

## Overcoding in Disciplines and Fields (After Deleuze): A Call for 'Dynamic Genesis' in Tourism Studies and Related Domains



Keith Hollinshead<sup>1</sup>, Rukeya Suleman<sup>2</sup>, Sisi Wang<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Independent Scholar: England & Australia

<sup>2</sup>Lecturer: International Tourism Studies: The University of Bedfordshire: England

<sup>3</sup>Doctoral Student: Tourism Studies: The University of Bedfordshire: England

**Corresponding Author: Keith Hollinshead**

Professor Keith Hollinshead : 157 Higham Lane: Nuneaton: Warwickshire C.V.11. 6.A.N.: England

---

**ABSTRACT:** This manuscript applies a crossdisciplinary cum postdisciplinary approach to scrutinising some of the metaphysical insights of French philosopher Deleuze on knowledge-production in the arts, film, literature, and science to like matters of authorial thinking within Tourism Studies. It seeks to translate his expansive thoughtlines on non-representational geophilosophy to the worldmaking agency of Tourism Studies (and related fields) not regarding what tourism *is* but what it *does*, notably in terms of how it generally works for institutions and interest groups, and how it specifically effects travellers and host populations, often giving them heavily-striated (i.e., densely-overcoded) visions of peoples/places/pasts/presents. The paper highlights many of the paradoxical dynamic dimensions ingrained within beyond-the-discipline Deleuzian thought, focusing upon his role as an 'outsider-philosopher' who unsettles commonplace visions of being and identity (within disciplines and domains of 'knowledge') by encouraging both individuals and en groupe populations towards fresh stranger-to-oneself yet creative *lines of flight* depersonalised understandings. It thereby suggests that the quasi-virtual world of Deleuzian conceptuality (viz.: his paradoxical insights into virtual realms [which are conceivably *real* without being 'actual' and *ideal* without being 'abstract']) have much oxygenating relevance to 'the creative encounter' possibilities of travel and tourism. The paper thereby has tall relevance for those in other fields who feel distinctly constrained by the dogmatism of their supposedly parent discipline or domain.

**KEYWORDS:** Dogmatic images of thought; becoming; the fold; majoritarian / minoritarian understandings; palpation; rhizomes; travel events / encounters; worldmaking agency; tourism and possibility; creative tourism / Tourism Studies

---

### Some Start-up Statements on Overcoded Understanding

"The first problem for all of us, men and women, is not to learn, but to unlearn."

Gloria Steinem (American feminist): 1971

"[Beware:] successful research impedes further successful research."

Keith J. Pendred (American scientist): 1963

"History is the archive, the drawing of what we are and what we cease to be, while [crucially] the present is the sketch of what we are becoming."

Gilles Deleuze (fluid conceptualist): (2007:50)

---

### **PROLOGUE: FIELDS OF UNDERSTANDING AND THE HIDDEN AND UNDER-THOUGHT TRUTHS OF OUR TIME**

Sometimes — no, let us say ever so commonly, even axiomatically — individuals who practice or research within a field or discipline simply do not see the wood for the trees 'there'. It is all too commonplace for such keen operators or investigators to over-respect hallowed aspects of their favoured domain or discipline, and cease to think on a broader level (Smith, 1998:320-322). For instance, a few years ago in the U.K., the archaeologist Tim Darvill recognised that the field of archaeology was replete with such loyalists

---

## Overcoding in Disciplines and Fields (After Deleuze):

### A Call for 'Dynamic Genesis' in Tourism Studies and Related Domains

(or should we say 'ultra-loyalists' / 'over-loyalists' here?). The point was nicely captured by Chris Catling at a 2016 'Archaeology Day' in Pembroke, west Wales:

While presenting [his] overview [of progressive matters in archaeology], Tim Darvill broke off from his prepared presentation to issue a wake-up call to archaeologists wedded to [just the field's] taxonomy. 'We have reached the limit of what we can learn by forcing [our] sites into monument typologies based on formal characteristics, and we must now try to make a leap of imagination and understand what these monuments might have meant to the people who built them ... . I come not to praise monument typologies but to bury them ... . [Nobody in the distant past said] OK folks, let's build a portal dolmen. Monuments were not built to a strict template; there was no blueprint in the modern sense, nor any Platonic ideal to which everyone aspired. Instead, individual communities built individual monuments, similar but different: sometimes bigger and better than those made by others; always improvised according to local materials, resources, and circumstances. Builders not only reflected elements of their underlying beliefs but also, most likely, played out their desire to go one better [than other communities], to show off. That being the case, we should celebrate diversity and difference ... instead of classifying monuments according their institutional complexity [as determined by our own institutional selves today] and building a neat but misleading evolutionary sequence from the simplest to the most developed. (Catling, 2017: 32-33; emphasis added).

This statement from Tim Darvill speaks to problems that can arise not just in archaeology, but in any disciplinary field. Individuals within domains and disciplines can frequently hoodwink themselves on a collective basis, where they ultra-believe in the pronouncements / over-believe in the projections of their field. And in recent years, the virtual-philosopher Gilles Deleuze has stepped right into these murky waters of knowledge production and institutional authority. This manuscript now therefore attempts to provide an embarkation into Deleuzian conceptualities into the dogmatic images of thought that can fast capture members of a particular domain or discipline, or indeed of any en groupe organisation or institution. The manuscript seeks (seek) to do that by giving critique of what Deleuzian insights can tell us about the common intent within fields of understanding to objectify both subjects and objects, and assume that those things pre-existed their moment of recognition or labelling. Thus, in this paper in the International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Analysis [hereafter, IJMRA], individual 'trees' are what might appear to be or to go on in travel and tourism (a field of subject 'tourists' and of object 'destinations', perhaps); in contrast, in following Deleuze (and with his frequent co-writer, Guattari), one might instead more broadly imagine 'the wood' of the nomadic logic that propels people here and there and which enables them to bump (or as Deleuze would have it flow into / fold into) all manner of other human and non-human events / experiences / encounters / excitations.

#### INTRODUCTION: A SHORT PREFACE ON DELEUZE

This cross disciplinary / post disciplinary article gives critique to the value of the liberating thought lines of Deleuze (and the Manu missive conceptualities of Deleuze and Guattari) for those who work on the world making agency of disciplines and fields (see the definitional piece of Hollinshead and Suleman (2018) on world making, ipso facto). The manuscript here in IJMRA seeks to introduce researcher and practitioners in and on travel and tourism to the call of Deleuze for 'dynamic genesis' in conceptuality about non-sedentary behaviours / proclivities / importances today. From the outset it is recognised — within this paper — that Deleuzian thought (and Deleuzoguattarian deliberation) maybe rather cryptic or rarefied for some practitioners in travel and tourism, given that (for instance) Tourism Studies researchers (themselves) tend to be schooled, fed, and watered predominantly upon business-driven values and econometric judgements (Horne, 1992; Echtner and Jamal, 1997; Tribe, 1997; Franklin, 2007). Ergo, the authors of this paper in IJMRA acknowledge upfront that some practitioners and researchers of the world-capturing nomadisms of travel and tourism may require a longer and more fulsome grounding in the cognitions of the in-many-senses-inventive and in-many-sense-dissident Deleuze (and his off-sider, Guattari). The purpose of this manuscript is not therefore to bring in a whole new phalanx of Deleuzian concepts or Deleuzoguattarian abstractions, per se, it is rather to colour in with a little more precision why the thoughtlines of Deleuze (and of Deleuze/Guattari) are often so radical for both the social sciences and the humanities in general and so 'progressive' for the understandings about the world making 'declarative agency' of nomadic logic of archaeology / tourism (Tourism Studies) / whatever, in particular. After all, and by definition, tourism is inherently a principal 'vehicle' for pet Deleuzoguattarian notions of nomadology within and across our globalising / glocalising world(s). [For a fuller introduction to worldmaking in Tourism Studies, refer to Hollinshead and Caton (2017). For path finding work on the notion of world making in a or any social science / humanities arena (or realm of the arts and aesthetics) refer to Goodman (1978).

