Annals of Tourism Research 88 (2021) 103178

Contents lists available at ScienceDirect

Annals of Tourism Research

journal homepage: https://www.journals.elsevier.com/annals-of-tourism-research

The (im)possibilities of doing tourism otherwise: The case of settler colonial Australia and the closure of the climb at Uluru☆·☆☆

Phoebe Everingham [a,*], Andrew Peters [b], Freya Higgins-Desbiolles [c]

[a] ECR, University of Newcastle Australia, Australia
[b] Faculty of Health, Arts and Design, Swinburne University of Technology, Melbourne, Australia
[c] School of Management, University of South Australia, Adelaide, Australia

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:
Received 15 November 2019
Received in revised form 20 January 2021
Accepted 12 February 2021
Available online xxxx

Keywords:
Decolonisation
Settler colonialism
Critical tourism studies
Indigenous peoples;Uluru
Australia

ABSTRACT

This article analyses the recent closure of the Uluru climb in the settler colonial context of Australia and reflects on (im)possibilities for doing tourism otherwise to practices and logics of coloniality. Tourism at Uluru is embedded within settler colonial map-making, privileging supply side models of consumption at the expense of the Anangu Traditional Custodians. We contribute to the emerging body of research in tourism that argues for a dismantling of colonial logics in practice and theory and discuss the possibilities inherent in forms of tourism led by the Aboriginal custodians. In this context, tourism can promote deeper engagement to place that is 'more-than-human', beyond the Eurocentric dualisms of nature and culture, human/non-human/spirit. Unlearning coloniality is key for promoting transformative tourism.

Introduction

> "The land has law and culture. We welcome tourists here. Closing the climb is not something to feel upset about but a cause for celebration. Let's come together; let's close it together." — Former Chairman of the Uluru-Kata Tjuta Board of Management Sammy Wilson
>
> [(cited in Parks Australia "Stotries", n.d.-c)]

Critical scholars have long argued that tourism can be a significant colonising and subjugating force, through both the actions of the industry and some tourists themselves (e.g. Enloe, 1989; McLaren, 2003; Mies, 1993). Tourism under capitalist globalisation

☆ This article makes a conceptual contribution to critical theory in tourism studies. The paper utilises interdisciplinary insights from decolonial theorising and critical Indigenous theory to critique the anthropocentric foundations of Australian nationhood, based on the attempted erasure of Aboriginal identity and sovereignty. A case study is used of the closure of the Uluru climb to discuss the links between settler colonialism, map making and the coloniality of tourism development and consumption. While the case study focuses on Uluru and Aboriginal Australia the paper has broader global implications for exploring the issues of settler-colonialism in the context of tourism and decolonisation in other parts of the world.

☆☆ The paper draws on interdisciplinary social science perspectives from sociology, anthropology, human geography, International political relations and critical Indigenous studies. The paper draws insights from critical Indigenous theory and decolonial theory to further the insights of postcolonial theory in understanding other ways of knowing and being-in-the world that have too often been sidelined by western Eurocentric practices and theories.

* Corresponding author.
E-mail addresses: Phoebe.Everingham@newcastle.edu.au, (P. Everingham), apeters@swin.edu.au, (A. Peters), Freya.higginsdesbiolles@unisa.edu.au. (F. Higgins-Desbiolles).

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annals.2021.103178
0160-7383/

has attempted to make the world's places and peoples products for consumption where, "for the twentieth-century tourist, the world has become one large department store of countrysides and cities" (Schivelbusch, 1986, p. 197). Yet those who are privileged enough to have mobility for tourism purposes make up a minority of the global population and there are clear inequities and injustices at the heart of contemporary tourism (Higgins-Desbiolles, Carnicelli, Krolikowski, Wijesinghe, & Boluk, 2019). These inequities are underpinned by the fact that communities in the Global South and Indigenous peoples have too often been forced into catering to tourists through the pressures of the global economy, debt and the need for capital, with the result that very few communities are off the well-worn paths of the tourism circuit (Mowforth & Munt, 2016).

Compounding this imposition of tourism dependency and the attendant vulnerabilities has been a boosterist pro-growth policy approach (e.g. Hall, 2008; Wall, 1997) privileging the supply-side model of tourism, rather than the needs and desires of local and Indigenous communities. As Mies (1993) argued more than 25 years ago, the advent of cheap mass tourism has urged tourists to "experience the challenges of early 'discoverers' and to commune with nature" opening up more places to 'white civilisation'[1]; in other words tourism and the money economy (p. 133). Yet as Chambers and Buzinde (2015) point out, despite the claims that tourism development underpinned by neoliberal capitalist models can 'boost' communities out of poverty, the global tourism industry has largely failed in their efforts to do so (see also Mowforth & Munt, 2016).The paradox of tourism consumption, as Mies (1993) argued, is that the desire to experience 'pristine' nature and exotic 'Others' destroys these places and communities in the process. The tourists' desire to 'consume' Uluru in Australia, by climbing it against the wishes of the Aboriginal custodians, exemplifies these contradictions and illuminates the ways in which tourism is embedded within what Quijano (cited in Grosfoguel, 2007, p. 217) coined the 'coloniality of power'. The 'coloniality of power is a way of understanding the intersectionality of how power operates in the current capitalist 'world system':

> race, gender, sexuality, spirituality, and epistemology are not additive elements to the economic and political structures of the capitalist world-system, but an integral, entangled and constitutive part of the broad entangled 'package' called the European modern/colonial capitalist/patriarchal world system
>
> [(Grosfoguel, 2007, p. 217)]

This concept of 'coloniality of power' adds conceptual layers to tourism studies expanding the scope of how the tourism academy engages with theoretical productions of knowledge in relation to the perpetuation of colonisation in places that are no longer under formal colonial administration (see Grosfoguel, 2007). Drawing on a case study of Uluru-Kata Tjuta National Park, located in the Northern Territory of Australia which receives over 250,000 visitors per year (Parks Australia, n.d.-a) we reflect on the coloniality of power embedded in tourism development at this site, raising questions around doing tourism otherwise to colonial logics. We highlight the problematic aspects of 'coloniality' including linguistic hierarchies and knowledge production that privileges "Western knowledge and cosmology over non-western knowledge and cosmologies, institutionalised in the global university system" (Grosfoguel, 2007, p. 217)[2].

Uluru first opened to tourism in the 1950s and has since come to symbolise the Australian national identity as the 'heart' of the nation (James, 2007). The controversial climb itself has assumed importance in Australian settler identity, where from the top of the 'rock' the tourist gaze employs imperialist notions of 'empty land' (Paschen, 2010, p. 68). This spatial logic of the climb is particularly problematic in the context of the colonisation of Australia, which was justified through the misguided 'legal' principle of *terra nullius* (land belonging to no one) (see Connor, 2005). The British colonisers claimed that Australia was empty of humans, making Australia 'available for settlement', rather than "requiring acknowledgement of acquisition by force, theft or conquest" (Howitt, 2012, p. 818). Climbing Uluru emerges from this Eurocentric sense of entitlement, failing to recognise the place within the cultural landscape of the Aboriginal people[3] – in this case, the Anangu[4] – that Uluru holds. In the case of Uluru, an international icon of Australia and world-renowned tourism destination, the western 'addiction' to gazing has commodified the sacred and once peaceful place into a 'tourism landscape' (Paschen, 2010).

In settler colonial contexts such as Australia multiple oppressions of conquest and plunder have both formed the bedrock of the Australian nation and continue to shape the Australian identity and sense of nationhood. Linking 'coloniality' to the tensions that arose with the closure of the Uluru climb we highlight the legacies of colonial map-making to the expansion of the Australian frontier, controlling the 'uncontrollable land', and link this to how tourism has been conducted at the site. This mapping and labelling of the Australian landscape inscribed a Eurocentric representation of the land and all it contains within dualistic divisions of mind/body/spirit/human/nature. It is these constructions, embedded within the colonial mapmaking and conquest of Australia, that underpin much of the tourism consumption at Uluru and consequently, the tensions that arose in the Australian public in relation to the closure of the climb. While reversing these dynamics that have contributed to the commodification of Uluru as a tourist destination is not possible, we must not forget the agency of Indigenous communities offering counter-narratives of re-

[1] We refer to white civilisation here drawing on the work of 'whiteness' in the sense of how race orients one in the world (Ahmed, 2007). Whiteness places certain objects in reach while keeping others out of reach - what is 'real" is produced by cultural biases (Eckstrand, 2017). Similarly, Moreton-Robinson highlights the centralising hegemonic role of 'Whiteness' as the "representation of humanity" (Moreton-Robinson, 2004, p. 77), negating 'other' realities and worldviews.

