RECIPROCITY, HOSPITALITY AND TOURISM:
An examination of Marshal Sahlins's contributions

Maximiliano Korstanje
University of Palermo, Argentina

ABSTRACT: Marshal Sahlins, a British anthropologist, envisaged that societies follow a principle of reciprocity that not only founds their economy but also their political order. To some extent, Sahlins considered that reciprocity took three different shapes: negative, generalized and balanced. Typically, contributions of Sahlins can be applied to many issues but there is only one of particular interests for tourism-related studies, the inception and application of visa as a formal document that determines the principle of hospitality. The outcomes of this research reveal the following interesting points: Argentina takes a rate of reciprocity of 2.13 which situate her within the balanced-type. Of a total of 38, 31 countries celebrated with Argentina a visa based on a balanced-reciprocity while only 5 (USA, Romania, Australia, Canada, and Colombia) endorsed a negative reciprocity. Let's remind readers that this means argentines needs of visa to enter these countries while citizens of these countries do not need visa to arrive Argentina. Findings in this research, anyway, should be continued in other contexts.
Keywords: nation-states, solidarity, society, anthropology, reciprocity, visa.

RESUMEN: Marshal Sahlins, antropólogo británico, ha sido uno de los primeros en darse cuenta que las sociedades siguen un principio de reciprocidad que no solo estructura su economía sino que también funda su orden político. En algún punto, Sahlins considera que la reciprocidad adquiere tres diferentes subtipos: negativa, generalizada e equilibrada. Las contribuciones de Sahlins puede ser aplicadas actualmente a muchos aspectos de la vida social pero por sobre todo a asuntos vinculados al turismo y la hospitalidad. El visado moderno es un residuo institucional propio de los lazos de reciprocidad y del principio de hospitalidad. En ese contexto, los hallazgos de la presente investigación versan en los siguientes aspectos: Argentina tiene respecto a 38 países una reciprocidad equilibrada/balanceada con la excepción de Estados Unidos, Canadá, Rumania y Colombia con quienes adquiere una reciprocidad negativa ya que mientras los argentinos necesitan de visado para entrar a estos países, los ciudadanos de estos países no requieren visado para entrar a la Argentina. **Palabras Claves:** estado-nación; solidaridad; sociedad; antropología; reciprocidad; visa.

RESUMO: Marshal Sahlins, antropólogo britânico, foi um dos primeiros a aperceber-se de que as sociedades mantêm um princípio de reciprocidade que, não apenas estrutura a sua economia, como também constitui as bases da sua ordem política. Sahlins considera que a reciprocidade pode assumir três formas: negativa, generalizada e equilibrada. Este legado de Sahlins pode

Maximiliano Korstanje is Tourism BA, Anthropologist (University of Moron, Argentina) and PhD (cand.) in Social Psychology (University John. F. Kennedy, Argentina). One of his areas of expertise is the sociological study of evilness and panic flights in disaster's situations in modern and ancient times (Roman Empire) as well as the risk perception theory applied on travels and tourism.

ser aplicado a muitos aspectos da vida social, e em especial a assuntos do âmbito do turismo e da hospitalidade. O visto turístico é um resíduo institucional característico dos laços de reciprocidade e do princípio de hospitalidade. Os resultados da presente investigação revelam que a Argentina mantém, em relação a 38 países, uma reciprocidade equilibrada, com excepção dos Estados Unidos, do Canadá, da Roménia e da Colômbia, em relação aos quais mantém uma reciprocidade negativa, já que os argentinos necessitam de visto para entrarem nesses países, mas os cidadãos desses países não necessitam de visto para entrarem na Argentina. **Palavras chaves:** estado-nação; solidariedade; sociedade; antropologia; reciprocidade; vistos.

