociology and Academic Director of the Social Research and Regeneration Unit at the University of Plymouth, UK.

Nigel Morgan is a Reader in Tourism Studies at the Welsh Centre for Tourism Research in The Welsh School of Tourism, Hospitality and Leisure Management, University of Wales Institute, Cardiff, UK.

Thu-Huong Nguyen is Lecturer in the School of Hospitality, Tourism and Marketing at Victoria University, Melbourne, Australia.

Dan Olsen is a PhD Candidate in the Department of Geography at the University of Waterloo, Canada.

Annette Pritchard is a Reader in Tourism Studies and Director of the Welsh Centre for Tourism Research in The Welsh School of Tourism, Hospitality and Leisure Management, University of Wales Institute, Cardiff, UK.

Marcus L. Stephenson is Senior Lecturer in the Sociology of Tourism and is the Director of Postgraduate Research in the Department of Business and Service Sector Management at London Metropolitan University, UK.

Victor B. Teye is Associate Professor in the Department of Recreation Management and Tourism at Arizona State University, Tempe, Arizona, USA.

Dallen J. Timothy is Associate Professor in the Department of Recreation Management and Tourism at Arizona State University, Tempe, Arizona, USA and Visiting Professor of Heritage Tourism at the University of Sunderland, England.

Alan Wong is a Lecturer in the School of Hotel and Tourism Management at Hong Kong Polytechnic University.

Preface

Rather fittingly, this book is the result of a transnational enterprise over the last two years. It is a celebration of the power of e-mail and the speed of telecommunications, of transgressing time zones and transcending geopolitical boundaries, and of an intricate multi-nodal social network with hubs in south-west England and in the south-western corner of the USA. It is the endpoint of a long and often arduous journey for both of us. It started with the realisation that tourism and diaspora are two prolific subjects of contemporary inter-disciplinary academic enquiry. In no small measure, their popularity as objects of their respective academic gazes stems from their position as defining features and conditions of the fin-de-millennium condition. Tourism, leisure and culture have become increasingly implicated within, reflections of, and transformed by, the restructuring of contemporary society and economy. Diasporas have rightfully been described as exemplars of transnationalism and the contribution of globalisation to the conduct of diasporic communities has been duly acknowledged. Somewhat surprisingly, among the burgeoning corpuses of attendant work, the establishment of explicit conceptual and theoretical linkages between the two themes appeared elusive. Although scholars of diaspora espoused the importance of routes and roots in the mediation of diaspora and diasporic identities, paradoxically they appeared reticent to explore the fuller implications of tourism for diaspora and vice versa. Equally taciturn were those in tourism studies who, by and large, overlooked diasporas as 'travelling cultures' in every sense of the term.

Or, so it seemed at the time. Since the start of this project we have uncovered reassuringly insightful, yet relatively fledgling interest in diaspora among tourism research workers. Like the concept itself, contributions on diaspora and tourism have been widely scattered among the literature, often to be found in the most unexpected and far-flung locations, and frequently taking unexpected, hybridized forms by lending theory, concept and method from a number of sources and inspirations. Diaspora is a topic area with which tourism academics have engaged, but one which has for the most part been bypassed and sidelined in the interests of other allegedly more relevant and critical debates. In producing this collection we contend that diasporas should occupy a more privileged position in tourism discourse. Diasporas are major communities and they challenge the hegemonic position of the nation-state in global society through their cross-border relations and mobilities, articulated not least through travel and tourism. A much deeper understanding of diasporic travel and tourism is clearly key towards a fuller understanding of mobilities in contemporary global society. Diasporas are also emblematic of the need to deploy new conceptual toolkits and fluid, reflexive

approaches through which deeper, more relevant readings of modern-day social motivations for travel and tourism may be constructed.

With this volume we hope to achieve two important goals: first, to raise the profile of diasporas in tourism studies, and thereby to point to their pivotal importance in establishing richer conceptual linkages between tourism and mobility; and second, to provide a platform from which to induce further critical research on tourism and diasporas. The approach we adopt is an inter-disciplinary one. Our contributors are from a diverse array of backgrounds. As befits tourism studies more widely, among the authors are those with backgrounds in history, geography, sociology and anthropology as well as tourism. The essays presented here represent a synthesis of the major developments in current research on diaspora tourism. As one of the contributors queries: is tourism studies ready to embrace the challenges of investigating diasporas? The answer may be that tourism research has already embarked on its journey of diasporic discovery and enlightenment. However, it is not a case of 'the more we know, the less we understand', rather 'the more we know, the more we appear to have to learn'.

Tim Coles, Exeter, UK
Dallen J. Timothy, Gilbert, Arizona, USA
October 2003

Acknowledgements

Inevitably with a book of this size and scope, production has been a major task. We would like to thank Andrew Mould (Commissioning Editor at Routledge) and Michael Hall (Series Editor) for their interest and enthusiasm in this project from a very early stage. Melanie Attridge at Routledge kept us on an even keel during the editorial process. We should like to thank the support staff in the Department of Geography at the University of Exeter for their excellent contribution to the manuscript. Cathy Aggett heroically fought her way through the text and diligently worked to make sense of our annotations to produce a crisp manuscript. Helen Jones turned our doodles into the excellent maps, diagrams and figures in this volume. Andrew Teed produced the photographic plates to his usual immaculate standards.

Several contributors to this volume desire to acknowledge people who have influenced their work and lives. Keith Hollinshead acknowledges the diligent word processing and punctilious proofing services of Janet H. (and the budding Ian David H.) in the compilation of his chapter. ‘Thank you. The Desborough Two, indeed’. David Duval wishes to thank Paul Wilkinson, Bill Found, Bonnie Kettel, Ray Rogers, David Trotman, David Telfer, Nick Kontogeorgopoulos and Victor Teye for comments on the arguments presented in his chapter. Thanks are also due to Mike Hall and Loretta Baldassar for useful discussions on migration and tourism and to Dave Palmer for comments on an earlier version of his chapter. For their joint chapter, Mike Hall and David Duval wish to recognize Colin Smithies, Department of Economics, University of Otago, for his insight into the economic history of New Zealand, particularly as it affected international migrants from the Pacific Islands and Mel Elliot of the Department of Tourism for her assistance with drafting some of the tables in their chapter. Dallen Timothy and Victor Teye would like to express their gratitude to the College of Public Programs, Arizona State University, for partial funding for the research upon which their chapter is based and to the people of the Cape Coast and Elmina Castle who made their work possible. Erik H. Cohen sends his thanks and best regards to Feuershtein Hadas, Educational Director of the Exodus Project; Danny Levine, Senior Educational Consultant of the Exodus Project; Doubi Szwarc, Director of the UK groups; Dany More, Director of the Israel Experience programmes; Jean-Charles Zerbib (FSJU) and Reuven Naamat (Youth and Hechalutz Department), Co-directors of the France groups; and Eva Labi (Regional Director, FSJU), who agreed to be interviewed at length. Thanks also go to Allison Ofanansky, who helped Erik Cohen organize and edit his chapter. Alan Lew and Alan Wong wish to recognize funding for their study by the School of Hotel and Tourism Management of the Hong

Kong Polytechnic University and Northern Arizona University. A previous version of Tim Coles' chapter was presented as a paper at the Annual Conference of the Association of American Geographers in Los Angeles (March 2002) and at the Tourism Society's *Family History Tourism* meeting in Dorchester, UK (November 2002). Participants at both venues provided helpful and constructive feedback, as did David Duval, Gareth Shaw and his co-editor, Dallen Timothy. Tim recognizes Brian Hay of *VisitScotland* for very kindly making available strategy and policy documentation on genealogical tourism. Finally, Deborah Che wishes to thank Tim Coles and Dallen Timothy for their constructive comments on an earlier draft of her chapter; Margaret Pearce for her cartographic assistance in drafting the early versions of the figures; and the Joint Archives of Holland, Michigan, for their kind assistance with her research program. Thanks to all.

