ABSTRACT: The accelerated globalization era in which we live today leads to increased mixing of foreigners of different races, ideologies, classes, religions, ethnicities and cultures, to which tourism makes a great contribution. In this paper, the entire phenomenon of international tourism is conceived as a global network of complex “face-to-face” interactions between foreigners and foreigners, and as the pursuit of the foreign (exoticism). This results in a more intense interpersonal and intercultural communication between foreigners of different categories and intensities of the foreign, which produces a wide range of mutual reactions that range from xenophilia to xenophobia. With this in mind, some fundamental xenological aspects of international tourism are in the focus of research, such as: foreigners (strangers), the foreign, a foreigner as an ontological antithesis and a negation of the self, a foreigner as a complement of ontological self-insufficiency, the foreign in ourselves - self-alienation, a stranger in the house - alienation from the loved ones, a foreigner in the homeland - alienation from compatriots, exoticism - the foreign of everyone and everything, and cosmopolitism - closeness of everyone and everything. Some main directions and objectives of the future research in the xenology of tourism are discussed in the conclusion.
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INTRODUCTION

Undeveloped Third World societies and their comparative analysis were in the focus of traditional anthropology. The tendency of anthropology to understand the world outside Europe was mostly reduced to the research in “primitive” cultures, where it commonly relied on “ethnographic” methodology that was used by Malinowski (1944). He advocated for the engagement of anthropologists in prolonged field research, where a considerably longer period of time was spent with the local community than had been the norm previously. Anthropology conceived in this way was based on the assumption that, in order to understand a community, it is necessary to come into contact with its members over a long period of time, usually several years. With this in mind, there are certain analogies between anthropologists and some categories of tourists who are interested in “foreign, distant and strange cultures.” In this sense, we can say that anthropologists are a specific type of life practicing tourists who stay long at a certain destination and try to fully enter into the spirit of the local community.

1 The words foreigner and stranger are used synonymously in the paper, since there is a word in the Serbian language that covers the meanings of both.
of the everyday existence of the local community in order to better understand and scientifically explain it in the context of cultural anthropology. At the same time, foreign tourists can also stay at selected destinations (albeit for a much shorter time) and can have strong amateur anthropological interests directed at the local community and its culture, which means that hidden “amateur anthropologists” lie in them. However, mass tourists can be seen as the antipode to the anthropologist, due to their superficiality, ignorance, indifference and brevity of the stay at the destination. The modern anthropology of tourism is increasingly expanding its subject of interest. Therefore, not only are local inhabitants of receptive areas researched, but also tourists, their places of residence and origin, intercultural relations between tourists and hosts, as well as mutual relations of tourists at the destination are studied. With the use of ethnographic methodology, cultural anthropology has a specific view of and access to tourism, where xenological aspects, as well as studies of perception and evolution of exoticism are particularly important.

**The terms “stranger,” strangeness and xenology**

The term “stranger”, according to Elaković (1991:63-77), entered the theory of tourism thanks to the research carried out by Simmel (1908). In his essay *Der Fremde*, he analyzed in detail the social position of the stranger, which proved to be an inspirational impetus for later work of many authors. In one observation, he points out that a stranger who is close (in the sense of being physically present) may be at the same time distant (in terms of cultural distance). Simmel’s “stranger” can be a productive, creative person, who draws their creativity from a specific position of interactions and dynamic interplay between the two moments: “closeness” and “distance.” The role of the stranger, however, cannot be reduced only to the function of travel in terms of going through space, but above all, it is primarily composed of an interpersonal relationship, in which a merge of the closeness and the distance is achieved. In this way, the distance within such a relationship “means that the closeness is distant, while at the same time, it means that the distance is close.” Nietzsche's (1983) concept of “love for the distant” (foreign, new, strange, unusual, the beyond), as opposed to the traditional “love for neighbor” (close, familiar, ordinary, everyday), is close to this concept. Developing this idea, some later theorists argue that, in modern society, thanks to mass communication, the effect of the “approximation of the distant” and the simultaneous “distancing of the close” due to the increasing alienation among people in the place of residence, is more prominent.

Derrida (2000:10-24) also discusses the matter of strangers. The key word of his presentation was the stranger (étranger). He quotes the Sophists, for which a stranger is someone who does not speak like the others, who speaks a strange kind of language. Like the Greek word *xenos*, which is also used here,
the term covers the English words *stranger* and *foreigner* at the same time. The question of strangers is, in fact, a question that a stranger asks a stranger. In a number of Plato's dialogues, often a stranger is the one who brings and asks unbearable questions. He shakes the dogmatism of paternalistic *logos*, contests and challenges the authority of the leader, the father, the head of the family, “the master of the house,” and even the power of hospitality. The question of strangers as a question of hospitality is articulated in the context of *being* (*sein*), while *not being* is a challenge to paternalistic logic, a challenge that comes from a stranger. A subversive stranger who expresses unorthodox views, at the same time, fears that he would be treated as a madman (*maniakos*), a mentally disturbed person, by the local community.