INTRODUCTION

A further examination of the historical background of the term hospitality leads us towards a new understanding that contrasts in sharp with our current form of seeing the phenomenon. Even if numerous studies have emphasized on hospitality from a commercial perspective (Lashley & Morrison, 2001; Santos Filho, 2008; Gallarza & Gil, 2008; Santana, 2006; Kathchikian, 2000; Alvarez & Korzay, 2008; Nadeau et al., 2008; Castaño, Moreno & Crego, 2006; Coronado, 2008; Lau & Mckercher, 2006; Toribio, Castellá & Serrano, 2005; Lynch, 2005; McNaughton, 2006; Heuman, 2005; Franch et al., 2008; Capriello & Rotherham, 2008; Kastenholz & Lopez de Almeida, 2008), no attention was given to its anthropological understanding. To fulfill this gap, the present paper not only traces the historic root of hospitality and its connection with reciprocity but also explores the contributions of Marshall Sahlins´s theory to the study of modern visa and migration policies worldwide.

Typically, a visa can be tentatively defined in terms of a temporal permission issued as a document to enter and remain in certain territory during a lapse of time. The modern visa and tourism are inextricably intertwined simply because the former allows the mass-exchange of travellers. Ethimological roots of visa stems from the Latin *Visum* (perfect past from videre) that means "seen". The wide-spread nature of Visum is present in almost all indo-Arian languages associated to modern English (wise), German (wissen), Lithuanian (visti), Bulgarian (vidya), Polish (widziec), Russian (videt) and Welsh (gwyn). To some extent, the visa played a role related to the monitor and control of foreign travellers.

An all-encompassed examination for previous studies in tourism fields shows that the originality of our theme is higher but this represents a limitation because new methods and literature of other disciplines are strongly needed. The present work provides readers with a new methodology to understand how the reciprocity among nation-states works. By means of the tabulation of migration policies for salient and transient argentines citizens, we have built a table containing the requirements of foreigners to enter Argentina as well as the argentine's formalities for traveling abroad. In doing so, we consulted the Argentine Guide of Tourism (Guía Argentina de Turismo y Afines)

wherein the international requirements of migration are exhibited. The tabulation of this dataset allowed us to elaborate a scheme based on three types of reciprocities ranging from 1 (generalized), 2 (balanced) towards 3 (negative). It is important not to lose sight that this methodology does not need of arithmetical correlations and the findings of this paper contribute notably to the understanding of the role played by reciprocity among States. Once again, the hospitality was historically feasible by means of the ancient inter-tribal alliances that facilitated the principle of reciprocity.

THE SOCIAL RECIPROCITY

From their inception, sociology and anthropology were two disciplines concerned to study the social bondage. The founding parents of sociology found that the in-group affiliation depended upon many factors as religion, trust, and language. 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. Certainly, in Europe the changes brought by the Industrialism in the different spheres of social life have created a new class: the bourgeoisie. This and other much broader shifts produced an ongoing declination in social trust creating serious aftermaths for the quality of life of Europeans. The process of industrialization captivated the attention of many scholars during the beginning of XXth century (Mauss & Hubert, 1904; Leach, 1965; Malinowski, 1986; Durkheim, 1982; Weber, 1996; Rousseau, 1993; Levi-Strauss, 2003; Weiner, 1992; Harris, 2006). Some of them surmised that trade and commerce transformed the ancient solidarity in new elaborated form of connection where impersonality and indifference prevailed. This does not mean that solidarity would have disappeared but it had been substantially changed. In other terms, the degree of materiality, economy and technological advances in West, engendered by industrialism, prompted a gradual declination of social bondage. In recognition to this, E. Durkheim, who was convinced of the importance of social bondage, argued that groups had two kinds of solidarities: mechanic and organic. Whilst the former was based on consuetudinary right where trust and solidarity predominate, the latter was determined by the division of labor, specialization of roles and an irreversible declination of social bondage. The durkhemian thesis focused on the fact aborigines developed the mechanic solidarity while the industrialized societies developed the organic one (Durkheim, 2004). The reciprocity, or solidarity, is often conditioned to the economic ways of production in

every society. Based on the belief that anthropological theories cannot be applied beyond the aboriginal world, some scholars contend that anthropology advances should not be used in tourism fields. Otherwise we strongly believe that connection between anthropology and tourism as disciplines of research is worthwhile for expanding the understanding of tourism issues.