1 'My field is the world'

Conceptualizing diasporas, travel and tourism

Tim Coles and Dallen J. Timothy

Tourism, migration and mobility: a missing piece of the jigsaw?

The quotation in the title is inspired by a photograph in Alan Kraut's (1982: 112) monograph *The Huddled Masses: The Immigrant in American Society, 1880–1921*. Dated circa 1900, the photograph depicts a scene in the departure hall of a German steamship company. Written in German and painted on the wall in bold Latin typeface for all to see, emigrants were offered this thought to reflect upon as they queued to secure passage on a Hamburg–Amerika steamer. In many respects, it encapsulates the themes and issues addressed by this book as well as the situation confronting the future *émigré* just prior to departure: the world of opportunities for travel and migration; the widespread reach and development of communications systems; spatially-extended communities linked by complex social networks articulated through major global nodes; for better or worse, new migrants' experiences along the way and wherever they may finally settle; the possibility of return; and, finally, the unfolding impact of each of these (and other) aspects on the migrants' identities as their journeys are recalled, appraised and acted upon.

Over a century has elapsed since the photograph was taken. Time and space have compressed; communications have become more straightforward, rapid and efficient not least through the Internet; and more extensive, intricate transnational social networks have emerged. As Urry (2000: 154) observes, 'most societies are not nations, let alone nation-states'. Instead, the world is now characterized by the proliferation of 'nation peoples'. These groups are defined by varying kinds and degrees of displacement and ambiguous location and, according to Urry, many may be regarded as diasporic. According to Mitchell (1997a: 534), 'diaspora' has been used by most scholars in a working sense to describe 'the situation of a people living outside of their traditional homeland'. Barber's (2001: 178) equally brief definition views diasporas as 'communities that define themselves by reference to a distant homeland from which they once originated'.

The aim of this book is to explore the contemporary connections and relationships between diasporas and tourism. It focuses on diaspora tourism, or tourism primarily produced, consumed and experienced by diasporic communities. Here, the intention is to concentrate on the relationship between the diasporic condition and the production and consumption of tourism for diasporas themselves rather than diasporas as exotic Others to be gazed upon (Urry 1990). In particular, we focus on three sets of themes

that are beginning to emerge in tourism studies of diaspora: namely, diaspora experiences of tourism; the spaces occupied by diaspora tourists; and the production of tourism for and by diasporic communities. The book attempts to bridge the disciplinary divide between diaspora and tourism. According to Edward Bruner (1996: 290), ‘the literature on diaspora and hybridity has on the whole neglected tourism, perhaps because tourist visits are thought to be temporary and superficial’. In his view this is a regrettable position because,

travellers such as migrants, refugees, exiles, expatriates, émigrés, explorers, traders, missionaries and even ethnographers may also travel for limited periods of time. To develop travelling theory, we need to know more about all patterns of travel (Clifford 1989), including tourism (Bruner and Kirshenblatt-Gimblett 1994).

(Bruner 1996: 290)

Irrespective of whether metaphors such as ‘travel’ and ‘journeys’ (cf. Clifford 1997) are deployed to unravel diasporic identities, diaspora studies has by and large bypassed tourism as a consideration in the mediation and sustainability of diasporic communities. While Bruner’s criticism places much of the blame for the estrangement squarely at the door of diaspora studies, tourism studies is equally culpable of having overlooked diasporas. To date, there has been just tacit recognition of the relevance of diasporic communities. This is notwithstanding their relevance as a key type of community and hence a basic constituency to be acknowledged in contemporary tourism management (Richards and Hall 2000: 2–3). Equally axiomatic has been the treatment of the distinctive cultural capital diasporas offer for commodification in place imagery and destination marketing (van Hear 1998; Richards and Hall 2000; Klemm 2002) and the role played by some diasporic migrants in servicing the tourism and hospitality sectors in cities as reserves of relatively low cost, non-militant, often unskilled labour (Eade 2000; Williams and Hall 2000a,b; Church and Frost 2004).

This schism is reflective of a similar separation between tourism and migration. Although both talk to the same basic theme of mobility, as Williams and Hall (2000a,b) contend, tourism and migration as subject areas have been uneasy companions until recently. Put more emphatically, they argue that,

the largely discrete literatures on tourism and migration have, at best, served to mark out the core areas of their research concerns. The failure to conceptualize adequately and define their fields of enquiry has . . . [led to] very few attempts to disentangle the changing relationships between tourism and migration . . . [which represent] an increasingly important component of the new forms of mobility.

(Williams and Hall 2000b: 7)

According to Feng and Page (2000: 247), one of the reasons for the ring-fencing was that population geography and migration research were not valorized as key issues within the dominant tourism research agenda (cf. Hall and Page 1999; Shaw and Williams 2002, 2003). While more mundane, functional definitions conceptualized tourism as temporary or short-term migration away from home (Cooper *et al.* 1998; Hall and Page 1999; Shaw and Williams, 2002), paradoxically there was an unwillingness

to engage in a more sustained, theoretical debate to explore the increasingly mutually implicated natures of tourism and migration in the late twentieth century. In this context, scattered populations of migrants were relegated primarily as the subjects for ethnic tourism and as travellers likely to undertake religious and secular pilgrimages practically as socio-cultural rites of passage (Shair and Karan 1979; Hudman and Jackson 1992; Park 1994; Vukonić 1996; Hall 2002; Jutla 2002; Olsen and Timothy 2002). Tourism was primarily portrayed as a lens through which visitors could gaze on exotic Other ethnic communities and indigenous groups (Urry 1990; MacCannell 1992; King 1994). Critical debates attended such issues as the authenticity and alleged perversion of local cultures in the face of pressure from tourists (Adams 1997; Wood 1998) and the ethnic politics of tourism development (Pitchford 1995; van der Berghe 1995; Callahan 1998; Jamison 1999; Wall 1999).

