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Abstract

In this paper I engage with a broad range of literature that provides evidence of an emerging and significant paradigm shift in human evolution as we face an increasingly distressed and unsustainable world that screams for some hope and transformation. To describe this shift, different authors use a variety of terms, such as transmodernity paradigm (Ghisi); transmodern philosophy of political liberation (Dussel); Hegelian dialectical triad of thesis, antithesis and synthesis (Magda); reflective/living-systems paradigm (Elgin); partnership model of caring economics (Eisler); relational global consciousness and biosphere politics (Rifkin). Reviewing a broad range of these perspectives, I will argue that tourism is actually one of the key indicators that manifest the global shift in human consciousness. In consequence, an engagement with transmodern critical tourism studies and hopeful tourism scholarship gives us an enormous political weight to point to the agency and authority of tourism to possibly change the world for the better and assist it in its longings for more caring global economy and society. In doing so, we can finally penetrate public discourses and change their dominant interpretations of tourism as being nothing more than a frivolous leisure activity or yet another form of economic development.
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Resumo

Neste texto, se analisa uma ampla literatura que aponta para a configuração de um paradigma emergente e significativo na evolução humana, tendo em vista um mundo cada vez mais problemático e não sustentável que grita por esperança e transformação. Para descrever esta mudança, diferentes autores usam uma variedade de termos, tais como paradigma da transmodernidade (Ghisi); filosofia transmoderna de libertação política (Dussel); tríade da tese, antítese e síntese da dialética Hegeliana (Magda); paradigma reflexivo/dos sistemas vivos (Elgin); modelo de parceria de capacidade econômica (Eisler); consciência global relacional e política da biosfera (Rifkin). Ao revisar uma gama destas perspectivas, argumento que o turismo é, na realidade, um dos indicadores chave que se manifestam na mudança global de consciência humana. Assim, um envolvimento com estudos críticos transmodernos do turismo e atividades turísticas de esperança nos dão um peso político enorme para apontar a função e autoridade do turismo para possivelmente mudar o mundo para melhor e ajudá-lo no desejo de uma economia e sociedade global mais consciente. Ao fazer isso, nós podemos, finalmente, penetrar os discursos públicos e mudar a sua perspectiva dominante do turismo como sendo nada mais que uma atividade fútil de lazer ou mais uma forma de desenvolvimento econômico.

Palavras-chave: turismo; transmodernidade; estudos críticos.

Resumen

En este trabajo, se compromete con una amplia gama de literatura que proporciona evidencia de un emergente y significativo cambio de paradigma en la evolución humana cuando nos enfrentamos a un mundo cada vez más angustiado e insostenible que pide a gritos algo de esperanza y transformación. Para describir este cambio, los diferentes autores utilizan una variedad de términos, como paradigma de la transmodernidad (Ghisi); filosofía transmoderna de la liberación política (Dussel); tríada hegeliana dialéctica de la tesis, antítesis y síntesis (Magda), paradigma de los sistemas de vida/reflexivos (Elgin), modelo de asociación de la economía del cuidado (Eisler), consciencia global de las relaciones y políticas de la biosfera (Rifkin). En la revisión de una amplia gama de estas perspectivas, voy a argumentar que el turismo es actualmente uno de los principales indicadores que pone de manifiesto el cambio global en la conciencia humana. En consecuencia, un compromiso con la crítica transmoderna en los estudios del turismo y esperanzados en que las becas en turismo nos den un enorme peso político para apuntar a la agencia y la autoridad del turismo un posible cambio al mundo, contribuirá para mejorar y ayudar en los anhelos por una economía mundial más solidaria y de la sociedad. De este modo, por fin podremos penetrar en los discursos públicos y cambiar sus interpretaciones dominantes del turismo como nada más que una actividad de ocio frívolo o, también, como otra forma de desarrollo económico.

Palabras clave: turismo; transmodernidad; estudios críticos.
1. Introduction

To speak what is and what is not relevant for tourism research and study today the most immediate point of departure is the current alarming state of the world system affairs and its unsustainable practices. When one looks at the facts and scientific warnings the most natural question needs to be imposed: where are we going and what are we doing as a single humanity? Let the facts speak for themselves.

