

HEALTH COVER, THE CASE OF MARTIN AND CAROLINA IN AUSTRALIA

Maximiliano E KORSTANJE

*University of Palermo, Larrea 1079, Buenos Aires
mkorst@palermo.edu*

Babu, GEORGE

*SMC University, Vorstadt 26°, Swizerland
babu.george@live.com***Abstract**

This research examines, from a qualitative perspective, some public opinion related to issues associated with the management of a tensed situation. In that process, it identifies some of the subtle differences in the Anglo-Latino cultural expectations. Martin, an Argentine tourist, contracted the Gullien-Barre syndrome in Australia, while enjoying his honeymoon vacation on a Tasmanian island with his partner Carolina. With the passing of days, Martin lost his mobility and was finally hospitalized in emergency. Doctors induced Martin into a coma temporarily because his muscles were paralyzed by the action of the virus. Health costs were more expensive than the family could absorb in Australia. The family had to request the intervention of the Argentine embassy and chancellery for help. In other words, this incident contrasts two world views: hospitality as the institution that historically developed to care and protect travelers versus hospitality as the commercial practice of exploitation.

Key words: *illness, hospitality, health, tourism, security*

JEL Classification: *B25, F5, I3, P1*

I. INTRODUCTION

Family is a significant institution for society and social life. The process of transformation of individual partners into a family, or rite of passage, is enthralled by a travel (honey-moon) where the couple consolidates its project in the long-run. The newlyweds agree to celebrate a pact of fertility which legitimizes the authority of state. Honeymoon has not only individual, but also community importance (Alberdi-Alonso, 1981). The family represents the tents of society. Its importance is defined in the honey-moon which is a rite of passage where the parts consolidate a covenant. Since the legitimacy of states depends on their abilities to protect strangers, honoring the pact of hospitality, alien safety is a divine mandate given by the Gods from immemorial times. Hospitality exhibits a fertile ground to study the social relations between hosts and guests (Korstanje & Olsen, 2011).

In this backdrop, it is interesting to read the story of Carolina Santori and Martin Renzacci who married in 2011. The couple decided to travel to Tasmania to enjoy their honeymoon but Martin, once there, caught the Gullien-Barre syndrome, which rapidly deteriorated all his basic functions. Stranded in an unfamiliar country, Australia, where the hospitalization of tourist should be paid, unlike in Argentina where this service has no costs, the couple faced its worst nightmare. What Martin and Carolina faced was a discrepancy between two types of

hospitalities. We are educated to think of hospitality only in a commercial way, but history reveals that hospitality is an ancient institution aimed at protecting the other. In the modern age, one conception of hospitality crystalized in the health system, hospitals, and other in tourism, or hotel chains. In fact, the mass-movements of people sometimes put two types of hospitalities at odds.

The Australian health system asked for Martin's family to pay the medical treatment and admission since the traveler insurance was not enough to absorb the expensive costs. Beyond the possibilities to pay that, Carolina resorted to the Argentinean Chancellery and the media. The former were pressed to negotiate with Australia an alternative course of action to assist Martin while the latter silenced the case so that panic did not flourish. This case study not only reminds us that Australia and Argentina developed diverse types of health services (hospitalities), but also how media is conducive to national interests whenever the message they transmit may jeopardize the social order.

Though there is no universal understanding of health in the world, two archetypes can be observed, the British and Latin paradigm. Within the British tradition, Australia has developed restricted public hospitals, which means that hospitalization should be paid no matter what the patients' resources or their status are. Rather, in Argentina public hospitals give attention and hospitalization at no cost, not only for the natives, but also for the strangers. These views contrasted notably, creating a conceptual tension

between the Latin American and the Anglo-worlds. The universal access to health is not granted in Anglo-speaking countries (Chemichovsky, 1995). This seems to be the point of departure of this essay-review.

II. MEDIA REPRESENTATION AND FEAR OF DEATH

West has created a negative image on death representing one of its major fears. Unlike others countries where the greatest fear was linked to the eternal condemnation of soul (Middle East, for example), secularized societies neglect the hereinafter. Therefore, the main problem of modern citizens seems to be death. One of the first philosophers who tackled the problem of death was Thomas Hobbes. According to his view, people move in two contradicting premises. The first refers to the need of possession; the second alludes to the drive of preservation. The introduction of state regulates for good or bad, the social behavior avoiding the war of all against all, but what is important to debate is that fear does not dilute. It remains by other means working in the social values (Hobbes, 1998). The media plays a vital role as an ethic instrument of indoctrination in Western societies delineating the individual and social behavior as well as its prone risky. Why we live in a society that valorizes so much the risk?