The need for research in the foreign is now increasing due to the growing importance of foreign and foreigners from the perspective of culture, politics and history. The foreign, according to Waldenfels (1991:9-12), increasingly determines our everyday life that is permeated with the flows of economic, technological, political and military globalization. It still goes back much further than this, to a deep dimension that cannot be reduced to changing trends. For this reason, there is a need for scientific research in the foreign. The foreign is a marginal phenomenon in the true sense of the word. It comes from elsewhere, even if it appears in its own house in the known world. There is no foreign without the place of the foreign. What happens among cultures shapes the foreign. *Xenology*, the science of the foreign and strange, has emerged from the research in culturally foreign, with ethnology or cultural anthropology.

The matter of the foreign, according to Waldenfels (2005:56-63), starts with its naming. Nothing is more common than the words “foreign” and “strange” and their variations and derivatives such as “foreigner,” “stranger,” “foreign language,” “estrangement.” The foreign is primarily what is happening outside one’s own environment as something external that stands in contrast to the *internal* (*externum, etranger, stranger, foreigner*). In addition, the foreign is what belongs to someone else (*alienum, alien, ajeno*) in contrast to one’s *own*. The word *alienation*, which is used as such in clinical and sociopathological terms, is related to this. The opposites *outer* and *inner* point to the *place* of the foreign. In this context, the meaning variants depend on each other. In this regard, it is obvious that “one’s own” is *Here* - closer to “internal” and “known” than *There*, which is synonymous with “external” and “unknown,” and their threads are intertwined.

When we talk about “otherness,” continues Waldenfels (2005:69-77), we mainly imply “the foreign.” However, often we do not imply anything else than differences, in terms of otherness. Namely, the contrast between the *same* and the *other*, which is the foundation of every order of things, results from the *demarcation* in which one differs from another. This differentiation takes place in a continuous sequence that mediates between the opposites. A tendency
toward hierarchy is too often hidden behind pretensions to universality. Eurocentrism, which follows the European tradition like a shadow, is the main carrier of the idea of demarcation and hierarchy. Europeans speak of Europeans and non-Europeans, white people of the colored races, tourists of the local population, etc. There is a barrier between cultures like the one that separates a genus from another genus, youth from old age, awakeness from sleep, life from death. In all these cases, one side of the difference is positive and clearly marked, and the other is a fluid opposite, a heterogeneous category whose only common denominator is non-affiliation to the reference category. An alternative to such a conceptualization of the world rests on systematic doubt (dubito ergo sum), self-criticism, overstepping and putting into question one’s own universe through the radically foreign, to which international tourism trends can make a great contribution.

If we consider deep-rooted definitions of the foreign, we always find two approaches, the first discussing the inaccessibility of a particular experiential area and the conception of the meaning, and the second discussing non-affiliation to a group. In the first case, something is foreign to us, and in the second case, others are foreign to us, and vice versa. Therefore, cultural and social foreignness can be distinguished. This experience of the foreign has a paradoxical nature, indicated by Husserl. In this sense, we can talk about the accessibility of the inaccessible, affiliation in non-affiliation, incomprehensibility in comprehensibility.

The foreign that has a characteristic of not being reduced to one’s own and cannot be integrated into a whole, and is, therefore, irreducible, Waldenfels (2010: 82-85) identifies as radical. As long as we do not accept this insight, we remain trapped in the relative foreign, an image of reality within us that corresponds to the prior state of appropriation. The appropriation can take place in the political, religious, philosophical or general cultural levels.

The experience of the foreign, as Waldenfels (2010:89-91) concludes, does not mean that one’s own and the foreign, one’s own body and other people's bodies, one’s native language and a foreign language, one’s own culture and a foreign culture, face each other like monads that are closed in themselves. It implies that one’s own and the foreign are, in the overall separation, more or less intertwined and tangled in each other. However, it excludes complete overlapping or merging, as equally as the complete disparity. This means that the absolute foreign or the total foreign cannot be discussed in interpersonal and intercultural fields. We would not be able to register as a foreign language a language that was completely foreign to us. Languages indicate different forms of relatedness, and so do cultures. In them, there are choice types based on relatedness, as well as rejections based on hostility. At the beginning, there is not only a difference, but also a mixture that unMASKs every national, racial or cultural ideal of purity as a mere fantasy.
There are different styles of the foreign that cannot be reduced to a single denominator.