One might realize that human beings have the need of giving gifts to others so that these gifts can be returned at a later time and so forth. This suggests that the "Gift exchange" creates a well-defined circle of right and duties among participants; this circle is called as reciprocity.

THE THEORY OF GIFTS IN PERSPECTIVE

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). Taking his cues from Thomas Hobbes who argued the society worked by means of a sentiment of solidarity, the main contributions of Mauss, undoubtedly, paved the pathways for a considerable volume of books and studies in ethnology and anthropology for many years. Among these works we come across with the British anthropologist Marshall Sahlins (1972;189)) who contemplated that "*reciprocity stipulates two sides, two distinct social-economics interests. Reciprocity can establish solidary relations, insofar as the material flor suggests assistance or mutual benefits, yet the social fact of sides is inescapable*".

As the previous argument given, reciprocity and distribution of wealth are two key factors that mobilize the scaffolding of economy. In this vein Sahlins (1972;190) goes on to say that "*the practical, logistic function – redistribution – sustains the community, or community efforts, in material sense*". 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: generalized (loan), balanced (exchange) and negative (robbery). Readers who want this clearer should take into consideration that the generalized reciprocity surfaces whenever one subject gives a good or service to others expecting anything else in return. The gap in wealth, power and

authority give as a result a generalized reciprocity to the extent the social distance among participants is considerably shortened. Rather, balanced or symmetrical reciprocity refers to the fact that both parts expect a fair return evoking moderate levels of trust. Most certainly, money mediates symbolically among participants equaling the duties of ones and others.

Ultimately, Sahlins (1972;195) admits that the negative reciprocity can be deemed as "*the attempt to get something for nothing with impunity, the several forms of appropriation, transaction opened and conducted toward net utilitarian advantage … negative reciprocity is the most impersonal sort of exchange. In guises such as barter it is from our own point of view the most economnic. The participants confront each other as opposed interest, each looking to maximize utility at the other's expense*". In this vein, Sahlins realizes that some factors such as spatial proximity, wealth, power, status potentiate the possibility to develop certain kind of reciprocity in detriment of others. By assuming that reciprocity operates in all contexts of social life in primitive but in industrialized communities too, Sahlins admits the following relevant points:

a) The geographic proximity or distance among giver and receiver is of paramount importance at determining the type of solidarity. People situated far away of each other are prone to celebrate a balanced reciprocity than others.

b) Differences in the Rank or Status. Whenever the status gap of people is enlarged the reciprocity takes a generalized typology simply because one part does not expect retribution from the other (poorer).

c) Wealth. In similar conditions explained to the earlier point 2, the differences of richness lead people towards a generalized reciprocity.

d) Type of exchanged good is crucial to determining the type of reciprocity. For further clarification, food aims to create a generalized-reciprocity type while money triggers a balanced reciprocity type.

Furthermore, it is important to note that one of the most visible aspects of reciprocity in tourism fields is the visa. 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, 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) (Korstanje, 2008a; Korstanje, 2008b).

THE ANCIENT AND MODERN HOSPITALITIES

The principle of visa is enrooted in the ancient institution of "hospitium" – hospitality which was primarily considered as a type of inter-tribal covenant. The historical tracking of hospitality leads us to Ancient Europe in Vth and VIth centuries B. C. Germans and Celtics honored hospitality as a form of politic liaison with other tribes before the advent of Rome as Empire that encouraged the institution of *patronatus*. For example, J. Huizinga (1968) examined repeatedly in Norse Mythology the role played by hospitality in games and banquets finding that under the principle of hospitality conflict was strictly banned because this represented a sacred-space where guests were welcomed.

One of the aspects that characterized the ancient hospitality was the protection of strangers because they were seen as messengers of gods. Starting from the premise that travelers who stood in transit lacked of a citizenship, hospitality bestowed to them a transitory protection during their travels. With this background in mind, Balbin Chamorro contemplates that the transitory transference of citizenship to foreigners is a rite which become a preconditions for modern hospitality (Chamorro, 2006; Humbert, 1978). In sharp contrast with Mommsen´s contributions, Chamorro inclines to say that hospitality was a natural product resulted from the needs of mutual protection. Ethimologically, the term hospitality stems from the formula *hostis and pet*. The former is related to the presence of enemies while the latter were certainly used in circumstances characterized by kindness or sympathy.

