Pathways to post-capitalist tourism

Robert Fletcher, Asunción Blanco-Romero, Macià Blázquez-Salom, Ernest Cañada, Ivan Murray Mas & Filka Sekulova

Routledge
Taylor & Francis Group

Check for updates

Pathways to post-capitalist tourism

Robert Fletcher[a] ⬤, Asunción Blanco-Romero[b] ⬤, Macià Blázquez-Salom[c]
⬤ Ernest Cañada[d] ⬤Ivan Murray Mas[c] ⬤ and Filka Sekulova[b] ⬤

[a]Sociology of Development and Change, Wageningen University and Research, Wageningen, Netherlands;
[b]Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona, Spain; [c]Universitat de les Illes Balears, Majorca, Spain; [d]ALBA SUD,
Barcelona, Spain

ABSTRACT

Potential to identify and cultivate forms of post-capitalism in tourism development has yet to be explored in depth in current research. Tourism is one of the world's largest industries, and hence a powerful global political and socio-economic force. Yet numerous problems associated with conventional tourism development have been documented over the years, problems now greatly exacerbated by impacts of the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic. Calls for sustainable tourism development have long sought to address such issues and set the industry on a better course. Yet such calls tend to still promote continued growth as the basis of the tourism industry's development, while mounting demands for "degrowth" suggest that growth is itself the fundamental problem that needs to be addressed in discussion of sustainability in tourism and elsewhere. This critique asserts that incessant growth is intrinsic to capitalist development, and hence to tourism's role as one of the main forms of global capitalist expansion. Touristic degrowth would therefore necessitate postcapitalist practices aiming to socialise the tourism industry. While a substantial body of research has explored how tourism functions as an expression of a capitalist political economy, thus far no research has systematically explored what post-capitalist tourism might look like or how to achieve it. Applying Erik Olin Wright's 2019 innovative typology for conceptualizing different forms of post-capitalism as components of an overarching strategy for "eroding capitalism" to a series of illustrative allows for exploration of their potential to contribute to an analogous strategy to similarly "erode tourism" as a quintessential capitalist industry.

摘要
在当前的研究中，辨别和培养旅游发展中的后资本主义形式的潜力还有待深入探索。旅游业是世界上最大的产业之一，因此是一股强大的全球政治和社会经济力量。然而，多年来，与常规旅游业发展相关的许多问题已被记录在案，而现在，由于持续的新型冠状病毒疫情的影响，这些问题大大加剧。长期以来，对旅游业可持续发展的呼吁一直在寻求解决这些问题，并使旅游业走上更好的道路。然而，这类呼吁往往仍会推动旅游业的持续增长，将其作为旅游业发展的基础，而对"去增长"的要求越来越高，表明增长本身就是在讨论旅游业和其他方面可持续性时需要解决的根本问题。这一评论文章断言，持续的增长是资本主义发展的内在特征，因此旅游业是

CONTACT Robert Fletcher ✉ robert.fletcher@wur.nl

全球资本主义扩张的主要形式之一。因此，旅游业的去增长将需要旨在使旅游业社会主义化的后资本主义做法。虽然大量的研究已经探索了旅游作为资本主义政治经济的表达方式的功能，但迄今为止还没有研究系统地探索后资本主义旅游可能是什么样子或如何实现它。本文运用赖特2019年把后资本主义不同形式概括为"侵蚀资本主义"总体战略一系列成分的创新性分类方法，考虑运用到旅游分析中，提出一个类似的"侵蚀旅游"战略, 使之成为一个典型的资本主义产业。

Introduction

The COVID-19 pandemic has further accentuated many of the problematic issues historically associated with tourism development in many place. Among these, the following are commonly highlighted: unsustainable levels of resource consumption and pollution including greenhouse gas emissions; social problems and unrest associated with gentrification and tourist saturation; and lack of economic diversification beyond the sector in populous destinations, coupled with workers' exploitation via precarious low-wage jobs (see e.g., Lenzen et al., 2018; Mowforth & Munt, 2016). While the global lockdown precipitated by the pandemic has notably reduced environmental and social impacts in numerous destinations, at least in the short term, it has greatly exacerbated economic disparities in places dependent on tourism revenue that has all but disappeared due to ongoing (if also constantly oscillating) travel restrictions both within and between societies worldwide.

Many of these problems have been attributed to the fact that the tourism industry is part and parcel of a global capitalist economy that demands the progressive externalization of social and environmental problems in pursuit of greater profit. Consequently, some critics have asserted that addressing problems of tourism development requires challenging the capitalist nature of conventional tourism development in pursuit of "post-capitalism." Yet despite some initial speculation and theorizing, systematic exploration of post-capitalist potential in tourism development has been lacking thus far.

Our analysis aims to fill this analytical gap. To do so, we draw on Erik Olin Wright's (2019) discussion of different post-capitalist strategies cohering in an overarching programme termed 'eroding capitalism.' Via a series of short illustrative examples grounded in our collective prior research (see e.g. Blanco-Romero et al., 2018; Blázquez et al., 2011; Blázquez-Salom et al., 2019; Cañada & Murray, 2019, 2021; Murray, 2020; Sekulova et al., 2021) we apply this framework to explore the extent to which these examples can be understood to contribute to an analogous programme for *eroding tourism* in relation to its status as a quintessential capitalist industry. In this way, our analysis contributes to research exploring the political economy of tourism by developing a novel conceptual framework to systematically analyze how imaginaries or variants of post-capitalism can be prefigured (Yates, 2015) or cultivated in concrete tourism practiced. This potential can then be articulated across different sites in pursuit of an overarching post-capitalist politics.

We begin by outlining previous research analyzing tourism development as an expression and embodiment of a capitalist political economy and the uneven geographical development it commonly engenders. We then outline our approach to identifying post-capitalist potential in tourism development grounded in Wright's (2019) framework. After briefly explaining our methodology, we present a series of empirical examples that illustrate the different dimensions of this framework. We conclude by highlighting the need for greater analytical attention to how different initiatives aimed at socialisation can be combined in a concerted programme for eroding tourism in pursuit of post-capitalism more broadly.

The potential for post-capitalist tourism

In highlighting the devastating impact of COVID-19 on the tourism industry both globally and in specific destinations worldwide, commentators point to a wide range of problems both past and present that will need to be addressed in a post-pandemic 'reset' (Gössling et al., 2021; Lew et al., 2020). Yet even prominent industry proponents like the UN World Tourism Organization (UNWTO) and World Travel and Tourism Council (WTTC) assert the need to work harder to mainstream 'sustainability' across the sector in a post-pandemic world. Such advocacy, however, still by and large emphasizes a need to restimulate tourism growth as the foundation of this recovery (see e g. https://www.unwto.org/actions-for-a-sustainable-recovery-of-tourism). Stated differently, this approach endeavors to solve problems caused by growth with more growth.

This belies the fact that in the years preceding the pandemic, a mounting focus of tourism critique concerned this growth itself and its impact in the form of what many labeled a crisis of 'overtourism' in numerous popular destinations (Milano et al., 2019). Consequently, critics questioned whether the sustainable tourism ostensibly pursued by the UNWTO and other industry leaders could ever be achieved in the context of the growth-dependent capitalist economy these leaders also advocate (Schmelzer, 2016). The UNWTO (2018), among others, responds predictably by claiming that growth itself was not the problem; it is merely how such growth is managed, a demonstration more of wishful thinking than empirical evidence or theoretical rigor (Akbulut, 2021; Hickel & Kallis, 2020). Milano (2017) thus describe the mainstream tourism industry as having proposed a series of 'D' strategies to render the industry (socially) sustainable without need to limit growth: Decentralization; Decongestion; Diversification; Deseasonalization; and a focus on cultivating elite Deluxe tourism as opposed to conventional mass tourism.

Yet critics contend that this is not nearly enough, asserting the need to go beyond merely working to make tourism growth sustainable to instead refocus the industry away from pursuit of growth altogether (Andriotis, 2018; Fletcher et al., 2020; Hall et al., 2020). This position builds on an overarching critique of sustainable development more broadly as contradictory when committed to growth, arguing that current levels of economic activity are already far beyond 'planetary boundaries' (Rockström et al., 2009; Chakraborty, 2021). Consequently, achieving genuine sustainability - let alone achieving this while also addressing rampant poverty and inequality - may require a concerted program of *degrowth*: an overall reduction and reorientation of economic

activity in the Global North that diminishes throughput to sustainable levels while enhancing equity, justice and wellbeing (Akbulut, 2021; Kallis, 2018).