**A foreigner as an ontological antithesis of the self**

At one point, Victor Hugo says that God created a mouse, but he repented, so he created a cat, as well. The cat is, therefore, a correction of the mistake. By following this logic, the dog is a correction of the cat, Eve is the correction of Adam, and Prometheus, as a symbol of human consciousness, is a correction of Nature. Analogous to this, the traveler can be seen as a correction of the sitter, and the foreigner as a correction of the compatriot. All this is certainly true in reverse. It seems as if the creator did not want to allow any living being to enjoy their existence arrogantly, self-complacently and safely. It seems as if he wanted to create the negating opposite of everyone, as a *correction* and an eternal *memento* that everything can be different, quite the opposite of what it is. This is the best lesson in modesty and humility; nobody, not even one principle or instinct, is so strong and durable so that it would be possible to replace it with the opposite one without destroying the world and society. Our existence is always threatened by completely different beings ontologically, in the same way that we potentially jeopardize their existence. This means that no one is entirely in one’s *self*, that nobody in their own world is completely at home. There is always a potential danger of a possible inversion of the being into a completely negating opposite (a radical change of the religious, national or ideological identity of the enemy under duress, by psychological methods of brainwashing or systematic propaganda). The possibility of negation of one’s own being and identity is as unacceptable and appalling as death itself for most people and, therefore, fear and irrational hatred of those beings who are perceived as ontologically opposite - “dangerous others,” arise.

With this in mind, a foreigner can be a destructive factor to the receptive environment and, as such, may cause astonishment, disturbance and confusion. In this context, there is often a fear of foreigners (xenophobia), i.e. a fear of everything that is other and different, that threatens the imagined purity and uniqueness of one’s own identity. This is one of the basic fears in every type of society and no system has thus far succeeded in eliminating this problem completely. History is full of examples of racial, ethnic, ideological and other forms of hatred towards people who are perceived as an ontological threat to one’s own identity at the personal, social, national, cultural or ethnic levels.

Analyzing the great geographical discoveries of new continents, as well as the first wave of colonization, Suchodolski (1972:17-21) points out that, at the time, the problem of man took unexpected horizons. New and unknown races, foreign and incomprehensible forms of life, distant and unusual art,
seemingly strange religions - all those things were encountered in the areas of America and Africa, and in the countries of the Pacific Islands and Asia. They have enriched the knowledge of man, arousing amazement and suspicion, admiration and hatred, critical reflection in relation to the biblical version of creation of the world and man.

For classic travelers, aboriginal inhabitants were a symbol of the stranger (foreigner), and not any stranger, but the one that is simultaneously the “radical foreigner” and “inferior other.” Classic travelers appropriated the dichotomy system, i.e. an artificial binary order that seeks to divide the complex world and different people into mutually antagonistic categories. It takes place in an endless series of valuatively conflicting pairs, such as human - animal, man - woman, normal - abnormal, domestic - foreign, good - evil, friend - enemy, white man - black man, etc. The aboriginal man also represents a radical opposition to the traveler (colonizer, explorer, anthropologist, missionary, tourist), to whom, in extreme cases, the following negative characteristics are attributed: stupid, evil, ugly, coarse, ignorant, backward, brutal, greedy, perverse, unreliable, lazy, submissive, and so on. A being who possesses these characteristics is inferior, bad and dangerous. It is treated as an eternal other characterized by fundamental foreignness (strangeness). This foreigner is “unheimlich.” It is, according to Aćin (1993:56-60), a German word that is difficult to translate and means non-homeland, unrelated, incomprehensible, belonging to someone else in a disturbing way, to which Freud devoted an extensive discussion.

When it comes to tourism, intercultural relations between tourists and hosts are burdened with numerous mutual stereotypes. Tourists are exotic foreigners for the local population; they are others who have come from an unknown distant land, stay a certain time and then return to their distant homeland. In addition to the general stereotype that is common to all tourists, in parallel, there are specific stereotypes that refer to tourists from specific countries (cold Englishmen, hardworking Germans, frugal Scots, cheerful Italians, etc.). The position of foreigners in the local community or group is “determined mainly by the fact that they have not belonged to the group from the very beginning.” Tourists are fundamentally mobile people,” who have the freedom to come and go, who interact with everyone, but are not organically linked through established ties, relatives, the place of residence and occupation to any person from the local group. The relationship of the host to newcomers-tourists can take various affective tonalities in a wide range from uncritical worship, admiration and affinity to fear, intolerance and hatred.