## **Overcoding in Disciplines and Fields (After Deleuze):**

### **A Call for 'Dynamic Genesis' in Tourism Studies and Related Domains**

For translated work on worldmaking in cultural and media spheres, refer to Nünning, Nünning, and Neuman (2010). For present purposes in this manuscript, the following definition of worldmaking may suffice:

Worldmaking is ... the creative — and often 'false' or 'faux' — imaginative processes and projective promotional activities which management agencies and other mediating bodies engage in to purposely (or otherwise unconsciously) privilege particular dominant/favoured representations of peoples/places/pasts within a given or assumed region, area, or 'world', over and above other actual or potential representations of those subjects.

(Hollinshead, 2007)]

#### **BACKGROUND: A PRIMER ON DELEUZIAN THINKING ON GERMINAL LIFE**

It is perhaps important, at this early juncture in this paper, to give further coverage of some of the foundational ideas of Deleuzian cognition, although some high priests of Deleuzian scholarship will be troubled here by our action (!!), for Deleuze himself (like Derrida) was axiomatically disturbed whenever a strong cornerstone principle or a robust rudiment was ever declared anywhere about anything (May, 2008:12; Bignall and Patton, 2010:6). But we (as authors of this manuscript in IJMRA) will soldier on with the provision of what might be a short primer (for some) and a recap (for others) on Deleuzian ideas.

The primer being provided hereunder is one composed in relation to the famous words of Albert Camus who maintained that an intellectual (and by implication, an informed and alert disciplinary practitioner) is “someone whose mind watches itself” (The Times, 2001). And certainly Deleuze was a philosopher who wanted individuals in bodies/organisation/institutions to continually and mindfully reflect upon how one might live (May, 2008:1) and thereby how one might relevantly also act (May, 2008:1). In this light, Deleuze did not want a predetermined philosophy or a pre-set ontology of being to regulate the course of one’s life or one’s actions within institutions. He wanted thinking to be a mobile and dynamic happening that embraced ‘discovery’ rather than being a stable and rule-laden framework that dictates (and limits) the immanent possibilities in and of ‘things’, and in and of ‘life’ (Young, Genosko, and Watson, 2013:72).

Thus, the brief primer here is one coloured by the general Deleuzian view “that philosophy does not [or should not] settle things. [Its value and function to the self-watching disciplinary practitioner and the self-agile in-domain researcher is to] disturb them” (May, 2008:19). Thinking about life is therefore a very serious field-crossing matter to Deleuze, and he (and Guattari) are not so much inspired by a or any search for truth, per se, but rather for what is ‘interesting, remarkable, or important’ (Deleuze and Guattari, 1994:82) wherever it is inspired from. Ergo, to Deleuze, neither the informed practitioner nor the reflexive / self-attentive researcher need conform to tight ontologies from yesteryear or from the authorial institutions of the present day (May, 2008:25). Thinking is about always being vigilant and unsettled (Deleuze and Guattari, 1987): it is about conceptual dwelling nomadically in or across a smooth and open-to-world ‘space’ (Bignall and Rigney, 2019:170-177) rather than being contained wherever possible within a striated and already-established/foreclosed ‘space’ (see Robinson and Tormey, 2010:24; Bonta and Protevi, 2012:151-155 on ‘the smooth’ vis-à-vis ‘the striated’). For clarity, in Deleuzian syntax, ‘space’ is the discursive practice belonging to or associated with an activity or arena, while ‘a smooth space’ is one that is expansive and boundless and it is not tied down by disciplinary borders or within-field distinctions, whereas ‘a striated space’ is one furrowed by pointedly demarcated lines or authorised divisions that differentiate by scale or classification and which are present in some determinant and demanding fashion (historically, politically, economically, or otherwise) (Parr, 2013:261-262).

#### **FOCUS: SOME PREVISION ON/ABOUT DELEUZIAN THOUGHTLINES**

In order (hopefully!) that the novice reader of Deleuzian ideas may speedily become comfortable with the enigmatic character of these ‘dynamic genesis’ thoughtlines of Deleuze and Guattari, some preliminary statements perhaps ought to be given about what Deleuzian/Deleuzoguattarian insights tend to dwell upon or emphasise vis-à-vis the quotidian or everyday production of 'knowledge'. In this respect, the following ten conceptual apertures (i.e., opening remarks or overtures) into the sentiments of Deleuze (and Deleuze/Guattari) are hereby offered:

- **Aperture 1: MULTIPLICITIES MATTER**

To Parr (2013:181/2), ‘multiplicity’ is conceivably Deleuze’s paramount concept. To him (Deleuze), humans are elements of or actors in the world, but what really must be understood is that all things continually move and change, and existence is thereby a function of the interaction between actual heterogenous multiplicities (i.e., states of affairs) and virtual heterogenous multiplicities (i.e., notably intensive ongoing processes of change). For Deleuze and Guattari (1987), what predominately counts is not the single and

## **Overcoding in Disciplines and Fields (After Deleuze):**

### **A Call for 'Dynamic Genesis' in Tourism Studies and Related Domains**

constant subject (the distinct/ particular phenomenon) over time, but how, when and where a collective assembly (a multiplicity) suddenly or adventitiously comes together (i.e., 'becomes together', crudely speaking) at or after an 'event' of some generally-unpredictable happenstance kind. To Deleuze — based on Bergson (1913) — multiplicities are either (i) **actual** but discontinuous; or (ii) a fusion of heterogeneous elements that is continuous, but **virtual** (Deleuze, 1991:8). See Young, Genosko and Watson (2013: 210-213) for further insight upon Deleuzian 'multiplicity and becoming', and their bedrock place in knowledge production and held institutional 'knowing'.

- **Aperture 2: THE UNEXPECTED IS NORMALLY THE WAY OF THINGS**

To Grinberg (2013:205/6), under Deleuzian thoughtlines people and things 'live', 'operate', and 'generate life' within the everyday/everyplace folds of existence within multiplicities, but much-to-all of this activity may be diffuse and seemingly contradictory. An ethnographic Deleuzian account tends therefore to be one that is rich in its juxtapositions as it necessarily seeks to map 'the unexpected' more so than 'the expected', but via understandings that are impossible to ever complete. To Mazzei and McCoy (2010:504), the fitting Deleuzian inspection of ongoing and perpetual matters of change and nomadism is one built upon situationally emergent but previously unthought questions about 'becoming'. Thus, while Foucault had seen people and things disciplined by established institutions or entrenched interest groups, his compatriot in France, Deleuze, maintained that (in raw life) people and things were not so much tightly-disciplined but more loosely channelled by the un-predictable interplay of difficult-to-foretell rhizomatic forces and unfolding lines of flight. In this sense, Deleuze thinks beyond normalised 'disciplinarity' (or Foucauldian governmentality) towards even more commonplace matters of **change, connectivity, and immanence** — that is towards unexpected events of configuration and reconfiguration (Colebrook, 2006:9). Deleuze therefore perpetually queries whether our knowledge systems in each discipline/field/domain ever keep up with the rhizomatic influences of the play of 'events' about us and upon us.