The degrowth proposal has been subject to a range of interpretations, elaborations, critiques, and debates that are beyond the scope of this discussion (but see e.g. Kallis et al., 2018; Kallis et al., 2020; Hickel, 2020; Treu et al., 2020). Suffice it to point out here that one important line of critique questions whether degrowth could ever occur within the context of a capitalist economy dependent upon ever-greater energy and material use as the basis of capital accumulation (Foster, 2011; Hinton and Maclurcan 2017; Liodakis, 2018). Degrowth advocates thus increasingly acknowledge that economic "[g]rowth is part and parcel of capitalism" and hence that "abandoning the pursuit of growth requires a transition beyond capitalism" (Kallis, 2018, p. 163).

Tourism has long been identified as a quintessential expression of the capitalist political economy. From this perspective, tourism expansion has been analyzed as both an instrument of capitalist development (e.g., Bianchi, 2018; Britton, 1991; Mosedale, 2011, 2016; Yrigoy, 2021) and a primary means by which the overarching capitalist economy sustains itself (Fletcher, 2011). It is, indeed, its emphasis on capitalist accumulation via pursuit of profit to which critics in this line of analysis attribute many of the negative impacts historically associated with tourism development in many places (e.g. Büscher & Fletcher, 2017; Mowforth & Munt, 2016; Robinson 2008). Thus, Robinson asserts, "It is not tourism per se that converts cultures, peoples and the environment into commodities, but *capitalist* tourism" (2008, p. 133, emphasis in original).

As Robinson goes on to point out, however, tourism "need not be a *capitalist* activity" (2008, p. 133, emphasis in original). To address problems of conventional tourism development, consequently, critics have called for tourism development to transcend its dominant capitalist character (e.g., Büscher & Fletcher, 2017; Fletcher, 2019; Higgins-Desbiolles 2010, 2018).

Thus, Higgins-Desbiolles asserts that truly "sustainable tourism necessitates a clear-eyed engagement with notions of limits that the current culture of consumerism and pro-growth ideology precludes" (2010, p. 125). Similarly, Büscher and Fletcher ask how "might tourism look if conceptualized from the point of view of a more general anti- or post-capitalist politics?" and answer by asserting that "tourism should move radically from a private and privatizing activity to one founded in and contributing to the common" (2017, p. 664). Elsewhere, Fletcher expands on this to suggest that a properly post-capitalist tourism would pursue: "(1) forms of production not based on private appropriation of surplus value; and (2) forms of exchange not aimed at capital accumulation; that (3) fully internalize the environmental and social costs of production in a manner that does not promote commodification and (4) are grounded in common property regimes" (2019, p. 532). This implies redesigning tourism's objectives to transform it from a vehicle in service of the accumulation and reproduction of capital to one that cultivates health, well-being and personal development as well as critical thinking.

Yet thus far, such discussion of post-capital potential in tourism development has remained largely speculative, with little attempt to explore how this potential has or can be realized in either theory or practice. In a recent attempt to redress this oversight in relation to COVID-19 impacts, Higgins-Desbiolles (2020) calls for "socialisation"

of the tourism industry post-pandemic, emphasizing a "community-centred tourism framework that redefines and reorients tourism based on the rights and interests of local communities and local peoples" (Higgins-Desbiolles, 2020, p. 610). While emphasizing community-level organization, however, it is clear that many of these measures proposed as part of this advocacy would require active state-level intervention to be successful. The need to simultaneously address issues of scale, uneven geography and political-economic transformation is also evident in discussions of degrowth more broadly. Fraser (2013; Fraser & Jaeggi, 2018) asserts that, in contrast to the conventional Polanyian "double movement" (Polanyi, 1944) in which social movements are seen to provoke a state response promoting social protection, degrowth should be understood as a "triple movement" pursuing an autonomous, emancipatory politics beyond state institutions. Consequently, as D'Alisa and Kallis (2020, p. 2) point out, thus far many "degrowth authors privilege bottom-up action by the grassroots" as their main scale for intervention. Yet as the authors also emphasize, many commentators then also "ask for top-down policy intervention from the state," given that their broader proposals often depend on state-level regulation, "without however offering a concrete view on the role of the state" needed to explain how such interventions could be achieved.

To direct attention to the potential for interventions to capture state processes and institutions in support of degrowth, D'Alisa and Kallis (2020) endorse a neo-Gramscian model of the state that views it not as a monolithic entity but rather a constellation of different forces and interests that congeal into a particular hegemonic structure as certain points in time (see also e.g. Jessop, 2016). This resonates with Poulantzas's (2001:128-129) similar assertion that "the (capitalist) State should not be regarded as an intrinsic entity: like 'capital', it is rather a relationship of forces, or more precisely the material condensation of such a relationship among classes and class fractions, such as this is expressed within the State in a necessarily specific form." Observing an analogous ambivalence concerning the potential for state action within anti-capitalist politics (which he equates with "*democratic* socialism") more generally, Wright argues that this is due to many activists' "belief that the character of the state in capitalist societies makes this impossible" (2019, p. 95). Contesting this position, Wright argues that while the state within capitalism is indeed usually co-opted in service of the status quo, this does not mean that it "cannot potentially be used to undermine the dominance of capitalism as well" (2019, p. 98). This is because "the apparatuses that make up the state are filled with internal contradictions" while "functional demands on the state are contradictory," opening potential for the state's co-optation in the interest of anti-capitalism as well (2019, p. 98).

Going further, Wright assets that like the state, the capitalist system more broadly can be understood as a complex constellation of divergent processes rather than a coherent monolithic entity. From this perspective, he suggests, "the contrast between capitalism and socialism should not be regarded as a simple dichotomy"; rather, "we can talk about the degree to which an economic system is capitalist or socialist" (2019, p. 71). This perspective speaks to longstanding debates concerning whether or not capitalism should be understood as a coherent global system, and hence whether effective opposition to capitalism requires a similarly global response aiming to transform the system as a whole. In contesting this

conventional Marxist perspective, Wright's approach resonates with J.K. Gibson-Graham's (e.g. 1996, 2006) assertion that "capitalo-centric" bias keeps us from acknowledging the diverse forms of economic activity that depart to greater or lesser degrees from capitalist logic existing within the interstices of the dominant system, a lens that others have productively used to highlight (the potential for) post-capitalist tourism practices in different contexts (see Cave & Dredge, 2020a, 2020b).

In contrast to Gibson-Graham, however, Wright maintains that capitalism continues to exercise an overall hegemony in most existing societies even if it harbours some post-capitalist spaces and potential. In this way, Wright offers something of an inter-mediate position between Gibson-Graham's extreme anti-structural stance and an equally extreme capitalocentric perspective they critique. While others have also recently explored potential for post-capitalist forms of development (e.g. Mason, 2016; Srnicek & Williams, 2015), they tend to adopt a more orthodox Marxist approach in emphasizing wholesale transformation of an overarching capitalist system. Consequently, we find Wright's analysis most useful for our purposes here in exploring both ground-level post-capitalist practices *and* the potential to scale and articulate these in pursuit of broader structural transformation.

Based on his nuanced understanding of the nature of capitalism, Wright outlines a variety of specific strategies that can be understood as enacting anti- or post-capitalism in different ways and at different levels. *Smashing capitalism* entails efforts to overthrow the system as a whole, which Wright considers untenable given that "evidence from the revolutionary tragedies of the twentieth century is that system-level rupture doesn't work as a strategy for social emancipation" (2019, pp. 41–42). *Dismantling capitalism*, by contrast, embodies the conviction that "a transition to democratic socialism could be accomplished through state-directed reforms that incrementally introduced elements of a socialist alternative from above" (2019, p. 42). *Taming capitalism*, Wright's third strategy, understands "capitalism as a source of systematic harms in society without attempting to replace it" but instead working "to build counteracting institutions capable of significantly neutralizing these harms" (2019, p. 44, 45). Within this approach, *anticapitalist* reforms are considered those "that introduce in one way or another egalitarian, democratic and solidaristic values and principles into the operation of capitalism" (Wright, 2019, p. 46). Wright's fourth strategy, *resisting capitalism*, comprises "struggles that oppose capitalism from outside of the state but do not themselves attempt to gain state power" (Wright, 2019. p. 49). *Escaping capitalism*, finally, embodies the contention that "[w]e may not be able to change the world at large, but we can remove ourselves as much as possible from its web of domination and create our own micro-alternative in which to live and flourish" (2019, p. 51). This is the very sort of local-level action that degrowth advocates (e.g. Treu et al., 2020) along with current proposals for socializing tourism tend to privilege.