Détente has characterized the more recent relationship between tourism and migration. Of late, two collections in particular, have explored the interactions between tourism and migration at the turn of the twenty-first century (Williams and Hall 2000a; Hall and Williams 2002). One of their central messages is that globalization has stimulated new forms of travel, tourism and migration whose production and consumption are intricately bound together (Williams and Hall 2000b; Oigenblick and Kirschenbaum 2002). In one sense, they concur with Franklin and Crang's (2001: 11) clarion call that '... tourism should search for links with other mobilities such as commuting, mobile labour markets, migration and Diasporas [sic]'. Notwithstanding, we would contend that, among these groups, diasporas have not been afforded the consideration that their status in contemporary transnational, global society would merit. Rather, they have been marginalized in recent discourses on tourism and mobility in favour of such themes as second-home ownership and retirement migrations (Williams *et al.* 1997; Tomljenovic and Faulkner 2000). The contributions presented in this book attempt to energize greater discussion about, and debate over, the connectivities between diasporas and tourism. Diasporas are complex entities. Almost inevitably, it is impossible here to review in any great detail the full intricacies and nuances of the discourses on diaspora. In what remains, we attempt to contextualize the subsequent chapters by offering an introduction to diasporas and their linkages with tourism consumption and production.

Towards conceptualization of diaspora

Diaspora is a word with long and rich historical lineage. For Helmreich (1992: 245), the etymology of word 'diaspora' may be traced back to the Greek word for 'dispersion' from the words for 'through' and 'sow or scatter' and originates in the Greek translation of the 'Book of Deuteronomy' in the Bible. Braziel and Mannur (2003) note that through its religious significance, the term was pervasive in medieval rabbinical writings about the Jewish diaspora and the predicament of Jews living outside Palestine.

Definitions and conceptualizations of diaspora are fluid and contested and have been the focus of considerable debate. Diasporas are groups of people scattered across the world but drawn together as a community by their actual (and in some cases perceived or imagined) common bonds of ethnicity, culture, religion, national identity and, sometimes, race. 'Diaspora suggests a dislocation from the nation-state or geographical

location origin and a relocation in one or more nation-states, territories, or countries' (Brazieli and Mannur 2003: 1). Several writers note the importance of the original point of dispersal, the 'homeland', as occupying a focal point in the mediation of diasporic identity (Safran 1991). For instance, Sheffer (1986: 3) regards modern diasporas as 'ethnic minority groups of migrant origins residing and acting in host countries but maintaining strong sentimental and material links with their countries of origin – their homelands'. Although diasporic communities vary greatly, Cohen (1997: ix) contends that, irrespective of their historical trajectories and experiences, all 'acknowledge that the "old country" – a notion buried deep in language, religion, custom or folklore – always has some claim on their loyalty and emotions'. Moreover, 'a member's adherence to a diasporic community is demonstrated by an acceptance of an inescapable link with their past migration history and a sense of co-ethnicity with others of a similar background'. James Clifford (1994, 1997), in contrast, warns of the problems of over-emphasizing origin and return. He draws attention to the extent of scattering; the lateral reach and complexity of intra-diasporic networks; and the geopolitical juxtapositions of diasporas. For him,

diasporas usually presuppose longer distances and a separation more like exile: a constitutive taboo on return, or its postponement to a remote future. Diasporas also connect multiple communities of a dispersed population. Systematic border crossings may be a part of this interconnection, but multilocal diaspora cultures are not necessarily defined by a specific geopolitical boundary.

(Clifford 1997: 246)

Diasporic processes and communities are not always the outcomes of voluntary actions. Robin Cohen (1997: ix) acknowledges that 'when applied to humans, the ancient Greeks thought of diaspora as migration and colonization' but for several groups – Jews, Palestinians and Armenians notable among them – diaspora has had much more sinister historical connotations, signifying as it does a sense of group identity resulting from collective trauma, banishment and exile. Paul Gilroy (1993) underscores the horror and cruelty of slavery in mediating the black Atlantic diaspora (see also Bruner 1996). Cohen (1997: 27) points to the origins of the Armenian diaspora in trade and commerce, only for brutal treatment at the hands of the Turks to lead to their forced displacement from 1915 to 1916. A similar scenario, he contends, was played out by the Irish at the hands of the British as migration followed the famine of 1845 to 1852.

Based on comparative readings of diaspora histories, several authors have attempted to define diaspora not by any single meta-statement, but rather based on a series of common characteristics and principal components (Safran 1991; Cohen 1997; Shuval 2000). Safran (1991: 83–4) postulated six attributes that captured the essence of diasporic communities. Not entirely satisfied with what he terms 'Safran's desiderata', Cohen (1997: 23) argued that there was too great an emphasis on the relationship between the diaspora and its homeland. Instead, he reworked the schematic principally to orientate it more towards the condition of the diaspora beyond the homeland; that is, in terms of scattering for aggressive or voluntarist reasons, the positive virtues of retaining a diasporic identity while abroad and the power of collective identity expressed not just with the homeland but also in the place of settlement and with

Box 1.1 Robin Cohen's nine common features of a diaspora

- 1 Dispersal from an original homeland, often traumatically, to two or more foreign regions
- 2 Alternatively, the expansion from a homeland in search of work, pursuit of trade or to further colonial ambitions
- 3 A collective memory and myth about the homeland, including its location, history and achievements
- 4 An idealization of the putative ancestral home and a collective commitment to its maintenance, restoration, safety and prosperity, even to its creation
- 5 The development of a return movement that gains collective approbation
- 6 A strong ethnic group consciousness sustained over a long time and based on a sense of distinctiveness, a common history and belief in a common fate
- 7 A troubled relationship with host societies, suggesting a lack of acceptance at the least or the possibility that another calamity might befall the group
- 8 A sense of empathy and solidarity with co-ethnic members in other countries of settlement
- 9 The possibility of a distinctive creative, enriching life in host countries with a tolerance for pluralism.

Source: adapted from Cohen (1997: 26).

co-ethnic members in other countries. The result was a definitional scheme for diaspora based on nine common characteristics (Box 1.1).

This diagnostic is an idealized one and one which has been compiled by reference to several diasporas. As the listing is a composite, Cohen recognizes that not all the characteristics have to be evident in every contemporary diasporic grouping. Similarly, the exact assemblages and strengths of the characteristics will vary among different sub-groups and intra-diasporic constituencies. A similar logic is asserted by Judith Shuval (2000) with her definitional schematic (Table 1.1). Responding to a concern that diaspora 'encompasses a motley array of groups such as political refugees, alien residents, guest workers, immigrants expellees, ethnic and racial minorities and overseas communities' (Shuval 2000: 41), she proposes a general framework, the attributes of which are intended to allow robust and structured comparison between different types of diasporas. For her, diasporas may also be defined more clearly by reference to the characteristics of, and within, host society and its disposition(s) towards diaspora groups.