Chamorro questions the thesis that hostis symbolized the natural prone to violence and conflict of human beings. From her perspective, hospitium is a result of the human nature by equaling forces to mitigate the negative effects of social conflict by means of dissuasion. To some extent, Chamorro notes that *hospes* means "Master of guest" but she gives not further references about the reasons behind. This moot-point reminds that the vulnerability of guests who are often introduced in an unknown land was somehow transformed in a need of possession. The hosts warranted their protection only if the guest accepted their authority. The ancient forms of hospitality evolved to other more sophisticated institutions as the mass-tourism and hospitality.

Underpinned in the supposition that home emulates symbolic attachment of people with their territory, Bordieu (2005) and Waldenfels (2005) argue that home can be considered a site wherein converges the work, blood, soil and kinship. To some extent, our home can be in-

terpreted as the root of political life (Balandier, 2004). 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 foreign travelers should be honored, the latter facilitated the celebration of different covenants aimed at strengthening the defense of their own territory. Hypothetically, Ramos and Loscertales (1948) suppose that these preventive measures helped in creating diverse nets of alliances in case of an outsider's aggressions or attacks (Rivero, 1993). In mid twentieth century, Álvaro d'Ors brilliantly analyzed the evolution of hospitium as institution in Spain validating the previous findings of Ramos and Loscertales. The thesis here seems to be that hospitality has been historically utilized to harness the geographical boundaries and prevent the onslaughts of other tribes (d'Ors, 1953). Ettiene, La Roux and Tranoy (1987) collected hard archeological evidence that proves the previous assumption in respect to hospitality. Once again, hospitality engenders a double risk that should be symbolized by means of rites of passages such as the migration clearance or visa requests. The fear and fanciful have been two key-elements present in the attractiveness of destinations from the inception of tourism (Douglas, 1997). Whenever the ontological security of people is in danger, displacement and tourism represent prophylactic alternatives to recover the sentiment of security. The violence exerted over guests can be proportional to its own vulnerability.

Most likely, hospitality and hostility share similar ethimological roots. The Greek-Roman Mythology presents the incident between Faunus and Heracles as a sign of the troublesome nature of hospitality. This legend narrates the story of Heracles, who has been invited by Faunus to visit his reign moved by the promise of a great banquet in accordance to his victories. However, Faunus, an overambitious king, planned to kill Heracles during a siesta. That way, Faunus would ensure more fame and glory. In a moment of the banquet, Heracles realized of this trick and executed Faunus merciless (Korstanje, 2009). Food, sex and other pleasures are part of the hedonism of hospitality remind Andrews, Roberts and Selwyn in a paper that emphasizes on the close-up connection between hospitality and erotism. To a greater or lesser degree both connote to the abeyance of conflict, however, the conflict cannot be completely eliminated and still remains in the core of the relationship between host and guest. The danger lies in the possibilities to cross the boundaries of security to the extent to satisfy our own desire of curiosity. Whether the hospitality should be honored as a divine mandate, where guests should not be harmed, erotism takes place by means of the convergence between self-hood and otherness.

Under this perspective, hospitality is defined as a form of abeyance of hostility determined by a specific contextualization (Andrew, Roberts & Selwyn, 2007).