On a closer look, this reality led by George Mead (1999) to deepen the dependency of audience and media in industrial mind. Mc Chesney (1994) explores the history of Media in the US considering that they achieved a rapid consolidation thanks to the elite's support. Although, in an outset, the media were not commercial with the passing of time, American aristocracy envisaged the possibility to coin a message for lay-people. The market of broadcasting is financed by the same business corporations the same media benefits. Quite aside from this, media and journalism posed leadership in creating and providing beliefs to people to construct a specific cosmology respecting to the environmental world. Whenever the society faces a problem, media describes, not more accurately, the situation introducing stereotypes which although simplify the reality, makes the world safer (Lippmann, 1922; Enteman, 1996).

From 9/11 onwards, more scholars have devoted attention to the risk of travel industries, as well as the social discourse both generate. The act by abandoning home signals to a symbolic rupture between familiarity and unfamiliarity, here and there, us and them. Since travels are subject to countless risk (Korstanje, 2010), hospitality may be defined as an ancient institution created to regulate the traveler's safety. From this term derived not only hospitals, but also hotels. We move because it entails a controlled risk, which gives arousal to our spirit. The sense of adventure, as Elias and Dunning put it, needs little threats. Any trip needs, from emotions, certain level of

uncertainty and risk. R. Fletcher (2011) suggests that the tourist destination attractiveness depends on a pervasive story where safety is combined with adventure. The meaning of discovery only is granted by the controlled-risk. Being in a dangerous place confers the traveler prestige and status. R. Falconer studied widely the role of women backpackers to consider the historical argument around travel that evokes the needs of danger. Backpackers are led to go beyond their own ethnocentrism, meeting with unfamiliar landscapes, people and customs, but sometimes they face serious problems. Tourism works as an instrument to sublimate the connection between the guilt to belong to industrial states with a radicalized sense of fear. Lastly, George, Inbarakan and Poyyamoli (2010) convincingly argue that one of primary characteristics of tourist travel is the sedentary needs of inhabiting a home, coupled with the need to explore others. The former refers to the nativist, while the latter is the tourist-drive. The balance of both grants the tourist displacement, but once one of them takes more gravity on psychological mind things change. If the nativist-drive overcomes to tourist, people experience the needs of returning home. M. Korstanje (2012) delved into the Pomar's tragedy, a mediated road accident where an Argentine family died, showing that audience tends to demonize by means of rumors whenever there is no rational explanation for the facts. Starting from the idea all we can be victims, the vulnerability of state to give protection to their citizens in the highways or abroad is veiled blaming the victim.

THE SENSE OF HOSPITALITY

Anthropologists agree hospitality resulted from the gift-exchange theory of M. Mauss (1979). Ethnicity was associated to a much broader process of territorialization enrooted in the doctrine of division of labor. The process of identity reinforced economically the exchange of goods and other merchandises among clans. Anthropology realized that primitive societies were fertile sources for enhancing the investigation and understanding the essence of industrialized countries. The social bond started to be considered a key factor in the politic fields of communities. The first entry in the discussion has been originally placed by Marcel Mauss who, in his respective studies, noted that society is united by a sentiment of solidarity (theory of gifts) based on three previous assumptions: a) gifts are never free and involve a material exchange between receiver and giver, b) the power of giver resides in the given object, and c) the exchange of gifts engenders a liaison of reciprocity among members of clans (Mauss, 1979; Sahlins, 1972; Weiner, 1992). The main contributions of Mauss, undoubtedly, paved the pathways for a considerable volume of books and studies in ethnology and anthropology for many years. The exchange of gifts is based on a primary drive where giver and receiver

construct a bond and logically, a dynamic, which triggers the economy of a community. As M Sahlins explained, Theory of reciprocity emphasizes on the needs of weaving alliances not only to protect the soil (sovereignty), but also to encourage the trade and travels. The ancient hospitality has been created as a strategic net of alliances to improve the material conditions and duties of clans during periods of peace and war-fare. It is important to note that reciprocity would play an important role in preventing the social fragmentation. Following this explanation, reciprocity can be classified in three different types: a) generalized (loan), balanced (exchange) and negative (robbery). Hospitality is firstly reciprocal and secondly allows weaving alliance among states.