For tourists, local residents are also foreigners. They are treated as inferior natives, to whom the numerous, above-mentioned negative characteristics are attributed. Their intensity of foreignness can vary from destination to destination. In this regard, studies of the adaptation to another
culture have shown that tourists feel better if the receptive culture is more similar and more compatible with their (imported) culture. This means that some foreigners are culturally less distant from others. According to numerous empirical studies, it has been concluded that there is a connection between the compatibility of cultures and the adaptation of tourists. If all other relevant factors are equal, tourists from Germany will better adapt to the local culture in Austria or Switzerland than in Albania or Russia. However, if the foreigner can develop a cooperative relationship with the local population, the adaptation will be faster and easier. A tourist who is interested in archeology or hunting, for example, can find local residents who have the same interests and implement joint activities and projects with them. In this way, similar interests open a door into mutual communication and intercultural rapprochement. It has also been noted that the warm welcome by the host reduces stress and fear in tourists.

Not only are tourists and hosts strangers (foreigners) to one another, but tourists from different countries at a specific destination are also strangers to one another. The interoperability between different tourists-foreigners depends on the cultural and linguistic proximity. Analogous to the previous example, German and Austrian tourists who spend their holidays on the beaches of Thailand will certainly get along better with one another than with tourists from China or Japan. If the cultural differences are larger, they may cause hostility and conflicts among tourists, which receptive countries have to take into account when placing foreign tourists. However, what connects tourists from different countries is the fact that all of them are gathered in a “foreign culture” and belong to a “tourist culture,” which is a common denominator for all of them, and which affects the increase in social cohesion and solidarity among tourists.

Finally, tourists who travel in a group of compatriots are also, in a way, strangers to one another. Although they belong to the same dominant national culture, they may come from various regions that differ in cultural, ethnic and linguistic terms. Travelers in a closed tourist group do not know one another personally and are temporarily gathered in the same place. They are strangers to one another, so, during the journey, different forms of interpersonal communication, i.e. repulsion or attraction, between the members of the group can be developed. During the journey, interpersonal communication intensifies and solidarity and internal cohesion of the group increase, which itself can affect the increase in the intensity of social satisfaction with the journey. The dynamics of interpersonal relationships within a tourist group are mainly the subject of psychology and social psychology, about which numerous professional and scientific papers have been published.
A foreigner as a complement of ontological self-insufficiency

Man is an incomplete being. As pointed out by Susnjic (1997:11-15), self-sufficient individuals are rare. The ancient philosophers believed that only beasts and gods could live alone, only they did not need anyone. Most people feel emptiness and self-insufficiency, so they seek some other being with whom they will merge in some way. This desire for merging with someone else into one has different dimensions: from physical merging through erotic contacts (which can be interpreted as subconscious nostalgia for return into a surrogate of the mother's womb) via intellectual, creative and emotional permeation, to spiritual bonding through common ideals and faith. With that in mind, a desire for communication and connection with a being that is ontologically different can appear in travelers. In this regard, an encounter with another man - a stranger can be far more valuable for the traveler than visiting cultural and historical monuments and other tourist attractions, for which they formally began their journey, and which is used as an alibi. A different man can be the biggest “tourist attraction” for tourists. Communication can fill a hole in the traveler, and in order for this to happen, another man who is different from the traveler is needed. According to Susnjic, we do everything in life to complement and fulfill ourselves, to become a complete person. A conversation with someone else, in this sense, is not in the service of an external goal, but it has a function of the ontological need to merge and complement with someone else and to affirm ourselves and develop as a person through it. The conversation presupposes the traveler’s openness to differences and different experiences, i.e. experiences of other people. What comes from other people, what is different and new, is not perceived as a threat and an obstacle, but as an experience that can be integrated into oneself. We are talking about a broad philosophical understanding of man (philosophical anthropology) as a being that constantly converses with other beings, with other people and with oneself, in order to reach a mutual understanding and universal brotherhood. The awareness of other people is the awareness of the difference between them and me; I and You are here understood as the relation between the same and different. Finally, no system, no dogma, can cover the experience of the world: for this reason, the individual and the society have to open all the windows of their own beings to other people and societies if they do not want to end up in the walls of their own prison. Traveling into the world and accepting travelers from the world represent this mutual global opening and tearing down the walls of prejudice, misunderstanding and hatred.