[2] While we acknowledge the problematic categories of 'western', 'non -western', and other such categories such as Global North and Global South, particularly in the context of settler colonial societies such as Australia, we follow on from Grosfoguel (2007, p. 220), who discusses 'non-western' in the context of peripheral nation-states and non-European people who live under the regime of 'coloniality'

[3] Throughout this article 'Aboriginal' will be used to refer to Australia's native people, culture and conditions, and 'Indigenous' will be used when referring to an international context, or when used within referenced sources in this work.

[4] Anangu are the traditional owners of Uluru-Kata Tjuta; of the Pitjantjatjara and Yankunytjatjara language groups.

sistance that have the potential to "reclaim cultural power and political discourse in the wider domain of indigenous [sic] representation" (Amoamo & Thompson, 2010, p. 36). As such, it is through the agency of the Anangu that the Board of Management of Uluru-Kata Tjuta National Park announced that climbing Uluru would be banned from 26 October 2019. This closure creates possibilities for rethinking tourism at Uluru and gives some insights into the (im)possibilities of 'doing tourism otherwise' to coloniality in relation to tourism more generally in other global contexts.

Closing the climb gives Anangu custodians more agency in how they engage with the tourism industry (Judd, Kearney, Hallinan, Schlesinger, & Cheer, 2019), with a national discussion opening up towards incorporating Anangu worldviews into how tourism is conducted at the site. However for Anangu (as well as Indigenous peoples elsewhere in the world) to conduct tourism in line with cultural beliefs and worldviews, the parameters of the discussion need to move beyond the Eurocentric dualisms that separate human from the non-human, mind, body, spirit, culture, nature. This involves not only recognising the intellectual, cultural, social, physical and economic constructions of coloniality that have shaped contemporary tourism, society and the academy (Battiste, 2009; Kovach, 2015; Rigney, 2006), but *also* opening up tourism in both thinking and practice to doing tourism otherwise. Recent work (e.g. Aikau & Gonzalez, 2019; Bawaka Country et al., 2016; Peters & Higgins-Desbiolles, 2012) has pointed out the potential tourism offers for producing knowledges and relationships outside of the coloniality paradigm, including through encounters which can subvert colonial stereotypes. Tourism spaces as contact zones have the potential to encourage tourists to think, feel and do tourism in ways that encourage intercultural recognition and respect for different worldviews. Indeed, tourism has the potential to contribute to the socio-cultural development of divided nations, societies and peoples, through fostering social justice and reconciliation (Higgins-Desbiolles, 2003).

This article seeks to explore these tensions and (im)possibilities of coloniality in the context of tourism consumption at Uluru. Firstly, we outline the trajectory of theorising in tourism research thus far, which calls for a radical shift away from the dominant western paradigm of knowledge production and binary anthropocentric thinking. This trajectory of research demonstrates that even the most critical tourism researchers must begin to accept the limitations of critical theory itself, embedded within western Eurocentric ways of thinking and forge alliances with those who have been marginalised and excluded from colonial structures. Such decolonising practices are regarded as vital to academia in many countries because of the anti-oppression and emancipatory powers it can unleash (Appleton, 2019; Battiste, 2009; Chambers & Buzinde, 2015; Kovach, 2015; Rigney, 2006).

Next, we position the case study of Uluru within the dominant settler colonial context of Australia. We consider the tensions between Aboriginal sovereignty and a national identity that is embodied within coloniality that has attempted the erasure of Aboriginal identity and being-in-the world, underpinned by ontological dualisms between nature/culture, and mind, body and spirit. These dualisms, so vital to early settler-colonial knowledge, are also linked to the colonial mapmaking expansion of Australia, underpinning conceptions of the Australian national identity. We conclude by considering how the decolonial shift in social theory calls for those in the academy to "learn to unlearn what we were taught before, to delink from the thinking programs which were imposed on us by culture, education, and environment marked by imperial reason" (Tlostanova, 2010, p. 27). The (im)possibilities of 'doing and thinking tourism otherwise' requires an 'unlearning' of the supposed neutrality of dualistic and anthropocentric ways of being in the world that underpins coloniality. One such way to 'unlearn' coloniality is through the idea of 'un-mapping', a process that peels back the layers of coloniality and presents counter-narratives of resistance. Being attentive to the pluriversal nature of reality, we take a 'critical multilogicality' perspective, that acknowledges non-anthropocentric ways of knowing and ways of relating (Wilson & Hollinshead, 2015). Taking a stance against 'objective' and 'universal' practises of knowing can help us face the contradictions and tensions encountered in the process of venturing beyond coloniality in both the tourism academy and tourism practice.

Situating ourselves in the research

A critical multilogicality perspective underpins this paper. Rather than putting forward a universalist position, we point to the complexities and messiness of coloniality in the context of settler colonial Australia and tourism development at Uluru, and acknowledge that all knowledge is partial, incomplete and never fixed (Haraway, 1998) This article is a collaboration between an Aboriginal man living in Victoria (Woiwurrung country) and two non-Aboriginal Australian women (living on Awabakal country, New South Wales and Kaurna Country, South Australia) who share a desire to collaborate in an analysis of the colonial settler identity of Australian nationhood in the context of the closing of the Uluru climb. Each of us bring various subjectivities such as age, gender, race and theoretical lenses – yet the three of us are deeply committed to bringing insights to tourism studies to address settler-colonial injustices on the country we live and work on. In this sense we take on decoloniality as an *option*; in the words of Tlostanova, a consciously chosen "political, ethical, and epistemic positionality and an entry point into agency" (Tlostanova, 2019, p. 165). Decolonial thinking as an option is "in contrast to a paradigm or grand theory — among a plurality of options" (Icaza Garza, 2017, p. 27). We acknowledge our own positionality in this research within intersecting oppressions and power relations and have each reflected together and alone on our own embodied positionality within the Australian nation and the ways our thinking has been shaped through our lived experiences, and the academy. In doing so we are working on 'unlearning' the ways in which our own subjectivities are entangled with coloniality and proposing an analysis that 'unworlds' conceptions of 'objectivity' and 'neutrality' (Wilson & Hollinshead, 2015).

We wish to be transparent about the fact that no one in this collaboration is from Anangu Country and are thus are not speaking on behalf of the Anangu or from any intimate, lived experience of managing tourism at the site of Uluru. There are limitations to our research then, in the sense that we have not had the opportunity to co-construct this research agenda with the traditional

custodians of Uluru. However, we act as allies, and foregrounded the voices of the Anangu from the public debates in the media that surrounded the closure of the climb.

Doing and theorising tourism otherwise - challenging colonial logics

The nexus between tourism and decolonisation has emerged in recent decades and become a key aspect of critical tourism studies in the 21st century. Building upon the discursive connections between tourism and postcolonialism (Hall & Tucker, 2004; Peters, 2017) scholars have recognised and challenged the assumptions of cultural superiority underpinning the colonial paradigm that is the bedrock of much of contemporary tourism. Tourism that is underpinned by coloniality risks assimilating communities such as Aboriginal Australians into the demand-driven and corporate form of tourism or face a stark choice to be completely cut off from the tourism circuit and denied recognition as legitimate authorities to govern and interpret sites (see Whyte, 2010). In this context, postcolonialism has provided the platform for critical analysis of historical interactions between Indigenous and non-Indigenous peoples; and is particularly important when discussing critical issues in contemporary tourism development. However we take the postcolonial critique further, by drawing a distinction between 'global colonialism' and 'global coloniality' (Grosfoguel, 2007); the latter acknowledging the continuity of colonial forms of power that affect our being-in-the world, and the structuring of our knowledge systems. As Icaza Garza (2017) points out decolonial thinking takes its point of departure from post-colonial studies not only in terms of belonging to a different geo-genealogy but through the acknowledgement that "there is no modernity without coloniality". "Coloniality as the underside of modernity constitutes an epistemic location from which reality is thought" (Icaza Garza, 2017, p. 27). Tourism development can thus not be disentangled from coloniality and in the case of Uluru, the negation of Aboriginal Australians as 'knowers'.