While dismissing *smashing capitalism* as counterproductive, Wright suggests that his other four strategies are in fact synergistic and capable of integration within an over-arching strategy he terms *eroding capitalism*. This would entail action on different levels simultaneously, bringing together "the bottom-up, civil society–centered initiatives of resisting and escaping capitalism with the top-down, state-centered strategy of taming

and dismantling capitalism" into a powerful whole (Wright, 2019, p. 58). In this way, Wright explains, "The strategy of eroding capitalism combines initiatives within civil society to build emancipatory economic alternatives in the spaces where this is possible, with interventions from the state to expand those spaces in various ways" (2019, p. 95). In a similar spirit, Feola (2019) asserts that degrowth must endeavour to "unmake" overarching capitalist institutions constraining local action for the latter to be able to flourish in the ways degrowth proponents envision.

Combining Wright's different anti-capitalist strategies with the different scales of intervention they pursue provides a productive framework through which to explore possibilities for post-capitalism within tourism development specifically. In the remainder of this article, we therefore adapt Wright's analytics to outline a series of empirical examples that exemplify different dimensions of his framework. Taken together, these examples can be seen to contribute to an overarching strategy that we, following Wright, term "eroding tourism" in relation to the latter's conventional understanding as a capitalist industry *par excellence*.

Methodology

Discussion of the potential to advance post-capitalist tourism must be based on existing practices that can advance desirable, viable and feasible alternatives in the form of what Wright (2010) calls "real utopias." Such examples can take multiple forms and originate from diverse actors and contexts. The articulation of a post-capitalist tourism will hardly arise from a single type of experience, but rather from the combination of multiple initiatives, which are built on the margins of capitalism or from the empowerment of different actors involved, and which respond to the needs of broad majorities. All of these various practices develop amidst the great contradictions of an environment dominated by capitalist relations, which cannot help but influence their form and outcomes. When approached individually, such practices could therefore be dismissed as irrelevant in relation to overarching capitalist processes. Yet when considered together from Wright's (2019) perspective, the possibility to view them as holding transformative potential greater than the sum of their parts arises. In our subsequent analysis, we therefore endeavour to strike a fine balance between attributing unwarranted importance to small-scale initiatives, as Gibson-Graham's diverse economies analyses have at times been accused of doing (by e.g., Kelly, 2005), and unfairly dismissing such initiatives' potential due precisely to the limited transformation they can each achieve on their own.

To develop our discussion, four examples of emancipatory practices at various scales have been selected. These are diverse experiences in different contexts whose common element is their potential to embody or prefigure a post-capitalist tourism "reset", through both top-down and bottom-up governance. All of them thus defy or escape, in different ways and to different degrees, the capitalist mode of production and exchange that currently dominates the tourism industry. The selected examples start from this premise, but cover a wide range of contexts and scales, thus illustrating the diversity of existing possibilities and realities. The cases have been chosen according to the background and research experience of the article's

six authors, selecting those that are most illustrative of our proposal, without claiming to be an exhaustive or quantitatively significant sample. The analysis includes examples focused on both Spain (Catalonia and the Balearic Islands) and Latin America (Brazil and Argentina). Our previous investigations in each of these sites have employed a variety of sources and analytical tools. Among them are analysis of primary documents, participant and non-participant observation in the various actions carried out in each place (e.g., assemblies, meetings, demonstrations, etc.), and conducting in-depth structured interviews with qualified informants or group focus.

Eroding tourism: empirical examples

Barcelona: dismantling tourism through municipal regulation

Spanish cities are being restructured and grown in accordance with the interest to commodify and financialize land development and the resulting built environment. Budgetary constraints and cliques of corruption have driven many urban and tourism planning decisions made by local authorities. Tourist and real estate bubbles have been fed by the entrepreneurial management of the cities, aiming to compete for capital investment through place branding (Eisenschitz, 2016) and bypassing civil society aside in promoting urban megaprojects (Flyvbjerg et al., 2003). Within this context, rental for tourist housing impacts on residential rentals and erodes the right to the city and its habitability (Martínez-Caldentey et al., 2020b).

In the face of such forces, the local governments of a few Spanish cities, such as Barcelona (Blanco-Romero et al., 2018), Madrid (Martínez-Caldentey et al., 2020a, 2020b) and Palma de Mallorca (Blázquez-Salom et al., 2019), have enacted measures restricting tourist rentals in order to defend the right to housing as an extension of the right to the city (Madden & Marcuse, 2016). Such regulations respond to demands from social movements (neighborhood associations, residents, activists, and tenant unions) to decommodify urban life (Brenner et al., 2012), championed by governments that emerged from the 15 M anti-austerity protests in 2011 and 2012 (Roth et al., 2019).

Barcelona (Catalonia-Spain) in particular has been, and continues to be, a laboratory of good and bad practices in tourism management. The Barcelona City Council charted a way out of the 2008 economic crisis centred on the development of a grand plan to promote the city as a prime tourist destination. This was so successful that conflicts generated by tourist overcrowding made tourism one of citizens' main concerns (Blanco-Romero et al., 2019). Starting in 2015, the City Council, governed by a coalition of left-wing parties (*Comuns*), started a new decision-making system focused on participation and citizen consensus. With the collaboration of civil society groups, the Council developed different post-capitalist measures for touristic management as well as to contain commercialization of key elements, such as homes transformed into tourist accommodations.

New intervention instruments that were approved included a fight against illegal tourist accommodation (mainly offered on online platforms like Airbnb). This began with the approval, in 2015, of a moratorium on the granting of licenses for the creation of tourist establishments for a year. Despite its scope, this first moratorium

had the initial support of the hotel sector and tourist apartments, until the arrival in 2017 of the Special Urban Plan for Tourist Accommodation (PEUAT, in its acronym in Catalan) regulating all tourist accommodations (including hotels, aparthotels, tourist apartments, pensions, hostels, houses for tourist use, student residences and youth hostels). The PEUAT was the first plan of its kind in Europe, designed based on extensive citizen participation (Blanco-Romero et al., 2018; Russo & Scarnato, 2018).

The main objective of the PEUAT is to improve the quality of life of the city's citizens, with the aim to: 1) alleviate tourist pressure; 2) contain the increase in tourist accommodation; 3) preserve the quality of public space and diversify it with other activities; 4) promote the diversity of urban fabrics; and 5) guarantee the right to housing, rest, privacy, well-being, sustainable mobility and a healthy environment. This pioneering initiative constitutes the regulatory framework for urban planning and management of tourist accommodation in the city through application of the urban planning law of Catalonia (Legislative Decree 1/2010). This decree regulates the creation of new tourist accommodations and short-term housing rentals (STHRs). The PEUAT was designed as an urban planning instrument, dividing the city into four specifically regulated areas, taking into account the distribution of accommodation throughout the territory, the relationship between the number of tourist establishments and the resident population, the relationship and conditions of various uses, the incidence of activities in the public space and the presence of tourist attractions (Ajuntament de Barcelona, 2017). Like all planning and regulation exercises, despite the extensive public consultation it has not addressed all of the demands of the myriad actors involved for various reasons. Yet it continues to be one of the few pioneering instruments in terms of both the creation process and the measures to be applied.

In parallel, trying to respond to the social conflict present in the city, the Strategic Tourism Plan 2020 was developed. This was one of the first intensive processes of reflection and networking on the tourist activity of the city and its effects. This effort focused on facing the key challenge of managing Barcelona as a tourist city compatible with the rest of the necessities of the multiple, complex and heterogeneous city that it is. Example of this include the reorganization of the port to move certain cruise terminals away from the center and the prohibition of renting rooms for tourist use until the creation of a specific municipal regulation (Guerrero, 2020).