In earlier studies, Korstanje (2008) found that the pact of hospitality was often celebrated after a battle-ground or in moment of general famine. In perspective, it represents a valid effort to coordinate with others to survive. Over years, hospitality has moved and evolved in diverse ways, such as the visa. The visa system is an inter-societal agreement that alludes to the reciprocity among the countries which sign the pact. If the nation A gives hospitality to B, B is reciprocally obliged to do the same. Based on the Latin word *Visum* that means to see, the visa is aimed at scrutinizing the guest before its introduction to the country. This document poses two or more countries in similar conditions to celebrate a covenant with the end of protecting and guiding their citizens abroad. A visa, very well, can be understood as a residual instrument of ancient hospitality because of many reasons, but two are of paramount importance: a) it can be symmetrical or asymmetrical depending on the wealth or degree of materiality among involved Nation-States (reciprocity in the visas), and b) it is subject to the management of time of the permission to enter in an unknown soil (expiry date of visa). Following this, the principle of visa seems to be an inter-tribal covenant. One of the aspects that characterized the hospitality was the protection of strangers because they were seen as messengers of Gods (Korstanje & Skoll, 2013).

Underpinned in the supposition that home emulates symbolic attachment of people with their territory, Waldenfels (2005) argues that home can be considered a site wherein converges the work, blood, soil and kinship. To some extent, our home can be interpreted as the root of political life. As previously mentioned, in Ancient Europe, hospitality was used as a form of communication between tribes in two different ways. From a religious perspective, strangers were welcomed as messengers of divinity: religious and political. Whereas the former refers to the idea that foreigner travelers should be honored, the latter facilitated the celebration of different covenants aimed at strengthening the defense of the own territory (Korstanje, 2010).

Travelling beyond the boundaries of home, abroad, presupposes a dislocation. Although, images

and visual marketing pivot the connection between self, narrative and destination, it is clear, as the investigation of Araujo Perazzolo, Capellano Dos Santos and Pereira (2013) shows, other psychological drives are involved in the same process. Certainly, tourists should develop an attachment to certain territory, which may be real or imagined-one. This rite of passages is moved by the desire of welcome that is still enrooted in the principle of hospitality. If this principle must be ensured, whatever the reason may be, traveller adopts a nativist attitude. It is possible that globalization paves the ways for the acceleration of travels, but this may engender conflict and despair.

In perspective, Castrogiovanni (2007) acknowledges that tourism is a rite of passage based on a linguistic re-introduction of self into another grammatical structure. The tourist space is something else than a geographical site; rather, it defies the principle of logic by introducing randomness. Neither guest, nor host know the intention of the other. Thus, it is safe to say that tourist space works in a dialogical nature nuancing opposed values such as good, bad, order, disorder, high and low. Tourism mediates between two object-subjects at odds. The conceptual dichotomies are redeemed according to a narrative which is politically built. Tourism engenders an objective-subjective re-structuration that appeals to a much broader hierarchal order. Touring can be considered a political practice where domination and legitimacy converge. The communication allows the construction and interpretation of a site which is symbolically negotiated. Not surprisingly, any site is enrooted in a process of communication that gives to it certain sense.

III. CALL FOR A SOCIETY BUILT AROUND

HOSPITALITY PRINCIPLE

Tourism, as a modern practice, seems to be a result of two combined factors, hospitality and leisure. While the former creates discontent and conflict, the latter revitalizes the broken tendons in order to prevent the social fragmentation. From the conquest of America, to the rise of most important Empires, almost all human allegories are circumscribed to hospitality. Being hospitable is a divine mandate, present in all cultures. Under such a context, we must understand hospitality as a rite that facilitates the acceptance of otherness reducing the risks and uncertainty. Of course, hospitality depends upon many factors, but travels and political alliances are in fact instruments that orchestrate the sense of community. Coming across the history, one might realize that tourism and hospitality have been inextricably intertwined. Exploring the diverse ways, communities accept or neglect the otherness is always a way to understand their economic or politic orders (Lashley and Morrison, 2001; Santos Filho, 2008; Gallarza and Gil, 2008).