In tourism research 'becoming otherwise in theory and practice' can be seen in Indigenous scholarship which is making its mark on critical tourism studies (e.g. McLaren, 2003; Tebrakunna Country and Lee, 2017; Whyte, 2010) and Indigenous and non-Indigenous scholars working in solidarity (e.g. Bawaka Country et al., 2016; Grimwood, Muldoon, & Stevens, 2019; Peters & Higgins-Desbiolles, 2012). For example, human geography researchers Sarah Wright, Kate Lloyd and Sandie Suchet-Pearson centre Bawaka country as author in their ongoing collaborations with Yolngu kin and Bawaka country in Arnhem land Australia. Bawaka country as author decenters the "privileging of human authors as the producers of knowledge and authorities of the written form", as well as "recognising the ways in which place informs what humans do", guiding human thought and action (Bawaka Country et al., 2016, p. 446). Similarly Australian Aboriginal scholar Emma Lee, has co-authored a paper with her custodial Country (Tebrakunna Country and Lee, 2017) and explores how Indigenous epistemologies can support new knowledge production in tourism through positioning herself as a "trawlwulwuy woman of tebrakunna country" (Tebrakunna Country and Lee, 2017, p. 102). A collaboration between Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal, Peters and Higgins-Desbiolles (2012) describe discourses on Indigenous tourism through their consideration of Aboriginal Australians as tourists and showed how this illuminates a very different perspective on the phenomenon of tourism that is usually understood through the Eurocentric gaze.

In the case of Uluru a decolonising lens uncovers the ways in which the rock has become aestheticized for tourism purposes within the field of coloniality - where control of the representation and experience has tended to exclude other ways of sensing and making meaning of the place, sustaining colonial difference. This aestheticization began with the Eurocentric processes of map-making. From this lens, aesthetics cannot be disconnected from a "geo-historical field for the control of representation and experience, for the control of subjectivity…" (Belle & Ehlers, 2020, p. 16). The dominance of the gaze in western aesthetics has worked to abstract "reality into an object of representation, and in turn exercising the power of representation to produce the world as artifice" (Belle & Ehlers, 2020, p. 25). Maps, as cartographic abstractions (relating to ownership) cannot be divorced from the 'modernising gaze' – a 'logic of representation' that separates subjects from the ground (and the relationalities of the body, the senses and the non-human) and negates other ways of being and relating to the landscape (Belle & Ehlers, 2020, p. 31) directing the tourist gaze. The work of Roberts (2010), for example, compares the map reader with site-seer, whose touristic gaze is mediated by these static semiotic inscriptions (embedded within coloniality and Eurocentric ways of relating to land).

Tourism development as embedded within these Eurocentric cartographies is thus problematic. However, non (or post) representational approaches to cartography have pointed to other ways of engaging with maps, challenging the privileging of the tourist gaze to focus on multisensory experiences and corporal engagements with maps and site seeing (Rosetto, 2012). We argue that these possibilities for engaging with touristic landscapes in 'other' ways requires an engagement with pluriversal voices in relating to landscapes. Foregrounding Indigenous and non-western voices and engaging with human and non-human 'Others' as 'knowers' is key for opening up possibilities of doing tourism otherwise (Chambers & Buzinde, 2015; Kwaymullina, 2016; Tebrakunna Country and Lee, 2017).

Engaging in a "radical project of epistemic de-linking from colonial ways of thinking" (Chambers & Buzinde, 2015, p. 3) includes advocating doing tourism in ways that respect the cultures, knowledges and spirituality of the host communities. We use the case study of Uluru to emphasise the (im)possibilities of emancipatory and reconciliatory aspects of engaging in a way that is culturally respectful and promotes the kinds of experiences and encounters that can subvert neocolonial stereotypes and disrupt anthropocentric thinking. We argue that it is only through actively promoting "Aboriginal political and cultural agency on the management of tourist behaviour and the Uluru – Kata Tjuta National park itself" that tourism practices at the site can "disrupt habitual western ways of seeing, encouraging tourists to engage with 'other' ways of knowing place" (Paschen, 2010, p. 65).

A radical epistemic shift away from these Eurocentric, universalist paradigms also involves an opening up of academic theory to 'pluriversality'; that is cognisant of the multiple cosmologies, world views and ways of being-in-the world (Chambers &

Buzinde, 2015; Everingham, 2018). Opening up these decolonising visions of tourism means acknowledging pluriversality and critical multilogicality to understand knowledge construction as partial (never complete) and fluid, to contest Eurocentric logics that inhabit research settings and always being open to possibilities for how things could be otherwise (Mignolo, 2013; Wilson & Hollinshead, 2015). In relation to Uluru, the promotion of a pluriversal and critical multilogical perspective among tourists could work to deepen their touristic encounters with 'the rock', beyond the 'all knowing and seeing' monological and colonial gaze from the top of the climb (Paschen, 2010). Thus the closure of the climb presents possibilities for tourists to experience the site from the Anangu perspective, as "a living co-presence, the body of an ancestor, forming the personal and collective link to a country and with past and future generations" (Paschen, 2010, p. 70). And yet, Uluru is also more than this fixed linguistic representation (and English translation). As Paschen (2010, p. 70) points out, to be with Uluru from the Anangu perspective is to be with the "embodied presence of living culture and knowledge" where one can feel "a sense of kinship and responsibility for country and people". Pluriversal and multilogical perspectives allow us to consider the more-than-human presences, to move beyond anthropocentric ways of engaging with a tourism site and moving beyond linguistic representations of place that fix experiences into monological and colonial frameworks of understanding and being- in- the world. As Bawaka Country et al. (2016, p. 450) point out, "[r]ecognition of more-than-human agencies is found within many Indigenous ontologies that understand place, people, animals and other tangible and intangible beings and co-becomings as active agents with both knowledge and Law". There is a need to broaden our view of tourism as merely a product for consumption, and look towards the possibilities to move towards decentring the supposed neutrality of Eurocentric and anthropocentric worldviews, and to promote the possibilities of transformation and reconciliation that these experiences can provide.

The climbing of Uluru and its banning: an illustrative case of the (im)possibilities of doing tourism otherwise

In 2017, the Board of Management of Uluru-Kata Tjuta National Park announced that climbing Uluru would be banned from 26 October 2019. This section presents the illustrative case of the closure of climbing Uluru in order to consider the tensions that arise in moving away from colonial forms of tourism consumption. We follow on from the example of Figueroa and Waitt (2011) who drew on Uluru as a case study to consider the moral terrains of tourism and the possibilities for tourism to act as a moral gateway. Like them, we transparently declare that we have not conducted fieldwork at Uluru. Instead this is a conceptual analysis that centres the coloniality of thought and being in Australian nationhood, and how this has influenced tourism development and consumption practices at Uluru. We see the closure of the climb as timely to put forward a conceptual analysis that works towards decolonising the parameters of how tourism can be otherwise to these colonial logics that led to the climb as a tourism activity at the site. Taking this soft sciences 'critical multilogicality' approach to the case study of the closure of the climb (Wilson & Hollinshead, 2015) we critique the "all knowing and universalising truths of 'orthodox' tourism research(ers) in the construction of tourism 'knowledge" (Wilson & Hollinshead, 2015, p. 31). This perspective is a radical diversion from positivist, 'objective' approaches to understanding tourism 'knowledge', highlighting the importance of reflexive writing, underlined by messying the methodological assumptions that underline tourism research that emphasises 'objective', 'neutral' research (Wilson & Hollinshead, 2015) with fixed outcomes. As Waitt, Figueroa and McGee (2007, p. 249) declared: "our interest in Uluru is personal" and our own subjective knowledge is transparently part of the research.

Ayers Rock to Uluru – tourism development and settler colonial expansion

Aboriginal Australia possesses the oldest living cultures on Earth, going back at least 80,000 years. Research demonstrates that Aboriginal Australia has a history of sophisticated land management and cultivation practices (Gammage, 2011; Pascoe, 2014) that were not recognised at the time of British invasion, conquest and settlement. The region that is the focus of this case study, now described as Uluru- Kata Tjuta National Park has been under the custodianship of the Anangu people for tens of thousands of years, guided by 'Tjukurpa'. "Tjukurpa is the foundation of Anangu culture. Just as a house needs to stand on strong foundations, so their way of life stands on Tjukurpa" (National Parks, n.d.-a). Tjukurpa is an essential foundation for Anangu law, lives and society and it is important to understanding Anangu custodianship of Uluru, as well as being an important pillar of the park's current joint management.