The structure of the world’s ecosystems changed more rapidly in the second half of the 20th century than at any time in recorded human history (Millennium Ecosystem Assessment, 2005). The world population is growing rapidly, putting more pressure on the earth’s recourses, there are many oil spilling disasters, we produce huge amounts of waste and also plastic, causing, for example, ‘plastic-soup’ in the oceans, there is loss of habitat and thanks to our economical ‘development’ (a word suggesting it is developing in the right direction) CO2 levels are increasing (Millennium Ecosystem Assessment, 2005), causing global warming. When all other life-threatening practices are added in terms of pesticides, pops and other poisons in our waters and food chains, acidification, etc., it is not surprising that some prestigious scientists are warning us that the face of humanity and Gaia (Greek name for the Earth) is on the way to get vanished (Lovelock, 2010).

These detrimental impacts on the body of our Earth are inevitably reflected in the state of our social and individual human bodies. For example, the consumption of anti-depressant Prozac is on ever increase in developed countries. Between 1991 and 2001 in the UK and the USA its consumption increased 3 and 4 times respectively; with depression (together with cancer disease) being the primary cause behind the steady increase in suicide rate worldwide since 1950; and that is the period that coincides with the global consumption boom (World Health Organisation, 2002). We live in the continuously widening gap between the rich and the poor. While the poorest 40% of the world’s population account for 5% of global income, the richest 20% account for three-quarters of world income. Yet, longitudinal studies in rich countries of the West show that increasing income (beyond the basic needs) does not increase the...
happiness (Layard, 2005), which clearly explains the increasing consumption of antidepressants. And while 1 in 5 of the world’s population (800mn) go hungry every day and round 27-28% of all children in developing countries are estimated to be underweight or starving, more than 300 mn people are obese with the estimate to become an epidemic and doubling its figure by 2015 (World Health Organisation, 2008).

So, these processes have raised a whole range of futurist scenarios from the ‘softer’ questions of environmental sustainability to the radical argument that humanity is in danger of a collective death (e.g. Brown, 2006; Rooney et al., 2005). The questions of (the earth’s) sustainability that have penetrated public discourse only recently are speeding ahead faster than we can comprehend. The problem is that we still frame it within the existing economic and political framework which continues to use rationality, money and technology as the most dominant measurements of progress and human development. Reflectively, social scientists, economists, political activists, writers, spiritual leaders and many successful entrepreneurs argue that humanity needs (and is actually going through) a major global mind change and a paradigm shift.

In this paper, I will review various standpoints and research that suggests a major global change in consciousness and will offer the concept of transmodernity as an umbrella term that connotes the emerging socio-cultural, economic, political and philosophical shift of consciousness, values, worldviews, and paradigms, which is spearheaded by a growing section of society. While the reviewed works propose a number of different concepts, some authors - the most influential of which are Marc Luyckx Ghisi and Enrique Dussel - link the phenomena of social change they describe to the notion of transmodernity, a term that was first coined by the Spanish philosopher and feminist Rosa Maria Rodriguez Magda.

So I will begin this paper with a short introduction of the concept in its philosophical terms as originally coined by Magda in her essay La Sonrisa de Saturno: Hacia una teoria transmoderna (1989); to be followed by a brief elaboration of Dussel’s views (and of his followers) who related transmodernity to more political issues of the postcolonial, epistemological and political liberation. The scant attention given here to Magda’s and Dussel’s views lies in the recognition that the newness of transmodernity (not only in tourism
studies but also across all social science) requires one general overview of the main trends and arguments, before we get into debates of its various aspects. Then, I will review the elaboration of the concept of transmodernity as given by Ghisi (2001; 2006; 2008) in terms of its economic and socio-cultural shift and its ‘silent revolution’ power (Ray and Anderson, 2001). In doing so, I will review many parallel terms that seem to encompassing similar values and claims of transmodernity: circularity paradigm (Steinem, 1993); reflective-living paradigm (Elgin, 1997); integral culture (Wilber, 2001) caring economy (Eisler, 2007).

