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Setting the Scene

In 2008, we explored both implicit and explicit relationships between royalty and tourism in contemporary and historic UK and some international contexts. In doing so, we provided an original, direct and specific focus on the hitherto neglected subject of ‘Royal Tourism’ (Long and Palmer, 2008). A range of historical, sociological and popular cultural perspectives were included as a basis for examining the royal tourism phenomenon. There has to date, and surprisingly given the continuing relevance of the subject and enduring prominence of royalty, been no further academic studies of which we are aware that focus specifically on this royal tourism phenomenon. Nine years on, we revisit the peculiar attraction of royalty for tourism and specifically consider an enduring and persistent touristic focus on the monarchy, particularly in the UK.

This chapter re-investigates the concept of 'Royal Tourism' as a specific form of popular cultural tourism and considers how royal tourism may be employed not solely for economic gain and commercial exploitation (one of the most enduring and publically contested aspects of the relationships between tourism and monarchy) but also as a political and socio-cultural tool and context. We consider Royal Tourism as a socially constructed concept (Berger and Luckman, 1966), whereby the entering into and playing out of roles and reciprocal actions by members of society as tourists are institutionalized. Thus, responses to royalty, in a tourism context, are embedded in the institutional fabric of society and popular culture. To explore this, we draw on our 2008 book though this material is adapted and updated to focus on popular cultural dimensions of Royal Tourism.

The chapter considers, in turn: how there persists a focus on monarchy per se and in specific relation to royal events and tourism development and marketing activities; royal families and their prominent contribution to the reproduction of social mores and the establishment of tourist destinations through their patronage; the politics of Royal Tourism; and Royal Tourism’s meeting of psychological and physiological needs for the tourist. It then attempts to make sense of these features collectively to consider how understanding of this specific form of tourism can inform and assist deeper understanding of tourism within a wider popular cultural context.
Theoretical Underpinnings

Monarchies are intriguing and persistent, if seemingly anachronistic and aberrant political, social, ritual and familial institutions that continue to exist and exercise actual and symbolic power to greater or lesser degrees and forms in many countries worldwide. As institutions and as individuals, royalty attracts considerable public interest among the subjects of monarchies and the citizens of non-monarchical republics alike. Public and scholarly attention often is drawn to the extraordinary ritual, formal and ceremonial dimensions of royalty as played out in public life through the media, as well as to their more mundane quotidian activities. Particular royal households and individual monarchs and their roles in a nation's historical and contemporary socio-political and cultural life are also subject to much scholarly research, popular publications, television series and public interest that, for some enthusiasts, verges on the obsessive. Moreover, the life stories and daily activities of certain contemporary royal families and individuals, however seemingly mundane, attract huge media attention, with their routines, behaviours, relationships, finances and movements subject to detailed, even frenzied media scrutiny and, at times, controversy. Some individual members of royal households attain global mega-celebrity status and even mythical, iconic qualities. Royal personages generally and more or less conspicuously travel a lot and tours, whether as official, state occasions or at leisure also attract considerable attention both at home and abroad.

The idea of travelling royals as ambassadors and representatives of the nation (reinforcing and transmitting national social values) has been suggested through the work of historians such as Linda Colley (1984). Her analysis of loyalty, royalty and the British nation in the context of work on King George III not only highlights the reverential status of monarchy in certain societies at certain times but also illustrates the ability of monarchs to be socially positioned, in the case of George, as 'Father of his people' (Colley, 1984: 94). In contrast, more recent work by Burnstein (2015) questions the symbolic cultural functions of the British monarchy since King George, noting an arguable shift from 'symbol of a unified nation' to 'a kind of royal soap opera' (McKechnie, 2002 as cited in Burnstein, 2015: 162). This throws into question the extent to which royal families (at home or 'on tour') reinforce the institutional fabric of society in a modern context. It also demonstrates how, to hold relevance, royal families themselves have to be much more reflexive and adaptive to change in modern societies - at times, becoming followers rather than leaders of the institutional fabric of society and facing challenges to retain status as 'exemplary institutions' (Díaz, 1993).

Generally, if arguably in decline as political and constitutional institutions with extensive powers, monarchies continue to play important embodied and symbolic roles. However, while the travels of individual monarchs have been the subject of historical

---

1 There are three broad categories of monarchy: First, where the monarch is de facto and de jure head of state, for example in Morocco, Saudi Arabia and the Gulf States; second where the Crown is endowed with a quasi-religious, formal and highly ritualised status, for example in Japan, Thailand and Bhutan and third; where the monarchy is symbolic of the secular state with very little political influence and no religious significance, though performing a symbolic role expressing national unity, for example in Scandinavia, the Benelux states and Spain. The British monarchy combines features of each of these categories (Hames and Leonard, 1998. See also Spellman, 2001).