Uluru is both symbolically and geographically a centre of the Australian nation. In 1873 with explorations for pastoral development and the overland telegraph, William Gosse reached Uluru and named it Ayers Rock in honour of the then Chief Secretary of South Australia (National Parks, n.d.-b). In that same year, Ernest Giles became the first European to climb Uluru, together with Khamran, an Afghan camel driver (National Parks, n.d.-b). 'Ayers Rock' became consigned in the collective knowledge of Australians as an outback monolith – 'the Rock'. As with many of Australia's natural features, this English labelling ascribed colonial knowledge and meaning, denying and denigrating the deep cultural history and knowledge of the Anangu people. This disconnection between knowledge systems has persisted and is at the foundation of contemporary debates about how tourism should be conducted at Uluru. To many non-Aboriginal Australians, the cultural knowledge and history of Uluru is unknown; and the concept of tourism there is based on western capitalistic notions of profit and the 'Rock' as a site of conquest rather than the sacred. In such circumstances, valuing alternative forms of tourist experiences (other than climbing) has remained a challenge.

The geography of tourism at Uluru is a product of settler-colonial mapping and labelling. In the early 20th century, mapping became a much desired and 'necessary' tool of colonial 'development', and thus colonisation. Mapping was required to address three key national 'needs': preparation of defense, aviation development, and resource identification and management

(Honman, 1939) and allowed the settler-colonists to shape the way the land was seen, perceived, and understood (Fellowes, in Henrikson, 1999). These maps were vital to successful colonial expansion (Peters, 2017). Mapmaking also afforded control of the 'uncontrollable' land and went a long way to forging the reputation of the frontier colonial explorers, and thus the emergent national identity. Maps of Australia thus evolved from a subjective, Eurocentric perception of the land and all it contains to a symbol of settler-colonial objectivity and universal 'truths'.

Coupled with these colonial tools of mapping was the complete lack of identification of, or consideration for, Aboriginal knowledge and understandings. Such knowledge extends far beyond the topographic two-dimensional representations of the land, and includes cultural and historical aspects that even in the 21st century we struggle to understand because of the dualistic anthropocentric conceptions of nature as separate to human. This leads to fundamentally myopic views and perceptions of the physical environment and what it 'means' to Australia. It is on this basis that Uluru assumes its role as central to contemporary national identity as well.

British mapping and labelling therefore at once ignored the Aboriginal culture and history of an area and ascribed 'new' settler-colonial knowledge to it, attempting to transform it into 'their' place (Attwood, 1992, p. v). This self-ascribed sense of ownership and entitlement is clearly evidenced in the example of Uluru. Tourism was concertedly developed from the 1930s in this context. Simultaneously, this was predicated on the Anangu's dispossession and they were pushed out under the assimilation policy of the time which saw them moved to far away reserves and controlled. The 1950s witnessed the declaration of Ayers Rock National Park, the construction of vehicle tracks, tourism promotion and the development of tourism services. Tourism expanded in 1959 with the granting of the first motel lease and the construction of an airstrip right next to the northern side of Uluru. This duality of tourism development and Anangu dispossession is iconic of what we suggest are the (im)possibilities of doing tourism otherwise at Uluru, where the nation at once claimed inland Australia (and in particular 'Ayer's Rock' and 'The Outback') as an inherent aspect of 'real Australia', while denying *any* other such connections to the land.

The dominance of these dynamics was challenged with the land rights movements of the 1970s. This resulted in Anangu returning to their country, asserting their rights as custodians and pressing for a change in the circumstances. Actions by traditional owners such as Paddy Uluru were pivotal in these developments (see National Parks, n.d.-b). These assertions of Aboriginal sovereignty were the catalysts to the handback of the national park to the Anangu in 1985 under the Land Rights Act and saw Ayers Rock return to its original name of Uluru.

However, this sovereignty was incomplete as the enabling legislation required the land to be jointly managed by Anangu and the Commonwealth, through a lease arrangement with the Director of National Parks; this was a 99-year lease, with Anangu to receive an annual rent and share of park revenue in return (National Parks, n.d.-b). It is important to note the climb was allowed to continue when the 99-year lease was agreed. The Northern Territory government and some in the tourism industry opposed the handback and demanded that the climb be allowed to continue. A plane even flew over the handback ceremony with a banner proclaiming "Ayers Rock for all Australians" (Dunlevie & Ellen, 2015).

The Uluru- Kata Tjuta National Park gained UNESCO World Heritage recognition twice – in 1987 (natural features) and 1994 (cultural) (Parks Australia, n.d.-c). – which underlines its complexity in terms of national recognition by emphasising dualisms inherent in creating its place. Although heritage listing has obvious benefits from a natural protection viewpoint, it is also potentially problematic as it undermines Anangu sovereignty through its designation as the heritage of humankind that requires universal access (Lutton & Williams, 2016). Heritage listing that rests on these dualistic notions of 'nature', 'culture' also erases Aboriginal notions of 'country' that incorporates kinship of country, humans, animals and spirits.

However, the recognition of the cultural significance of Uluru, does acknowledge the role of joint management, and in particular, 'Tjukurpa' as the key pillar:

> Tjukurpa, Anangu traditional law, knowledge and religious philosophy, guides everything that happens in the park - as it has done for thousands of years. This concept is expressed on the cover of the Plan of Management by the words: 'Tjukurpa Katutja Ngarantja' - Tjukurpa above all else
>
> [(National Parks, n.d.-c)]

The joint management of the park is often positioned as an exemplar of reconciliation in tourism, where "all Australians, whether Indigenous or settler, should feel they belong" (Waitt et al., 2007, p. 248). This approach aims to reconcile Anangu cultural and heritage imperatives with those of the natural landscape of the park, and the economic priorities of a tourism 'product' (including of course, visitor experience and enjoyment).

However, in practice the possibilities that Uluru under joint management presents in disrupting settler colonial identity are undermined by the broader dynamics that underlie Australian nationhood, built upon the "erasure of Indigenous governance" and the "continuing structural and procedural racism and state hostility to Indigenous rights…" (Howitt, 2012, p. 817). Moreover, while co-management of Uluru incorporates Anangu culture and heritage, the Eurocentric assumptions inherent within resource management separate humans and nature, often ignoring "the emotional, symbolic, spiritual and other widely perceived intrinsic values of the natural world inherent in the creation of place" (Avoy, McDonald, & Carlson, 2003, p. 87).

Uluru then, is a site of messy, complex and competing ideologies, practices and performances of Australian nationhood, all premised on the knowledge created from and underpinned by colonial expansion. Co-management requires empowering Aboriginal people to be involved in decision-making and requires strong commitment from governments as well as Aboriginal managers to ensure an achievement of conservation and cultural goals (Ross et al., 2009). However, the dominant narratives of Eurocentric

Australian nationhood are characterised by "emptiness, occupation and possession" framing "Indigenous Australian's relationships to their traditional lands, waters, territories and resources in terms of absence, erasure and denial" (Howitt, 2012, p. 817). While Uluru as a tourism site is co-managed, it is also a tourism site that embodies a moral struggle between "Indigenous performances of personhood" and "performances of colonial nationhood" (Waitt et al., 2007, p. 252). The climb itself can be seen as an act of 'conquering' and in the minds of some, a cultural and legal right of the settler colonial tourist (see Bolt, 2018; Hendrickx, 2018).

The climbing of Uluru

Since 1999, the proportion of visitors to Uluru who have climbed had gradually reduced from 71% to under 20% (Hendrickx, 2018; Whitford & Becken, 2017). Some insight has been gained into the motivations and attitudes of tourists who climb or alternatively choose not to climb through typically very small samples (e.g. McKercher, Weber, & du Cros, 2008; Waitt et al., 2007). As James (2007, p. 400) pointed out, the initial social construction of the site as 'a natural site' during World Heritage listing rather than an 'Aboriginal cultural landscape' paved the way for the National Park to become synonymous with "a 'wild' site for tourist activities, such as climbing, and controlled by the (settler) national government". The national narrative surrounding Uluru as a 'natural' site then, continues to overwrite the cultural and spiritual significance of Uluru and the wishes of the traditional owners that people do not climb.