Furthermore, J. Derrida considers that hospitality starts to be applied whenever the State asks aliens: "how are you?", and "what do you want from me?". The patrimony, lineage, name, and origin play a pivotal role in determining the principle of hospitality (Derrida, 2006). In this vein, O´Gorman dwells on Derrida´s contributions considering the following relevant points: a) hospitality can be defined as the act enrooted in a moral virtue for what a person welcomes foreigners with the end of meeting all their needs providing an invitation to intimacy (home), b) tourism provides with strangers a comodified frame of conditional hospitality, only they are guest if they can pay for that status, and c) the language plays a pervasive role in the configuration of nation-hoods. France, England and other powers expanded their sovereignty in former centuries (process of colonization) thanks to the unconditional hospitality offered by the periphery but in our days these European countries exert considerable influence to prevent the migration of workers coming from the civilizations they cynically colonized in past (O´Gorman, 2007). As the previous background, the visa can be considered as a valid and effective instrument to control who and under what conditions are introduced in a country. This institution not only evokes the ancient reminiscences of hospitality but also selects the stranger's entrance. Therefore, modern visa takes a territorial nature often associated to the principle of property that Sahlins brilliantly examined. As early noted, these types of covenants among States are not symmetrical in all circumstances. The conceptual model of Sahlins helps readers to understand how the visa works in our modern world.

INTERPRETING THE VISA

Whenever a travel begins, people ensure to have their documents in order as air-ticket, driver license, passports and of course the visa. Otherwise, we run the risk of being rejected by the hosting country. Neighbouring countries usually do not require visa while over-seas travellers are asked for more legal formalities. This validates Sahlins´s assumptions respecting to the role played by physical distance in the configuration of generalized-reciprocity. Moreover, a modern visa seems to be circumscribed to three types of reciprocity: negative, balanced and generalized.

For further understanding, the balanced reciprocity takes place when two States celebrate similar formalities for their citizens to enter in a country. This is the case between Argentina and Germany. Table 1 shows how both Citizens have similar requirements: no visa is requested and the resulted permission takes 90 days. The acceptance or

prohibition in entrance is not a requisite to determine the balanced reciprocity. Whether Argentina asks German tourists for a visa and Germany applies the same restriction on argentines, it is safe to admit there is balanced-reciprocity. In our study, the balanced reciprocity is being rated as 2. Rather, the negative reciprocity can be seen in United States and Australia, which solicit visa to Argentinean travellers, but Argentina does not counter-apply this to Americans or Australians. This type of reciprocity is codified as 3 in our table. Generalized type often is associated to policies of refugees wherein the involving countries do not celebrate a covenant in a strict sense of the term. Needless to say that, in tourism, these sorts of cases are uncanny. The average of all rates will give the types of reciprocity Argentina had respecting to the 38 involving other States.

At a first glance, the outcomes reveal that the average gives 2.13 which mean that the reciprocity between Argentina and 38 countries is balanced with exception of USA, Canada, Colombia, Romania and Australia which show a negative type. In spite of being situated in the core of South-America, anyway, Colombia requests visa to Argentina travellers. We assume this is because of security issues. Ultimately, nor New Zealand neither South Africa, two English speaking countries request visa to argentine visitors. This dataset suggests that ethnicity and physical distance are not key factors to explain the negative reciprocity.

Other point of entry in this discussion connects the wealth each country with the GBP (Gross Product) index. Per statistics of IMF (International Monetary Fund) in 2007, USA had a GPB of 43.223 million dollars while Argentina reached only 16.080. Canada showed 35.514 and Australia 33.037 million dollars. Similarly to Argentina Colombia registered 8.260 and Romania 10.125 million dollars (IMF, 2007). In this sense, the thesis of Sahlins should be revisited because the wealth asymmetries can explain why US, Australia and Canada celebrate negative reciprocity respecting to Argentina but this is not the case for Romania and Colombia.

Table 1. Visa requests.

Item	Country	From Argentina to Abroad		Abroad to Argentina		Rate
		VISA	Allowed Days	VISA	Allowed Days	
1	Germany	No	90 days	No	90 days	2
2	Algeria	Yes	Visa	Yes	Visa	2
3	Australia	Yes	Visa	No	Visa	3

(Continued)

(cont.)