Beyond checklist approaches, Cohen (1997) proposes a five-fold typology of diasporas based on commonalities of experiences and the structural processes mediating diaspora. Victim Diasporas such as the Jews, the African diaspora, the Armenians and the Palestinians are typified by their forced and traumatic displacement from a territory, not least resulting from (nation-)state formation or denial. In contrast, Cohen (1997: 57) argues that Labour Diasporas, as exemplified by the Indians under British Rule, arise from scattering in pursuit of work. He notes, however, that not all groups who migrate internationally need necessarily be described as diasporas. The British are regarded as the quintessence of Imperial Diasporas. Like the Spanish, Portuguese, Belgians, French and Germans, the British scattered to further their colonial

Table 1.1 Judith Shuval's theoretical paradigm of diasporas

<i>I. Characteristics of the diaspora group</i>	<i>II. Characteristics of homeland</i>	<i>III. Characteristics of host</i>
a. Chronology of group	a. Level of reality	a. Structural features
b. Causes of dispersion toward ethnic groups	b. Legitimacy	b. Cultural-ideological stance
c. Differentiation (to sub-groups?)	c. Attitude of residents and government in homeland to diaspora and returnees	c. Behaviour of government and sub-groups toward ethnic groups
d. Retention of ethnic culture	d. Behaviour to returnees	d. Relevance of homeland to host government and sub-groups in host society
e. Location, links and relations among members	e. Behaviour of returnees	
f. Quality of relations among members		
g. Attitudes and feelings to homeland		

Source: abridged from Shuval (2000: 50).

ambitions. Similarly, Trade Diasporas refer to extended networks of merchants, traders and entrepreneurs who carry out their business by buying, selling, trading and marketing their goods and services over long distances. These are exemplified by the reach of Chinese traders in southern and east Asia and Lebanese merchants in West Africa and the Americas. Finally, Cohen (1997: 127) proposes Cultural Diasporas as an attempt to address the postmodernists' fascination with the 'collective identity of homeland and nation [which] is a vibrant and constantly changing set of cultural interactions that fundamentally question the very ideas of "home" and "host"'. For Hague (2001: 145), a cultural diaspora exists where connections between people are not so much based on shared historical experiences or movement to return home, but rather they are grounded in the belief of common ethnic and cultural origins. Although Urry (2000: 155) asserts that all diasporas are by definition in part inherently cultural, in a strong echo of Gilroy's (1993) ideas and Bhabha's (1994) postulates (see also Ch. 2), Cohen (1997) explores the way in which Caribbean peoples are cemented as much by literature, political ideas, religious convictions and life-styles as permanent migration under conditions of postcolonialism. While it may be tempting to pigeon-hole each diaspora into one of these groupings, it is clear that the boundaries between the individual groupings are somewhat blurred. Equally, it is possible for an individual diaspora to have dual or multiple presence in more than one of the groupings. For instance, indentured Indian labour, which may reasonably be typical of a Labour Diaspora may in fact in certain instances also be categorized under the heading Victim Diaspora.

The diasporic condition and the 'hype of hybridity'

According to Shuval (2000: 43), in essence, the critical components of such definitions are a history of dispersal, myths and memories of the homeland, alienation in the host country, desire for eventual return, ongoing support of the homeland and a collective identity defined by these relationships.

For many commentators, however, such apparently rigid approaches towards definition are unacceptable, perhaps even quasi-imperialist taxonomical exercises,

reducing as they do a concept of inherent complexity and fluidity to a series of distinct, discrete and stiff criteria (cf. Bhabha 1994; Hall 1990, 1996; Hollinshead 1998; Braziel and Mannur 2003). For Mitchell (1997a,b), one of the alluring reasons for the study of diaspora is that it challenges prior orthodox narratives of fixity and mobility. The propensity in earlier discourse was to reduce the world to a series of banal binary oppositions (Soja 1996). Diasporas, as metaphors for social and cultural analysis at large and as entities in themselves, suggest that instead of strict, sclerotic, bi-partite divisions, more effective modes of explanation are plurality, compromise and negotiation (cf. Anthias 2001). In short, as Lisa Lowe (1991) emphasizes, diasporic communities are notable for their hybridity, heterogeneity and multiplicity and, lending from Stuart Hall, she asserts that diasporic identity is a matter of 'becoming' and 'being'. Simply put, diaspora identity is creolized or hybridized (Featherstone 1995; Friedmann 1999; Nurse 1999); it is shaped by a melange of influences and constraints – cultural, social, political, economic – mediated through articulated through such themes as ancestral inheritance, the process of migration, the experience in the host space and further subsequent influences from the homeland to the remote diasporic communities (Mitchell 1997; Urry 2000).

Thus, through their roots and their routes, diaspora identities are multi-faceted and composed of complexly inter-woven strands of ethnicity, religion and ancestry. Diasporic communities have specific geographies and histories, they have multiple loyalties, they move between regions, do not occupy a single cultural space and, perhaps most importantly, operate exterior to state boundaries and their cultural effects (Mitchell 1997a). Interstitial positions are occupied by diasporas for whom there is a growing sense of their location in-between different cultures (Mirzoeff 2000: 2) which, in the case of these 'halfway populations' (Hollinshead 1998; see Ch. 2), may often be expressed by feelings of unease, ambiguity and ambivalence. More rigid forms of definition simply favour particular diasporic groups which in turn become the preferred objects of the academic gaze (Cohen 1997; Braziel and Mannur 2003). Readings grounded in fixed notions of home, identity and exile are also accompanied by the propensity to,

privilege the geographical, political, cultural and subjective spaces of home-nation as an authentic space of belonging and civic participation, while devaluing and bastardizing the states of displacement and dislocation, rendering them inauthentic places of residence.

(Braziel and Mannur 2003: 6)

Earlier interpretations are further compromised insofar as some groups such as Haitian, Cuban, Vietnamese and Khmer refugees may wish to bury deeply in their sub-conscious their troubled memories and recollections of the complex reasons and turbulent times that precipitated their departure from the home country. In this instance, looking back nostalgically may not be a primary action or defining feature of diaspora. Other complex histories may similarly frustrate definitional approaches based on the dualism of host country and homeland mediated by flow. For instance, Falzon (2003: 662) documents how Hindu-Sindhis left Sind in newly created Pakistan in 1947 and settled in Bombay in India. Today, Bombay, not Sind, functions as, what he terms, the 'cultural heart' of the diaspora, 'the node that connects and organizes translocality'. Thus, as

Brazier and Mannur (2003: 19) suggest, many members of diasporic communities ‘may not know where *home is in order to stay there*’ (emphasis in original). They draw on the work of Caren Kaplan (1996: 7) who concluded that,

For many of us there is no possibility of staying at home in the conventional sense – that is, the world has changed to the point that those domestic, national or marked spaces no longer exist.

(Quoted in Brazier and Mannur 2003: 19)

Instead, alternative conceptualizations have been proposed which attempt to embrace the complexity and plurality of diaspora. Brazier and Mannur (2003: 4) argue that ‘once conceptualized as an exilic or nostalgic dislocation, diaspora has attained new epistemological, political and identitarian resonances as its points of reference proliferate’. For instance, Brah (1996: 180) argues that diasporas should be understood as ‘historically contingent genealogies in the Foucauldian sense’. By exploring the historical trajectories of diaspora, she provides a critique of the fixed origins thesis such that a ‘homing desire’ may be identified, but this is entirely different to a desire for a ‘homeland’ (see also Falzon 2003). The distinction is crucial because it alerts us to the fact that not all diasporas are motivated to return. In this respect, the metaphor of the rhizome may be usefully deployed in so far as diasporas may be perceived as rootless (sometimes even schizophrenic). Pnina Werbner (2002: 119) describes diasporas as ‘*chaorders*, chaotic orders, which are inscribed both materially and imaginatively in space, time and objectifying practices’. From dislocated positions in their multi-nodal networks, although organizationally chaotic, diasporas are notable for their shared sense of co-responsibility, in particular as articulated in material gestures across space and in the struggle for enhanced citizenship rights for themselves and fellow diaspora members elsewhere.