Debate has long existed over whether or not Traditional Owners (TOs) and Aboriginal groups support or allow the climb. Since the hand-back in 1985, the Anangu have consistently cared for Uluru and their Tjukurpa, and while not *banning* the climb, have taken a cultural approach in preferring visitors *not* to climb, and to respect these cultural wishes. In addition, the cultural responsibilities of Anangu including caring for and protecting visitors and climbing Uluru is considered dangerous with more than 30 deaths recorded to date (Parks Australia, n.d.-b). Other concerns in climbing include environmental degradation, pollution, and hazardous weather conditions.

Despite Anangu wishes, marketing and framing tourist expectations still centered on climbing, and this was perpetuated through merchandise and social media. As James (2007) noted, the role of marketing, text and images have largely constructed the 'tourist gaze', shaping the expectations of the visitors and the boundaries of their experience, marginalising and even co-opting the Anangu view of Uluru. Many people had thus already decided to climb Uluru before arriving at the 'please do not climb' sign. Yet climbing was not an automatic given, highlighting the possibilities for attracting tourists to experiencing other activities at the site. Visitors were often disciplined to temporary closures due to adverse weather conditions or cultural reasons – including the 2001 passing of a senior TO, that was received sympathetically by visitors who did not seem to object to being unable to climb (Stevenson, 2001). Despite this possibility of non-climbing tourism activities, marketing and promotion of the climb still presented it as the main "performative engagement with the site" (James, 2007, p. 407).

The 2010–2020 Uluru- Kata Tjuta Management Plan stated that the climbing of Uluru would stop when three conditions were met:

- the proportion of visitors climbing the rock drops below 20%, or
- when the park board is satisfied adequate alternative experiences have been established, or
- when "the cultural and natural experiences on offer are the critical factors when visitors make their decision to visit" (National Parks, 2010, p. 92).

This attempt to establish clear thresholds for climbing Uluru presents an apparent ideological dilemma, underlying the (*im*)possibilities of doing tourism otherwise in a context of coloniality. On the one hand we have the 'coloniality' imperative of neoliberalism, which centres Australia's non-Aboriginal history and objectives of capitalism; and on the other, the 'decolonising' imperative of privileging Aboriginal voices and history. The former seeks to oppose the ban on the basis of non-Aboriginal measures of 'progress', and the adherence to Uluru as a tourism product, rather than the Aboriginal connections to land, country and spirit. An indicative example of the framing of Uluru in relation to capitalist colonial forms of consumption was offered by former NT Chief Minister Adam Giles, who stated that climbing Uluru was no different to climbing the Sydney Harbour Bridge or the Eiffel Tower and that tourism income and employment were too vital to risk by banning the climb (Davidson, 2016).

The climb's closure: (im)possibilities for decolonising tourism practices?

On announcing the ban in 2017, Chairman of the Board and TO Sammy Wilson stated:

> Some people, in tourism and government, for example, might have been saying we need to keep it open but it's not their law that lies in this land. It is an extremely important place, not a playground or theme park like Disneyland. We want you to come, hear us and learn. We've been thinking about this for a very long time
>
> [(cited in Aikman, 2017)]

On 26 October 2019, the Traditional Owners and other Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal people gathered for ceremony and celebrations at the base of Uluru. In a stark example of 'last chance tourism', an extra 10,000 visitors a month were recorded in the six months before the ban's implementation (Brown, 2019) on October 25, 2019. On its last day, hundreds of climbers queued amid high tensions, high winds, and scrambles to be the 'last person off Uluru'. Aboriginal public intellectual Celeste Liddle described it:

> This is purely about the climbers "conqueror complex", their disrespect for Traditional Owners and their land. Most of these people have probably never bothered setting foot in the Northern Territory before now. To prove their "point", they're driving

> thousands of kilometers only to turn around and drive back without ever learning a thing about the land they've just desecrated… At the end of the day, perhaps all this last minute coloniser scrambling to the summit is for the best. After the ban begins, the likelihood of any of these people returning to Uluru is most certainly nil
>
> [(Liddle, 2019)]

Now that the climb has closed, we must wait to see what now occurs. Park visitor data has been hard to source as only six months after the closure, the COVID-19 pandemic crisis saw tourism collapse around Australia.

In the face of post-COVID challenges there are calls to re-open the climb to kickstart tourism – calls that have been rejected by TO Sammy Wilson: "No. Enough is enough. The word is no. We don't want to open a can of worms or put more logs on the fire" (Haskin, 2020). Will tourists abandon Uluru, or will they engage with 'new' experiences? Will they ignore laws and still climb? There are also socio-political views that still see climbing Uluru as a 'public right' and a "natural wonder that belongs to all of us" (Right to climb, n.d.).

Perhaps if previous tour guides and marketing had privileged the Anangu perspective of Uluru and emphasised other non-climbing aspects of the experience, more people would not have climbed (James, 2007). This is also evidenced by the fact that more and more tourists in Australia and around the world are seeking opportunities to experience Indigenous culture (Department of Foreign Affairs and State (DFAT), 2019).

Indeed COVID-19 has impacted the strategic directions of Tourism Australia, who in the context of COVID-19 and severe restrictions to overseas travel – as well as the impact of international visitors to Australia are now promoting localised tourism, and Aboriginal tourism: "Today's conscious traveller is increasingly looking for a real connection to the land and sea, and a new way of experiencing it – exactly the kind of life-changing and immersive experience that Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander tourism can provide"(Philippa Harrison quoted by Travel Weekly, 2020).

The Uluru site then, provides ample opportunity for tourists to engage with the Anangu in a range of educational eco-cultural activities including nature walks, painting workshops, bush yarns and bush food experiences (Whitford & Becken, 2017). Rather than taking a monological colonial perspective of conquest, the closure could provide opportunities for tourists to have an intimate encounter with Country that extends beyond just the visual gaze from the top of 'the Rock' that could work to unsettle the power of coloniality through transformative encounters that centre Anangu ontologies. The closure of the climb gives the Anangu more agency in representing their place and their living culture and represents possibilities for doing tourism otherwise, offering tourists experiences that go beyond nature/culture/human/ spirit binaries. An embodied experience with Uluru, mediated from the pluriversal, multilogical Anangu perspective gives agency to the non-human and spirit. As Bawaka Country et al. (2016, p. 462) point out, possibilities exist within Aboriginal led tourism for transformative tourism in "more-than-human, ongoing and incomplete" ways. Tourists have an opportunity to experience and learn in ways that are "co-constituted with Country and that Country is co-constituted with tourists" (Bawaka Country et al., 2016, p. 450). However, transformation in this context is not fixed or complete, rather transformation is 'unknowable' folding "into the open-ended construction of reality" (Bawaka Country et al., 2016, p. 462). Taking a pluriversal and multilogical perspective to decolonising tourism practice and the academy, means taking seriously the *processes* that lead to transformations, while acknowledging there are no universal fixed outcomes.

Dismantling Eurocentric logics in relation to map-making is one tool that can be used to unsettle colonial ways of relating to landscapes. Work on 'un-mapping' presents some exciting possibilities for reconfiguring the coloniality of tourism spaces. Goffe and Grullón (n.d.) for example have worked pedagogically with students towards 'un-mapping' the coloniality of global geography through mapping with the body, creating 'counter-maps' through memory and music. In doing so they engage a multisensorial approach to new forms of mapping the Caribbean, taking into account global diasporic communities and histories of slavery. In line with unmapping, work by McGinnis, Harvey, and Young (2020) working together with the Waigman Aboriginal community demonstrates how digital mapping and knowledge sharing can be used by Indigenous communities to share cultural knowledge in tourism. They reveal how combining traditional and modern means of sharing knowledge through digital tourism products "can empower local Indigenous communities involved in tourism and educate locals and tourists to conserve such knowledges for the long term" McGinnis et al., 2020, p. 96). Detours are another example of unmapping and subverting the coloniality of the tourism gaze. Aikau & Gonzalez disrupt the tourism fantasy of Hawai'i as tropical paradise playground, and describe how detours can direct the gaze towards a multilayered engagement with the culture, history and effects of colonisation on the islands (Aikau & Gonzalez, 2019).

While the closure of the climb remains a contested issue at the heart of the tension inherent in Australia's settler colonial national identity, possibilities for 'un-mapping' this tourism landscape that engage tourists with Indigenous ontologies and more-than-human encounters could also work to promote transformative possibilities for doing tourism otherwise to coloniality, promoting ways for 'unlearning' coloniality in relation to mapping and site-seeing.