- **Aperture 3: THE CONSTANT TENSION BETWEEN FORCES THAT STRIATE AND SYSTEMATISE SPACE AND FORCES THAT RADIATE SMOOTH AND UNENGAGED SPACE**

To Grinberg (2013:206), under the Deleuzian vision, a constant tension exists between power relations that pointedly stratify, and those that are in struggle and which inherently gravitate towards 'becoming' and 'the open'. While striated space privileges a totalised (or at least, conventional) order of things, smooth space tends to haunt or disrupt such specified or imposed knowledge-produced striations. In Ringrose's (2011:614) view, the informed Deleuzoguattarian researcher is thus one who is able to map the cartographies of flows and molecular forces that lie in tension with 'molar bodies' (i.e., concretised and repressive regimes), and which disrupt them. Under Deleuzian thought, the nomad (be it philosopher/scientist/artist/whatever ... be it, perhaps, archaeologist or Tourism Studies specialist!!) is one who moves from one fixed or striated territory of some kind to intensively experience the vibrations of a new and smooth territory (Parr, 2013:262). So, for instance, how genuinely 'smooth' and artlessly 'open' to the other are those who work in the regulated domain of Tourism Studies?

- **Aperture 4: RHIZOMES ARE IMPORTANT PROCESSES THAT DISRUPT TERRITORIALIZED MILIEUX / STRIATED SPACE**

To Young, Genosko, and Watson (2013:300) — in capturing Deleuzian thoughtlines — much of the world consists of homogenous or territorialised space where things are arranged in parallel (demarcated) layers and vertical (demarcated) points within what one could call 'conceptually gravity'. In contrast, rhizomes are inclined to be varied and unlimited processes that are created haphazardly and which seemingly move evasively to establish new connections between things (i.e., between new relations between 'chains' and 'circumstances'). Constituting a series of intersections and lines of movement that "lack cohesion, centre, retention (memory), expectation, or signification [they] are thus practically impossible to locate and/or destroy" (Young, Genosko, and Watson, 2013:265). Under Deleuzoguattarian logic, thereby, the rhizome has neither a starting point nor a definitive end, yet — significantly — it always has an over-spilling middle (milieu) (see Deleuze and Guattari, 1987:21-23).

In the view of Deleuze and Guattari, within the arts, the sciences, and social struggles, the rhizome ceaselessly works to make connections with other spaces, with other 'melodies', in the broadest sense of the word (whatever the field, whether it be musical or non-musical, artistic or non-artistic (Hickney-Moody, 2013:89)). In this regard rhizomatic forces which liberate tend to be immanent (i.e., instantaneous and asymmetrical) and they fold (or connect) from within as tiny moments of counter-actualisation: but they never reach a limit and are thus unfinalisable (Jackson, 2013:121). Thus, in researching tourism, what are the unexpected rhizomatic forces or the befalling events that are nowadays having unforeseen influence over a population or place?

## **Overcoding in Disciplines and Fields (After Deleuze):**

### **A Call for 'Dynamic Genesis' in Tourism Studies and Related Domains**

- **Aperture 5: THE NEW LANGUAGE OF 'BECOMING'**

To Goodchild (1996:2), the writings of Deleuze and Guattari do not so much reject established theoretical understandings but rather offer “a whole range of digressions and alternatives that carry thought elsewhere, shattering the coherence of hegemonic discourses”. In this regard, Deleuzoguattarian vistas of multiplicity and becoming scatter the postpostivist-cum-neopositivist predilections of meaning, truth, and interpretation that had been codified during the late twentieth century, and which have given rise to an abundance of new images and perceptions that signify the constancy of change and nomadism in and of all life. To Mazzei (2013:98), these fresh vistas of seeing and thinking beneficially constitute a veritable raiment (or an empowering array) of new concepts and unfamiliar syntax through which data, voice, and ethics (amongst other things) can be vivifyingly interrogated. In her view, the fresh conceptual language of Deleuzian thought is indeed a means of helping social science researchers today in each or any discipline usefully become ‘undone’ and slide inventively towards the sorts of getting lost ‘cross-methodologies’ and ‘post-methodologies’ advocated by Lather (2007:20), or otherwise rewardingly gravitate towards new analytics of posthuman qualitative inquiry (see Jackson and Mazzei 2012, here).

In these regards, Deleuze’s new language of ‘becoming’ is neatly critiqued by Pisters in her own recent chapter on the paradoxes of nomadic thought which individuals in any field (be they archaeologists, Tourism Studies scholars, whatever), and others who work on matters of mobility and motility can reflexively and fruitfully contemplate:

Deleuze’s concepts [on such as intensity and the impersonality of becoming] are hard to accommodate within the usual ... framework of [for instance] political representation and the critique of ideology since they operate within a wholly different philosophical framework of virtual becoming and actual being, rather than that of reality and ideology ... . Deleuze’s concept have nothing to do with [as many commentators hastily and erroneously otherwise judge] with abstractions or escape from the world, but are related to fundamentally mixed states of the world and the mixed state of our perception and consciousness that is always layered with multiplicities, visions, memories, knowledge: in short, with virtualities.

(Pisters, 2010:214/5; emphasis added)

- **Aperture 6: THINKING FROM WITHOUT**

To Mazzei (2013:108), one of the principal gains that social scientists and humanists (posthumanists) can take from the interruptive and invigorating conceptualities of Deleuze and Guattari is to learn “to confront [their own disciplinary] reliance on essential objects or material representations [in the effort] to understand and explain [things]”. Such ‘disrupted’ or ‘undone’ crossdisciplinary or postdisciplinary thinking indeed comprises the endeavour to think without a subject. In this Deleuzoguattarian light, research approaches that are decently fortuitously ‘disrupted’ or ‘undone’ thus require researchers to “approach [their] role not as conduits of meaning, but as transformers of thought” (Mazzei, 2013:108). To Taylor (2013:43), such emancipated but irruptive research thought is necessarily “acentred, connective, heterogenous, non-hierarchical and multiple” — after Deleuze and Guattari (1887) themselves. For Ringrose and Coleman (2013/B:128), this disturbed but freshly-connective ‘cross’ or ‘post’ research effort is tuberous (i.e., distinctly rhizomatic), and in this regard, to Colebrook (2002:38), it involves connective kinds of oxygenated thinking that is not so much ‘done’ but of a sort that [just] happens to us: importantly [it is thereby a kind of thinking] from without”. Thus, how cloistered or how porous are the thought-doms of individuals who work in Tourism Studies / Related Fields ... on the given subject-people, the subject-place, the subject-past, the subject-present?