2 See, for example: Cannadine and Price, 1987; Edensor, 2002; Handelman, 1997; Hughes-Freeland, 1998; Palmer and Jankowiak, 1996

3 Bramley, 2002; Broad, 1952; Couldry, 1999; Prochaska, 2002; Rowbottom, 2002a

4 The late Diana, Princess of Wales and Queen Elizabeth the Queen Mother are obvious examples from the British monarchy.

5 Clarkson, 2006; Garrett, 1982; Maynard, 1984; Pigott, 2005; Price, 1980; Rowbottom, 2002.
research and popular publications, there has been little work that has explored the broad and specific relationships between royalty and tourism in contemporary contexts. A direct, specific focus on the subject of ‘Royal Tourism’ has thus been overlooked in the tourism literature (as well as in much other scholarly work on royalty).

It is possible to locate the concept of Royal Tourism within wider contemporary socio-political and popular cultural contexts. It highlights the multi-faceted relationships between monarchy and tourism and identifies Royal Tourism as a complex form of (both) special interest (and mass) popular cultural tourism, illustrating the ability of tourism to both reflect and perpetuate more fundamental social issues and class relationships. The links between royalty and tourism are played out or mediated both within public and private spheres. Contrasts between national, monarchy-endorsed events and celebrations (such as Royal weddings, ceremonies etc.) and private, family royal events (such as Royal holidays and social occasions etc.) must be noted. The former legitimises and formalises Royal Tourism and the latter, with respect to socially embedded roles, suggests uninvited, almost deviant or at least intrusive public (tourist) attention. In this context, we are minded of many ongoing debates that exist around royalty and 'public interest', particularly in the context of the UK royal family and its constitutional position. Thus, Royal Tourism itself becomes something positioned in terms of public interest (with official royal tourism recognised to be institutionalised, scripted, stage-managed and malleable performances) versus an unofficial, illegitimate and intrusive royal tourism where boundaries set by the royal family are crossed. The ultimate example of the latter was demonstrated through the arrest of an intruder to Buckingham Palace in 2014 who was 'expecting a private audience with the Queen' (Corcoran, 2014).

For defenders of monarchy, there is a need for royalty to be seen in order to justify its existence and appeal to public support and funding. As the constitutional historian Walter Bagehot put it more than 120 years ago in the context of Queen Victoria's prolonged absence from the public gaze following the death of Prince Albert, there is a need to resolve the paradox of letting 'daylight in on the magic' of royalty while at the same time attempting to retain its 'divine, sacredly ordained mystique' (quoted in Hobsbawn and Ranger, 1983). Blom’s (in Long and Palmer, 2008) distinction between 'visitors' and 'seekers' is useful here together with the proposition that royal tourists are seeking contrasts from everyday life in terms of exceptional or par excellence experiences. Butler’s (in Long and Palmer, 2008) ideas also gain relevance here in terms of the associated linguistic value of the prefix ‘Royal’, upper class acceptance and significance, linked to pre-eminence. If one of the key issues around heritage and cultural tourism is authenticity, then for royal tourism the issue of (accessible) extraordinary and memorable experiences in contrast to the everyday mundane routine for the public appears to be a key issue.

With respect to this, it is possible to recognise how, in the context of Royal Tourism, the linguistic value and connotative meaning of 'Royal' can drive visitor demand even where the royal family has had both direct or indirect association with locations, sites or scenes and this appears to hold true both in historical and contemporary contexts. For example, English Heritage has recently based a promotional campaign for the Isle of Wight, a favourite holiday destination of Britain's longest reigning monarch, Queen Victoria, around the Queen's favouring of the destination for her holidays. 'Holiday like Queen Victoria' not only focuses on the places patronaged by Queen Victoria but also the private beach, dubbed 'Queen Victoria's Beach' (English Heritage, 2015), a 300 metre stretch of sand and shingle with no discernible remarkable qualities aside from its royal associative value, (and hitherto, restricted access), has opened to the public for the first time. In 2014, it was reported that
Prince Andrew had given his seal of approval for a London pub, 'The Duke of York' to include his picture on its sign. The landlady of the pub was quoted as saying, '...It is something I think Londoners will love but will of course be a pull for tourists too' (Bothwell, 2014). Even an incidental 'brush with royalty' it seems can affect visitor demand for a site or destination. The naked antics of the UK royal Prince Harry in Las Vegas in 2012 (well-covered by international media) have, it is claimed, contributed to record-breaking annual visitor numbers for the resort in 2012 and have been dubbed the 'Prince Harry effect' (Saunders, 2013).