I suggest the concept of transmodernity as ‘the merger’ term not just as a theoretical exercise, but rather out of heartfelt sympathy with the shift, and a genuine conviction that, in order to be visible, effective and compelling, any movement needs a unifying name (Eisler, 2002).

Once the main philosophical tenets and levels of change are explained, I will proceed to discuss the transmodern critical tourism studies perspective and hopeful tourism scholarship (Ateljevic, Pritchard & Morgan, 2007; Pritchard, Morgan and Ateljevic, 2011) as one of responses to calls for inclusivity, partnership, and love ethics which appear to drive the transmodern voices. The tourist as a metaphor of the social world (Dann, 2002) has been staring us in the face for quite some time – from the early claims of MaCannell’s (1976) theory of international tourism being the quest of modernity to a whole array of postmodern forms of travel, such as the boom in backpacking and so-called new age and spiritual tourism. In recognition of the interpretations of either inward-looking and market-oriented special interest tourisms (Ateljevic and Hannam, 2008) or critical views of dominant tourisms of fear and despair (Franklin 2003; 2007), here I send a call for possibilities of transformation and hope for tourism (studies) to be remade and to re-make the world.

2. The Philosophical Origins of Transmodernity Concept

Transmodernity was originally coined by the Spanish philosopher and feminist Rosa Maria Rodriguez Magda in her essay La Sonrisa de Saturno: Hacia una teoria transmoderna (Magda, 1989) in which she uses Hegelian logic whereby Modernity, Postmodernity and Transmodernity form the dialectic triad that completes a process of thesis, antithesis and synthesis. As expressed in her own words: ‘the third tends to preserve the defining impetus of
the first yet is devoid of its underlying base: by integrating its negation the third moment reaches a type of specular closure’ (Magda, 1989:13). In other words, transmodernism is critical of modernism and postmodernism while at the same time drawing elements from each. In a way it is a return to some form of absolute ‘logic’ that goes beyond the Western ideology and tries to connect the human race to a new shared story, a new reconstructed vision, so desperately needed in the postmodern rubble of our world, as expressed by political scientist Jeremy Rifkin (2005:5):

If post-modernist razed the ideological walls of modernity and freed the prisoners, they left them with no particular place to go. We became existential nomads, wandering through a boundaryless world full of inchoate longings in a desperate search for something to be attached to and believe in. While the human spirit was freed up from old categories of thought, we are each forced to find our own paths in a chaotic and fragmented world that is even more dangerous than the all-encompassing one we left behind.

3. Dussel’s and the Subaltern View of Transmodernity

While it may be claimed that Magda originally coined the term, it is Enrique Dussel, an Argentinean scholar currently based in Mexico, and one of the most respected Latin American visiting scholars at Harvard University who is the most cited in the field of subalterns studies for transmodernity as a neo-Marxist philosophy of liberation (Dussel, 1995). However, as I previously stressed in the introduction, it goes beyond this paper to engage seriously with the epistemological and political aspects of Dussel’s way to unsettle the Eurocentric coloniality. Yet, a few key elements can be identified. First, Dussel’s acknowledgement that postmodernity has been critical of various modern Eurocentricisms but in his opinion not enough, as it still represents the Eurocentric critique of the included negation which has paradoxically reinforced the process of ‘Othering’ by the further demarcation of difference and identity politics.