Diasporas, citizenship and transnationalism

The term ‘hyphenated community’ as an alternative to diasporic community has resulted from the semantic coupling of the homeland and the host state. For example, people originally of Irish origin who have settled and lived in the USA are referred to as ‘Irish-Americans’, persons of Asian descent in the UK are often described as ‘British-Asians’ and Russians with German ancestry from Volgaland who subsequently migrated to the USA are German-Russian-Americans.

Hyphenation in this manner presents commentators with a series of analytical opportunities as well as potential pitfalls. As Soja’s work (1996) intimates, it is effectively the hyphen in ‘hyphenated community’ that is a crucial first step towards understanding diasporic identity. This is because it implies the resolution of the contemporary act of ‘being’ with the historical process of ‘becoming’. Effectively, the hyphen demarcates the diasporic community as a distinct social group in the host state while simultaneously distinguishing it from other similar groups scattered in the diaspora but originating from the same homeland. Thus, although professing a common bond to the homeland as well as accepting some common historical antecedents, Scottish-Americans, Scottish-Canadians, Scottish-New Zealanders and Scottish-South Africans will, for this reason, inevitably have similar, yet contrasting identities, shaped,

as they have been and will continue to be, by the alternative narratives and stimuli in the receiving countries.

The hyphen emphasizes that diaspora is a byword for compromise, negotiation and differentiation, even instability and metamorphosis. Unfortunately, for some critics, 'diaspora' and associated hyphenations have been indiscriminately used in under-theorized and even untheorized ways (Cohen 1997; Braziel and Mannur 2003). Here, the hyphenated designation may obscure plurality rather than expose it fully. For instance, labels such as 'African-American', 'Asian-American' and 'British-Asian', or descriptors such as 'the African diaspora' or the 'Black Atlantic diaspora' may be used (too) casually, almost for convenience's sake, to distinguish particular groups without full forethought of the implications. 'Catch-all' terms of this manner mask important differences within wider diasporic communities as well as obscuring the particularities and complexities of trajectories and episodes of past identity formation. Lowe (1991) and Radhakrishnan (2003) depict important internal fissures inside groups described broadly as 'Asian-Americans' and 'Indian-Americans', while Paul Gilroy (1993) warns against essentializing narratives of the 'African diaspora' by arguing that important cleavages exist within this 'group' in terms of social, cultural, economic lineaments. As such, Braziel and Mannur (2003: 3) warn that 'theorization of diaspora should not be divorced from historical and cultural specificity'. Stuart Hall's (1990) reading of cultural identity and diaspora extends this logic. He reads the Caribbean as triply traversed by a *Présence Africaine*, *Présence Européenne* and *Présence Américaine*, (as well as several other cultural presences such as the Indian, Chinese and Lebanese among others) that over time both mediate and position, as well as re-negotiate and relocate, Caribbean identities. In this respect, it is useful to reflect that diasporas do not exist in 'splendid isolation', practically hermetically sealed away from other diasporic communities and groups in host society. Abstractions that deal with dual host and homeland may overlook that multiple diasporic landscapes may be superimposed on one another in space. Instead of singularity and exclusivity of spatial occupation, diasporic populations exist side-by-side in many countries, cities and neighbourhoods.

In its favour, Hague (2001: 145) observes that the hyphenation highlights the crucial duality of ethnicity and citizenship which is imbued in each diasporic community. Hague argues that it is significant that ethnic identity (usually) precedes citizenship in the hyphenated construction. Ethnicity is especially important in fashioning self-identity, but the coupling of ethnic self-identification with a citizenship affiliation mediates a much stronger identity. However, we would contend that, although not without merit, such a view downplays the significance of citizenship in diasporic identity forming. Citizenship may precipitate further troubling dilemmas that add to the feelings of destabilization, uncertainty and ambiguity that so characterize the diasporic condition. By provoking the issue of affiliation (to a state or states), diasporas are forced to confront their roots and routes and how these mediate sense(s) of belonging. The most obvious and immediate dilemma is, as Scheffer (1995: 13) recognizes, where to take citizenship. Scheffer's view is that ideally homeland governments would prefer migrants to retain their original citizenship, with only temporary status when away and regular contacts with home. Should they decide to settle away permanently, home governments would prefer the migrants to remain as 'incipient diasporas' because, as an interim stage, this does not preclude the possibility

of return; it presupposes reasonably strong contact with social, cultural and political institutions at home; political control over the diasporic communities is made much easier; and diasporic organizations are less likely to reflect the host country's interests.

As Clarence (1999: 202) reminds us, citizenship refers to more than membership of a particular state. Rather, 'citizenship is a status bestowed on those who are full members of a community. All who possess the status are equal with respect to the rights and duties with which this status is bestowed' (Marshall 1992: 18, cited in Marshall and Bottomore 1992). Thus, citizenship incorporates issues of participation and access as well as rights and obligations of the citizens themselves. As a basis for discussion, Clarence invokes Marshall's (1992) triadic conceptualization of civil (rights to secure individual freedom and justice), political (rights to participate in elections to institutions that exercise power) and social citizenship (rights to economic welfare, security, social heritage and socially acceptable way of life). Delanty (2000: 14) notes that Marshall's ideas, originally published in 1950, marked the shift from a previous market-based model of civil society to a state-based model, thereby reflecting a gradual confluence of liberalism with social democracy.

Criticized now as dated, Anglo-centric, lacking in universality, failing to address gendered and ethnic inequalities and underestimating the power of the state (Clarence 1999; Delanty 2000; Urry 2000; Pearson 2002; Murphy and Harty 2003), Marshall's ideas serve two purposes here: they allow us to confront the prior orthodoxy of 'entitlement' and its relationship to diaspora; and they introduce more recent, radical alternative conceptualizations of citizenship resulting from transnationalism. Although transnationalism is a highly contested concept (Hannerz 1996; Portes *et al.* 1999; Vertovec 1999; Delanty 2000; Faist 2000; Papastergiadis 2000; Kivisto 2001), the working definition adopted here is Braziel and Mannur's (2003: 8). For them, transnationalism is 'the flow of people, ideas, goods and capital across national territories in a way that undermines nationality and nationalism as discrete categories of identification, economic organization and political constitution'. They differentiate 'diaspora from transnationalism . . . in that diaspora refers specifically to the movement – forced or voluntary – of people from one or more nation-states to another. Transnationalism speaks to larger, more impersonal forces – specifically those of globalizations and global capitalism'. Faist (2000: 197) adds the caveat that 'diasporas tend to constitute a specific type of transnational community' and in his view they 'can only be called transnational communities, if the members also develop some significant social and symbolic ties to the receiving country', although these ties need not necessarily be concrete.