- **Aperture 7: BEWARE BINARY CLASSIFICATIONS OF THINGS — ESPECIALLY THOSE THAT ADAMANTLY DISTINGUISH THE ACTUAL FROM THE VIRTUAL**

To Grinberg (2013:203), it is crucial that those who practice or research under Deleuzian cognitions, continually remind themselves that reality is seen to be a multiple spectrum, and that is it not only unhelpful but decidedly limiting to develop ultra-tight within-field / within-discipline binary readings of things or to conjure up singular or equivocal interpretations of ‘being’. Accordingly, inquiry into culture or into a society (for an archaeologist or a Tourism Studies worldmaking agent, whomever) is inevitably an exploration of “the multiplicities and folds of daily life and work, of how people live, operate, and generate life, [it necessarily inspects] the heterogenous, diffuse, contradictory, and juxtaposed forms that take shape and intersect in the [given] field and that come before us like a puzzle that is it impossible to [ever] complete” (Grinberg, 2013:204). In this regard, Grinberg remains faithful not to Plato’s ideal of being as ‘distinct’ and ‘equivocal’ in each of its forms, but to the counter Deleuzian argument for univocity which accordingly recognises and champions a multiplicity of changeable interpretations of and about the instances of life. While Platonism has (through the centuries) supported the view that “only one being truly is, [and] other beings are dependent, secondary,

## **Overcoding in Disciplines and Fields (After Deleuze):**

### **A Call for 'Dynamic Genesis' in Tourism Studies and Related Domains**

[and] either not truly substances nor different types of substance” (Colebrook in Parr, 2013:296), Deleuzoguattarian thought tends to reject such distinct and hard-line classification of things and maintains that (to Deleuze, in particular) no event or phenomenon (and thereby, no interpretation of and about them) is “more real than any other” (Colebrook in Parr, 2013:295). Drawing from Spinoza and Nietzsche (amongst others), Deleuze's support for univocity consequently suggests that if there is only a single existence, “perceptions, anticipations, memories, and fictions are as real as atoms, universals, concepts or bodies” (Colebrook in Parr 2013:295; emphasis added). Thus, to him (Deleuze), under univocity, mind and matter are not two discrete and detached entities, and indeed — if there is only one kind of existence or being — anything in life (an event, an idea, a past, a future, a virtual experience) can be immanently actualised as ‘life’, and should not be concretely overcoded as a dependent, secondary or inferior entity (or forever-classified subject cum forever-categorised object).

The French philosopher Badiou is uneasy on this matter of Deleuzian univocity, however, and finds it to be irreconcilable with the other important Deleuzian concept of ‘multiplicity’ (see Young, Genosko and Watson, 2013:326-328, on these Badiou-contested matters of ‘univocity’).

- **Aperture 8: BECOMING IS NOT A LINEAR PROCESS**

To Jackson (2013:115), Deleuzian ontology is not one based on stable identities, and on the longtime comparison between (or relations of) always-the-same entities. Thus, in terms of ‘becoming’ — by such Deleuzian open-to-the-world premises — change does not occur transcendentally via a readily-followable linear process, and the act/flight/shift of becoming is only of significance to the social field or the mix of forces to which it pertains: “there is no [mappable] origin, no [discernable] destination, no [comparative] end point or goal” (Jackson, 2013:115) by which the becoming-thing can be easily classified and roundly cum universally known. It is not so important, therefore under Deleuzian ontology to register what a or any becoming is, but rather to glean what it does (Deleuze and Guattari, 1987:293) in the found local and temporal moment. That becoming is a unique event, or a created newness “that produces experimentation and change: a state of being in-between” (Jackson, 2013:116). Indeed, that in-between state constitutes a temporary or midpoint threshold that has no meaning nor purpose itself until it is attached to other things in some ways as a point of (passageway for) entry or exit (Jackson, 2013:116). Under Deleuzian ontology, thereby, there are multiple thresholds (or sites of becoming) here, there, and everywhere — physical and social — where entities can collide, coalesce, and create (i.e., be freshly created or newly experienced). ‘Becoming’ is thus not a predictable linear or readily-traceable journey, it is a happening, connective, and not-so-predictable ‘event’. It is an act of ongoing change, or rather an intricate movement of folding and unfolding (Bignall, 2010:97). And so, in tourism settings / travel scenarios for instance, how does an encountered population appear to be ‘travelling’ itself, and under what kinds of arriviste influxes (flows) or arrestive happenings (folds)?

- **Aperture 9: THE VIRTUAL IS ALWAYS RELATED TO THE ACTUAL**

To Pisters (2010:204) one of the classic misunderstandings about Deleuzian ontology is that the virtual is important, but that it is an out-of-this-world phenomenon and one not-related-to-actual-reality. As stated under aperture 7 above, however, the Deleuzian virtual is no such lesser, junior, or subsidiary entity in comparison to the actual, and indeed Pisters (2010:214) registers the point that under Deleuzoguattarian thinking, “the virtual is always connected to the actual but in a far more intimate way than by [mere] opposition”: in fact, it is unhelpful to see the virtual as ever being opposed to the actual. As Deleuze (1996:179-180) phrases it himself: “every actual is surrounded by a mist of virtual images [just as every] virtual reacts on the actual”. Consonantly, under Deleuzian thought, the virtual and the actual are closely entwined just as imagination and reality are always tightly interwoven ‘appreciations’.

Ansell-Pearson (2002:162) warns, however, that the Deleuzian interlacing of the virtual within, around, and through the actual is not easy for many modern minds to grasp, for (again) contemporary disciplinary understandings are inclined to “stem in large measure from our imposition of symbolic [master] diagrams upon the movement of the real, which serve to make it [the real] something uniform, regular and calculable for us, but which also cover it up and come to constitute our only experience of the real devoid of any substitutive recognition of the virtual”. Indeed, in this vein, Miller (2003) is another scrutiniser who has probed (in problematic fashion) this postidentitarian predicament of the Deleuzoguattarian embrace of the-virtual-with-the-actual under nomadic thinking, notably with the abstraction or diminution it appears to cause for ‘realworld’ local or Indigenous knowledge systems.

## Overcoding in Disciplines and Fields (After Deleuze):

### A Call for 'Dynamic Genesis' in Tourism Studies and Related Domains

And Hallward (2006:161) is also decidedly uneasy with the ascendancy of the virtual in Deleuzian thought. He (Hallward) is very strident on this supposed Deleuzian 'philicide' where (to him) the constant Deleuzian interweaving of the virtual in and through the actual provides no opportunity for concrete historical times to ever be brought into appreciation. Many archaeologists / Tourism Studies researchers / whomever (in related fields) might therefore be in strong sympathy with Hallward, of course. To him, the Deleuzian rejection of 'the subject' is a dangerous matter indeed, and it particularly gives no decent place or space to 'the other'. To Hallward, Deleuzian philosophy of a conjoint abstract-cum-virtuality thus provides meagre opportunity for assessments of realtime political accountability. [For a response to Hallward's "wilfully tendential reading of Deleuze", see Nesbit, 2010:104-107, though].