Second, and in consequence, Dussel sees the potentiality in transmodernity to move us beyond traditional dichotomies; to articulate a critical cosmopolitanism beyond nationalism and colonialism; to produce knowledges beyond third world and Eurocentric
fundamentalisms; to produce radical post-capitalist politics beyond identity politics; to overcome the traditional dichotomy between the political economy and cultural studies and to move beyond economic reductionism and culturalism (Grosfoguel, et al., 2007). In a similar vein, Ziauddin Sardar (2004) sees the positive potentiality of the transmodern world to bridge what appears currently the impassable gap between Islam and the West due to the concept of ‘tradition’ as an idée fixe of western society. He shows how transmodern tenets of consensual politics and modalities for adjusting to change are at very heart of Islam. Yet he warns us that in developing a transmodern framework to open discussions, it is important to think of the Muslim world beyond the strait jackets of either ultra-modernist or ultra traditionalist governments (neither of whom have any understanding of transmodernism) and involve ordinary people instead – activists, scholars, writers, journalists, etc. In doing so, Sardar (2004) argues we will discover that most people have critical but positive attitudes towards the West; and women will be as willing, if not more so, to participate in such discussions and the transformations they may initiate, as men. He is of the opinion that if the West shift towards transmodernism, the involvement of the public will open up massive new possibilities for positive change and fruitful synthesis which would replace homogenizing globalization with a more harmonious and enriching experience of living together.

4. Transmodernity - the main tenets

Transmodernity can generally be characterized by optimism to provide hope for human race. Ghisi (1999; 2001; 2006; 2007; 2008) describes transmodernity as a planetary vision in which humans are beginning to realize that we are all (including plants and animals) connected into one system, which makes us all interdependent, vulnerable and responsible for the Earth as an indivisible living community. In that sense, this paradigm is actively tolerant and genuinely democratic by definition, as the awareness of mutual interdependency grows and the hierarchies between different cultures dismantle.

Transmodernity is also essentially postpatriarchal in a sense that women’s visions and intuitions are to be recognized as indispensable in order to invent together innovative urgent solutions. This is radically different from the (preceding and necessary) (post)modern feminist
movements that fight for women’s rights only. Rather it is about a joint effort of men and women to fight for the better world of tomorrow by rejecting values of control and domination.

It is also essentially postsecular in a sense that redefines a new relation between religions and politics in a way that re-enchants the world towards a new openness to spiritual guidance as a basis for “private” behavior and “public” policy, whilst rejecting religious divisions and dogmas. It is open to the transcendental, while resisting any authoritarian imposition of religious certainty. In doing so, it tries to rediscover the sacred as a dimension of life and of our societies.

Transmodernity opposes the endless economic progress and obsession with material wealth and instead promotes the concept of quality of life as the measure of progress. This is expressed in the form of the knowledge economy which moves the emphasis from material capital to intangible assets and the nourishment of human capital. It challenges the rationalized notions of work in its artificial divorce from life. It combines rationalism with intuitive brainwork.

It moves away from vertical authority toward “flatter,” more “horizontal,” organizations; away from “recommendations-up-orders-down” management and toward more consensual decision-making (Ghisi, 1999, p.3). It downsizes the concept of clergy, technocrats and experts in order to raise the self-awareness, self-knowledge and individual accountability of all. It promotes Earth citizenship and draws from the highest potentials of humanity. It redefines the relation between science, ethics and society to reach for real and radical transdisciplinarity.

Yet it is not a uniforming view as global reconciliation around a sustainable future and a broad range of cultural diversity is maintained at the same time. Within the global vision of connected humanity it claims that each community or region needs to be free to develop in ways that are uniquely suited to its culture, ecology, climate and other characteristics. It wants us to see that the danger of today is less between cultures and religions, than the conflict between different paradigms (Ghisi, 1999). As such, it offers a powerful path to peace and a new platform of dialogue between world cultures.
In developing the concept of transmodernity, Ghisi speaks from the capacity of a Belgian theologian, philosopher and researcher on global cultural transformation who worked in the "Forward Studies Unit" of the European Commission for 10 years, advising presidents Delors and Santer on EU visions, ethics and culture shifts.