Originally, E. Cohen (1972) proposed that tourism should be viewed as a form of commercialized hospitality where hosts and guests renegotiate their own identities. This type of approach is based on the continuance of human relationships. With the passing of years, this view has been changed to more elaborated forms. It is unfortunate that the current view of hospitality has nothing to do with its historical roots. Being hospitable now means a way of enhancing business and profits. We explore the opposite thesis. For us, as discussed here, hospitality seems to be a millenarian institution that reduces and controls the uncertainty that supposes an inter-ethnic encounter. The tourists-receiving as well as tourist-delivering communities need from protection whenever an alien is introduced to their soil. Hospitality works not only scrutinizing the travelers, but also giving to them a safe-site to dwell on. This means that the hospitality seems to be associated to the risk engendered by uncertainty. J. Derrida argues that there are two types of hospitality, conditioned and absolute. Whilst the former refers to the protection exerted only for those who travels with a patrimony, the latter demands hosts to open the home to any alien in any conditions. Nation states today do not offer absolute hospitality simply because the protection is superseded to the purchasing power of travelers (Derrida, 2006). In this vein, O’Gorman contends that industrial countries construct significant barriers to deter mobilities but, at the same time, encourages tourism as a privileged form of travelling to peripheral areas. These types of conditioned hospitalities, enrooted in the capital hegemony, not only open the doors to economic asymmetries, but also to resentment and terrorism. Tourism, as an industry of services, seems to be unable to offer an absolute hospitality. At some extent, Derrida’s contributions become in fertile source to consider the moral view of hospitality (O’Gorman, 2007).

As the previous argument given, Andrews, Roberts & Selwyn (2007) assertively emphasize on the conflictive nature of hospitality. Our own penchant to visit other sites is explained by the curiosity but these rites of passages should be conditioned under a framework of stability and safety. Hospitality facilitates travels defining the boundaries across inter-personal connection. This encounter is often honored as a divine doctrine. Those communities who provide aliens with support and assistance are compensated by the Gods. F. Amuquandoh addressed how ancient hospitality in Ghana (mythical archetype) not only paved the ways for the commercialization of tourism, but also posed a view of strangers as messengers of Gods. These communities developed the beliefs that disasters, misfortunes and other unlucky events are a product of spirits anger. Whenever travellers or strangers are mistreated whatever the reason may be, this gets furious to Gods. The religious life seems to be a primary factor of hospitality. Similarly, the British Anthropologist J. Goody (1995) observed how

Lodagaa, another African tribes bring to outlanders a diversity of food and beer to celebrate hospitality. Otherwise, demons may put a curse on the children of community. This ritual works as a mechanism that help intellectualize the otherness, the uncertainty that wake up any alien because Gods protect strangers. G. Visser (1991) acknowledges that food is a sign of well gesture that characterizes the hospitality from other practices. Basically, civilizations are not possible without food, and what is at stake during welcome rites is the luck for the next hunting. However, sometimes the travelers cross some limit that leads involving actors to conflict. As a form of abeyance, authors see in hospitality and eroticism a mechanism to regulate the hostility. Korstanje (2010) explored the anthropological roots of hospitality to conclude that

1- Hospitality represents an ancient institution aimed at reducing the traveler’s risk or to potentiate alliance among tribes.

2- From a spiritual point of view, the alcoholic beverage offered to tourist or the welcome drinks emulate the protection given to strangers by the Gods.

3- The money (as a balanced-type of hospitality) mediates between host and guest enabling a conditional hospitality, demanding the guest-return to home.

The figure of risk by guest and hosts is reduced by the adoption of hospitality. Host alludes to know who is the stranger, while guest requests for protection during its stay. If the state is unable to ensure the tourist’s security, its image respecting to other states declines. The visa allows the state to firstly know how the solicitant is, as well as its trajectory and biography. Police exhibits the boundaries the tourist should follow not to break the hosting law. Nonetheless, as we will see, there are some situations where the forms of hospitality do not converge. To put this in a nutshell, one might admit that Australia developed a conditioned sense of hospitality, while Argentina is based on offering an “absolute” hospitality to strangers. Both systems not only contrast, but also were in tension alongside Martin’s case.