A key question that arises in this context is what and whom tourists seek elsewhere. What is it that they cannot find Here, so they have to travel There? Do they travel to find someone else for essential communication, because they cannot find that person at home? Does this mean that at home, in the universe that always repeats the same things, they cannot satisfy their ontological need
for other people, different human beings and diversity? Diversity is precisely a fundamental value in tourism, since the degree of attractiveness of tourist destinations, as well as tourist satisfaction during and after the trip, depend on its intensity. Therefore, the foreign and foreigners are very important categories in the tourism industry and represent its specificity, since they satisfy a universal human need for change. It cannot be satisfied by the well-known and always the same, by repeating the everyday rituals in the place of residence. Individuals are saturated with the faces of work colleagues, neighbors, friends and family members. They are dissatisfied with life in the surroundings where people are too similar to each other because they belong to the same race, nationality, culture and class. They are bored with people who look the same, dress the same, act the same, think and speak the same. The content and the outcome of communication with them is known in advance and predictable, so there are no surprises or excitement. For this reason, individuals travel to other cities and countries, and increasingly to very distant, exotic places, with the hope that somewhere among the Sherpas in the Himalayas, among the Indian tribes in the Amazon, on an isolated tropical island or in an “asphalt jungle” (New York, London), they would find different, better, more honest and open people with whom they will be able to achieve a new, fresh, radically different, and most importantly, an essential communication about fundamental questions of human existence. Since individuals cannot find other people who are sufficiently different from them in order to fulfil them ontologically, they search for such people in remote, bizarre cultures, among complete strangers.

A stranger within oneself - self-alienation

An encounter with strangers causes discomfort in us. Therefore, we reject them because they do not belong to us, are not from our tribe, from our indigenous community. We suppress them, run away from them. They are unheimlich, intruders. The whole time, however, their strangeness is within ourselves, not only outside of us, and this is exactly what causes fear. They are the hidden face of our suppressed identity. Divided, we are intruders, strangers to ourselves. The stranger is within us. Facing him, we fight with our own unconscious, struggling with him in ourselves. Rimbaud indicated this intrapersonal strangeness, when he stated: “Je est un autre…” This means that the individual (Ego) can have a suppressed stranger (Id) in himself, who is unacceptable in the society in which he lives, so in this sense, Super Ego, as the supreme internal self-controller, suppresses it, attempting to sublimate it into socially acceptable creative work. However, this Freudian model does not always function. The accumulated instinctive energy of Id increases, boils and threatens to erupt. The individual feels the suppressed alter ego, carries a hidden stranger in himself who, as an enemy, is not welcome in his own culture. He embarks on a journey to places and countries from which the stranger in
him comes. The traveler is, therefore, able to free the stranger in himself. This happens easier in places with a permissive environment, in which the stranger in us no longer feels like a stranger. Far away from home, outside the repressive intracultural reality of the homeland, in a distant There, Dr. Jekyll can appear freely in public and behave like Mr. Hyde, satisfying the needs of his instinctual \textit{Id}. In this way, the internal stranger becomes free, socialized and accepted by others, by foreigners like him in the foreign country, so he is no longer the intrapersonal stranger for the traveler.

**A stranger in one’s own house - alienation from the loved ones**

The experience of the foreign, referred to by Freud, is not only ingrained in us, and is not elsewhere, far away from our home and homeland. It resides with us in our home. Here, man, surrounded by people close to him, by his family and friends, feels like “a relative stranger.” Individuals can be alienated from their life partners, members of their immediate and extended family, about which numerous novels have been written and numerous films have been made. It is not always the case that only one family member is alienated from the others; it can happen that every family member is alienated from the others (parents from children, children from parents, spouses from each other, etc.). In fact, it is sufficient that only one family member becomes alienated from another one for a chain reaction to start, which implies successive alienation of every family member from all the other family members. Progressively, from day to day, misunderstandings are increasing and the intensity and depth of communication are decreasing, leading to a growing mutual alienation and isolation in one's own hermetic world of hobbies, literature and creativity. In addition, family members are increasingly “fleeing from home,” spending more time elsewhere and with someone else (at work with colleagues, in bars with friends, in love nests with lovers). In those other people, strangers, they are looking for fun, intellectually stimulating interlocutors, substantive communication, and emotional and physical closeness that they lack at home. All these things, under different pretexts, postpone homecoming and shorten the stay within the estranged family. In this regard, business trips or bogus business trips allow for a more radical form of temporary escapes from home. As an example, we will mention a Serbian immigrant in Canada, who was employed as a truck driver, in order to, according to her own admission, spend time away from her family as long as possible, far away from her husband. In addition, she often has excuses to travel alone abroad or to visit her relatives in Serbia. Trips, therefore, can be a form of escapism from the alienation in the family, but also, simultaneously, a search for strangers in whom we seek closeness that we cannot reach in contact with close people who have become strangers to us.
A foreigner in one’s own country - alienation from compatriots