It must, however, be noted, in contrast, that a need to retain the mystique of royalty may perhaps explain the relative absence of images of contemporary royals in current induced tourism promotional literature. For example, both Yew Tree Farm in Borrowdale, UK and Klosters in Switzerland have regularly hosted visits from the current Prince of Wales but have refrained from claiming his royal patronage in their publicity materials. Is this restraint voluntary on their part or required by the Prince's household in the interest of retaining his divine, sacredly ordained mystique, as well as his personal security?

**Implications for Popular Cultural Tourism**

The roles that monarchies play in societies are largely embodied and symbolic, not least in connection with tourism in countries where royalty continues to exist (or existed in the past and is now treated as part of a heritage tourism product), and in places which may lay claim to past royal associations or are favoured with recent or regular royal visits. Haid (in Long and Palmer, 2008) and Corak and Ateljevic (in Long and Palmer, 2008) consider this with respect to the imperial tourism associated with the Austro-Hungarian monarchy and the Habsburg (also known as Hapsburg) family. The way in which Austrian tourism policy was observed to be shaped around imperialistic memory, creating challenges around a lack of contemporary cultural contexts. Haid (in Long and Palmer, 2008) raises questions for visitor interpretation and sense-making. Coupled with observations from Nicola Palmer (in Long and Palmer, 2008) around the (cognitive) accessibility of providing meaning and significance to deceased characters and past events it is possible to support the notion of tourism marketing managers as ‘cultural brokers’ of tourism (Adams, 1984). The recent discovery of the remains of English King Richard III in Leicester and that city's exploitation of his re-internment and opening of a visitor centre is an excellent example of this. The specific implications of such memorialisation in terms of shaping and manipulating the role and appeal of royal families for tourist consumption need to be considered.

As well as in the tourism packaging and consumption of royal ceremonials, there is a widespread selection and commodification of images, sites, memorabilia and the physical presence (whether historical, legendary, ghostly or contemporary) of royalty that is aimed at stimulating tourist interest. A material and corporeal as well as an imaginary and fantasised popular culture of royal tourism therefore exists. The nature of this culture has also been explored through the work of Nicola Palmer (in Long and Palmer, 2008). She reflects on fragmented national and regional identities in a (dis)United Kingdom, with arguably a privileging of England and London in royal associative place making. She thus considers the
appropriation of the British Royal Family and associated royal links in the tourism promotion of Britain by public sector tourism agencies. A key issue here is what this typically deferential emphasis on royal associations with particular places in the UK symbolises both from the viewpoints of international tourists and British subjects.

Royal families are literally extraordinary people and institutions. They are also a declining breed in that there are now relatively few monarchies remaining in the world with explicit constitutional powers, as republican, liberal democratic models of governance and government have become arguably normative. The possession of an enduring monarchy therefore sets those nations in possession of a royal household apart as being different, distinctive and exotic - a valuable attribute by itself in appealing to tourist interest in the novel, anachronistic and unique. As far as the United Kingdom is concerned, the abnormal and archaic nature of the place of the monarchy culturally and constitutionally is a marker of difference and a tourist attraction in its own right, although this 'glamour of backwardness' and cultivated anachronism is a source of shame for some (Nairn, 1990). Perhaps more positively, as Brunt (1999: 290) puts it, 'the Royal Family form, by virtue of reproducing themselves, the only enduring category of Britishness. If they no longer existed, what would still be great about Britain?' While our 2008 book included contributions on monarchy and national identity in historic Austro-Hungarian and Spanish contexts, there is a need for research which addresses this in the context of tourism from other monarchical national contexts, such as Thailand, Saudi Arabia and Japan for example.