Conclusion: beyond coloniality and doing tourism otherwise

The mapmaking that accompanied settler colonialism in Australia is a monocultural, monological approach that allowed little space for the histories, cultures and practices of the original inhabitants. The case study presented here highlights the settler-colonial agenda that has long underpinned tourism development, and the 'coloniality of power' that denigrate and ignore Indigenous peoples, cultures and histories.

Being an ally to the decolonising imperative is to *consciously* choose to commit to unlearning our own worldviews that have been shaped by privilege and academic theory that has prioritised western forms of knowing, embedded within coloniality.

Political praxis needs to be co-created between non-western and Indigenous knowledges to "becoming otherwise in theory and practice to the dominant logics, and relationalities of patriarchal capitalist-coloniality" (Motta & Bermudez, 2019, p. 9).

While recent focus on truth-telling has brought national awareness to the sophistication of Aboriginal culture and land management (Gammage, 2011; Pascoe, 2014), the deception of terra nullius and the subsequent taking of the land from Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples still casts a shadow on the identity of the Australia nation, and relationships between Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal Australians. In the tourism context, this contributes to a societal disconnection between 'place' as containing continual Indigenous presence, and 'place' as a destination product. This creates the (im)possibilities of doing tourism otherwise at Uluru (and perhaps at all sites of Indigenous and non-western significance); the possibilities of engaging with Anangu for alternative experiences that connect with the culture and spirit beyond the physical landscapes vis a vis the impossibilities of an entrenched colonial mindset mapped onto (and into) physical landscapes.

In order to 'do otherwise', tourism should not limit goals to (neo)colonial profit accumulation. By continuing a development model that privileges supply-side, tourism perpetuates a reality that conceals exclusions (such as Indigenous ontologies and epistemologies) while simultaneously denying (or ignoring) the existence of coloniality that underpins modernity (Vázquez, 2011).

With the closure of the climb in 2019, a moment has arrived for a critical multi-vocality and multi-logicality approach to doing tourism at Uluru. This case study resonates with other tourism sites in settler colonial societies (see Lemelin et al., 2013; Mason, 2014) where, despite seemingly dominant 'grand colonial narratives', spaces can be diversified and opened up to show and examine "the different social realities experienced by Indigenous communities" (Lemelin et al., 2013, p. 267). In her work on the importance of Mâori perspectives in national park tourism in New Zealand, Carr (2004) found that re-inscribing Indigenous place names emphasised spiritual connection to the land and tribal identity, transforming the ways that tourists experience the landscape. The decolonial shift as 'option' foregrounds Indigenous agency, and in the case of tourism, possibilities for transformative encounters for tourists with Country, thus shifting the focus from the hedonistic, capitalist consumption of Uluru to a deeper engagement with a meaningful 'place' (Tebrakunna Country and Lee, 2017) that can better align the priorities of all stakeholders.

However changing focus and behaviour is threatening to many, particularly those who have benefited from the legacies of settler colonialism and the individualistic, accumulative forces of capitalism that have followed and that drive contemporary tourism (Higgins-Desbiolles, 2008). The role of marketing however, (eg. social marketing and demarketing) could go some way towards changing tourist consumption practices, promoting behavioural change towards sustainable tourism development, redirecting tourist information (Medway, Warnaby, & Dharni, 2010; Truong & Hall, 2013). We suggest this could also be applied to educating tourists about coloniality and tourism and how to behave appropriately at Indigenous sites.

Un-mapping is also a tool that can help facilitate the critical multilogicality and processes of 'un-learning', to denaturalise the coloniality of tourism spaces. As Razack explains "[t]o unmap one must historicize, a process that begins by asking about the relationship between identity and space. What is being imagined or projected onto specific places" (and bodies) (Razack, 2000, pp. 95–96). Unmapping could assist in helping an unlearning of coloniality, the privileges given to the identity of whiteness and how these notions of 'reality' are mapped onto the Eurocentric consciousness – and consequently into and onto tourism spaces and places. In the case of Uluru unlearning requires us to unpack settler colonial power in Australia and the legacies of map-making. For the tourism academy unlearning involves disrupting the linear-thinking assumptions in critical theory, the privileging of western forms of governance and ideologies, anthropocentric models that separate humans from nature and a negation of the sacred as reality (Grande, 2004).

The issues involved in the case of Uluru cannot be fully understood in a settler colonial context using the lens of academic theory that negates Aboriginal world views and ways of being. For the Anangu people Uluru is not just a 'rock'. Uluru has agency as a spiritual being; a non-dualistic concept that emerges from the deeply meaningful beliefs of their Tjukurpa. As Kwaymullina (2005, p. 12) states, "it is only when this Indigenous way of knowing is accepted as being valid, and as real as the 'ways of the west' that the identity and nature of this continent, and the place of Aboriginal law in sustaining it, can begin to be understood". These diverging worldviews lie at the heart of the conflict concerning Uluru.

We acknowledge the limitations of this conceptual paper in relation to the abstracted approach to the case study of the closure of the Uluru climb. However, we see the closure of the climb as timely for recognising and connecting the coloniality of power to the legacies of mapmaking, which underpin the tensions that continue to occur in the Australian national conversation over the closure of the climb. We wish to foreground tourism that can provide transformative and subversive ways of engaging with people and places.

Moving away from universal understandings of reality, future research on decolonising tourism spaces should consider pluriversal approaches that can assist in unlearning the colonial mindset of 'whiteness' in tourism and the academy: "It is only from an awareness of our positioned realities that we can enter in relation with each-other, that we can listen to each-other and learn each-other" (Vázquez, 2020, xix).

CRediT authorship contribution statement

Use this form to specify the contribution of each author of your manuscript. A distinction is made between five types of contributions: Conceived and designed the analysis; Collected the data; Contributed data or analysis tools; Performed the analysis; Wrote the paper.

For each author of your manuscript, please indicate the types of contributions the author has made. An author may have made more than one type of contribution. Optionally, for each contribution type, you may specify the contribution of an author in more detail by providing a one-sentence statement in which the contribution is summarized. In the case of an author who contributed to performing the analysis, the author's contribution for instance could be specified in more detail as 'Performed the computer simulations', 'Performed the statistical analysis', or 'Performed the text mining analysis'.

If an author has made a contribution that is not covered by the five pre-defined contribution types, then please choose 'Other contribution' and provide a one-sentence statement summarizing the author's contribution.

References

Ahmed, S. (2007). A phenomenology of whiteness. Feminist Theory. 8(2): 149–168. 1464–7001 DOI: https://doi.org/10.1177/1464700107078139.

Aikau, H. K., & Gonzalez, V. (Eds.). (2019). *Detours: A decolonial guide to Hawai'i.* Durham: Duke University Press.

Aikman, A. (2017). *1 November. The Australian*, Online: Climbing Uluru banned Retrieved 3 September 2019, from https://www.theaustralian.com.au/national-affairs/indigenous/climbing-uluru-banned/news-story/53511b7f2e58f7ed03d5b0c3f66e2792.

Amoamo, M., & Thompson, A. (2010). (Re)imaging Māori tourism: Representation and cultural hybridity in postcolonial New Zealand. *Tourist Studies*, *10*(1), 35–55.

Appleton, N.S. (2019). Do not "decolonize"… if you are not decolonizing: Progressive language and planning beyond a hollow academic rebranding. Critical ethnic studies, University of Minnesota. Retrieved 20 August 2019, from, http://www.criticalethnicstudiesjournal.org/blog/2019/1/21/do-not-decolonize-if-you-are-not-decolonizing-alternate-language-to-navigate-desires-for-progressive-academia-6y5sg

Attwood, B. (1992). Power, knowledge and aborigines: Introduction. *Journal of Australian Studies*, (35), i-xvi.

Avoy, L., McDonald, D., & Carlson, M. (2003). American Indian/first nation place attachment to park lands: The case of the Nuu-chah-nulth of British Columbia. *Journal of Park and Recreation Administration*, *21*(2), 84–104.

Battiste, M. (2009). Maintaining aboriginal identity: Language and culture in modern society. In M. Battiste (Ed.), *Reclaiming indigenous voice and vision* (pp. 192–208). UBC Press: Vancouver.

Bawaka Country, Wright, S., Lloyd, K., Suchet-Pearson, S., Burarrwanga, L., Ganambarr, R., & Ganambarr (2016). Meaningful tourist transformations with Country at Bawaka, north East Arnhem Land, northern Australia. *Tourist Studies*, *17*(4), 62–88.