IV. THE CASE OF MARTIN AND CAROLINA

On 27 July of 2011, a news was widely broadcasted by the media shocking public opinion: two Argentine citizens were stranded in Australia where they stayed by honey-moon. Martin, the husband, caught Gullian-Barre syndrome after a regular vaccination in Buenos Aires. The vital signs of Martin were deteriorated to the extent that the doctors opted to induce him into comma. Tasmania, a dreaming destination, becomes, in hours, an iron cage for the youth couple. Hospitalized at the royal Hobart Hospital, the medical treatment requested Martin to be immobile at least 6 months. The exorbitant costs of this admission ranged from 5.000 to 7.000 dollars per day. Beyond their financial possibilities, Carolina and her family were put to the wall. She conducted in the

media a caring financial campaign to receive donors and money in Buenos Aires to support Martin abroad.

Gullian Barre syndrome affects 1 in 100.000 vaccinated persons, attacking directly the nervous system of victim. If the respiratory capacity is seriously compromised, the patient may die. Technically, this syndrome is induced by a vaccine producing the deterioration of myelin, a source which gives mobility to muscles. In a couple of day, the patient loses the sensibility in the extremities, and after that falls in comma. Basically, the experts consider that this syndrome represents a response of the body to an external pathogen (Asbury & Cornblath, 1990; Chernichovsky, 1995). Before to this situation, media faced two great quandaries. On one hand, expanding the news of how the syndrome triggers, entails to impose the idea that travelers do not need vaccination when they travel abroad. The effects of this would be pretty negative. The media created an impasse by covering the news only when Martin returned to Buenos Aires, 7 months later of his hospitalization. In the midst, Australia and Argentina entered in a diplomatic tension which was resolved by the chancellery. The problem was that the dichotomy in the way Argentina and Australia develop their sense of hospitality leads the discussion to a dead-point. It is important to note that the intervention of chancellery should be kept in secrecy because it opens a serious controversy. May Argentinian state intervene to solve the problems its citizens face abroad?, If so, why? If the Argentine state is not intervening directly to protect the working conditions of labor (blue-collar workforce or homeless), why it would be different with travelers?

The fear of the State was that other similarly travelers would demand the protection of Argentine state beyond the limits of its jurisdiction. This reveals the idea that media plays a moral role in covering those news by which they had a previous response. The function of press and journalism is to give a solution for a problem. Beyond its corporative interests, as ethical instrument of control media, it creates a message which is portrayed to all society. However, things may be not easier than thought; under some outstanding conditions, the media does not make the new public to preserve the social order. The restricted hospitality of Australia contrasts directly the rules of Argentina in two senses. Unfortunately for this couple, the insurance companies were unable to cover the cost of hospitalization. In Buenos Aires, their families went to State to intervene with Australia to bring this problem to a rapid solution. Meanwhile, mass-media opted not to cover the news. Otherwise, the news would affect seriously not only the image of Australia, but also tourism in Argentina. The message was pleased do not travel to Australia! This would create serious problems for trade between the two countries. The omnipotence of nation-state that characterized its life decades before, today is subject to a wide range of variables. To fulfill the gap given

by this, the media alluded to controllable allegories such as crime. Since it has nothing to say respecting to Martin's trouble, the space was covered by the assassination of two French tourists in Salta, Argentina. This reminds what Korstanje said respecting to the sense of certainness whereby the nation-state is built. We are educated to think things may progress with a reason or that problems may be controlled to enhance the security. What falls out of control is not covered by the media. Instead, the news on crime (like the French tourists) problematizes into a range of controllable reality. In sharp contrast to these types of viruses, the local crime exhibits considerable familiarity for the media and its audience. Crime, as a visible urban issue, is controllable by the implantation of a previous narrative which is widely accepted by every actors of society. However, virus runs in another direction. Irrespective of age, or status, if affects any person besides the ocular possibility of detection. Since viruses engender panic the media-cover is discretional.