- **Aperture 10: THE POWER OF REPRESENTATION IS ILLUSORY**

To Colebrook (2006:154), Deleuze is a vitalist thinker who is repeatedly uncomfortable with conceptualists who start to build up transcendent — or paramount/preeminent — disciplinary or institutionalised theories for systems of discourse, signification, and (especially) representation, for any society, or interest group, or discipline. As Colebrook (2006:154) succinctly puts it, "rather than question just how images emerge from life [the contemporary tendency is still for us, these days] to explain life from some already formed [consummate] image" — i.e., from some already-disciplined representation of the world that in fact we (ourselves) have conjured up from our own preconceptions, just as the archaeologist Darvill was adamant about in his 'Archaeology Day' vociferation in Pembroke — as given in the prologue for this manuscript here in IJMRA. Such transcendent and disciplined interpretations of the world overstate the power and place of the already-identified or the inherited conceptual subject, and (under Deleuzian thoughtlines) they severely underestimate the flexible capacity of the organism (i.e., the thing/the idea/the people) to maintain 'itself' and change/extend/develop in relation to environmental happenings or socio-political/cultural 'events'. Hence in his anti-representational stance, what counts to Deleuze in the arts / the sciences / philosophy — and thus, conceivably, in archaeology amongst the established disciplines, and in dawning operational fields like Tourism Studies — is not how 'actual things' are represented but how that thing **becomes** 'there and then', i.e., how it is created and comes to be (momentarily) by event(s), episode(s), or experience(s). To Deleuze, the problem with the overcoding of classificatory systems of disciplinary representation is that they only tend to focus upon the apparent actual and misses the degree to which the actual and the virtual indeed dance together, in tandem. To him in film (for instance), a given representation might capture 'the real' (viz., a perceived reality), but it might inductively and significantly undervalue the teeming imagination that bolsters it and constantly the rich dreaming that pre-sustains it.

And this is what seemingly so fired up Darvill in west Wales. His within-field worries are Deleuzian in cogency. Too many disciplinary representations of the world are thereby merely images of the eye (Deleuze 1989:243), and Deleuze favours films/performances/narratives that do not seek to conclusively and ubiquitously capture and represent a subject or people but which allow reality and imagination to interplay with the other non-representationally. To him, empowering effects are vital and the power of 'invention' is crucial (Deleuze, 2007), particularly if a nomadic subjectivity or a missing people is to be openly and creatively conceptualised.

It should however be realised that while Deleuzian conceptualities (operating within the philosophical framework of virtual-becoming and actual-being rather than within conventional political representations of reality and ideology (Pisters,2010:214)), they are no paltry, occult, or 'woolgathering' matter, abstract or removed from the world. They are inclined to work immanently and explicitly about becoming subjects / becoming ideas / becoming peoples in deft (i.e., often paradoxical) ways. And, to restate a key point for archaeologists and for researchers and practitioners in Tourism Studies, wherever, the immediate value of such Deleuzian contentions is so often interruptive to what generally are received within-field ways of seeing and assumed ways of disciplined knowing, or rather to ways of pre-seeing and pre-knowing categorised subjects/objects/things.

## DELEUZE APPLIED IN GENERAL INSTITUTIONAL SETTINGS

### THE DOGMATIC IMAGE OF THOUGHT

The work of Deleuze — and the work of Deleuze with his frequent co-author, the psychoanalyst Guattari — is not commonly deemed to be 'pure philosophy.' To Deleuze, philosophy is an act of positive thinking, or rather it is an event in and of life (meaning an episode, experience, or encounter) where fresh concepts are formulated beyond what is or has already been given. It is an act through which the existing assumptions, the foundational propositions and presumed differences of various systems of held thought are questioned, **for Deleuze is uncomfortable with thought that stems from already defined and thereby conceivably**

## Overcoding in Disciplines and Fields (After Deleuze):

### A Call for 'Dynamic Genesis' in Tourism Studies and Related Domains

'dead' terms. To him, we exist in a world where received signs / established codes / decreed systems / installed series always confront us in each and every setting and at each and every moment, and which therefore goad us into thinking that the world is already meaningfully 'known'. And Deleuze's philosophy is thereby asystemic (Deleuze, 1994) whereby he looks for responses to produced 'affect' rather than pursuing recognised and established 'meaning', per se, and where he calls for fixed and implanted thought to be 'freed up' from over-defined or overdetermined institutionalised terms which have lived on well beyond their situational usefulness. All of this is a Deleuzian rejection of over-disciplined meaning and of the overcoded classification of the world and its peoples/places/pasts/presents.

In seeking to break with habitual modes of institutional knowledge-production, Deleuze maintains that his own approach to philosophy — i.e., the productive making of fresh and open concepts — should not only be creative but proactive. Following Leibniz, Deleuze rejects classicist notions of philosophy with their own and uniform 'systems', and he promotes a baroque style of philosophy instead, in which openings as foldings 'inflect' through particular ongoing 'events' and crop-up 'encounters' (Deleuze, 1993). And, for Deleuze, this inflection is accounted for through his own advocated concept of the fold or the curvature where such happenstance or admixture of forces meets or occurs: refer to Lorimer (2013: 68-9) here on 'the fold' vis-à-vis postcolonial heritage tourism, for instance. In this light, Deleuze suggests it is not the job of the philosopher to smooth out difficulties within our received thinking, it is incumbent upon him or her (the aware world-aware and cosmos-alert discipline-crossing philosopher) to formulate new problems, to identify new folds, and to thereby create new and deeper styles of generative thinking and of post disciplinary imagination. Thus, to him, just as life is in constant change, so is philosophy, and his own style of philosophy must therefore be active and creative, but also affirmative — that is, affirming the power of people 'to become' (Colebrook, 2002:66) rather than just 'to be'. And art (and cinema, and music) is notably distinct in its respective power (in their powers) to affect and therefore assist that dynamic 'becoming'. And in like vein, so can disciplinary archaeology and nascent Tourism Studies, whatever domain, each be made rather less striated and somewhat more smooth, open, and fertile in its dynamic genesis, as Deleuze (1969) styles it.

### DELEUZE APPLIED IN SPECIFIC TRAVEL / TOURISM / NOMADIC SETTINGS: PRODUCTIVE THOUGHT – THOUGHT FREED UP

In seeking to explore old / tired dogmas of over-disciplined or over-institutionalised understandings, creating a plenitude of new productive thoughtlines along the way, Deleuze is adamant that **subjects (i.e., assumed things) should not precede perception**, for the ongoing goal of individual philosophers (and, by extension, of individuals in life) ought to be expand their own power of perception as primed by 'the flows of events' they come across, and the folds or curvatures they find are influential 'there' and 'then'. To Deleuze, thinking is thus an act of discovery which does not generate meaning for ubiquitous deployment elsewhere in other settings and scenarios, but it is a productive act or a generative event itself which registers a or the open flow of becoming, or otherwise what is freshly immanent 'there' and 'then'. And while art is particularly useful at generating such immanence (i.e., such fresh possibilities, such blooming potentials), it is cinema (to Deleuze) that is notably adapt at lubricating such fixed images from the past and thereby rendering one's perception more 'mobile' where that mobility relates to either images of movement across place or across contours of time (Deleuze, 1986).

And it is the view of the authors of this manuscript in IJMRA that such forms of immanent becoming — such forms of creative 'dynamic genesis' — can conceptually also be readily applied in the Darvillian domain of archaeology. It is our view that there is always large scope in especially interpreting the difficult happenings around the world under neocolonialism / postcolonialism / after-colonialism of our era via such Deleuzian matters of classificatory over-representation and, hence, via the discursive power of disciplines and fields. See Bignall and Patton (2010) here, on such normalising / naturalising / worldmaking acts of institutional pre-coding and academic overcoding in the instances they cover in Asia, Africa, the Americas, Australia, and Palestine.