Catherine Palmer’s (in Long and Palmer, 2008) consideration of the British royal household’s image and identification as a family and how this pertains to tourism suggests that the royal familial image, including its, at times, displays of dysfunctionality, may be seen as representing British national ‘character’ and institutions for people in the countries that they tour. A further analytical issue arising here is the extent to which royalty personifies an ‘ideal’ version of family life as a model for emulation by other family tourists in the destinations that they visit and in the activities that they may aspire to pursue. The idea of monarchy as a transmitter (and social regulator) of values and social codes and the royal family as societal role models helps us to understand the emphasis on and dissonance surrounding royal acts of ‘deviance’ (divorce, drunkenness, sex scandals etc). There is a need for deeper analysis around the need for role models at all to maintain ‘healthy societies’. Indeed, as Piper and Garratt (in Long and Palmer, 2008) argue, the discourses of tourism promotion and publicity that eulogise monarchy contribute significantly to underpinning a regressive state of affairs. Are claims for the ‘moral excellence’ of the royal family profoundly misplaced in that they leave the British as subjects of the Crown as opposed to citizens of the nation? Furthermore, is the early acculturation of children into the ritual and rites of royal events, performances and holidays a form of indoctrination into a highly inequitable status quo? (Catherine Palmer in Long and Palmer, 2008). Thus, Royal Tourism can be interpreted as a means of reproducing inequity and doing so in a way that promotes this as not only socially acceptable but where to desist or protest suggests deviance or ‘anarchy’.

There are recorded historical reports that support this (albeit with few signs of sustained dissent and popular support for republicanism in recent years), although the Spanish royal family has been under critical scrutiny since the onset of the economic crisis in that country. Dissenting, anti-monarchist voices were suppressed during Victoria’s Golden
Jubilee, with outspoken republicans imprisoned as a precaution to avoid oppositional performances at jubilee events (Taylor, 1999). More recently, the BBC’s banning of the Sex Pistols’ version of ‘God Save the Queen’ during the 1977 Silver Jubilee provides a more contemporary example of such suppression (Back, 2002). However, there was little such public dissent to detract from the celebrations of Queen Elizabeth’s Golden and Diamond Jubilees in 2002 and 2012. Indeed, taking a corporate heritage brand management perspective, Balmer (2011) argues that at the time of the royal wedding of Prince William in April 2011 and the celebration of Queen Elizabeth II’s Diamond Jubilee (1952–2012), there was evidence of bilateral trust between the Crown (British monarchy) and the British public. In terms of the reproduction of social mores this highlights the centrality of 'trust' to the management and maintenance of the monarchy (Balmer, 2011) and, also, it might be observed that relationship is fundamental to the underpinning of Royal Tourism, whereby endurance of royal events in particular requires public consent. This leads us to consider some of the political aspects of Royal Tourism.

The pomp, pageantry and ceremonial performances that are associated with royalty provide exceptional and unique as well as predictable and scheduled events for tourist attention. The media hype that anticipates, reports and comments on some of these occasions and the images of crowds attending royal events may themselves stimulate the involvement of people wishing to be part of seemingly historical moments. However, their symbolic socio-cultural and political significance extends far beyond their touristic and economic values.

James’ (in Long and Palmer, 2008) focus on discourses of nationality, loyalty and pageantry considers the Duke and Duchess of York’s 1897 royal tour of Shannon, Ireland as a staged piece of political theatre. In this context a royal visit to a region at that time ‘undiluted to foreign influences’ provoked contrasting responses amidst politically divided unionist and republican communities. The politics surrounding monarchy are explicitly considered by James and raise questions around the British royal family as sovereign celebrity endorsers of place, whether intended or otherwise. That this visit took place without major protests or disruptions again raises questions around the perceived status and interpretation of the royals as individuals and societal role models in particular times and places. It also raises some key questions around ‘the mobilisation of symbols of the Crown in tourist development schemes’. To what extent might such endorsements not only attract but repel or disenfranchise sections of a tourist population?

There is little research evidence on this beyond anecdotal reports and, indirectly, market research responses to the popularity of the monarchy reported via media polls. Where academic research has been undertaken it appears to imply that the British royal family at least has a positive effect on not only visitor numbers but can contribute additionally to tourism’s ability to assist indirectly some wider and dominantly conservative political causes. For example, Haven-Tang and Jones (in Long and Palmer, 2008), discuss the employment of royal heritage themes in the development of a distinctive sense of place in a cultural tourism strategy devised for Monmouthshire, Wales, and raise the question of royal associations attracting tourist interest in the preservation of minority languages and regional / national identities.
In her examination of the responses of international tourists to royal encounters with the British royal family, Nicola Palmer (in Long and Palmer, 2008) notes how, regardless of royalist or republican persuasion, the experiences appear to be highly memorable and readily articulated events. Far from being manipulated, the general public emerges as an active and willing audience, conscious of the inter-dependent roles being played out between monarch / royal family member and audience in 'the royal performance'.