4	Austria	No	90 days	No	90 days	2
5	Belgium	No	90 days	No	90 days	2
6	Bulgaria	Yes	Visa	Yes	Visa	2
7	Canada	Yes	Visa	No	90 days	3
8	China	Yes	Visa	Yes	Visa	2
9	Colombia	Yes	Visa	No	90 days	3
10	Croatia	No	90 days	No	90 days	2
11	Denmark	No	90 days	No	90 days	2
12	Ecuador	No	90 days	no	90 days	2
13	USA	Yes	Visa	no	90 days	3
14	Spain	No	90 days	no	90 days	2
15	France	No	90 days	no	90 days	2
16	Ethiopia	Yes	Visa	Yes	Visa	2
17	Hungary	No	90 days	no	90 days	2
18	Holland	No	90 days	no	90 days	2
19	Israel	No	90 days	no	90 days	2
20	Italy	No	90 days	no	90 days	2
21	Japan	No	90 days	no	90 days	2
22	Libanon	Yes	Visa	Yes	Visa	2
23	Mexico	No	90 days	no	90 days	2
24	Mongolia	Yes	Visa	Yes	Visa	2
25	New Zealand	No	90 days	no	90 days	2
26	Panama	No	30 days	no	90 days	2
27	Romania	Yes	Visa	no	90 days	3
28	Ruyesa	Yes	Visa	Yes	Visa	2

(cont.)

29	Taiwan	Yes	Visa	Yes	Visa	2
30	South Africa	No	90 days	no	90 days	2
31	Serbia	No	90 days	no	90 days	2
32	Ruanda	Yes	14 days	Yes	Visa	2
33	Senegal	Yes	Visa	Yes	Visa	2
34	Tanzania	Yes	Visa	Yes	Visa	2
35	Togo	Yes	Visa	Yes	Visa	2
36	Trinidad and Tobago	Yes	Visa	Yes	Visa	2
37	Venezuela	No	90 days	no	90 days	2
38	Zambia	Yes	Visa	Yes	Visa	2
					Total	81
					Average	2,13

Source: Migration Office –Year LX – Issue 711. Book of Travel Agents, 2007. Buenos Aires.

Our thesis is that wealth and fortune asymmetries (sometimes) generate a negative reciprocity because the exchange of goods or people is circumscribed gravitating in favour of richest State. The politic and economic dependency of peripheral countries respecting to a centre (USA, Canada) pave the pathways for the advent of negative reciprocity. This happens because the late-capitalism often allows accumulating material and human resources in similar degrees. The attractiveness of these destinations is associated to the capital concentration. The working-related migration not only contrasts notably with tourism but also facilitates the conditions for tightening policies for migrants. Since at time of arrival many migrants frequently declare to be under the status of tourists, this explains why richer countries ask for visa while poorer ones do not respond with the same constraint. A lot hangs on how flux of passengers does not correspond with the technology and exchange of capital between developed and developing countries. While migration assumes that poorest workers travel to richest countries, tourism shows richest travellers going to poorest countries for leisure and entertainment purposes. This explains the reasons why some peripheral countries (like Argentina) allow the arrival of Americans and Canadians without visa whereas these States discourage the entrance

of peripheral workers. In forgoing, one might speculate that the asymmetrical richness among States engenders a negative-reciprocity for the exchange of their citizens.

CONCLUSION

The social bondage has been a concern that drew the attention of many scholars. Typically, the principle of reciprocity and hospitality are two factors of paramount importance at time of explaining how the society works. From this perspective, the theory of Marshall Sahlins denotes that the solidarity, which takes the name of reciprocity in his development, encompasses three distinctive forms: negative, balanced and generalized. Some states are often based on a double dynamic wherein questions of reciprocity and economy converge. The current exchange of workers, elaborated goods and services under the figure of migration and tourism deserve to be analyzed by means of a qualitative study. The outcomes of this research reveal the following interesting points.

At a first glance, Argentina takes a rate of reciprocity of 2.13 which situate her within the balanced-type. Of a total of 38, 31 countries celebrated with Argentina a visa based on a balanced-reciprocity while only 5 (USA, Romania, Australia, Canada, and Colombia) endorsed a negative reciprocity. Let reminds readers that this means argentines needs of visa to enter these countries while citizens of these countries do not need visa to arrive Argentina. In addition, there are no cases of generalized reciprocity because this type applies only for refugees denoting a state of conflict between refugee-delivering and receiving countries. The accumulation of capital would explain the conflictive relationship between migration and tourism.