5. Socio-cultural Change: the silent revolution of cultural creatives

Ghisi substantiates his claims with reference to the phenomenon of the ‘silent revolution’ led by the growing numbers of so-called ‘Cultural Creatives’ (Ray, 1998; Ray and Anderson, 2000), ‘who create new values and who, without knowing it, are activating the 21st century paradigm’ (Ghisi, 2008: 158). The concept of the silent revolution of cultural creatives comes from the historian Arnold Toynbee who analysed the rise and fall of 23 civilisations in world history and who claims that when a culture shift occurs, usually 5% of ‘creative marginals’ are preparing the shift in silence. This concept has been borrowed by sociologist Paul H. Ray and psychologist Sherry Ruth Anderson who have applied it to their market cluster research of politics in America. Drawing upon 13 years of survey research studies on over 100,000 Americans, plus over 100 focus groups and dozens of in-depth interviews they have discovered that around 24% of Americans are departing from traditional or modern cultures to weave new ways of life. They describe this new subculture as the cultural creatives, who care about ecology and saving the planet, about relationships, peace, social justice, self actualization, spirituality and self-expression. They are both inner-directed and socially concerned. They are activists, volunteers and contributors to good causes – more so than other Americans. Amongst many interesting behavioural indicators, they are those who read and listen to the radio the most, and watch television the least. They reflect on themselves, actively travel and are looking for a spiritual dimension in life that goes beyond religious dogmas. In everyday life they search for the harmony of the body, mind and spirit; hence their travels often consist of spiritual and educational trips (e.g. retreats and events focused on spirituality and inner search, well-being, alternative medicine, etc.). Interestingly, 66% in this group are women.
The evidence goes beyond the North American continent, however. The Statistics Office of the European Commission (Eurostat) used a similar method to the American study and confirmed a similar trend of approximate 20% of the European population who exhibit a similar set of values (Tchernia, 1997). In his latest work, Ghisi (2008) also gives numerous anecdotal evidence which shows that this trend is quietly spreading throughout Eastern Europe, Asia and the Middle East. Ray and Anderson (2000) claim, however, that the visibility of cultural creatives and their power to produce serious change are overshadowed by the fact they are often disregarded as the esoteric New Agers, who simply opt for an alternative lifestyle. Subsequently, and typically for tourism scholars, this significant socio-cultural shift has been promptly recognised to feed the market of ‘new age tourists’ (Pernecky and Johnston, 2006) who consume spa, wellness and spirituality tourism (Smith and Kelly, 2006). Yet I argue that we need to go beyond this reductionist view of ‘market philosophy’ and see it rather as an evidence of this significant paradigm shift. In doing so, tourism studies can gain great social and scientific power of indicating ‘something’ that goes well beyond of just simply a ‘new age’ consumption.

In parallel, another scholar, Duane Elgin (1997), similarly provides social indicators that suggest the new emerging world-view which he calls a reflective/living-systems paradigm. He derives his claims from the comprehensive overview of cultural transformation literature as well as the empirical evidence of world statistics on main behavioural trends, emerging social values and sustainable ways of living. Many of Elgin’s claims have also been based on the well-known World Values Survey, run by Ronald Inglehart, who also spoke about the silent revolution (1977), although more in terms of a general intergenerational shift in the values of the people living in advanced industrial societies. More recently, he examined the relationship between the sacred and the secular, based on new evidence of the World Values Survey in 80 societies which found that a growing proportion of the population in both rich and poor countries spends time thinking about the meaning and purpose of life (Inglehart & Norris, 2004).
6. Economic and Political Changes

For the sceptics who often too easily disregard these claims as being rather an elitist, upper/middle class luxury, I would like to cite two renowned social and political scientists - Riane Eisler (1987; 1996; 2002; 2007), a macrohistorian and, Jeremy Rifkin (1995; 2005), a social critic and advisor to government leaders and heads of state (in Europe and USA). Although these two authors do not use the term transmodernity as such, I intentionally use their work because they speak, in a similar vein, about the new technological, economic and political arrangements that are creating and manifesting the change.