An individual can feel like a foreigner in his own country, where he was born and raised. There he finds “incomprehensible even what is understandable to others.” In this case, one is not able to find oneself at home, in everyday life, among millions of mutually isolated and alienated compatriots; one is not able to find a human being that would be close to him; one cannot meet a “soulmate” with whom he would have substantial communication on intellectual, emotional, spiritual or erotic levels. In contemporary society, there is an increasing number of formally (single, unmarried) and/or substantially lonely individuals who are not able to establish the desired communication with people in their own environment. In addition, the dominant domestic culture, the dominant value system, political situation, national mentality and everyday existence, are eventually becoming stranger and unbearable to them. The individual feels like an intruder, like a foreigner in his own country. At the same time, the native society quickly recognizes such an individual, and becomes to treat him like a foreigner and, due to this, it stigmatizes and gradually rejects him. All this creates a desire in him to escape to another country, somewhere far away, where everything will be different, but at the same time, much closer. This means that, over time, the close has become foreign (the homeland), but at the same time, the foreign (a foreign land) has become close. The traveler starts his search for an ideal, alternative homeland, in which he will be able to accomplish everything he was not able to do at home. He seeks people similar to him in the strangers whom he meets. Behind their external differences, he searches for the fundamental sameness, unity and understanding.

With this in mind, a tourist subconsciously seeks in an exotic decor, in an unknown other - in a foreigner, someone who is similar to him. He travels with the hope that elsewhere, on the train or plane, on a cruise, on a beach or in a hotel, he will find the “right person,” someone with whom he will be able to converse, a stranger to whom he will be able to open his soul. One of the main motives for travel, in this case, is a hope that we will meet interesting strangers similar to us, who have the same interests, problems, sense of humor as we do, with whom we will be able to establish substantive communication, and who will understand and accept us better than the people with whom we have lived on a daily basis. Rastko Petrovic (1977:57) discusses this phenomenon in his “Travelogues”: “Sometimes several months pass, and nothing happens to you; you do not meet a single interesting person; and then, it is sufficient just to enter a train and get involved in hundreds of events, meet hundreds of fantastic people. The fact that every person opposite you on the train thinks that you will never see each other again, makes them submissive to you; they will open their heart to you more spontaneously than they have done so to their spouse in twenty years of marriage, or to their father since they were born.” Certainly, there is always hope that some of these contacts with unfamiliar
people will not be just a passing event or an adventure, but that it will grow into a lasting friendship, romantic love or marriage. The media, through melodramatic films, television series, a variety of love-adventure novels and similar products of mass culture, often fuel this kind of hope, building the myth of a sudden romantic love with a stranger on a journey. This usually happens in an exotic decor, on the beaches of Bali or the Seychelles, in a shadow of the Pyramids or on a luxury ship cruising the southern seas.

**Exoticism - to be a stranger (foreigner) everywhere**

There are also tourists who are not looking for someone who is similar to them or just a little different, but someone who is “totally different,” “absolutely different” from the people among whom he lives in his own country. This need for inversion fits into the context of “exoticism” and “exoticists” who constantly search for new, unusual and strange landscapes, customs and people. The pursuit of radically different, in a way, reflects the depth of an ontological lack in man and disappointment in himself and his estranged compatriots who are similar to him, who are unable to mutually complement and fulfill one another. The need of tourists for radical diversity is usually related to the term of exoticism, which is understood precisely as different aesthetics. Segalen, according to Todorov (1994:70-74), points out that, for him, the exotic is what is different from him, everything that is the other, getting to know something that we ourselves are not. Diversity has to be appreciated, because it is the only thing that provides the intensity of feelings, and to feel means to live. One who knows how to practice exoticism, i.e. to enjoy the differences between himself and the object of his perception, can be called an *exoticist*. This is someone who feels all the charm of the different, someone who never gets tired of traveling. The experience of the exotic is only possible if we are somewhat separated from the object of pleasure. However, the author warns that first we have to merge with everything that is in front of us, and then to separate ourselves from it, in order to feel its taste of the *objective*. The object remains the object, and the subject remains the subject: the encounter does not deprive them of their liberty, or their identity. One of them does not need to be much stronger than the other: because, if the subject is such, it will absorb the object and will not leave a trace of it, and if the object is such, the subject is at risk of drowning in it, giving up its own being. Diversity can be felt only by those who possess a strong individuality. One’s own solid identity is essential for the experience of the exotic. Therefore, it is necessary to distinguish carefully the experience of the exotic from the experience of the immersion in a culture or environment. A person who lives with the Chinese in the same way that they do, to the smallest detail, will forget that he lives with the Chinese and, therefore, will not perceive them as foreigners. Namely, only those who do not feel Chinese, who do not identify with the Chinese, can enjoy
the contact with the Chinese society. So, without distance, without the expression of diversity, we lose ourselves and exoticism disappears. Since it is more difficult to achieve complete merging of two entities and mutual assimilation than to preserve the distance, the risk of loss of exoticism is not great. The desire of lovers to become one being is absurd, and the same can be said for the desire of different groups and races of people that are not able to penetrate into each other and merge together. A perfect match is just an illusion, Segalen concludes, but instead of saddening us, it should gladden us: in this way, the experience of exoticists becomes preserved.