It is important to see that the three types of reciprocity engender three irrespective forms of hospitalities: a) balanced hospitality, b) negative hospitality, and c) generalized hospitality. To be more precise, the balanced hospitality means that two or more State will set similar conditions for entrance of strangers. A State of course discourages or encourages the migration of foreigners depending on their interests. Whenever these interests are materialized, in similar policies, among States, a balanced hospitality surfaces. However, when one state unilaterally bans the arrivals of foreigners and the counter-state does not follow this strategy, one may bespeak of negative hospitality. This is exactly the example of United States, Canada and Colombia respecting to Argentina. Here two previous assumptions should be discussed. Negative-hospitality not only is a result of wealth asymmetries among countries but also a consequence of security concerns. Ultimately, generalized-hospitality applies almost always in case of refugees or migration triggered by political issues. One of the aspects that characterize the generalized-hospitality seems to be involving states are in rivalry because one hosts dissidents whose lives run risk. It is clear that Sahlin´s theory

opens the door for a new alternative in hospitality-research. However, this is a much broader issue that should be continued in other works.

REFERENCES

Alvarez, M., &. Korzay, M. (2008). Influence o politics and media in the perceptions of Turkey as a tourism destination. *Tourism Review. 63*(2), 38-46.

Andrews, H., Robert, L., & Selwyn, T. (2007). Hospitality and erotism. *International Journal of Culture and Hospitality Research, 1*(3), 247-262.

Balandier, G. (2004). Parentesco y poder. In *Antropología política* (pp. 123-154). Buenos Aires: Ediciones del Sol.

Balbín, P. (2006). Ius Hospitii y ius civitatis. *Revista Gerión*, *1*, 207-235.

Capriello, A., & Rotherham, I. (2008). Farm attraction, networks and destination development: a case study of Sussex, England. *Tourism Review, 63*(2), 59-71.

Castaño, M., Moreno, A., & Crego, A. (2006). Factores psicosociales y formación de imágenes en el turismo urbano: un estudio de caso sobre Madrid. *Pasos*, *4*(3), 287-299.

Coronado, G. (2008). Insurgencia y turismo: reflexiones sobre el impacto del turista politizado en Chiapas. *Pasos, 6*(1), 53-68.

Derrida, J. (2006). *La Hospitalidad.* Buenos Aires: Ediciones de la Flor.

Durkheim, E. (1982). *Las formas elementales de la vida religiosa.* Madrid: Editorial Akal.

D`ors, A. (1953). *Epigrafía jurídica de la España romana.* Madrid.

Douglas, N. (1997). The fearful and the fanciful: early tourists' perception of Western Melanesia. *The Journal of Tourism Studies. 8*(1), 52-60.

Durkheim, E. (2004). *La División del trabajo Social.* Buenos Aires: Ediciones del Libertador.

Etienne, R., Le Roux, P., & Tranoy, A. (1987). La tessera hospitalis, instrument de sociabilité et de romanisation dans la Péninsule Ibérique. *Sociabilite, pouvoirs et societe. Actes du colloque de Rouen 1983*, Rouen, 1987, 323-336.

Franch, M., et al. (2008). 4l tourism (landscape, leisure, learning and limit): responding to new motivations and expectations of tourist to improve the competitiveness of alpine destination in a sustainable way. *Tourism Review. 63*(1), 4-14.

Gallarza M., & Gil, I. The concept o value and its dimmsions: a tool for analyzing tourism experiences. *Tourism Review. 63*(3), 4-20.

Harris, M. (2006). *The rise of anthropological theory - a history of theories of Culture.* Mexico: Siglo XXI.

Heuman, D. (2005). Hospitality and reciprocity working tourist in Dominica. *Annals of Tourism Research. 32*(2), 407-418.

Hobbes, T. (2004). *Leviathan.* Buenos Aires: Ediciones Libertador.

Huizinga, J. (1968). *Homo Ludens.* Buenos Aires: Emece editores.

Humbert, M. (1978). Municipium et civitas sine sufragio. L´organisation de la conquête jusqu´à la guerre sociale. Roma.

IMF (2007). *World Economic Outlook Database*, *October*.