Based on her work as a cultural historian and evolutionary theorist over the last 20 years, Riane Eisler introduced the partnership and the domination system as two underlying possibilities for structuring our beliefs, institutions and relations. It is her particularly brilliant historical analysis (1987) over 30,000 years that provides us with a refreshing view of our past and ‘givens’ in all areas of our personal, communal, economic and political life. With reference to recent archaeological discoveries, she shows that ancient times (before 3,500BC) were based on matrifocal values, which did not mean the opposition to patriarchy (i.e. the domination of women over men), but rather the societal organization focused on the values of giving life, fertility, the pleasure to exist, artistic creations and sexual pleasure. In the ‘new’ world, of which we are the last heirs, ‘power’ is no longer viewed as the ability to give life, but is construed as the power to bring death, destroy life, dominate others and be obeyed at all cost. In deconstructing the long history of domination, however, she now gives us a beacon for our tired world of an ongoing mistrust, blood, misery and injustice. By transcending the trap of polarised thinking she offers a way forward by pointing to the partnership model in which social structure is more generally egalitarian, with difference (be it gender, race, religion, sexual preference or belief system) not automatically associated with superior or inferior social and/or economic status. In providing us with an impressive range of worldwide evidence of personal, communal and economic initiatives, organisations and policies she claims that we are finally witnessing the worldwide movement towards this new model (1996; 2002).
In her latest groundbreaking work (2007) on the *Real Wealth of Nations*, she deconstructs Adam Smith’s theory of the ‘invisible hand of the market’ to unpack its deep-seated culture of domination and exploitation that has devalued all activities which fall out outside of the market’s parameters of buying and selling. Instead, she proposes a new concept of ‘caring economics’ that takes into account the full spectrum of economic activities of the household, to the life enriching activities of caregivers and communities, to the life-supporting processes of nature. Her claims of critical and caring businesses is further supported by evidence that many mainstream businesses have been re-questioning the main purpose of their ‘bottom-line’ existence (i.e. going for profit only) which has led to the concept of spiritual economy and spiritual entrepreneurs conscious of her/his mission towards the common good of humanity (see Allee, 2003; Harman, 1998; www.worldbusiness.org).

Whilst Riane Eisler provides us with a new economic model for the future, Jeremy Rifkin (2005: 7-8) claims that it is the ‘European dream of the United Europe’ (in its all potentiality) that is already a political manifestation of the new coming era which is quietly eclipsing the American dream:

> The new European dream is powerful because it dares to suggest new history, with an attention to quality of life, sustainability, and peace and harmony....The new dream is focused not on amassing wealth but rather, on elevating the human spirit...It takes humanity out of the materialist prison in which it has been bound since the early days of the eighteenth-century Enlightenment and into the light of a new future motivated by idealism.

To substantiate his claims, which could be easily interpreted as overtly idealistic in the light of many EU controversies, hypocrisies and problems, he stresses two main points. First, he clearly states that dreams reflect hopes, not achievements, hence the notion of the *potentiality* in many of the tenets provided by the ideal of European dream. Second to contextualize the possibilities more strongly, he provides us with a painstaking overview of the historical making of the Enlightenment/modern age, which created the earth-shattering changes for the medieval era.
In elaborating his thesis, he gives an overview of how the fundamental pillars of the modern era: individualism; the market-exchange economy, the ideology of property; and territory-bound-nation-state governance (forged with capitalistic markets) were once created and how they are now also slowly getting replaced with the new spatial, economic, social and political arrangements of the global (or what I would call transmodern) era. By giving us as an overview of its political architecture, and the historical making of the united Europe, its unique features of extra-territorial governance, constitution, internal workings and various policies, he gives us the realistic picture of its many hypocrisies and contradictions yet many of its many achievements and potentialities. He presents a neat insight into the workings of the knowledge economy concept based on the cooperative commerce of reciprocity and trust; the three-sector politics which include civil society organizations; environmental sustainability policies, etc.

Being acutely aware of the word limits of this paper and for the sake of not diluting the argument on transmodernity, I cannot summarise here all his convincing evidence of the new history in making. Yet one of his key underlying arguments needs to be stressed, as it neatly supports the main contention I am trying to display here. Namely, he also speaks about the shift to a new relational consciousness in which humans are increasingly becoming aware of shared risk and vulnerability, economic, social and environmental interdependencies that together make up the Earth’s indivisible living community. In other words, he moves us from the current geopolitics (and its assumption that the environment is a giant battleground where we all fight for our own individual survival) to a truly innovative concept of biosphere politics (the premise of the Earth as a living organism made up of interdependent relationships in which we are all connected as one).