What this case illustrates is that regulation for post-capitalist tourism should focus not only on the "tourism issue," but on multiple dimensions of city management, to ensure protection against the various forms of social exclusion and accumulation by dispossession (Harvey, 2005) occurring throughout the territory in question. Barcelona thus endeavors to develop other public initiatives for the city's management not directly related to tourism, such as:

- the law approved by the Parliament of Catalonia for the limitation of rental prices;
- the purchase of buildings by the city council for their transformation into social rental housing, as part of the Plan for the Right to Housing 2016–2025,

thus combating gentrification and the expulsion of neighbors by investment funds and Real Estate Investment Trust (REIT);

- creation of Points of Defense of Labor Rights, aimed at reversing dynamics such as job insecurity, economic monoculture or gentrification through the Barcelona Economic Development Plan 2016–2021; and

- creation of energy advisory points where the City Council offers the necessary advice and support so that citizens at risk can exercise their energy rights before the basic supply companies.

Despite the institutional effort exerted to create this battery of initiatives, time is showing the limitations they face. Firstly, development of the proposed measures has been largely conditioned by the loss of control and institutional weight within the municipal government of tourism industry promoter groups, who continue to exert pressure on the ongoing process of their implementation. Additionally, lack of sufficient financing for the program's full development leaves it without resources for implementation of important measures and hence limits its effectiveness. Third, the inability of local social movements to exert sufficient pressure on the City Council to compel them to assume firmer changes in tourism policies has significantly limited possibilities for more dramatic transformation. This demonstrates the vital importance of the overarching governance process in deciding whether tourism activity can be designed according to other logics that do not focus on the reproduction of capital but rather on objectives, principles and diverse development capacities oriented to the common good.

SESC Bertioga (Brazil): taming tourism through social enterprise

Since the 1930s and 1940s, social tourism has been conceived as a means of providing access to free time to certain groups that could not enjoy it, mainly for economic reasons. With the Montreal Declaration of Social Tourism of 1996, and its addendum in 2006, this vision became more complex and also included in its objectives enhancing the well-being of tourism workers as well as the local communities and environment in which tourism occurs (Schenkel, 2017). Additionally, recognition of more factors hindering access to tourism gave rise to programs designed for the elderly, young people, people with different capacities, with serious diseases, and in marginalized situations, among others (Minnaert et al., 2013).

Since its origins, social tourism has displayed contradictory and ambivalent dynamics from an emancipatory perspective (Minnaert et al., 2013). On the one hand, it supposes a kind of preventive social reformism, from which protective institutions of the working classes were promoted in order to distance them from trade union movements and class politicians, and therefore as a control and integration mechanism. But at the same time, social tourism has also developed to institutionalize broad social demands, for instance the emancipation of female workers or the needs for rest, well-being and personal development. Thus, the practices of social tourism can be very different, even confrontational, ranging from initiatives conceived as a market niche to facilitate the expansion of business areas or a means to subsidize the tourism

industry, to programs with a clear desire to train a critical citizenry to fully develop human capacities.

In this latter sense, the experience of the SESC São Paulo, founded in Brazil in 1946, by entrepreneurs of the services, trade and tourism sectors, stands out (de Almeida, 2011; Schenkel & de Almeida, 2020). Its operation is regulated by a specific law and recognized in the Constitution since 1988, which has shielded it from various attempts to change its functions. It is financed through mandatory contributions from companies for this type of activity, comprising 1.5% of all salaries paid. In its beginnings, the SESC SP had a strong welfare orientation and sought to address basic needs, in matters related especially to workers' health. For this reason, they created hospitals and nurseries with the aim to improve people's hygiene and nutrition. But since the 1990s, the SESC SP has been transformed into an institution oriented towards non-formal education. Within this reorientation, social tourism was conceived as part of an educational action, with special attention to promoting artistic activities, for the development of critical citizenship. This purpose is currently carried out through a network of 43 units in 21 cities.

Among these units, the SESC Bertioga stands out: a beach resort in operation since 1948, aimed at workers in services, commerce and tourism (Cañada, 2020). At present it can accommodate 1000 people overnight, plus 350 who can enter daily to spend the day. 87% of the people who stayed at the SESC Bertioga in 2018 were workers from these three sectors with incomes of between 243 and 1215 euros per month (which makes this a destination for low and medium income workers rather than the truly destitute). The emancipatory potential of this initiative lies in the possibility of organizing tourist activity that responds to the needs of a large majority of workers to access a coastal environment and a quality cultural and recreational offer that seeks to enhance their capacities and social conscience. It is also a type of tourism that does not involve long-distance travel, thus reducing its ecological impact. In addition, the working conditions of the initiative's own employees are of high quality, well above the norm for the hotel sector. Finally, instead of becoming an exclusionary enclosure, as all-inclusive resorts often do (Blázquez et al., 2011), SESC Bertioga can access the same educational, recreational and sports programs as any other unit of SESC São Paulo and hence offer these to its entire constituency.

The Hotel Bauen: escaping tourism through cooperative ownership

Post-capitalist practices are often not planned, but arise spontaneously in reaction to specific circumstances. The Hotel Bauen could be considered a paradigmatic example of tourism production and social empowerment under post-capitalist logics that has garnered attention from social movements and critical scholars (Fernández-Miranda, 2019; Higgins-Desbiolles, 2012; Ruggeri et al., 2018). Located in the centre of Buenos Aires in Argentina, the hotel was inaugurated in 1978 during the military dictatorship. The hotel first opened its doors to visitors for the 1978 FIFA World Cup, an event considered a means to mask the political genocide undertaken at the time. The owner, Marcelo Iurcovich, who had fluid relations with the military powers, built the hotel thanks to a public loan by BANADE (Banco Nacional de Desarrollo) that was never repaid (O'Donnell, 2007).

Following the dictatorship, Argentina suffered from intense socio-economic turbulences related to the adoption of neoliberal structural adjustment programs (SAPs). This provoked, in 2001, a profound social, economic and political crisis (Fernández-Durán, 2003). Grassroots social movements, advancing the slogan "que se vayan todos" ("all politicians get out"), played a key role in forcing five presidents to resign within eleven days. The extremity of the crisis caused myriad non-capitalist practices to bloom since neither the state nor private sector could address human needs (Zibechi, 2003). Within this context, the "Movimiento Nacional de Empresas Recuperadas" (MNER), adopting the slogan "occupy, resist, produce" from the Brazilian "Movimento dos Trabalhadores Rurais Sem Terra", took over several factories and companies bankrupted and abandoned by their owners during the crisis. These were then run as worker-owned cooperatives as a means to socialise the economy and empower common people (Ruggeri, 2017).

In December, 2001, the owner of the Hotel Bauen, who had long attempted to sell it, closed the establishment and fired all workers. Two years later, a group of employees, supported and advised by the MNER, decided to occupy and reopen the hotel.[1] In 2004, the hotel resumed operation managed by the Hotel Bauen Workers' Cooperative – a form of tourism production without bosses. Workers had to radically change their political goals from when they were wage workers, from struggling against the capitalist class towards democratic organization of tourism production. Furthermore, the cooperative and its more than 150 members become a neuralgic centre of local cultural and political activity (Ruggeri et al., 2018).[2]

Yet the Bauen cooperative along with many other workers' cooperatives faced an adverse situation characterised by protracted legal struggle against eviction efforts. Societal elites framed companies recovered by workers as a clear attack against private property that had to be suppressed. In this regard, from 2005 the Bauen cooperative faced a long and complex legal battle after the family owners reclaimed the property. This had a notable impact on the hotel's functioning. That battle eroded the project in a double sense: first, much effort had to be put into the cooperative's legal defense; while second, funds for improving the hotel's facilities were scarce partly due to the unstable legal situation. On the other hand, the political struggle also resulted in strong support for the cooperative from civil society.

After twelve years of legal contestation, the senate chamber declared that the hotel could remain in the hands of the cooperative (Machado, 2015). However, Mauricio Macri, prime minister of Argentina from 2015 to 2019 and a prominent businessman, used his executive power to reverse the decision (Centenera, 2016). Despite the eviction threats, the Bauen cooperative continued to operate until October 2020 when the COVID-19 tourism crisis and debt burdens finally forced it to close the hotel doors (Piscetta, 2020).