In constantly querying the assumptions which lie behind supposedly-tested-and-secure disciplinary systems of thought, and in seeking to generate concepts beyond the institutionally-given, Deleuze promotes the view that **much of the world's knowledge and received morality is arbitrary and is consonantly platformed only upon single-plane understandings rather than at points of confluence between several (i.e., multiple) generational influences**. In contrast to such hackneyed forms of knowledge-mongering, Deleuze demands forms of thinking which are dynamic (that is, which are 'alive' for the moment and for the future as all 'things' change / mutate / become other), and which are not necessarily geared up to formulate 'knowledge', per se. In searching for such new kinds of thinking — and thereby in identifying new kinds of productive 'power' — Deleuze is not so much drawn towards majoritarian understandings / majoritarian populations (i.e., to entrenched forms of knowledge and to groups of



## **Overcoding in Disciplines and Fields (After Deleuze):**

### **A Call for 'Dynamic Genesis' in Tourism Studies and Related Domains**

people who have a fixed and dominant grounding-standard of some mainstreamed sort ... both of which (viz., the forms of within-field knowledge and the groups of people) are therefore deemed to be 'major' — but to minoritarian understandings / minoritarian populations neither of which have attained a or any precedential mainstream or standard status but which are engaged in current process of creative or corrective or compensatory 'becoming'. Thus, to repeat the point, it is not the arborescence of majoritarian things and people — with their distinctly ordered form and fixed direction that appeals to Deleuze — but **the rhizomatics** of events and encounters, which by definition are random, decentred, and proliferating (Colebrook, 2002: xxvii), and which are thereby unfixated.

To Deleuze, such is to gain understanding through palpation that is through the palpation of always-divergent life, at each where and for each when: and, to him generally, such divergent or disruptive folding is always potentially transformative. To Deleuze, life ought to ineluctably be — and indeed is — an important act of (and continual orientation towards) the prospects and dividends of 'change'. And this is what the practitioners and researchers of tourism and travel (or of any field) can rewardingly take on board as they define peoples/places/pasts/presents and as they promote access to different societies and spaces. This is the authorial (or juridical) role and function of tourism / Tourism Studies today in governing the world's perceived cultures, spiritualities, and cosmologies: refer to Hollinshead (1999/A) on the juridical agency of tourism judges (i.e., decision-takers in tourism bodies/organisations/institutions) under the systematic Foucauldian normalising / naturalising governmentalities of the practitioner-industry and its entangled research-domain. It is this juridical — and often dogmatic — juridical agency and power that makes Deleuze so uncomfortable.

The usefulness of Deleuzian thought in any industry or field is that it can help both stakeholding groups and single individuals recognise how modern society / modern networks conceivably suppress the possibilities (or rather the virtualities) of 'difference' and strictly contain people within fixed identities which alienate them from what they could do — i.e., preventing them from going beyond the perceived fettered limits of their prescribed and internalised potential. Consonantly, bona fide Deleuzian thought (once grasped!!) has the promise of helping both institutions and individuals recognise that the existence of "the static genesis" (Deleuze, 1969) of overcoded identities can cripple the capacity of people to become what they could otherwise become via an adventitious loosening up of their own aspirations. Thus, the declarative power of archaeology (for instance) might be tall, but so is the enunciatory and affirmative potential of that and other disciplines for more unfastened interpretations of and about global populations and global places. In tourism / Tourism Studies, such Deleuzian empowerment may thus be recognised, for instance, in terms of where the travellers of our time want to travel to and why. It may also be gleaned via an enhanced acceptance of the possibility of unexpected 'experiences' or fortuitous 'events' (where, to repeat a point, 'events' in the Deleuzian sense, comprise the novel-yet-immanent and accidental-yet-potent confluence of 'things') wherever, whenever, however.

And, to Deleuze, such events may openly be any non-essential activity, any non-essential person or people, any non-essential idea, any non-essential setting (Lawlor, 2012:112-116) as is encapsulated, for instance, in what Deleuze (1969) indeed calls 'dynamic genesis'. To him, such opportunity, such potential, and such otherness lies in the delicious chaos of freshly-folded / vitally-curved 'chance', 'convenience', or 'happenstance'. Travel and tourism, then, will always be redolent with such Deleuzian openings, such Deleuzian prospect, and such Deleuzian risk. Oh why oh why did not Deleuze — the herald (with Guattari) of nomadic thought — not let his own powers of illumination on dynamic genesis run au courant within or into the potentially prolific flux and triggering nomadology of tourism, ipso facto?!!

But we must register the point that in many senses Tourism Studies is still (today) something of a second-storey field. It very much depends upon what the first-storey fields (or rather the ground-floor disciplines) of domains like archaeology — and of anthropology, of cultural studies, of history, and of geography, et cetera) — have initially chronicled (i.e., pre-chronicled / pre-packaged) for it. Oh-so-commonly Tourism Studies takes its hailed knowledges already-pre-baked in the disciplinary-ovens of so called 'senior' disciplines.

#### **SUMMARY — DELEUZIAN ONTOLOGY AND THE FLUX OF LIFE:**

##### **DELEUZE AND ASPIRATIONAL / ADVENTITIOUS 'BECOMING' THROUGH TOURISM**

The philosophy of Deleuze — especially when working with Guattari — is thereby far from conventional. His philosophical insights do not constitute a cohesive body of tightly-reasoned singular arguments, but rather comprise a panoply of distinctly new ways of reflecting upon the world. Following Spinoza, he did not seek to generate a pool of self-contained expostulations or general

## Overcoding in Disciplines and Fields (After Deleuze):

### A Call for 'Dynamic Genesis' in Tourism Studies and Related Domains

prescriptions about things in the world, but rather sought to build up an interleaved mix of assertions about the world where it (the world) is not seen as external object 'out-there-from-us' (there to be judged) but as a **protean plane of forces and folds that operate within us and upon us** (Deleuze, 1992). Hence for Deleuze — as it was for Spinoza — philosophy is not foundational but dynamic, and as it mirrors the rich mobility of life, it must itself be highly mobile. Accordingly, if philosophy has an aim as it is incorporated as a small 'p' matter within archaeology / within Tourism Studies / within wherever, it is to help render the strange familiar and the familiar strange whereby received 'sound sense' as 'the only direction' is vigilantly undermined (Deleuze 1990:5). And to our mind — as authors of this manuscript — this is the postdisciplinary (Deleuzian) philosophy: it seeks to be open-to-the-always-changing-world thinking.

In this light, the philosophy of Deleuze is a raft of liquid and mutable conceptualisations which can inspire new connections for thinking (Deleuze, 1994) and new rhizomatic styles of understanding in so many disciplines and fields. For Deleuze, it is the postdisciplinary relatability of things that counts, or otherwise (put another way) it is the coupling and the conjointment of 'ideas' / of 'possibilities' / of 'futures' that matters. Such are the liquid and dynamic Deleuzian 'planes of thought' (Deleuze, 1994) which work together in a plurality of fluidly-imbricated junctions and not-so-predictable but engaging unions (Deleuze and Guattari, 1987).