Belle, L. V & Ehlers, J (2020). 'La tour: The modern gaze. The elevator and the view from above' in Vázquez, R. (2020). Vistas of modernity: Decolonial aesthesis and the end of the contemporary. Mondriaan Fund. Essay 014.

Bolt, A. (2018). Why ban what these Aborigines once did? *Daily Telegraph (Online)*. Retrieved 21 April 2020, from https://www.dailytelegraph.com.au/blogs/andrew-bolt/why-ban-what-these-aborigines-once-did/news-story/5e9b2135172f357ec8aa441636277b88

Brown, V. (2019). 25 October. *Authorities warn of the hefty fine imposed on people who try to climb Uluru after the ban* Retrieved 13 June 2020, from https://www.news.com.au/travel/australian-holidays/northern-territory/video-shows-hundreds-of-tourists-line-up-before-the-climb-ban-at-uluru-is-introduced/news-story/a6a9e56223228886ddfc1332a6c7ac2f.

Carr, A. (2004). Mountain places, cultural spaces: The interpretation of culturally significant landscapes. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, *12*(5), 432–459.

Chambers, D., & Buzinde, C. (2015). Tourism and decolonisation: Locating research and self. *Annals of Tourism Research*, *5*(1), 1–16.

Connor, M. (2005). Terra Nullius? *Radio national* Retrieved 20 October 2019, from http://www.abc.net.au/radionational/programs/counterpoint/terra-nullius/3313974#transcript.

Davidson, H. (2016). *20 April.* Uluru: Northern territory chief minister opposes climbing ban. The Guardian online Retrieved 30 December 2018, from http://www.theguardian.com/australia-news/2016/apr/20/dont-stop-tourists-climbing-uluru-says-northern-territory-chief-minister.

Department of Foreign Affairs & State (DFAT) (2019). Indigenous tourism surge. Retrieved 20 October from, https://www.dfat.gov.au/about-us/publications/trade-investment/business-envoy/Pages/january-2019/indigenous-tourism-surge

Dunlevie, J., & Ellen, R. (2015). 26 October. *Opponent of Uluru handback Ian Tuxworth changes tune 30 years on*. ABC New: Online Retrieved 26 October 2019, from https://www.abc.net.au/news/2015-10-26/opponent-of-uluru-hand-back-changes-tune-30-years-on/6886090.

Eckstrand, N. (2017). The activeness and adaptability of whiteness: Expanding phenomenology's account of racial identity. *Journal of Social Philosophy*, *48*(1), 20–37. https://doi.org/10.1111/josp.12179.

Enloe, C. (1989). *Bananas, beaches and bases: Making feminist sense of international politics.* Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Everingham, P. (2018). Speaking Spanglish: Embodying linguistic (b)orderlands in volunteer tourism. *Emotion space and Society*, 27, 68–75. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.emospa.2018.04.001

Figueroa, R. & Waitt, G. (2011). The moral terrains of ecotourism and the ethics of consumption. In T. Lewis & E, Potter (eds.) *Ethical consumption* (pp. 260-274). New York: Routledge.

Gammage, B. (2011). *The biggest estate on earth: How aborigines made Australia.* Crows Nest: Allen and Unwin.

Goffe, T.L. & Grullón, A. (n.d.). Mapping the Caribbean. Retrieved 13 January 2021, from https://mina-loy.com/endehorsgarde/unmapping-the-caribbean/

Grande, S. (2004). Red pedagogy: The un-methodology. In. N.K Denzin, Y.S Lincoln & L.T Smith (eds), *Handbook of critical and indigenous pedagogies* (233-254). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc.

Grimwood, B. S. R., Muldoon, M. L., & Stevens, Z. M. (2019). Settler colonialism, indigenous cultures, and the promotional landscape of tourism in Ontario, Canada's "near north". *Journal of Heritage Tourism*, *14*(3), 233–248. https://doi.org/10.1080/1743873X.2018.1527845.

Grosfoguel, R. (2007). The epistemic decolonial turn. *Cultural Studies*, *21*(2–3), 211–223.

Hall, C. M. (2008). *Tourism planning: Policies, processes and relationships* (2nd ed.). London: Prentice-Hall.

Hall, C. M., & Tucker, H. (2004). *Tourism and postcolonialism: Contested discourses, identities and representations.* London: Routledge.

Haraway, D. (1998). Situated knowledges: The science question in feminism and the privilege of partial perspective. *Feminist Studies*, *14*(3), 575–599.

Haskin, E. (2020). Calls to reopen Uluru climb to kickstart northern territory tourism hit by Corona virus. ABS news. Retrieved from https://www.abc.net.au/news/2020-05-12/business-lobby-group-calls-for-uluru-climb-to-reopen/12234066 10.6.2010.

Hendrickx, M. (2018). The immoral ayers rock climbing ban. *Quadrant Online* Retrieved 8 March 2020, from https://quadrant.org.au/magazine/2018/04/banon-climbing-ayers-rock-immoral-illegal/.

Henrikson, A. K. (1999). The power and politics of maps. In G. J. Demko &W. B. Wood (eds.) Reordering the world: Geopolitical perspectives on the twenty-first century (pp. 94–116). Boulder, Westview Press.

Higgins-Desbiolles, F. (2003). Reconciliation tourism: Tourism healing divided societies? *Tourism Recreation Research*, *28*(3), 35–44.

Higgins-Desbiolles, F. (2008). *Capitalist globalisation, corporatized tourism and their alternatives.* New York: Nova Publishers.

Higgins-Desbiolles, F., Carnicelli, S., Krolikowski, C., Wijesinghe, G., & Boluk, K. (2019). Degrowing tourism: Rethinking tourism. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, *27*(12), 1926–1944. https://doi.org/10.1080/09669582.2019.1601732.

Honman, C. S. (1939). Mapping in Australia. *Australian Surveyor*, *7*, 269–271.

Howitt, R. (2012). Sustainable indigenous futures in remote indigenous areas: Relationships, processes and failed state approaches. *GeoJournal*, *77*, 817–828.

Icaza Garza, R.A. (2017). Decolonial feminism and global politics: Border thinking and vulnerability as a knowing otherwise. In *Critical Epistemology of Global Politics* (pp. 26–45). Retrieved from http://hdl.handle.net/1765/103270

James, S. (2007). Constructing the climb: Visitor decision-making at Uluru. *Geographical Research*, *45*(4), 398–407.

Judd, B., Kearney, A., Hallinan, C., Schlesinger, C., Cheer, J.M., Reeves, K.J (2019, 31 October). After the climb: How new tourism opportunities can empower the traditional owners of Uluru. Retrieved 2 May, from https://theconversation.com/after-the-climb-how-new-tourism-opportunities-can-empower-the-traditional-owners-of-uluru-125929.

Kovach, M. (2015). Emerging from the margins: Indigenous methodologies. In S. Strega, & L. Brown (Eds.), *Research as resistance: Revisiting critical, indigenous, and anti-oppressive approaches* (pp. 43–64). Toronto: Canadian Scholars' Press.

Kwaymullina, A. (2005). Seeing the Light: Aboriginal law, learning and sustainable living in country. *Indigenous Law Bulletin*, *6*(11), 12–15.

Kwaymullina, A. (2016). Research ethics and indigenous peoples: An Australian indigenous perspective on three threshold considerations for respectful engagement. *Alternative*, *12*(4), 437–449.