The Hotel Bauen experience can shed light on important dynamics of post-capitalist tourism projects. In Fraser's terms, the Bauen cooperative can be considered a clear example of a triple movement pursuing autonomy transcending all forms of external domination (Fraser & Jaeggi, 2018), or in Wright's (2019) terms, as an effort to *escape capitalism*. Indeed, Wright goes so far as to suggest, "In a democratic socialist economy, worker cooperatives would potentially constitute a substantial sector, perhaps

even the dominant form of organization engaged in market production for many goods and services" (2019, p. 77).

But at the same time, this example demonstrates some of the limits to such autonomous projects when emancipatory politics are not scaled up. The Hotel Bauen and other workers' cooperatives had to concentrate efforts not only on maintaining their economic and political projects, but also on resisting re-incursion by the state apparatus. For community-level actions like these to succeed, the take-over of hotels and factories would need to be accompanied by supportive state-level action – a double movement to complement the workers' triple movement. State regulation legitimizing property expropriations and establishing workers' cooperative laws could have made things much easier for the worker-recovered companies. Failing this, par-adoxically, workers who gained control of companies lost wage workers' rights because Argentinian law considers them no longer workers but quasi-businesspeople. While widespread social organization and strong social approval have made possible the proliferation of workers' recovered companies in Argentina, therefore, resistance by elites backed by the state has undermined these projects' performance and potential.

Argentina's social conditions can be conceptualized as paradigmatic of Latin American neoliberalism. Since the great crisis of 2001, many Latin American states, including Argentina, have transitioned towards different sorts of socialism or 'post-neoliberalism', although in the context of multiple contradictions (Burbach et al., 2013). Poulantzas's (2001) theorization of the state, noted earlier, helps to under-stand the contradictions of this ostensive Latin American socialist turn. If we follow Poulantzas in conceptualizing the state beyond its deification – state as a thing or as a subject (2001, pp. 128–129) – then changes in the political parties commanding the state apparatus do not necessarily equate with transforming the complex and contradictory class relations that comprise the state itself. Therefore, "change in class relationship of forces always affects the State; but it does not find expression in the State in a direct and immediate fashion" (Poulantzas, 2001: 130).

The successive Kirchner administrations, between 2003 and 2015, attempted to reverse neoliberal policies to some extent, under pressure from strong social mobili-zations, while reinforcing popular sectors and augmenting social policies. However, societal elites had long influenced the state and could confront those policies utilizing the same state apparatus. After decades of neoliberalism and corruption, those logics did not disappear but were deeply rooted within the state. Coinciding with the Kirchners' presidency of the Republic of Argentina, Mauricio Macri was elected pres-ident of the Autonomous City of Buenos Aires (2007–2015). Macri, a well-known businessman, embodies the class conflict within Argentinian politics. The legal struggle over the Hotel Bauen's expropriation thus played out at different political scales, from the province level (the Buenos Aires Parliament controlled by Macri) to the national one (the National Congress under Kirchner's influence). Bauen was the first case of a recovered company whose expropriation was elevated to the national political level, since most such cases were addressed and resolved at the province level. After decades of legal contention and when the Bauen's legal status were about to be decided, Macri became president of the Republic (in 2015) and opposed its legalization. The Bauen case is thus a paradigmatic example of elites' resistance to socialisation. Moreover, the Bauen illustrates the importance of attention to the state even in

ostensibly autonomous projects. Consequently, transforming the social relations that comprise the state becomes crucial in the construction of post-capitalist projects, which following Poulantzas (2001) are based on deepening democracy. By the same token, autonomous projects such as the Bauen play a key role in this deepening of democracy understood as emancipatory politics.

La Trapa: resisting tourism through common property regimes

Dominguero is the Spanish word for a recreationist enjoying leisure time rambling or picnicking in the countryside. Yet while the number of *domingueros* in Spain grows steadily, the public infrastructure to accommodate them (managed natural areas, picnic sites, *Grande Randonée* (GR) paths or public access to sea coast and river banks) continually declines, particularly due to the conversion of the countryside into private residential facilities in touristified areas, such as the Balearic island Mallorca. Mallorca holds record numbers of hotel beds and tourist arrivals in relation to its size and number of inhabitants. The tourism offer there is diversified from standard sun and beach developments to a broader spectrum, including outdoor recreation activities that increase frequentation of natural areas. Mallorca's functional specialization in tourism is driven by urban development promoters and hoteliers (Pons et al., 2014). Yet landscape preservation is also demanded by environmentalists, real estate investors, rich in-migrants, business owners and local power cliques, who hold monopolistic economic interests over large areas of the island (Blázquez-Salom et al., 2019).

Many local Majorcan social movements and NGOs have articulated demands for nature conservation and people's right to enjoy this (Garcia-Munar, 2017; Rayó, 2004). Struggles to halt urban growth, mostly due to tourist supply development, have been expressed in campaigns to defend threatened natural areas. This was the aim of the peaceful occupation of the islet of Sa Dragonera, located in Mallorca's vicinity, in 1977, where an elitist urban development was planned (for 3770 tourist beds in an islet of 288 hectares). Three years later, the GOB, a Majorcan environmental NGO, bought a rural estate called La Trapa (opposite the island and containing remains of a Trappist shelter from the early 19th century), through donations from its members and others. Yet this non-profit initiative has received no support from the public administration, due to GOB's counter-hegemonic role in denouncing environmental damage and political corruption associated with the tourism industry (Murray et al., 2010). Forty years later, the ancient derelict monastery of the Trappist order has been partly restored through more communitarian contributions and the whole natural area is being managed for the general enjoyment of residents and tourists. This is how a non-profit initiative has grounded nature and cultural heritage conservation in a common property scheme, for its use rather than exchange value and through an autonomous community-led initiative. This case can also be understood as a "triple movement" pursuing an autonomous, emancipatory politics beyond state institutions. Following Young and Markham (2020), La Trapa's management as a public, non-profit enterprise contributes to decommodify its enjoyment, as it is the opposite of the "enclosed land" (privatised, alienable, individuated, abstracted, valuated and displaced) that proliferates in Mallorca.

Visitation to La Trapa has increased steadily since the COVID-19 pandemic, which has painfully reminded us of our interconnection with nonhuman nature. As our social contacts are restricted, leisure in nature contributes to both our well-being and our becoming aware of the necessity to achieve ecological balance. Selective, forced or voluntary confinements of certain segments of the population make clear the need to regulate the right to leisure in nature. Insofar as La Trapa is primarily a natural and heritage conservation project, its overuse for recreation purposes (such as by *domingueros*) during the pandemic is thus generating intense debate among GOB members. As the confinement measures end, tourists also return to ramble there.

On the other hand, the preservation of nature is also used as justification to deprive the bulk of the population of this right to leisure or to turn nature into another commodity - for example, by reserving conserved spaces for private enjoyment or even charging for access to so-called Private Protected Areas (Müller & Blázquez-Salom, 2020). The neoliberal mode of regulation is at the root of this strategy, in relation to which it is appropriate to investigate formulas for the socialisation of leisure in nature via commoning and community control (Büscher & Fletcher, 2020). The case of GOB's work in La Trapa exemplifies this sort of initiative to resist capitalism, emerging from civil society, to avoid the space's transformation into a urban touristic commodity.

Conclusion

This article has explored how post-capitalist tourism is or can be operationalized in different contexts, via both top-down and bottom-up initiatives that challenge or escape to varying degrees the capitalist mode of production and exchange currently dominating the global tourism industry. Four empirical examples, ranging from state-centered regulatory practices responding to demands from social movements to bottom-up, civil society-centered initiatives, have illustrated the spectrum of different strategies capable of contributing to such a project. The case of town hall policies in Barcelona, championed by governments that emerged from the 15 M response, contributes to explore Wright's (2019) question of whether the state apparatus, usually co-opted in service of the capitalist system, can also be harnessed to undermine the latter's dominance. The SESC Bertioga initiative of social tourism in Brazil also illustrates the possibility of tourism on a substantial scale to meet the needs of the working classes for educational and human development. Moving further towards Fraser's "third movement" transcending all forms of external domination, the Hotel Bauen project of "tourism production without bosses" through cooperative workers' self-organization exemplifies the other end of the strategic spectrum: resisting incursion by the state and struggling against the capitalist class towards democratic operation of a tourist accommodation. The case of La Trapa, finally, also aims to arrest urban growth and socialise leisure in nature for both tourists and residents via a common property scheme, within the context of Mallorca's dominant strategy to reserve conserved spaces for private enjoyment in relation to tourist driven real estate markets.