Thus, in a world characterized by dynamism, flows across borders and enhanced mobilities of goods, services, knowledges, risks, cultures and travellers, older constructs of citizenship are challenged by the 'exemplary communities of the transnational moment', diasporas (Tölölyan 1991: 4–5). As Cohen (1997: ix) observes, the old dogma that 'immigrants would identify with their adopted country in terms of political loyalty, culture and language can no longer be taken for granted'. In other words, a former, very static view, whereby to qualify for citizenship diasporic members as immigrants had to assimilate or integrate over a long period, has been largely superseded by alternatives such as ethnic pluralism and the border crossings of social spaces. This is notwithstanding the concession that assimilation may be a more powerful force for the second and subsequent generations (Portes 1999, cited in Kivisto

2001: 563). Instead, new forms of citizenship have emerged which reflect the erosion of the power of the state, the increasing importance of sub-state groups, such as diasporic communities, and their claims for the same political and democratic rights as majority (national) groups (Tambini 2001; Hindess 2002; Murphy and Harty 2003). Globalization and transnationalism have mediated a situation whereby states have been compelled to move 'into a realm of global citizenship where rights and duties and forms of participation and identity, operate in a "post" or "de" nationalized and borderless world of labour, capital and knowledge movements' (Pearson 2002: 991–2).

The implications for the relationship between diasporas and tourism are profoundly important. Levitt and de la Dehesa (2003) identify a more erudite approach on the part of homeland states to their relationships with their diasporas. Instead of a more suspicious, ambiguous and cynical relationship of the type articulated by Sheffer (1995), heightened globalization may forge stronger ties between migrants and their home states. Increasingly, states are willing to de-couple residence and citizenship. By effectively extending the state boundaries to incorporate those living overseas, states are prepared to allow migrants to participate in the national development process. As discussed later (Chs 12–16), tourism is a vital, but critically disregarded framework through which overseas citizens can exercise their rights to participate and by which they may be encouraged to do so by institutions at home. Thus, tourism represents a vital medium by which post-national and post-sovereign social relations may be resolved because it acts practically as a strong socio-cultural glue which bonds the home state with 'its' migrants. Moreover, as David Duval (2003; Ch. 3) argues, tourism is one major mechanism by which the de-territorialization of culture functions. Increasingly, as Papastergiadis (2000: 115) puts it, 'people now feel they belong to various communities despite the fact that they do not share a common territory with all other members'. In these 'pluri-local' or 'hetero-local' (Zelinsky 2001) social networks, people feel connected with one another across geopolitical boundaries and sometimes vast distances by imagined and/or tangible common bonds. Through the return visit, tourism becomes an embodiment of and facilitator for, these widespread social practices. Faist's (2000) thesis provides further support for such a valorization of tourism. He argues the terms 'transnational social spaces' and 'transnational communities' are often used practically synonymously. For him, a more nuanced view of international migration, in fact, reveals that there are three types of transnational social spaces: transnational kinship groups, transnational circuits and transnational communities. These are the outcomes of three primary mechanisms of integration that operate in transnationalism: reciprocity in small groups, exchange in circuits and solidarity in communities. Transnational social spaces, which may be occupied by diasporas, operate on different scales from families and kinship groups to circuits and networks of interest (perhaps in trade) and to collectives and communities (such as the diaspora *per se*). In each of these cases, tourism is a crucial structural framework through which the agencies of these three types of transnational social space function and are articulated. It provides a means of connecting people as the basis for reciprocity in kinship visits; it facilitates the performance of exchange in the development of trade circuits and networks; and it provides a platform for the mobilization of the collective where solidarity is the objective.

Ethnicity, diaspora and tourism

Without wishing to become embroiled in the intricacies of definition (Banton 2001), an operating definition of the concept of ethnicity may be the ‘process by which individuals allude to a sense of belonging to groups with similar socio-cultural traits and normative behaviour’ (Drury 1994, cited in Stephenson 2002: 379). From this perspective, Stephenson (2002) notes that ethnicity has become a frequently discussed component in tourist motivation. In an early paper, King (1994) identified two forms of ‘ethnic tourism’ in which ethnicity is a primary determinant. The first and perhaps more predictable form is evident in Smith’s (1978) and Graburn’s (1978) early work among others; namely, ethnic tourism is manufactured from a desire to seek out the cultural exoticism of other ethnic groups and societies (McIntosh and Goeldner 1990: 139–40). Exotic ‘others’ become the primary focus of the tourist gaze (Urry 1990; MacCannell 1992). For example, the cultures of indigenous peoples in Australia (Hollinshead 1996; Zeppel 1998; Moscardo and Pearce 1999), Canada (Li 2000) and New Zealand (Barnett 1997; Ryan 1997) have been heavily commodified (Butler and Hinch 1996). Ethnic tourism becomes a means by which another culture may be experienced and interpreted by outsiders. According to Li (2000), it is effectively an antidote to the rationalizing discourses of western white culture identified by Dean MacCannell (1992), albeit the strength of ethnicity as a motivation varies notably among visitors to ethnic attractions (Moscardo and Pearce 1999; Ryan and Huyton 2000a,b).

King’s (1994: 173–4) second and less frequent application of the term applies to travel movements whose primary motivation is ethnic reunion. He notes that,

[t]his travel could be motivated by a desire to delve into family histories through travel to the relevant country. It might or alternatively might not involve actually staying with family . . . and this type of ethnic tourism has tended to be regarded as virtually synonymous with the visiting friends and relatives or VFR traffic.

(King 1994: 174)

Here, he argues, the emphasis is not on contrast or on the exotic as in the first form. Rather, the search for similarity, belonging and group identification is a primary motivation. Esman (1984) noted that some ethnic groups use travel and tourism to the ‘home country’ to (re)assert, reaffirm and perform their heritage (cf. Timothy 2002a). Thanopoulos and Walle (1988) recorded that 30 per cent of Greek-Americans are potential travellers back to Greece, while in high summer 1989, 38 per cent of visitors to Poland were Polish-born (Ostrowski 1994). However, there are subtle, yet significant variations among ethnic tourists. Some may be motivated by familial piety and obligation as practically ethnic pilgrimages to ancestral homes (Cohen 1974), some may be motivated by temporary returns as expatriate migrant workers and others may even pave the way for remigration of members of the community (King and Gamage 1994; Nguyen and King 1998; Kang and Page 2000; Feng and Page 2000). Travel among and within ethnic groups is uneven depending on the structural framework of social, cultural and economic conditions in which an ethnic group is embedded (Stephenson and Hughes 1995).

Of course, this latter reading of ethnic tourism forms a starting point for much of the subsequent attention here to diasporas and tourism. Scattering of ethnic groups around the globe is an obvious precondition for this type of ethnic tourism. Thus, from Wood's (1998: 218) review essay, it is hardly a blinding revelation that the three principal conceptual strands that bind tourism with ethnicity, ethnic relations and ethnic identities are also applicable to diasporic groups: first, tourism becomes a form of ethnic relations (in this case between members of the diaspora and/or with members of other ethnic groups) (van der Berghe 1980, 1994); second, tourism plays a role in the development of touristic ethnic (i.e. diaspora) cultures, in which interaction with tourism becomes an integral part of the construction of ethnic (i.e. diaspora) identity; and third, through the de-differentiation of the tourist realm, touristic modes of visualization and experience become characteristics of the expression and consumption of ethnicity (see also Picard and Wood 1997).