Lemelin, R. H., Whyte, K. P., Johansen, K., Higgins Desbiolles, F., Wilson, C., & Hemming, S. (2013). Conflicts, battlefields, indigenous peoples and tourism: Addressing dissonant heritage in warfare tourism in Australia and North America in the 21st century. *International Journal of Culture, Tourism and Hospitality Research*, *7*(3), 257–271.
Liddle, C. (2019, 7 October). The rush to climb Uluru reeks of white Australian entitlement. 10 daily online. Retrieved 9 October 2019, from https://10daily.com.au/views/a191006pwevq/the-rush-to-climb-uluru-reeks-of-white-australian-entitlement-20191007.
Lutton, J.C. & Williams, G. (2016). Interrogating the 'universal' in St. Lucia's pitons management area. In L. Bourdeau, M. Gravari-Barbas & M. Robinson (eds), *World heritage sites and tourism: Global and local relations* (ch.5). New York; Routledge.
Mason, C. W. (2014). *Spirits of the Rockies: Reasserting an indigenous presence in Banff National Park*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
McGinnis, G., Harvey, M., & Young, T. (2020). Indigenous knowledge sharing in northern Australia: Engaging digital technology for cultural interpretation. *Tourism Planning & Development*, *17*(1), 96–125.
McKercher, B., Weber, K., & du Cros, H. (2008). Rationalising inappropriate behaviour at contested sites. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, *16*(4), 369–385.
McLaren, D. (2003). *Rethinking tourism and ecotravel* (2nd ed.). West Hartford, CT: Kumarian Press.
Medway, D., Warnaby, G., & Dharni, S. (2010). Demarketing places: Rationales and strategies. *Journal of Marketing Management*, *27*(1–2), 124–142.
Mies, M. (1993). White man's dilemma: His search for what he has destroyed. In M. Mies, & V. Shiva (Eds.), *Ecofeminism* (pp. 132–164). London: Zed Books.
Mignolo, W. (2013). On pluriversality. [ONLINE]. Retrieved 5 April 2018 from http://waltermignolo.com/on-pluriversality/.
Moreton-Robinson, A. (2004). Whitening Race: Essays in Social and Cultural Criticism. Canberra: Aboriginal Studies Press.
Motta, S. C., & Bermudez, N. L. (2019). Enfleshing temporal insurgencies and decolonial times. *Globalizations.*, *16*(4), 424–440. https://doi.org/10.1080/14747731.2018.1558822.
Mowforth, M., & Munt, I. (2016). *Tourism and sustainability* (4th ed.). London: Routledge.
National Parks (2010). Management plan 2010–2020 Uluru- Kata Tjuta National Park. Retrieved 3 August 2019, from http://www.environment.gov.au/resource/management-plan-2010-2020-uluru-kata-tjuta-national-park
National Parks (n.d.-a). Culture and history, Uluru-Kata Tjuta National Park. Retrieved 3 August 2019, from http://www.environment.gov.au/topics/national-parks/uluru-kata-tjuta-national-park/culture-and-history.
National Parks (n.d.-b). History of the park, Uluru-Kata Tjuta National Park. Retrieved 3 August 2019, from http://www.environment.gov.au/topics/national-parks/uluru-kata-tjuta-national-park/culture-and-history/history-park.
National Parks (n.d.-c). Park management, Uluru-Kata Tjuta National Park. Retrieved 3 August 2019, from http://www.environment.gov.au/topics/national-parks/uluru-kata-tjuta-national-park/management-and-conservation/park-management.
Parks Australia (n.d.-a). Amazing facts, Retrieved 10 March 2020 https://parksaustralia.gov.au/uluru/discover/highlights/amazing-facts/
Parks Australia (n.d.-b). World heritage. Retrieved 3 August 2019, from https://parksaustralia.gov.au/uluru/people-place/heritage.html.
Parks Australia (n.d.-c) Please don't climb Uluru. Retrieved 13 July 2019, from http://www.parksaustralia.gov.au/uluru/do/we-dont-climb.html.
Parks Australia (n.d.-d). Stories. Retrieved 2 September 2019, from https://parksaustralia.gov.au/uluru/discover/culture/stories/
Paschen, J. A. (2010). Decolonizing the gaze at Uluru (Ayers Rock). *Tourism and Visual Culture*, *1*, 64–75.
Pascoe, B. (2014). *Dark emu black seeds: Agriculture or accident?* Broome, WA: Magabala Books.
Peters, A. (2017). Moondani Yulenj: An examination of aboriginal culture, identity and education. PhD thesis, Swinburne University of Technology, Melbourne.
Peters, A., & Higgins-Desbiolles, F. (2012). De-marginalising tourism research: Indigenous Australians as tourists. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Management*, *19*, 1–9. https://doi.org/10.1017/jht.2012.7.
Razack, S. (2000). Gendered racial violence and spatialized justice: The murder of Pamela George. *Canadian Journal of Law and Society*, *15*(2), 91–130.
Right to climb (n.d.). Right to climb ayers rock. Retrieved 6 November 2019, from http://righttoclimb.blogspot.com.
Rigney, L. -I. (2006). Indigenist research and aboriginal Australia. In J. E. Kunnie, & N. I. Goduka (Eds.), *Indigenous peoples' wisdom and power: Affirming our knowledge through narratives* (pp. 32–48). Hampshire: Ashgate.
Roberts, L. (2010). Dis/embedded geographies of film: Virtual panoramas and the touristic consumption of liverpool waterfront. *Space and Culture*, *13*(1), 54–74.
Rosetto, T. (2012). Embodying the map: Tourism practices in Berlin. *Tourist Studies*, *12*(1), 28–51.
Ross, H., Grant, C., Robinson, C. J., Izurieta, A., Smyth, D., & Rist, P. (2009). Co-management and indigenous protected areas in Australia: Achievements and ways forward. *Australasian Journal of Environmental Management*, *16*, 242–252.
Schivelbusch, W. (1986). *The railway journey: Trains and travel in the nineteenth century*. Oxford: Blackwell.
Stevenson, A. (2001, 19 May). *Tourism chiefs defend ban on climbing rock*. Online: Sydney Morning Herald.
Tebrakunna Country & Lee, E. (2017). Performing colonisation: The manufacture of Black female bodies in tourism research. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 66, pp. 95–104.
Tlostanova, M. (2010). *Gender epistemologies and Euroasian borderlands*. USA: Palgrave Macmillan.
Tlostanova, M. (2019). The postcolonial condition, the decolonial option and the postsocialist intervention. In M. Albrecht (Ed.), *Postcolonialism cross-examined: Multidirectional perspectives on Imperial and colonial pasts and the Newcolonial present* (pp. 165–178). London: Routledge.
Travel Weekly (2020). Destinations. Retrieved 13 January 2021, from https://www.travelweekly.com.au/article/the-two-types-of-experiences-tourism-australia-is-banking-on-to-drive-the-travel-rebound/
Truong, V. D., & Hall, C. M. (2013). Social marketing and tourism: What is the evidence? *Social Marketing Quarterly*, *19*(2), 110–135.
Vázquez, R. (2011). Translation as erasure: Thoughts on modernity's epistemic violence. *Journal of Historical Sociology*, *24*(1), 27–44.
Vázquez, R. (2020).'Preface' Vistas of modernity: Decolonial aesthesis and the end of the contemporary. Mondriaan Fund. Essay 014.
Waitt, G., Figueroa, R., & McGee, L. (2007). Fissures in the rock: Rethinking pride and shame in the moral terrains of Uluru. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers NS.*, *32*, 248–263.
Wall, G. (1997). Sustainable tourism unsustainable development. In J. J. Pigram, & S. Wahab (Eds.), *Tourism, development and growth* (pp. 33–49). London: Routledge.
Whitford, M. & Becken, S. (2017). Closing Uluru to climbers is better for tourism in the long run. The conversation. Retrieved 3 April, 2019, from https://theconversation.com/closing-uluru-to-climbers-is-better-for-tourism-in-the-long-run-86831 10.6.2010.
Whyte, K. (2010). An environmental justice framework for indigenous tourism. *Journal of Environmental Philosophy*, *7*(2), 75–92.
Wilson, E., & Hollinshead, K. (2015). Qualitative tourism research: Opportunities in the emergent soft sciences. *Annals of Tourism Research*, *54*, 30–47. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annals.2015.06.001.

Phoebe Everingham is an early career researcher and sessional academic at the University of Newcastle, Australia. She is an interdisciplinary researcher drawing on insights from Sociology, Anthropology and Human Geography. She is particularly interested in working with theories that centre the body, subjectivity and affect and looks to decolonial theorising to expand her understandings of power and agency in intercultural contexts.
Andrew Peters is an Indigenous academic from Victoria, who teaches in all areas of Indigenous Studies at Swinburne, and has conducted research in a range of areas including Indigenous tourism, community consultation, cultural identity, sport, disability, and homelessness. He is particularly interested in analysing and discussing the connections between Indigenous forms of knowledge and contemporary society.
Freya Higgins-Desbiolles is a non-Indigenous academic that has researched and taught on the subject of Indigenous engagement with tourism for nearly two decades. Her approach as a critical scholar is to seek the emancipatory capacities of collaborative research to co-create change for better futures.