In their diverse forms and aims, this collection of examples supports Wright's contention that "[t]he optimal institutional configuration of a democratic-egalitarian economy is…likely to be a mix of diverse forms of participatory planning, public

enterprises, cooperatives, democratically regulated private firms, markets, and other institutional forms, rather than to rely exclusively on any one of these" (2019, p. 72). Taken together, the examples can be seen to demonstrate the potential to combine diverse forms of action in different contexts and scales within an overarching strategy to erode capitalism, as Wright (2019) suggests. In this sense, different initiatives can be understood to contribute to a common "process of expanding and deepening the socialist elements of the economic system in such a way as to undermine the dominance of capitalism" (Wright, 2019, p. 71). As Wright describes the broader potential for such a strategy, "Eventually, the cumulative effect of this interplay between changes from above and initiatives from below may reach a point where the socialist relations created within the economic ecosystem become sufficiently prominent in the lives of individuals and communities that capitalism can no longer be said to be dominant" (2019, p. 62). It is this potential to articulate touristic socialisation at scale that this article has sought to highlight, and that we invite other researchers to explore further in the future.

It must be emphasized, of course, that post-capitalist practices of the sort documented in this discussion are fragile, situated and contingent. Just as such practices may contribute to eroding capitalism, therefore, capitalism may in turn erode their post-capitalist potential. Consequently, we should understand this post-capitalist potential as occurring within a specific temporal (and spatial) context conditioned by the particular conditions obtaining then (and there). Despite their contingency, however, our various examples illustrate diverse and winding pathways for prefiguring and constructing post-capitalist tourism practices. In contrast to the 20th century revolutionary imaginary, in this regard, we argue that far from an organized and large-scale project, post-capitalist revolution in the 21st century should emerge from a constellation of concrete real utopias (Wright, 2010). Actually existing post-capitalist practices, with their own contradictions and diffuse manifestations within the hegemonic capitalist system, are likely to be the ones that build a counter-hegemonic order through eroding capitalism in the way that Wright (2019) suggests. Consequently, without overstating the potential of any of our specific examples to effect significant change in their own right, considered together they can be understood as contributing to an overarching if largely disconnected effort to expand the space for post-capitalism within an overarching global tourism industry that remains decidedly capitalist in character. Overcoming this fragmentation by more proactively bringing together such disparate initiatives within a common (if not hierarchically organized) governance framework will be essential to enable them to transcend their individual limitations and contribute to broader structural change than any alone can achieve. Future research should explore more concretely how this can be done.

As we have shown throughout our analysis, the question of the state stands central to discussion of this post-capitalist potential in tourism as elsewhere. Understood as a social relation crystallizing class forces and power conflicts, the state commonly stands opposed to the emergence and expansion of post-capitalist politics. However, due to the state's same status as a contingent social relation, changing social relations have potential to produce (multiple) cracks in the state apparatus creating space for prefigurative post-capitalist and emancipatory politics. In addition to including state-led action as an element of eroding capitalism (or simply mitigating its contradictions),

our interest is also to highlight the role of social movements to limit state excess, by exercising popular power and pursuing autonomous and emancipatory politics beyond state institutions (Malm, 2020).

We are well aware, moreover, that pursuit of touristic degrowth must go beyond merely eroding capitalism to ensure that alternatives thereby established also align with planetary boundaries by working to reduce material and energy throughput. Bringing this essential ecological focus into conversation with potential for tourism socialisation requires further and wider narratives, tools, measures, and practices. Among these would include: working to de-commodify tourism services entirely; dramatically reducing fast-based travel and associated infrastructure; limiting development of new tourism-related infrastructure; or alternatively, converting energy- and material-intensive touristic facilities into low-impact housing or community employment hubs. Initiatives such as these that directly address the ecological dimensions of post-capitalist practice also demand further attention in efforts to socialise tourism.

Finally, there remain important questions concerning the extent to which socializing tourism might contribute to escaping the hedonic treadmill of mass and conspicuous consumption more generally (Sekulova, 2014). Rethinking tourism from the perspective of degrowth might therefore further imply questioning fast speed/long-distance/short-term travel for personal pleasure *en toto*, as part of a deeper level transformation of livelihoods and lifestyles in line with post-capitalist principles. Such issues constitute another vital focus of future research and praxis.

Notes

1. Two more hotels were recovered by their former employees: Pipinas and Pismanta (Fernández-Miranda, 2019).
2. Four other cooperatives were based at the hotel: El Descubridor, el Movimiento Popular La Dignidad, La Poderosa and the journal *Cítrica*.

Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the authors.

Notes on contributors

Robert Fletcher is Associate Professor in the Sociology of Development and Change group at Wageningen University in the Netherlands. He is the author of Romancing the Wild: Cultural Dimensions of Ecotourism (Duke University, 2014), co-author of The Conservation Revolution: Radical Ideas for Saving Nature beyond the Anthropocene (Verso, 2020) and co-editor of The Ecolaboratory: Environmental Governance and Economic Development in Costa Rica (University of Arizona, 2020) and NatureTM Inc.: Environmental Conservation in the Neoliberal Age (University of Arizona, 2014).

Asunción Blanco-Romero is Associate Professor in the Department of Geography at the Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona (Spain), and also participates with UNED (National University of Distance Education), UOC (Universitat Oberta de Catalunya) and OSTELEA

School of Tourism and Hospitality. She is member of TUDISTAR-UAB research group (Tourism and new social and territorial dynamics), with which she has participated in several research projects. Her research focuses on tourisms and local development, tourism and degrowth, and geography and gender issues in regional development.

Macià Blázquez-Salom is Associate Professor in the Department of Geography at the University of the Balearic Islands. His research interests include tourism territorial planning and nature conservation from a sustainability perspective. He has been visiting scholar in several European and Central American universities. His most recent publications deal with urban and regional planning regulation and the expansion of the Balearic Islands' hotel chains in Central America and the Caribbean.

Ernest Cañada is the founder and coordinator of Alba Sud, an independent research center specialized in tourism from critical perspectives. He also collaborates as an associate professor at the University of Barcelona, in Spain, and at the University of Angers, in France. Recently he has published, together with Ivan Murray, the book Turistificación global: perspectivas críticos en turismo (Editorial Icaria, 2019). Among his lines of research, the following stand out: a) studies on work in tourism, b) socio-ecological conflicts linked to tourism, c) community tourism, and d) post-capitalist alternatives in the organization of tourism.

Ivan Murray Mas holds a PhD in Geography from the University of the Balearic Islands and a MsC in Environmental Sustainability from teh University of Edinburgh. He is Associate Professor of geography at the University of the Balearic Islands. He is member of the Research Group on Sustainability and Space. His research merges political ecology, political economy and ecological economics of tourism. He has recently co-edited with Ernest Cañada Turistificación global. Perspectivias críticas en turismo. He is also involved in social movements.

Filka Sekulova is a postdoctoral researcher at the Institute of Environmental Science and Technology (ICTA) at the Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona, with a background in ecological economics, psychology, and urban environmental justice.

ORCID

Robert Fletcher http://orcid.org/0000-0002-5365-1697
Asunción Blanco-Romero http://orcid.org/0000-0002-5869-8603
Macià Blázquez-Salom http://orcid.org/0000-0002-5522-6539
Ernest Cañada http://orcid.org/0000-0001-6086-1644

References

Ajuntament de Barcelona. (2017, March 2). *Plan Especial Urbanístico de Alojamiento Turístico*. http://ajuntament.barcelona.cat/pla-allotjaments-turistics/es

Akbulut, B. (2021). Degrowth. *Rethinking Marxism*, *33*(1), 98–110. https://doi.org/10.1080/08935696.2020.1847014

Andriotis, K. (2018). *Degrowth in tourism: Conceptual, theoretical and philosophical issues*. CABI.

