Chapter 3
The Industry of Cruises: Neglecting Hospitality

ABSTRACT

This chapter discusses critically the modern definition of hospitality and mobility. As a social institution, hospitality encourages contact with strangers. This creates a latent risk because host and guests are not familiar with the intention of the other. In the luxury of shipping lines and cruises, the sense of hospitality as an inter-tribal pact of protection is neglected. Reducing the displeasure to zero degrees, cruises are disciplinary mechanisms of control and indoctrination that hide “the other” who is not legally authorized to be on board. This discussion is not new in tourism fields, from the inception of bubble tourist literature. However, disasters are only a question of time whether the risk is ignored. From Titanic to Costa Concordia, despite the sentiment of omnipotence cruises wake up, any human error or technical failure may lead the ship to the collapse. This suggests that the quest of zero-risk society not only is a fallacy but a dangerous path to follow.

INTRODUCTION

The expansion of globalization has created not only high mobility but also a liquid society which expanded the limits of sociology as never before (Bauman, 2013). Recently, mobilities became a buzz-word, a widely-used term in the circles of academicians in Europe and the US. However, as Bauman puts it, there are two types of mobilities between the global North and South.
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On one hand, tourists living in developed nations are legally encouraged to travel to different geographical points. On another, in the opposite scenario are situated asylum-seekers, migrants and refugees who are systematically persecuted and deported (Lyon & Bauman 2013). The global North seems to be reluctant to welcome migrants coming from the South. Based on the needs of rethinking the migratory paradoxes, academicians who are interested in mobilities emphasize on the material asymmetries created to capitalism. In *Mobilities Paradox: a critical analysis* we hold the thesis that the modern nation-state disciplined and controlled many nomad ethnicities disposing their subordinations into a specific territory. In so doing, the state imposed a false sense of mobility to construct the basis of its hegemony. To put the same in other terms, mobilities serve as an ideological discourse to legitimate workers’ exploration (Korstanje 2018). Once mobilities became in a dominant narrative the world was divided into two: mobile and immobile societies. Being or not mobile seems to be a question of status and privilege. While the exemplary center enjoys from a climate of economic prosperity where travels and cultural consumptions are the main characteristics, a “doomed” periphery remains immobile. The evidence suggests that tourists demand the same comfort they had in their societies, which lead locals to import countless commodities and goods. This global modernity escapes to the hegemony of nations. The scrutiny of governments on the private sector or the “liberal market” is slim. In a more than interesting book as *Advances Introduction to Globalisation*, Jonhathan Michie (2017) alerts that the liberal thinking has failed in introducing a clear understanding of mobilities and globalization. The recent stock and market crisis happened in 2008 reminds the importance of regulating the capital market. Based on the theory of A. Glyn, the author acknowledges that the European powers—in the former centuries- imposed a colonial rule which allowed a rapid growth. Once consolidated, cynically they promoted the idea of free-market in order for the impoverished periphery to bolster a fluid commerce with them. The golden Age of Capitalism, which characterized by the induction of scale production set the pace to a global and disordered capitalism where speculation, privatization and the weakening of working unions prevailed. The dominant ideology convinced scholars that globalization was the hallmark of modernity ignoring that each civilization—adapted to their particular backgrounds- were mobile and modern. From that moment onwards, the exegetes of “the unleashed capitalism” introduced the belief that deregulation and the lack of financial barriers were the key forces towards development (Michie 2017). What is more important, the
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