V. CONCLUSION

The present review attempted to trigger a debate on the role of solidarity in humanitarian situations, as well as the way risk and hospitality are inextricably intertwined. It also explores how cold impersonality of State regulations make a mockery of the word 'hospitality'. Martin and Carolina faced a nightmare when they least expected it. This case defied not only the cultural values of two societies, Argentina and Australia, but their models of hospitality. The lack of hospitality constitutes an ancient primitive fear that transcends all cultures and times. After all, it is not accident the fact that hospitality, hostility and hospital share the same etymological root. States construct their legitimacy according to the protection they can perform for their citizens abroad. Far from being enemies of state, this case study evidences how media are conducive to cover some path-breaking news that can collapse the social system. As a regulatory instrument of access to reality, media creates a fiction which is internationally consumed and criticized, but at some extent they play a vital role to avoid the social disintegration. This paper helps the analysts to appreciate that.

We wish to clarify that the thesis of this review-case does not argue that Australia opposes Argentina in the health system. We would rather sustain the fact that both countries have developed different views about conceiving their health and hospitality systems. While Australians oriented to forge a "pay for" system, in Argentina the assistance to strangers is free. Following the French philosopher, J. Derrida (2006), two types of hospitalities emerge. In this review, we do not understand hospitality as the commercial relationship of tourists and natives, but as an ancient institution which protects travelers from external risk, illness and other threats. From

hospitality (*hospitium* lat.), two terms stem, hospital and hotel. Both work in similar manner, the former gives protection to ill citizens, the latter to tourists. Secondly, this case reveals the limitation of mass-media and journalists to cover a news which may create a serious disruption for the health system (Korstanje, 2008, 2011; Derrida, 2006). Not only Martin was forced to pay an expensive treatment abroad, which would have deserved the assistance of Argentine Government, but also he was ill because followed the recommendations of a health system to vaccinate before travelling. Anyone of us may be a

victim of an accident-alike, this being the point where the media opted to silence. Much of the appreciation shown in this paper may sound as speculations, but they are not. We have sustained our analysis on the legacy of anthropology and philosophy in authors such as Marcel Mauss (1979), Marshal Sahlins (1972) and Jacques Derrida (2006). It is important to turn the attention to the conceptual definition of hospitality given by anthropology. It can be introduced in tourism fields to expand the current understanding of social relations.