Where diasporas differ from other ethnic groups and hence warrant more detailed consideration with respect to tourism, is in their distinct assemblages of characteristics and attributes, their temporal and spatial experiences, their contemporary geographical juxtapositions and their social and cultural constructs. We would contend that diasporas have been under-valorized in tourism discourse because the potency of the mutually implicated relationships between tourism and the dual conditions of 'being' and becoming' have yet to be fully recognized (cf. Ch. 2). As the next section identifies, on a more functional level particular patterns and processes of tourism consumption and production precipitate from the diasporic condition. However, travel and tourism have crucial roles to play reflexively in the processes of learning and self-discovery that define the fluid, constantly unfolding nature of diasporic identities (Hollinshead 1998). Tourism does not just represent a vehicle for straightforward, practically automatic voyages of self-discovery and identity affirmation. Visits to homelands or elsewhere into the diaspora may result in troubling, disconcerting and ambiguous experiences as well as new-found ambivalences (Stephenson 2002; Duval 2003). Tourism contributes to the construction of contemporary narratives of diasporic heritages which articulate to members of diasporas, as Lowe (1991) may put it, who they are and how they came to be.

Spaces and places of diaspora travel and tourism

Given the complexities and nuances of the relationship between tourism and diaspora, it is none the less three of the central, most frequently mentioned and widely accepted characteristics of diaspora that have immediate resonances for tourism enquiry: namely, the duality of the 'home' and the 'host' country in the consciousness of diaspora members; the myths, nostalgia, imagined and actual histories of the group and the home; and perhaps, most importantly, that identities, behaviour and cultures in diasporic communities 'abroad', although similar to the 'homeland' and elsewhere in the diaspora, are inevitably distinctive and contrasting due to the infusions and confluences borne of their interstitial existence. When teased apart further, these three facets either alone or in combination suggest that there are six distinctive patterns of travel and tourism associated with the spaces and places occupied and travelled through by diasporas. Each results in quite individual encounters and visitor experiences and

each has major consequences in terms of the production of tourism products and packages as well as place more widely.

First and perhaps most predictably, members of diasporic communities make trips in search of their roots and their routes with aims of reaffirming and reinforcing their identities. Most commonly, these are associated with trips back to their original homelands, but they may also include, as a second variant, trips to visit co-members of the extended community beyond the homeland. These trips, which often take the form of secular pilgrimages, are practised by diaspora members in the vain hope of discovering more about themselves, their ancestry, their heritage, their families and their extended communities. Stephenson (2002) describes how members of a UK Caribbean community travel to ancestral lands is mediated in no small measure by mothers' and grandmothers' encouragement to maintain links with their place of origin. Matriarchal as well as peer group networks contribute to the creation of particular place narratives and the generation of aspiration. Duval (2003) charts the return visits of Toronto's Eastern Caribbean communities. Their experiences revealed that visits were used as a means of retaining social histories as well as contextualizing social and cultural backgrounds after migration. Importantly, his study pointed to the ambivalences of experience encountered by some diaspora tourists which were sometimes compounded by their discomfort at their ambiguous reception in the homeland (cf. Stephenson 2002: 409). Bruner (1996) explores visits to Ghana by African-Americans and their meetings with local Akan-speaking Fanti at Elmina Castle, a major staging post in the mid-Atlantic slave trade (see also Ch. 7). Considerable differences are evident in the readings of slave castles between indigenous West Africans and African-Americans with the latter described as 'too emotional' by the former. This state of enhanced sentiment is ascribed by Bruner (1996: 293) to the 'almost mythic image of Africa as Eden. For black American men . . . a return to Africa is a return to manhood, to a land where they feel they belong, where they can protect their women and where they can reconnect with their ancestry'. Epstein and Kheimets (2001) focused on the concepts of dis- and re-connection with diasporic homelands in their study of the visits made by Russian Jews to Jerusalem in the post-Soviet era. They drew similar conclusions by identifying a 'double pilgrimage': in the first element, their trips comprise visits to King David's capital and the foundations of the original and ancient Jewish state; as part of the second they visit the roots of Christian civilization (Via Delorosa, the Garden of Gethsemane and the Holy Sepulchre). Greatest understanding of the tourists' roots was obtained from Yad VaShem, the 1953 Holocaust commemoration. The significance of the double pilgrimage is in its appeal to post-Soviet perceptions of self-identity which they read as the need to embrace the heritage of Grand Russian culture, an essentially Christian meta-narrative and the Jewish legacy, a feature which was denied by Soviet censorship.

The search for roots and routes has also manifested itself in the rise of so-called 'genealogical' (Nash 2002; Meethan 2002; Ch. 9), 'ancestral' (Fowler 2003) or 'family history' tourism. This form of travel may be both domestic and international depending on the family's routes and roots. Increasingly, visitors are travelling longer distances and over longer periods to retrace the footsteps and experiences of their ancestors. Genealogical tourism may comprise several components, some of which overlap with ethnic reunion tourism. Visiting friends and relatives in extended families and communities to reaffirm bonds of kinship may be accompanied by visits to poignant

sites in the personal heritages of individuals and communities. As Fowler (2003) points out, these are increasingly being supplemented by the visitor's search for documented evidence and tangible artefacts of a forebear's existence. More structured, targeted research trips to local libraries, archives and government offices for 'official documentation' are being built into private and commercially marketed trips. Once the domain of local history societies, in recent time 'family history' has become one of the most commonly practised recreational pursuits throughout the world with tourism joining the Internet as the means for an individual to develop a richer understanding of his or her personal heritage (Timothy 1997; Fowler 2003). As subsequent chapters demonstrate, those searching for their roots and routes represent potentially fruitful market segments in an increasingly competitive global (cultural) tourism market place (Liu *et al.* 1984; Thanopoulos and Walle 1988; Morgan *et al.* 2002).

The third pattern practically represents the first in reverse. Residents of the original 'homeland' may make a trip to diaspora spaces to discover how co-members of the diaspora, perhaps even their friends and relations, have adapted to life and conditions in another place. Although many of these visits may also be routine VFR exercises (Feng and Page 2000; Kang and Page 2000), many are centred on the consumption of experiences, events, spectacles and festivals in their particular manifestation beyond 'home' in the diaspora (see Ch. 17). For instance, weekend city packages to Boston, New York and Chicago to experience the St Patrick's Day parades, pageants and events are popular short break products in the Irish market. Similarly, Scottish-Americans celebrate 6 April as Tartan Day (Hague 2001) and the 'Juneteenth Celebrations' in the USA attract many African-American visitors commemorating, as they do, General Granger's proclamation in Galveston (Texas) on 19 June 1865 that all slaves were free (Janiskee 2002). In 2001 there were 285 Juneteenth celebrations in 46 states and most were held in Texas and California.