Bianchi, R. (2018). The political economy of tourism development: A critical review. *Annals of Tourism Research*, *70*, 88–102. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annals.2017.08.005

Blanco-Romero, A., Blázquez-Salom, M., & Cànoves, G. (2018). Barcelona, housing rent bubble in a tourist city. Social responses and local policies. *Sustainability*, *10*(6), 2043. https://doi.org/10.3390/su10062043

Blanco-Romero, A., Blàzquez-Salom, M., Morell, M., & Fletcher, R. (2019). Not tourism-phobia but urban-philia: Understanding stakeholders' perceptions of urban touristification. *Boletín de la Asociación de Geógrafos Españoles*, *83*(83), 1-30. https://doi.org/10.21138/bage.2834

Blázquez, M., Cañada, E., & Murray, I. (2011). Búnker Playa-Sol. Conflictos derivados de la construcción de enclaves de capital transnacional turístico español en el Caribe y Centroamérica. *Scripta Nova. Revista Electrónica de Geografía y Ciencias Sociales*, Universidad de Barcelona, 368, 10/07/2011 (edición online).

Blázquez-Salom, M., Blanco-Romero, A., Vera-Rebollo, F., & Ivars-Baidal, J. (2019). Territorial tourism planning in Spain: From boosterism to tourism degrowth? *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, *27*(12), 1764–1785. https://doi.org/10.1080/09669582.2019.1675073

Brenner, N., Marcuse, P., & Mayer, M. (Eds.). (2012). *Cities for people, not for profit*. Routledge.

Britton, S. (1991). Tourism, capital, and place: towards a critical geography of tourism. *Environment and Planning D, 9*, 451–478.

Burbach, R., Fox, M., & Fuentes, F. (2013). *Latin America's turbulent transitions*. Zed Books.

Büscher, B., & Fletcher, R. (2017). Destructive creation: Capital accumulation and the structural violence of tourism. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, *25*(5), 651–667. https://doi.org/10.1080/09669582.2016.1159214

Büscher, B., & Fletcher, R. (2020). *The conservation revolution. Radical ideas for saving nature beyond the anthropocene*. Verso.

Cañada, E. (2020). *SESC Bertioga, donde el turismo social construye esperanza*. Alba Sud Editorial, colección Informes en Contraste, 11.

Cañada, E., & Murray, I. (Eds.). (2019). *La turistificación global. Perspectivas críticas en turismo*. Icaria.

Cañada, E., & Murray, I. (Eds.). (2021). *#TourismPostCOVID19 Turistificación confinada*. Alba Sud.

Cave, J., & Dredge, D. (2020b). Regenerative tourism needs diverse economic practices. *Tourism Geographies*, *22*(3), 503–513. https://doi.org/10.1080/14616688.2020.1768434

Cave, J., & Dredge, D. (Eds.). (2020a). *Reworking tourism: Diverse economies in a changing world*. Routledge.

Centenera, M. (2016). *El hotel Bauen, símbolo de las empresas recuperadas, resiste a Mauricio Macri*. https://elpais.com/internacional/2016/12/31/argentina/1483212344_219328.html

Chakraborty, A. (2021). Can tourism contribute to environmentally sustainable development? Arguments from an ecological limits perspective. *Environment, Development and Sustainability*, *23*(6), 8130–8146. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10668-020-00987-5

D'Alisa, G., & Kallis, G. (2020). Degrowth and the State. *Ecological Economics*, *169*, 106486. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolecon.2019.106486

de Almeida, M. V. (2011). The development of social tourism in Brazil. *Current Issues in Tourism*, *14*(5), 483–489. https://doi.org/10.1080/13683500.2011.568057

Eisenschitz, A. (2016). Tourism, class and crisis. *Human Geography*, *9*(3), 110–124. https://doi.org/10.1177/194277861600900308

Feola, G. (2019). Degrowth and the unmaking of capitalism. *ACME: An International Journal for Critical Geographies*, *18*(4), 977–997.

Fernández-Durán, R. (2003). *Capitalismo financiero global y guerra permanente*. Virus.

Fernández-Miranda, R. (2019). *El largo viaje del patrón. Un análisis de los hoteles recuperados en Argentina. Alba Sud 13/06/2019.* http://www.albasud.org/noticia/es/1119/el-largo-viaje-del-patr-n-un-an-lisis-de-los-hoteles-recuperados-en-argentina.

Fletcher, R. (2011). Sustaining tourism, sustaining capitalism? The tourism industry's role in global capitalistexpansion. *Tourism Geographies, 13*, 443–461.

Fletcher, R. (2019). Ecotourism after nature: Anthropocene tourism as a new capitalist 'fix. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, *27*(4), 522–535. https://doi.org/10.1080/09669582.2018.1471084

Fletcher, R., Murray Mas, I., Blanco-Romero, A., & Blázquez-Salom, M. (Eds.). (2020). *Tourism and degrowth: Towards a truly sustainable tourism*. Routledge.

Flyvbjerg, B., Bruzelius, N., & Rothengatter, W. (2003). *Megaprojects and risk: An anatomy of ambition*. Cambridge University Press.

Foster, J. B. (2011). Capitalism and degrowth: An impossibility theorem. *Monthly Review*, *62*(8), 26–33. https://doi.org/10.14452/MR-062-08-2011-01_2

Fraser, N. (2013). A triple movement? Parsing the politics of crisis after Polanyi. *New Left Review*, *81*, 119–132.

Fraser, N., & Jaeggi, R. (2018). *Capitalism. A Conversation in critical theory*. Polity.

Garcia-Munar, P. (2017). *Salvem sa Dragonera. Història dels ecologismes a Mallorca*. Illa edicions.

Gibson-Graham, J. K. (1996). *The end of capitalism (as we knew it): A feminist critique of political economy*. University of Minnesota Press.

Gibson-Graham, J. K. (2006). *A postcapitalist politics*. University of Minnesota Press.

Gössling, S., Scott, D., & Hall, C. M. (2021). Pandemics, tourism and global change: A rapid assessment of COVID-19. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, *29*(1), 1–20. https://doi.org/10.1080/09669582.2020.1758708

Guerrero, D. (2020, August 26). *Barcelona prohíbe el alquiler de habitaciones a turistas*. La Vanguardia. https://www.lavanguardia.com/local/barcelona/20200826/483060699561/barcelona-alquiler-habitaciones-turistas-prohibido.html

Hall, C. M., Lundmark, L., & Zhang, J. (2020). *Degrowth and tourism: New perspectives on tourism entrepreneurship, destinations and policy*. Routledge.

Harvey, D. (2005). *A brief history of neoliberalism*. Oxford University Press.

Hickel, J. (2020). *Less is more. How degrowth will save the world*. Penguin.

Hickel, J., & Kallis, G. (2020). Is green growth possible?*New Political Economy*, *25* (4)https://doi.org/10.1080/13563467.2019.1598964, 469–486.

Higgins-Desbiolles, F. (2010). The elusiveness of sustainability in tourism: The culture ideology of consumerism and its implications. *Tourism and Hospitality Research, 10*(2), 116–129.

Higgins-Desbiolles, F. (2012). The Hotel Bauen's challenge to cannibalizing capitalism. *Annals of Tourism Research*, *39*(2), 620–640. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annals.2011.08.001

Higgins-Desbiolles, F. (2018). Sustainable tourism: Sustaining tourism or something more? *Tourism Management Perspectives, 25*, 157–160.

Higgins-Desbiolles, F. (2020). Socialising tourism for social and ecological justice after COVID-19. *Tourism Geographies*, *22*(3), 610–623. https://doi.org/10.1080/14616688.2020.1757748

Hinton, J., & Maclurcan, D. (2017). A not-for-profit world beyond capitalism and economic growth?. *E phemera, 17*(1), 147–166.

Jessop, B. (2016). *The state: Past, present, future*. Polity Press.

Kallis, G. (2018). *Degrowth (the economy: Key ideas)*. Agenda Publishing.

Kallis, G., Kostakis, V., Lange, S., Muraca, S., Paulson, S., & Schmelzer, M. (2018). Research on degrowth. *Annual Review of Environment and Resources*, *43*(1), 291–316. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-environ-102017-025941

Kallis, G., Paulson, S., D'Alisa, G., & Demaria, F. (2020). *The case for degrowth*. Polity Press.