Let the the Deleuzian self-reflexivities therefore flow across the disciplines and domains. Let the Deleuzoguattarian challenge to pre-digested over-disciplined knowledge gain force. Let us all be aware of the dogmatic images of thought that might conceivably be constraining our own individual capacity and our en groupe abilities to think smoothly and openly (Colebrook, 2006: 69-72) within singular disciplines and demesnes. If there are certain arenas where the need to be able to think otherwise (after Deleuze) (May, 2008:120-1) is vital then, they may clearly lie within archaeology (as it seeks to trace the lost past into the lived present), and also within Tourism Studies (as it can uncover the aspirational imperatives of populations in the visitable now as they beckon their own sought / preferred future). These crossdisciplinary cum postdisciplinary Deleuzian ideas on the dynamic genesis of becoming and on the dynamic genesis of understanding are thereby teeming with conceptual excitement. It is the view of the authors of the manuscript here in IJMRA that they are fecund both for a first-storey (i.e., first-interpretive-story!!) and supposedly-foundational (sic!!) discipline like archaeology, and fertile for an applied and incipient second-storey (i.e., second-interpretive-story!!) field like Tourism Studies. The potential for such liquid world-representing domains (such **worldmaking** demesnes) is immense.

And so, Tim Darvill — in Pembroke in 2016 — was justified in warning against the striations of ultra-conservative / already-fetishised / overfamiliar worldmaking declarations of juridical authority from, in this case, overcoding archaeologists. Overcoding-tourism-practitioners and overcoding-Tourism-Studies-researchers be warned, in like regard!! Overcoding-practitioners and overcoding-researchers in each and every discipline be warned: get to know where your own constraining striations start and stop ... or rather, where they just do not stop!!

## REFERENCES

- 1) Adey P, Bissell D, and Urry J (2010). Mobilities, meeting, and futures: An interview with John Urry. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*. 28: 101-116.
- 2) Augé M (1995) *Non-places*. London: Verso.
- 3) Baggini J (2018) *How the World Thinks: A Global History of Philosophy*. London: Granta.
- 4) Bauman Z (2003) From pilgrim to tourist — or a short-history of identity. In: Hall S and du Gay P (eds). *Questions of Cultural Identity* London: Sage, pp.18-36.
- 5) Bergson H (1988) *Matter and Memory* [Trans. N.M. Paul & W.S. Palmer]. New York: Zone Books.
- 6) Bignall S (2010). *Affective assemblages: Ethics beyond enjoyment*. In: Bignall S and Patton P (eds.). *Deleuze and the Postcolonial*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh Univ. Press, pp.78-102.
- 7) Bignall S and Braidotti R (2019) *Posthuman systems*. In: Braidotti R and Bignall S (eds) *Posthuman Ecologies: Complicity and Process after Deleuze*. New York: Rowan and Littlefield, pp.1-16.
- 8) Bignall S and Patton P (2010). *Deleuze and the Postcolonial*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh Univ. Press.
- 9) Bogue R (2012) *Deleuze and literature*. In: Smith DW and Somers-Hall H (eds) *The Cambridge Companion to Deleuze*. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, pp.286-306.
- 10) Bonta M and Protevi J (2012) *Deleuze and Geophilosophy: A Guide and Glossary*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- 11) Braidotti R (2019) *Posthuman Knowledge*. Cambridge: Polity.

## Overcoding in Disciplines and Fields (After Deleuze):

### A Call for 'Dynamic Genesis' in Tourism Studies and Related Domains

- 12) Buchanan I (2000) *Deleuzism: A Metacommentary*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh Univ. Press.
- 13) Buck E (1993) *Paradise Remade: The Politics of Culture and History in Hawai'i*. Philadelphia, Pa.: Temple Univ. Press.
- 14) Catling C (2017). *Heathery livrocky land: Rethinking the stones of neolithic Pembrokeshire*. *Current Archaeology* 324: 32-41. [March].
- 15) Clarke DB and Doel MA (2013) *Zyzzunt Bauman*. In: Hubbard P and Kitchin R (eds) *Key Thinkers in Space and Place*. Los Angeles: Sage, pp.55-62.
- 16) Clifford J (1997) *Routes*. Cambridge, Ma.: Harvard University Press.
- 17) Colebrook C (2002) *Understanding Deleuze*. Crows Nest, NSW, Australia: Allen and Unwin.
- 18) Colebrook C (2003) *Gilles Deleuze (Routledge Critical Thinkers)*. London: Routledge.
- 19) Colebrook C (2006) *Deleuze: A Guide for the Perplexed*. London: Continuum.
- 20) Coleman R and Ringrose J (2013) *Deleuze and Research Methodologies*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh Univ. Press.
- 21) Delanda M (2012) *Deleuze, mathematics and realist ontology*. In: Smith DW and Somers-Hall H (eds) *The Cambridge Companion to Deleuze*. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, pp.220-238.
- 22) Deleuze G (1969) *Logique du Sens*. Paris: Minuit.
- 23) Deleuze G (1983) *Nietzsche and Philosophy*. [Trans. H. Tomlinson] New York: Columbia Univ. Press.
- 24) Deleuze G (1986) *Cinema 1: The Movement Image (Trans. H. Tomlinson and B. Habberjam)*. Minneapolis: Univ. of Minnesota Press.
- 25) Deleuze G (1988) *Spinoza: Practical Philosophy*. San Francisco: City Lights Books.
- 26) Deleuze G (1989) *Cinema 2: The Time-Image (Trans. H. Tomlinson and R. Galeta)*. Minneapolis: Univ. of Minnesota Press.
- 27) Deleuze G (1990) *The Logic of Sense (Trans. M. Lester; ed.C.V. Boundas)*. New York: Columbia Univ. Press.
- 28) Deleuze G (1992) *Expressionism in Philosophy. (Trans. M. Joughin)*. New York: Zone Books
- 29) Deleuze G (1993) *the Fold: Liebniz and the Baroque. (Trans. T. Colney)*. London: Athlone Press.
- 30) Deleuze G (1994) *Difference and Repetition (Trans. P. Patton)*. New York: Columbia Univ. Press.
- 31) Deleuze G (2007). *Two Regimes of Madness: Texts and Interviews, 1975-1995. (Ed.: D.Lapoujade; Trans.: A.Hodges and M.Taormina)*. N.York: Semiotext(e).
- 32) Deleuze G and Guattari F (1987) *A Thousand Plateaus (Trans. B. Massumi)*. Minneapolis: Univ. of Minnesota Press.
- 33) Deleuze G and Guattari F (1994) *what is Philosophy? (Trans. H. Tomlinson and G.Burchell)* New York: Columbia Univ. Press.
- 34) Deleuze G and Parnet C (2007) *Dialogue (Trans. H. Tomlinson and B. Habberjam)*. New York: Columbia Univ. Press.
- 35) Echtner CM and Jamal TB (1997) *the disciplinary dilemma of tourism studies*. *Annals of Tourism Research* 28(4): 868-884.
- 36) Finley S (2018) *Critical arts-based inquiry: Performance of resistance politics*: In: Denzin NK and Lincoln YS (eds) *The Sage Handbook of Qualitative Research*. Los Angeles: Sage, pp.561-575.
- 37) Franklin A (2007) *the problem with tourism theory*. In: Atelejjevic I, Pritchard A and Morgan, N (eds) *The Critical Turn in Tourism Studies*. Amsterdam: Elsevier, pp.131-148.
- 38) Garoian CR (2015) *Performing the refrain of arts prosthetic pedagogy*. *Qualitative Inquiry* 21, 487-493.
- 39) Gibson C (2018) *Touring nation: The changing meanings of cultural tourism*. In: Rowe D, Turner G and Waterton E (eds) *Making Culture: Commercialisation, Transnationalism, and the State of 'Nationing' in Contemporary Australia*. London: Routledge, pp.116-128.
- 40) Giroux H (2013) *the violence of organised forgetting: Thinking beyond America's disimagination machine*. Available at: [www.truthout.org/opinion/item](http://www.truthout.org/opinion/item)
- 41) Goodman N (1978) *Ways of Worldmaking*. Hassocks, Sussex: Harvester.
- 42) Groys B (2008) *Art Power*. Cambridge, Ma. Massachusetts Institute of Tech. Press.
- 43) Hollinshead K (1999/A) *Surveillance of the worlds of tourism: Foucault and the eye-of-power*. *Tourism Management* 20. 7-23.
- 44) Hollinshead K (1999/B) *Tourism as public culture: Horne's ideological commentary on the legerdemain of tourism*. *International Journal of Tourism Research* 1, 267-292.
- 45) Hollinshead K (2007) *'Worldmaking' and the transformation of place and culture*. In: Atelejjevic I, Pritchard A and Morgan N (eds) *The Critical Turn in Tourism Studies*. Amsterdam: Elsevier, pp.165-193.
- 46) Hollinshead K and Caton K (2007) *Worldmaking and the representation of peoples and places in/through tourism*. In: Lowry L (ed) *The Sage International Encyclopedia of Travel and Tourism*. Thousand Oaks, Ca. Sage, pp.1486-1490.
- 47) Hollinshead K and Ivanova M (2013) *the multilogical imagination: Tourism studies and the imperative for postdisciplinary knowing*. In: Smith M and Richards G (eds) *The Routledge Handbook of Cultural Tourism*. London: Routledge, pp.53-62.