Interpersonal foreignism, therefore, starts with intrapersonal foreignism, and intercultural foreignism begins with intercultural foreignism. According to Waldenfels (2005:97-99), one could make the following objection against this: if there is no place where an individual or a group is at home - *chez soi*, then we keep sinking into a sea of foreignism, and where everything is foreign, eventually nothing is foreign. Furthermore, internal and external foreignism should not be seen as two parallel and separate forms of reality, but as a double rhythm that merges into one. Interpersonal and intercultural foreignness should not be separated from intrapersonal and intercultural foreignism. Finally, foreignism that we encounter in others is leaving us with deeper and deeper marks, no matter how much it rested on disputed and suppressed characteristics. This means that no one belongs to their own culture without any remainder, so, statements about one’s own national identity, language and culture should be taken with a grain of salt.

The following question is raised: in what way can we treat the foreign without taking away its foreign mark? The tourist and the host tend to communicate with each other and overcome the barriers that are separating them, a gap that stands between I and You, i.e. We and They. However, the feeling that the barrier should be torn down is accompanied by the risk that the others will become similar to me, and therefore lose their foreignism, exoticism and appeal. Knowledge is, as noted, incompatible with exoticism. Therefore, admirers of exotic oppose to mixing of cultures, because it leads to their homogenization, loss of diversity and the disappearance of exoticism. In order for the experience of the exotic to be possible, it is necessary that nations remain as far as possible away from one another. For this reason, some thinkers, like Gobineau, Loti, and Levi Strauss, believe that illusory universality and the convergence of nations should be prevented at any cost. Tourism, in this context, is accused of being one of the main enemies of exoticism, since it leads to immediate mass merging of various nations, mixing and permeation of their cultures, which leads to homogenization and equalization, virtually deleting their differences and destroying the exotic. Communication, convergence and exchange threaten to destroy the differences and increase similarities, i.e. to reduce the *other* to the same, the unknown to the known. This leads to the
inclusion of the foreign in the reference system of one’s own culture (for everything unknown, we will look for something that is known to us, to which the unknown is similar, since the mass tourist cannot stand the unknown that is irredicible to the known), i.e. its familiarization, appropriation and degradation to banality, which makes tourism, as a search for the different, deprived of its purpose.

The term exoticism, however, can have a slightly different meaning. In this sense, we talk about people for whom all other people are strangers (foreigners), from those closest to them in their own family and homeland to foreigners that live halfway around the world. They are total exoticists; everything is foreign to them everywhere. Those are travelers who cannot establish the desired communication and familiarity with anyone, and for this reason, they remain alienated and lonely. Over time, they become misanthropes who feel the best when they are alone, far away from other people, in a closed universe of their own home or room (Pascal's room). This phenomenon is not only a privilege (or punishment) of philosophers; a growing number of people prefer independent living without a permanent life partner, family and children. This means that “the dominant paradigm of family existence” has a new alternative (which is contrary to the failed alternative of collective life in a commune that was popular in the hippie movement). Specifically, as a result of frustration in interpersonal relations, alienation and misanthropy, there is a growing number of people who prefer to live alone to living in a life-long union with any other human being (life partner).

When it comes to travel, these people do not pay attention to the establishment of intercultural and interpersonal communication with foreigners, but they are focused on other intrapersonal dimensions of the journey (enjoying nature, adventure, visiting cultural and historical monuments, etc.). However, during the trip, some of these people search for hedonistic, interpersonal satisfaction that they cannot find at home. This potential satisfaction ranges from local foods through the consumption of psychoactive substances, to enjoying sexual promiscuity with exotic inhabitants of a distant land or other foreign tourists staying at the destination (Flaubert in Egypt, Loti in Asia, Gide in Africa, Houellebecq in Thailand).