Kelly, P. (2005). Scale, power and the limits to possibilities. A commentary on J.K. Gibson-Graham's "Surplus possibilities: Postdevelopment and community economies. *Singapore Journal of Tropical Geography*, *26*(1), 39–43. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.0129-7619.2005.00202.x

Lenzen, M., Sun, Y.-Y., Faturay, F., Ting, Y.-P., Geschke, A., & Malik, A. (2018). The carbon footprint of global tourism. *Nature Climate Change*, *8*(6), 522–528. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41558-018-0141-x

Lew, A. A., Cheer, J. M., Brouder, P., Teoh, S., Clausen, H. B., Hall, M., Haywood, M., Higgins-Desbiolles, F., Lapointe, D., Mostafanezhad, M., Mei Pung, J., & Salazar, N. (Eds.). (2020). Tourism Geographies 22(3), special issue on "Visions of Travel and Tourism after the Global COVID-19 Transformation of 2020.

Liodakis, G. (2018). Capital, economic growth, and socio-ecological crisis: A critique of de-Growth. *International Critical Thought*, *8*(1), 46–65. https://doi.org/10.1080/21598282.2017.1357487

Machado, D. (2015). *El Hotel Bauen, para los trabajadores*. https://www.diagonalperiodico.net/global/28523-hotel-bauen-definitivamente-para-trabajadores.html

Madden, D., & Marcuse, P. (2016). *In defense of housing. The politics of crisis*. Verso.

Malm, A. (2020). *Corona, climate, chronic emergency*. Verso.

Martínez-Caldentey, M. A., Murray, I., & Blázquez-Salom, M. (2020a). En la ciudad de Madrid todos los caminos conducen a Airbnb. *Investigaciones Turísticas*, *19*(19), 1–27. https://doi.org/10.14198/INTURI2020.19.01

Martínez Caldentey, M. A., Murray, I., & Blázquez-Salom, M. (2020b). Habitabilidad y Airbnb: el alquiler de la vivienda en el distrito centro de Madrid. *Cuadernos de Turismo*, *46*(46), 367–393. https://doi.org/10.6018/turismo.451881

Mason, P. (2016). *Postcapitalism: A guide to our future*. Macmillan.

Milano, C., Cheer, J. M., & Novelli, M. (Eds.). (2019). *Overtourism: Excesses, discontents and measures in travel and tourism*. CABI.

Milano, C. (2017). *Overtourism y turismofobia. Tendencias globales y contextos locales*. Ostelea School of Tourism & Hospitality. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/323174699_Overtourism_y_Turismofobia_Tendencias_Globales_y_Contextos_Locales

Minnaert, L., Maitland, R., & Miller, G. (Eds.). (2013). *Social tourism: Perspectives and potential*. Routledge.

Mosedale, J. (Ed.). (2011). *Political economy of tourism: A critical perspective*. London: Routledge.

Mosedale, J. (Ed.). (2016). *Neoliberalism and the political economy of tourism*. London: Routledge.

Mowforth, M., & Munt, I. (2016). *Tourism and sustainability: Development, globalisation and new tourism in the third world* (4th ed.). Routledge.

Müller, N., & Blázquez-Salom, M. (2020). El uso público en la custodia de territorio. ¿Hacia un domino de intereses privados? In G. X. Pons, A. Blanco-Romero, R. Navalón-García, L. Troitiño-Torralba, & M. Blázquez-Salom (Eds.), *Sostenibilidad Turística: Overtourism vs undertourism* (Vol. 31, pp. 197–208). Palma, Mallorca, Spain: Societat d'Història Natural de les Balears.

Murray, I. (2020). De las geografías del capital a las geografías postcapitalistas. In J. Farinós (Coord.), *Desafíos y oportunidades de un mundo en transición* (pp. 285–305). Publicacions de la Universitat de València & Tirant lo Blanc.

Murray, I., Amer, J., & Blázquez-Salom, M. (2010). Doblers, poder i territrori de "marca balear" (1983-2009). *Journal of Catalan Studies*, *13*, 321–350.

O'Donnell, S. (2007). El padre, el hijo y un espíritu non sancto. *Página*, 12. https://www.pagina12.com.ar/diario/elpais/1-90028-2007-08-21.html.

Piscetta, J. (2020). *El cierre del Hotel Bauen: una leyenda de la vida porteña que marcó un hito en el cooperativismo*. https://www.infobae.com/sociedad/2020/10/07/el-cierre-del-hotel-bauen-una-leyenda-de-la-vida-portena-que-marco-un-hito-en-el-cooperativismo/

Polanyi, K. (1944). *The great transformation: The political and economic origins of our time*. Beacon.

Pons, A., Rullan, O., & Murray, I. (2014). Tourism capitalism and island urbanization: Tourist accommodation diffusion in the Balearics, 1936–2010. *Island Studies*, *9*(2), 239–258.

Poulantzas, N. (2001 [1978]). *State, power, socialism*. Verso Books.

Rayó, M. (2004). *Història de l'ecologisme a les Balears*. Documenta Balear.

Robinson, W. (2008). *Latin America and global capitalism: A critical globalization perspective*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Rockström, J., Steffen, W., Noone, K., Persson, Å., Chapin, F. S. I. I., Lambin, E., Lenton, T. M., Scheffer, M., Folke, C., Schellnhuber, H. J., Nykvist, B., de Wit, C. A., Hughes, T., van der Leeuw, S., Rodhe, H., Sörlin, S., Snyder, P. K., Costanza, R., Svedin, U., … Foley, J. (2009). Planetary

boundaries: Exploring the safe operating space for humanity. *Ecology and Society*, *14*(2), 32. https://doi.org/10.5751/ES-03180-140232

Roth, L., Monterde, A., & Calleja-López, A. (Eds.). (2019).*Ciudades democráticas. La revuelta municipalista en el ciclo post-15M*. Icaria.

Ruggeri, A. (2017). Las empresas recuperadas en Argentina: Ocupar, resistir, producir. In D. Azzellini & I. Ness (Eds.), *Poder obrero. Control y autogestión obrera desde La Comuna hasta el presente*. (pp. 495-518). Madrid, Spain: Oveja Roja.

Ruggeri, A., Desiderio, A., & Balaguer, E. (2018). *Bauen: El Hotel de los trabajadores*. Descontrol.

Russo, A. P., & Scarnato, A. (2018). Barcelona in common: A new urban regime for the 21st-century tourist city?*Journal of Urban Affairs*, *40*(4), 455–474. https://doi.org/10.1080/07352166.2017.1373023

Schenkel, E. (2017). *Política turística y turismo social. Una perspectiva latinoamericana*. Buenos Aires: Ediciones CICCUS / CLACSO.

Schenkel, E., & de Almeida, M. V. (2020). Social tourism in Latin America: Regional initiatives. In A. Diekmann & S. McCabe (Eds.), *Handbook of social tourism* (pp. 33–42). Edward Elgar.

Schmelzer, M. (2016). *The hegemony of growth: The OECD and the making of the economic growth paradigm*. Cambridge University Press.

Sekulova, F. (2014). Happiness. In G. D'Alisa, F. Demaria, & G. Kallis (Eds.), *Degrowth: A vocabulary for a new era*. Routledge.

Sekulova, F., Anguelovski, I., Kiss, B., Kotsila, P., Baró, F., Palgan, Y. V., & Connolly, J. (2021). The governance of nature-based solutions in the city at the intersection of justice and equity. *Cities*, *112*, 103136. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cities.2021.103136

Srnicek, N., & Williams, A. (2015). *Inventing the future: Postcapitalism and a world without work*. Verso.

Treu, N., Schmelzer, M., & Burkhart, C. (2020). *Degrowth in movement(s): Exploring pathways for transformation*. Zero Books.

United Nations World Tourism Organization (UNWTO). (2018). *Overtourism'? Understanding and managing urban tourism growth beyond perceptions*. UNWTO.

Wright, E. O. (2010). *Envisioning real utopias*. Verso.

Wright, E. O. (2019). *How to be an anticapitalist in the twenty-first century*. Verso.

Yates, L. (2015). Rethinking Prefiguration: Alternatives, Micropolitics and Goals in Social Movements. *Social Movement Studies*, *14*(1), 1–21. https://doi.org/10.1080/14742837.2013.870883

Young, F., & Markham, M. (2020). Tourism, capital and the commodification of place. *Progress in Human Geography*, *44*(2), 221–276. https://doi.org/10.1177/0309132519826679

Yrigoy, I. (2021). Strengthening the political economy of tourism: Profits, rents and finance. *Tourism Geographies*, https://doi.org/10.1080/14616688.2021.1894227

Zibechi, R. (2003). *Genealogía de la revuelta. Argentina, una sociedad en movimiento*. Letra Libre.