## Overcoding in Disciplines and Fields (After Deleuze):

### A Call for 'Dynamic Genesis' in Tourism Studies and Related Domains

- 48) Hollinshead K and Kuon V (2013) the scopic drive of tourism: Foucault and eye dialectics. In: Moufakkir O and Reisinger Y (eds) *The Host Gaze in Global Tourism*. Wallingford, Oxon: Cabi, pp.1-18.
- 49) Hollinshead K and Suleman R (2017) Time for fluid acumen: A call for improved tourism studies dialogue with the decolonizing world. *Tourism, Culture and Communication* 17: 61-74.
- 50) Hollinshead K and Suleman R (2018) the everyday installations of worldmaking: New vistas of understanding on the declarative reach of tourism. *Tourism Analysis* 23: 201-213.
- 51) Horne D (1992) *the Intelligent Tourist*. McMahan's Point, Sydney. Margaret Gee Holdings.
- 52) Jackson AC and Mazzei LA (2018) Thinking with theory: A new analytic for qualitative inquiry. In: Denzin NK and Lincoln YS (eds) *The Sage Handbook of Qualitative Research*. Los Angeles: Sage, pp.717-737.
- 53) Kirschenblatt-Gimblett B (1998) *Destination Culture*. Berkeley, Ca. Univ. of California Press.
- 54) Lawlor L (2012) Phenomenology and metaphysics and chaos: On the fragility of the event in Deleuze. In: Smith DW and Somers-Hall H (eds) *The Cambridge Companion to Deleuze*. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, pp.1103-1125.
- 55) Lorimer J (2013) More-than-human visual analysis. In: Coleman R and Ringrose J (eds) *Deleuze and Research Methodologies*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh Univ. Press, pp.61-78.
- 56) Maiolo F (2012) *Foucault e la Souranità*. Roma. Arcana Editrice.
- 57) Mavrič M and Urry J (2009) Tourism studies and the new mobilities paradigm (NMP). In: Jamal T and Robinson M (eds) *The Sage Handbook of Tourism Studies*. Los Angeles: Sage, pp.645-657.
- 58) May T (2008) *Gilles Deleuze: An Introduction*. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press.
- 59) McKay I (2004) *Quest for the Folk*. Montreal: McGill and Queens Univ. Press.
- 60) Mol a (2003) *the Body Multiple: Ontology in Medical Practice*. Durham, N.C.: Duke Univ. Press.
- 61) Nesbitt N (2010) the postcolonial event. In: Bignall S and Patton P (eds) *Deleuze and the Postcolonial*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh Univ. Press, pp.103-118.
- 62) Nünning V, Nünning A, and Neumann B (eds) (2010) *Cultural Ways of Worldmaking: Media and Narratives*. Berlin, Germany: De Gruyter.
- 63) Nye JS (2004) *Soft Power: The Means to Success in World Politics*. New York, N.Y.: Public Affairs.
- 64) Parr A (2013) *the Deleuze Dictionary*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh Univ. Press.
- 65) Patton P (2012) Deleuze's political philosophy. In: Smith DW and Somers-Hall H (eds) *The Cambridge Companion to Deleuze*. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, pp.198-219.
- 66) Pearson KA (1999) *Geminal Life: The Difference and Repetition of Deleuze*. London: Routledge.
- 67) Pisters P (2010) Violence and laughter: Paradoxes of nomadic thought in postcolonial cinema. In: Bignall S and Patton P (eds) *Deleuze and the Postcolonial*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh Univ. Press, pp.201-219.
- 68) Robinson M and Jamal TB (2009) Conclusions: tourism studies — past omissions, emergent challenges. In: Jamal TB and Robinson M (eds) *The Sage Handbook of Tourism Studies*. Los Angeles: Sage, pp.693-702.
- 69) Rothman H (1998) *Devil's Bargains*. Lawrence, Ks.: Univ. Press of Kansas.
- 70) Saxena G (2015) Imagined relational capital: An analytical tool in considering small tourism firms' sociality. *Tourism Management* 49: 109-118.
- 71) Smith MJ (1998) Situated knowledges: Rethinking knowledge and reality. In: Smith MJ (ed) *Social Science in Question*. London: Sage, pp.277-330.
- 72) Soanes C and Stevenson A (2006) *Oxford Dictionary of English*. 2nd edition: revised. Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press.
- 73) St. Pierre E (1997) Methodology in the fold and the irruption of transgressive data. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education* 10(2): 175-189.
- 74) Thomas N (1994) *Colonialism's Culture: Anthropology, Travel and Government*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton Univ. Press.
- 75) Tonkonoff S (2017) *From Tarde to Deleuze and Foucault: The Infinitesimal Revolution*. New York: Palgrave-Macmillan.
- 76) Tribe J (1997) The indiscipline of tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research* 24(3).
- 77) Williams J (2009) *Gilles Deleuze's 'Logic of Sense': A Critical Introduction and Guide*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh Univ. Press.
- 78) Young EB, Genesko G, and Watson J (2013) *The Deleuze and Guattari Dictionary*. London: Bloomsbury.