Cosmopolitanism - not to be a foreigner anywhere

Cosmopolitanism can be defined as striving for a direct mutual communication between foreigners belonging to different races, nationalities, religions and cultures. Those are literally “citizens of the world,” for whom the whole world is the homeland and who feel at home everywhere. They also “belong where they do not belong,” are exempt from local, provincial and national discipline, ideas and prejudices and are able to open up to foreigners and foreignism. However, cosmopolitanism implies certain dangers. Namely,
tourists risk to find themselves eventually in an “ontological vacuum,” i.e. not to belong Here (We) or There (They) anymore, to be everywhere and always foreigners. This happened to Chateaubriand: “Soon I began to feel lonelier in my homeland than I have previously been in any foreign country.” He was, according to Todorov (1994:285), eventually rejected by the French, and the Indians failed to accept him truly. He was never able to become a savage, even though he resided among them, because his refusal to live in his own country rather than any real choice brought him to their homeland. He permanently, no longer temporarily, made peace with the fate of a foreigner. However, there are travelers, such as Descartes, who believe that being a foreigner everywhere means to be free and independent: “The way I live now, with one foot in one country, and the other foot in another country, I find myself in a very fortunate position in so far as it means freedom” (Works, p. 1305). There is a possibility for tourists who travel the world often (globetrotters) to assume a “decentralized nature of personality,” i.e. to become alienated, over time, from the Center of their own culture, from which they are escaping, but at the same time, they cannot find refuge or peace in any other center, in any foreign culture. Therefore, they roam the world from one center to another, constantly spinning in circles, looking for the meaning of their own existence. Intense exposure to the impact of global cosmopolitanism and tourist culture, therefore, runs the risk of losing one’s own identity, without assuming a new identity, for which one strives. They, in this way, remain “stuck” in the gap between two antagonist identities.

The same risk is taken by the members of local communities in receptive societies. An analogous phenomenon occurs in the opposite direction. Individuals who, in this process, become too related to tourists and their culture, and at the same time, become alienated from their own environment and compatriots, also run the risk of finding themselves in the open space between the two antagonistic cultures (one of the cultures rejected them, and the other one has not accepted them). They become alienated from family and tribal bonds of their traditional society, and they see in foreigners the possibility of an ontological fulfilment that they need. The arrival of tourists to remote areas of the world, to indolent fishing and mountain villages, has given to a certain segment of people the possibility of new social contacts with completely different people. These people, foreigners, are not only members of their own national identities, but also the holders of the global tourism culture and cosmopolitanism. This means that the local population is simultaneously exposed to the cross-impact of various imported cultures, tourism culture and the spirit of cosmopolitanism. This attractive “carpe diem” consumer culture of experience” fascinates the local population (especially young people) who tend to imitate the lifestyle and behavior of foreign tourists, as carriers of this culture. However, the ultimate goal is not just an imitation of someone else's
life, but a complete assimilation of the foreign identity, which is an unattainable goal for the majority.

Conclusion

If we start from the provocative assumption that “a man is a stranger to another man,” and that our entire social environment can be categorized in the range from “relative strangers (foreigners)” to “radical strangers (foreigners),” the xenology of tourism has two essential and mutually opposed directions of research. The first one is overcoming the strangeness (foreignness) and the alienation of human relations, from the micro level (intrapersonal communication within the family) to the macro level (global intercultural communication). In this sense, the question is raised of whether, and how, throughout life, we can become close to some strangers and how they can become close to us. The second level is of particular importance for tourism, due to the high intensity of foreignness between participants in the global tourism (different ethnic, racial and religious affiliation, large cultural distances, intercultural misunderstandings, mutual stereotypes and prejudices, different languages and dialects, etc.). In order to overcome these radical forms of foreignness, it is necessary to “de-xenofy” foreigners and the foreign, bring them closer to one another, reduce the unknown to a known reference, perform their de-exoticisation and appropriation, so that they would become similar or close. It is extremely difficult to achieve this, so high humanistic aspirations of tourism and international declarations aimed at establishing understanding, cooperation and friendships among peoples through tourism, remain a dead letter (“Tourism as a passport to peace”). In contrast, there is a need for preservation of foreignness (the exotic), since the attractiveness of tourist destinations is directly proportional to the intensity of differences in relation to the origin of tourists (emitting countries). This means that what is specific, different and unusual at the destination should be saved from banality in order for it to maintain a high level of foreignness, i.e. exoticism. Today the survival of differences, as the most valuable tourism resource, is more topical than ever, considering the homogenizing effects of globalization. In this regard, it is necessary to preserve the authenticity and uniqueness of every national culture, and not only traditional culture, but also modern culture that has to strive to be original, creative and differentiated in relation to external homogenizing influences and fashionable trends. Between these two extreme poles of research, there is a whole sequence of other questions that can be studied by the xenology of tourism.
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