VI. REFERENCES

1. Andrews, H. Robert, L and Selwyn, T. (2007). *Hospitality and Erotism*. International Journal of Culture and Hospitality Research, 1 (3), pp. 247-262.
2. Anuquandoh, F. (2011). *Lay concepts of Tourism in Bosomtwe Basin, Ghana*. Annals of Tourism Research, 37 (1), pp. 34-51
3. Araujo Perazzolo, Capellano Dos Santos, M. & Pereira, S. (2013). O Acolhimento – ou hospitalidade turística – como interface possível entre o universal e o local no contexto da mundialização. Pasos Revista de Turismo y Patrimonio Cultural, 11 (1), pp. 45-55
4. Asbury, A. K., & Cornblath, D. R. (1990). *Assessment of current diagnostic criteria for Guillain-Barré syndrome*. Annals of neurology, 27(S1), pp.21-24.
5. Castrogiovanni, C.A. (2007). *Lugar, no-lugar y entre-lugar: los ángulos del espacio turístico*. Estudios y Perspectivas en Turismo, 16 (1), pp. 5-25.
6. Chernichovsky, D. (1995). *Health system reforms in industrialized democracies: an emerging paradigm*. The Milbank Quarterly, 1 (1), pp. 339-372.
7. Cohen, E. (1972). *Toward a Sociology of International tourism*. Social Research, 39 (1), pp. 164-182.
8. Derrida, J. (2006). *On Hospitality*. [2 edition] De la Flor, Buenos Aires.
9. D'ors, A. (1953) *Epigrafía jurídica de la España romana*. Ministerio de Justicia, Madrid
10. Durkheim, E (1995). *The Elementary Forms of Religious Life*, translated by Karen E. Field. Free Press, New York, NY.
11. Enteman, F (1996) *Stereotyping, prejudice and discrimination*. Images that injure, pictorial stereotypes in the media. Paul M Lester (ed), Praeger, Westport, pp. 8-19.
12. Etienne, R. Le Roux P. y Tranoy, A. (1987). "La tessera hospitalis, instrument de sociabilité et de romanisation dans la Península Ibérique", *Sociabilite, pouvoirs et societe. Actes du colloque de Rouen 1983*, Rouen, Paris, pp. 323-336
13. Falconer, E. (2011). *Risk, Excitement and Emotional Conflict in Women's travel narratives*. Recreation and Society in Africa, Asia & Latin America, 1 (1), pp. 65-89.
14. Fletcher, R. (2011). The only risk is Wanting to stay: mediating Risk in Colombian Tourism Development. *Recreation and Society in Africa, Asia & Latin America*, 1 (2), pp. 7-30
15. Gallarza M. and Gil, I. (2008) *The concept of value and its dimensions: a tool for analyzing tourism experiences*. Tourism Review, 63 (3), pp. 4-20.
16. George, B, Inbakaran, R. y Poyyamoli, G. (2010). To Travel or Not to travel: towards understanding the theory of nativistic motivation. *Tourism, an international interdisciplinary Journal*, 58 (4), pp. 395-407.
17. Goody, J. (1995). *Cocina, Cousine y Clase: estudio de sociología comparada*. Gedisa, Barcelona.
18. Hobbes, T. (1998). *Leviatán o la materia, forma y poder de una República Eclesiástica y Civil*. Fondo de Cultura Económica, México.
19. Innerarity, D. (2001). *Ethics of Hospitality*. Peninsula, Barcelona.
20. Korstanje, M. (2008). *Los Sistemas de Reciprocidad Migratoria: comprendiendo el sistema de visado Argentino*. Nómadas. Revista Crítica de Ciencias Sociales y Jurídicas, 20(4), pp. 481-497.
21. Korstanje, M. (2010). *Las formas Elementales de la Hospitalidad*. RBTUR, Revista Brasileira de Pesquisa em Turismo., 4 (2), pp. 86-111
22. Korstanje M (2011) *Reciprocity, Hospitality and Tourism: An examination of Marshal Sahlins's contributions*. European Journal of Tourism. Hospitality and Recreation, 2 (2), pp. 89-103
23. Korstanje, M. (2012) *The Strange Case of Pomar Family: the dangers of roads*. International Journal of Tourism Anthropology, 2 (3), pp. 230-242.
24. Korstanje, M. & Olsen, D. (2011) *The Discourse of Risk in Horror Movies post 9/11: hospitality and hostility in Perspective*. International Journal of Tourism Anthropology, 1 (3-4), pp. 304-317.
25. Korstanje, M & Skoll, G (2013) *The borders of tourism and hospitality: the dark side of Empire*. Revista Rosa Dos ventos, 5 (1), pp.: 77-82
26. Mauss, M. (1979). *Ensayo sobre los dones: motivo y forma del cambio en las sociedades primitivas*. Editorial Ténos. Madrid
27. Mc-Chesney, R. (1994). *Telecommunications, Mass-Media, & Democracy. The battle for the control of Us broadcasting 1928-1935*. Oxford University Press, Oxford.

28. Mead, G. H. (1999). *Espíritu, Persona y Sociedad: desde el punto de vista del conductismo social*. Paidós, Barcelona.
29. Lashley, C and Morrison, A. (2001). *In the search of hospitality*. Butterworth Heinmann, London.
30. Lippmann, W. (1922) *Public Opinion*. Grace and CO, New York.
31. O’Gorman, K. (2007). *The Hospitality Phenomenon: philosophical Enlightenment?*. International Journal of Culture, Tourism and Hospitality, 1 (3), pp. 189-202.
32. Santos Filho, J. (2008) *Hospitalidade no Brasil Império: a visao o naturalista George Gardner*. Revista Brasileira de Pesquisa em turismo, 2 (2), pp. 3-19.
33. Sahlins, M. (1972). *Stone Age Economics*. Routledge Editorial, London.
34. Visser, M. (1991). *The Rituals Dinner*, Harper Collins, Toronto.
35. Waldenfels, B. (2005). “El habitar físico en el espacio”. In *Teoría de la Cultura: un mapa de la cuestión*. Schroeder, Gerhardt y Greuniger, Elga (Compiladores), Fondo de Cultura Económica, Buenos Aires, pp. 157-178.
36. 36-Weiner, A. (1992). *Inalienable possessions: the paradox of Keeling-while-giving*. University of California Press, Berkeley.