7. Transmodern Critical Tourism Studies: a call for transformation

The preceding discussion has clearly shown that the transmodern paradigm shift on the whole, points to the intuitive aspirations for inclusivity, diversity, partnership, sacredness and quality of life, deep play, sustainability, universal human rights, the rights of nature and peace on Earth. That is very much in line with the sustained efforts I have tried to promote through our
critical tourism studies network and an academy of hope (Ateljevic, et. al 2007; 2011). In the recognition that our world is at a tipping point environmentally, socially, culturally, economically and intellectually, I argue that studies of tourism cannot afford any longer an isolationist approach that treats tourism as an industry or a social phenomenon in its own right. As Peter McLaren and Nathalia Jaramillo (2011 xxxix), remind us in their essay:

A critical approach to tourism needs to expand the issue of tourism beyond questions of management and governance, to that of reclaiming the world for humanity. Technological revolution and the market will not be enough to solve the growing environmental challenge and alleviating the problem of ecological decline and overcoming necessity. Tourism inquiry, as well as tourism as a social practice, must be rethought from the standpoint of those who exist at the bottom of the global capitalist hierarchy, if we are to survive the continuing wars over scarce resources.

In this paper, I use the opportunity to further promote the need for transmodern critical tourism studies efforts in which we call for a transformational perspective of hopeful tourism scholarship. It is a values-led, humanist perspective that strives for the transformation of our way of seeing, being, doing and relating in tourism worlds and for the creation of a less unequal, more sustainable planet through action-oriented, participant-driven learnings and acts (Pritchard, Morgan and Ateljevic, 2011). It connects critical and interpretive tourism scholarship with the values of the emergent perspectives of the dynamic feminine (Hill 1992, Judith 2006), transmodernity (Ghisi 2006, 2008) and worldism (Agathangelou and Ling 2009) and advocates critique, education and action for planetary justice and responsibility – the enquiry-learning-action nexus. Unquestionably now seems to be an appropriate time to dispute the hegemonic neo-liberal ways of producing and disseminating tourism knowledge (Ayikoru, Tribe and Airey 2009) and to call on responsible tourism intellectuals to engage knowledge which directly relates to the challenges of creating a just and sustainable planet (e.g. Higgins-Desbiolles 2006 and 2008; Cole and Morgan 2010; Pernecky 2010).

In the line of my argument that tourism is actually one of the key indicators that manifest the global shift in human consciousness our responsibility to indicate so and promote it as such becomes extremely significant. If governments, civil society, tourism producers and
consumers begin to recognize such deeper meanings of tourism potentialities, tourism can become a leader ‘industry’ in the emerging concept of caring/spiritual global economy. In consequence, this realization gives us an enormous political weight to point to the agency and authority of tourism to possibly change the world for the better and assist it in its longings for interconnectedness and communion. In doing so, we can finally penetrate public discourses and change their dominant interpretations of tourism as being nothing more than a frivolous leisure activity or yet another form of economic development.

New perspectives are emerging across many disciplines and research fields – from relativity theory in physics and the findings of depth psychologists, to new approaches in anthropological and ecological studies - as constant revision redefines how we understand our universe and our human race. For example, scholars in global change, resilience and sustainability studies are seeking conceptualizations and models, which integrate the earth system, human development and sustainability based on a widely shared view that ‘the challenge of sustainable development is the reconciliation of society's development goals with the planet's environmental limits over the long term’ (Clark and Dickson 2003: 8059).

Such revisionism and reflection is particularly pertinent as never before in human history have so many cultures, belief systems, and new scientific discoveries emerged and interacted so quickly. Our contemporary moment is calling into question much orthodoxy and the dominant ways of being in and understanding the world and its business, governance, and institutional structures increasingly seem flawed. This period may yet prove to be one of generational economic and social transformation during which people, communities and places will need to find alternative ways of living and working and in that context the concept and practice of ‘tourism’ - as we know it - needs to be drastically transformed.
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