Spectacles like Juneteenth are not exclusive to, or possibly even dominated by, the consumption of diaspora tourists (see Zelinsky 2001). Thus, as Hoelscher's (1998) work on Swiss-Americans in New Glarus (Wisconsin) makes clear, in a variation of the above, diasporic communities also become the object of a wider tourist gaze. Diasporic destinations become notable attractions and features on 'mainstream', non-diaspora tourists' vacation itineraries; in effect, they come under a particular lens of 'ethnic tourism' to gaze on exotic Others. Local commodification of unique imagined and/or real diasporic heritage(s) may help produce local place distinctiveness in an increasingly competitive global market otherwise characterized by thematic replication and serial reproduction (Short and Kim 1999; Coles 2003). Either deliberately or unintentionally, the melange of cultural and ethnic influences in diasporic spaces produce distinctive place products and experiences which appeal to non-diasporic cultural (or ethnic) tourists. Ukrainian, Polish and Swedish neighbourhoods in Chicago warrant mention in most guidebooks (Given 2001), while the Polish Museum of America is second in the top 25 attractions in the city (Sinclair 2002). Patagonian tourism development has benefited greatly from the cultural capital imbued in the landscape by nineteenth-century Welsh migrants. In this part of southern Argentina, the peculiarities of afternoon tea, an annual Eisteddfod (festival) and the Welsh architectural style combined with more recent Argentinean cultural heritage have conspired to engender a vacationscape of great appeal to domestic visitors and the overseas Welsh (Schlüter 1999). In Neu Braunfels (Texas), German heritage is

privileged in order to differentiate the town in the visitor market place (Adams 2002; cf. Hoelscher 1998). This commodification creates ironies and tensions in two respects. First, the Hispanic population is growing rapidly and is marginalized in the tourism commodification process. Second, although not explicitly settled by Bavarians, as indeed much of Texas was not, the local community has still chosen to use the iconography and cultural references of southern Germany to fashion place identity. Such a deliberately selective approach is not untypical in the USA (Zelinsky 2001).

The themes of travelling, mobility and movement and transit spaces in the process of diasporic scattering are the basis for the fifth form. For many European-Americans, Ellis Island and the Statue of Liberty have become one of the most important attractions managed by the US Park Service. Equally, for many Asian-Americans, Ellis Island, although not directly implicated in their diasporic episodes, has come to symbolize (indirectly) their migration to and entry in to the USA (see Ch. 10; Kraut 1982; Kirshenblatt-Gimblett 1998). The European port towns of Rotterdam, Bremen, Hamburg, Liverpool, Southampton, Cork and Omagh have recently collaborated to develop a network of common heritage attractions to celebrate their roles as nodes in the mass migrations of the late-nineteenth and early-twentieth century (Richards and Bonink 1995: 177; see also Hoerder 1993). Spaces of transit do not necessarily have to include points of departure or entry, disembarkation or administrative processing such as port, quays, immigration depots and customs houses. Sites of 'dark tourism' or 'thanatourism' often recall dislodgements, dislocations and dispossessions in the collective histories of diasporas (Lennon and Foley 2000; Dann and Seaton 2001; Butler 2001; Essah 2001; Seaton 2001). Concentration camps and other sites of Nazi atrocities in the Holocaust have become regular features on Jewish travellers' itineraries to Europe (Kugelmass 1993, 1994; Ashworth 1996; Gruber 1999, 2002). In the case of Jewish-Americans' travel in the USA, they include important – in some cases former – Jewish neighbourhoods in major cities (Ioannides and Cohen Ioannides 2002; see also Ch. 6). Brooklyn and the Lower East Side of Manhattan offer subsequent generations the opportunity to walk the streets their forebears once trod and to imagine the conditions in which they lived (cf. Riis 1890). As Conforti (1996) has recently argued, ghettos have become popular tourist attractions. Urban 'ethnic tourism enclaves' (Timothy 2002b), or 'ethnic villages and showplaces' (Zelinsky 2001: 94), such as Chinatowns, Little Italies and Little Indias (Conforti 1996; Henderson 1999; Chang 2000; Eade 2000), have been heavily developed and deliberately commodified by public and private capital to attract and to cater for large volumes of visitors. The existence of these enclaves and hence their potential roles as tourist attractions is, however, uncertain as many face considerable threats from the forces of contemporary urbanization and urbanism (Buzzelli 2000; Eade 2000; Gabaccia 2000; Timothy 2002b).

Given the process of post-arrival colonization, the final form of travel flows and tourism spaces generated by diasporas is to destinations, resorts, retreats and vacation spaces which they have fashioned for themselves in the host state. For example, the Jewish community in the North East USA developed and congregated at the Catskill mountain retreat (Brown 1998; Ioannides and Cohen Ioannides 2002). Similarly, much of the capital invested in the early development of the resort of Sosua in the Dominican Republic was from exiled German Jews who arrived in 1941 (Cameron 2000).

Structure of the book

We have placed diasporic spaces and how they are mediated for and negotiated by the diaspora tourist at the centre of the book's organization. By definition, diasporas exist scattered across space, tourism consumes space and place and the mutually reinforcing relationships between diaspora and tourism are played out in highly particularized spaces. The book is divided into three sections between which there is a degree of overlap. Briefly put, these are concerned with how diaspora tourists consume and experience space; the types of spaces and settings occupied by diaspora tourists; and the mechanics of commodifying diaspora and stimulating diaspora tourism.

Diasporic experiences of tourism

In the first section of the book, we aim to explore diasporic experiences of tourism. The emphasis is on the interaction between tourism experience and identity; how identity helps to figure the selection and choice of tourism and travel experiences and episodes; and how the tourist experience may be reflected upon, or reflexively shape the fluid, constantly unfolding identities of diasporic groups and their individual members.

Keith Hollinshead offers an intricate reading of the connectivities between tourism and diaspora as well as a critique of current tourism engagement with diasporas. Inspired by post-colonial discourse and the work of Gilroy and Bhabha in particular, he presents a detailed exposé of two approaches to conceptualizing diaspora to augment the discussion above. His contribution articulates the inherent complexity and multiplicity of diasporic populations and questions whether it is possible to know and understand them in a full sense. His argument echoes Braziel and Mannur's (2003: 3) warning against an 'uncritical, unreflexive application of the term "diaspora"'. One of the key issues raised particularly in Chapter 2 and elsewhere in his work (Hollinshead 1996, 1998), is the ontological foundations of the subject matter and their epistemological challenges for tourism studies. Tourism clearly may impact on diasporic identity and vice versa, but this relationship resolves in highly complex and deeply subtle ways. Not surprisingly in light of the intricacy of most writings on diaspora, somewhat provocatively Hollinshead questions whether members of the tourism academy are equipped to interpret and decode relationships between tourism and diaspora and their attendant processes of mediation and negotiation. This, he contends, is not possible until tourism researchers appreciate more sympathetically the full dimensions of the fluidity, dynamism and interstitiality that define diasporic groups.

Subsequent chapters in this section take up Hollinshead's call to arms. Beyond his elaborate hypothecations, other contributors delve into specific connotations of diaspora discourse for understanding diaspora tourism. The common denominator is the mutually implicated nature of the experience of tourism and diasporic identity. David Duval adopts a transnationalist perspective to conceptualize the return visits of members of the Eastern-Caribbean diaspora living in Toronto (Ch. 3). Duval stresses the positive role of tourism as a discrete social practice in enabling transnational social networks to function. By bringing diaspora members into physical contact with one another, tourism cements the social relevance of the extended community for individual members while renewing, reiterating and reinforcing their cultural norms and values. Duval concedes that ambiguities and ambivalences may also be evident in individuals'