Kastenholz, E., & Lopez, A. (2008). Seasonality in rural tourism – the case of North Portugal. *Tourism Review. 63*(2), 5-15.

Khatchikian, M. (2000). *Historia del Turismo*. Lima: Editorial de la Universidad San Martin de Porres.

Korstanje, M. (2008a). Ingreso y alojamiento: una perspectiva macrosociológica para comprender el sistema turístico en la ciudad de Buenos Aires. *Revista de Turismo Visao y Accao, 9*(3), 372-392.

Korstanje, M. (2008b). La reciprocidad en Marshall Sahlins: un enfoque interdisciplinario para el estudio de los no show en turismo y hotelería. *Palermo Bussiness Review, 2*(1), 117-128.

Korstanje, M. (2009). Formas de ocio en Antigua Roma: desde la dinastía Julio-Claudia (Octavio Augusto) hasta la Flavia (Tito Flavio Domiciano). *El Periplo Sustentable. 15*, 27-76. Retrieved from http://www.uaemex.mx/plin/psus

Lau, G., & Mckercher, B. (2006). Understanding tourist movement pattern in a destination: a GIS approach. *Tourism and Hospitality Research. 7*(1), 39-49.

Lashley, C. & Morrison, A. (2001). *In the search of hospitality*. London, Butterworth Heinmann.

Leach, E. (1965). *Levi-strauss, anthropologist and philosopher*. Barcelona: Anagrama.

Levi-Strauss, C. (2003). *Pensamiento salvaje*. Buenos Aires: Prometeo Libros.

Lynch, P. (2005). Sociological impressionism in a hospitality context. *Annals of Tourism Research, 32*(3), 527-548.

Malinowski, B. (1986). *Los argonautas del Pacífico Occidental*. Barcelona: Editorial Planeta-Agostini.

Mauss, M. (1979). *Ensayo sobre los dones: motivo y forma del cambio en las sociedades primitivas*. Madrid: Editorial Técnos.

Mauss, M., & Hubert, H. (1904). Esquisse d' une théorie de la magie. *L' Année du Sociologique, 7*, 1-46.

McNaughton, D. (2006). The host as uninvited guest: hospitality, violence and tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research, 33*(3), 645-665.

Nadeau, J., et al. (2008). Destination in a country image context. *Annals of Tourism Research*, *35*(1), 84-106.

O´Gorman, K. (2007). The hospitality phenomenon: philosophical enlightenment? *International Journal of Culture, Tourism and Hospitality, 1*(3), 189-202.

Ramos y Loscertales, J. M. (1948). Hospicio y clientela en la España Céltica. *Revista Emerita, 10*, 308-337.

Rivero, M. P. (1993). El hospitium celtibero: estado de la cuestión. Universidad de Zaragoza. Ciclo II. Retrieved October 22, 2007, from http://155.210.60.15/HAnt/Hispania/hosp.celt.html

Rousseau, J. J. (1993). *El contrato social.* Barcelona: Editorial Altaya.

Sahlins, M. (1972). *Stone Age Economics.* Londres: Routledge Editorial.

Santana, A. (2006). *Antropología y Turismo.* Barcelona, Ariel Ed.

Santos Filho, J. (2008). Hospitalidade no Brasil Imperio: a visao o naturalista George Gardner. *Revista Brasileira de Pesquisa em turismo, 2*(2), 3-19.

Toribio, A. Castella, P., & Serrano, I. (2005). Determinación de las preferencias de los clientes internacionales para la practica del turismo rural en la Republica de Cuba. *Pasos, 3* (2), 283-295.

Waldenfels, B. (2005). El habitar físico en el espacio. In G. Schroeder & E. Greuniger (Eds.), *Teoría de la cultura: un mapa de la cuestión* (pp. 157-178). Buenos Aires: Fondo de Cultura Económica.

Weber, M. (1996). *Economía y sociedad: esbozo de sociología comprensiva.* México: Fondo de Cultura Económica.

Weiner, A. (1992). *Inalienable possessions: the paradox of Keeling-while-giving.* Berkeley: University of California Press.