For some habitual, loyal, dedicated and enthusiastic 'royal tourists' there may be a curious psychological need for royal narratives and for imagined participation in royal lives. This demonstrates the strange transnational obsession with and devotion to idealised, iconic celebrity individuals as evidenced by extensive mass media coverage of the 'royal soap opera' (at times played as tragedy, farce or fairy tale). As Hitchins (1990) puts it, there is something rather hysterical and strange in the adulation afforded to royalty in the UK. There is also an enduring nature to royal celebrity compared with other more ephemeral media personalities, as Blain and O'Donnell (2003: 163) observe, ‘...royal celebrities are of a different substance from most other celebrities. They endure’. Meeting members of the royal family or even just 'being in the presence' of royalty is described as a life affirming moment or transformational experience by some of those who have had such encounters and there is some evidence to suggest that dreaming about meeting royalty is commonplace (Masters, 1972).

The existence of ‘real royalists’ (Rowbottom, 2002a) throws up questions about a typology or continuum of royal tourism responses (ranging from fanatical through apathetic to antagonistic, though the latter seem likely to be a small minority in the UK at the time of writing). Issues of embodiment arise in relation to Blom’s (in Long and Palmer, 2008) consideration of the 1997 funeral of Diana, Princess of Wales. The ways in which symbols are used as mental labels for experiences and expectations in relation to the assessment of tourist attractions and events using a scale of values is considered. This supports the idea of royal tourism as a socially constructed concept. Blom’s work also raises deeper issues around self identity, being able to feel ‘nearness’ and participation in another’s misfortune. Similarly, Catherine Palmer’s (in Long and Palmer, 2008) consideration of family as ‘a state of mind’ in relation to the royal family and Schama’s (1986) domestication of monarchy raises issues around deeply embedded symbolic psychological and social meanings involved in the interpretation of royalty.

Royal performances and personalities as major media phenomena have been the subject of some theoretical discussion in relation to, for example; textual and visual representations of royalty past and present, the narratives of the monarchical 'soap-opera' and the development and portrayal of the celebrity / iconic characteristics of individual members of the royal family. While these ideas may be extended and applied to royal tourism-related media, very little such research seems to have taken place. The motivations of royal tourists and the character portrayal of royal ‘actors’ suggest some deeply rooted factors to be at play. With respect to the latter, the work of Maddens and Vanden Berghe (in Long and Palmer, 2008) is illuminating. They discuss the changing interpretation over time of important heritage tourist sites in Spain with royal associations through a close, historically informed

---

6 A local example of dedicated royal tourists was contained in reporting in the Sheffield Star newspaper following a visit by the Queen and Duke of Edinburgh in May 2003 to open the city's new Winter Gardens. Here it was reported that the crowd gathered to witness this event included people who had travelled the 200 miles from London solely for the purpose of being in the Queen’s presence, as well as a local man who calculated that he had travelled some 13,000 miles during a life time following royal tours.

reading of official guide books and observe that ‘the choice of the sites considered ‘royal’ and the way these are discursively constructed in the rhetoric of tourism depends, amongst other considerations, on the prevailing ideological climate and the public and elite attitudes towards royalty’ (Maddens and Vanden Berghe in Long and Palmer, 2008: 102-103). This is an important comment that may be considered in respect to the interpretation of sites with royal associations in other former (post-colonial) and current monarchical states and the ways in which these may reflect official and public discourses about past and present royal regimes.

Conclusions

The direct, explicit and the indirect, implicit relationships between royalty, popular culture and tourism (and not just in relation to British royal tourism) are multifarious and have been little researched. This seems to reflect an apparent indifference from tourism social science researchers on the subject of royalty that may be explicable by possible perceptions of the anachronistic, dated and irrelevant notion of monarchical institutions and systems in an era of globalisation and Neo-liberal democracy. Alternatively, the subject may simply have been overlooked as having little to offer in developing theoretical and applied understandings of contemporary tourism. However, we suggest that researchers on tourism (and on royalty) may usefully explore this field, with reference, for example to the work that has been produced by historians on royal biographies that include analysis of royal travels and tours as well as by commentators on royalty and social, political and constitutional matters, where their work may be related to issues of national identity and image as conveyed to tourists (Bogdanor, 1995; Broad, 1952; Coates, 2006; Pimlott, 1996; Prochaska, 2002; Thomas, 1989).

Re-examination of academic ideas around royal tourism identifies this specific form of tourism as a mechanism for reinforcing wider more deeply embedded social norms, values and hierarchical power structures. It can be recognised that royal tourism acts as a structural enabler for royal tourists to perform as actors/agents in the mobilisation and perpetuation of a status quo surrounding class structures, divine rule and power. Certainly in the context of the British royal family, some of the big issues around monarchy continue to be formed around republican versus unionist and even anarchistic beliefs and viewpoints. In this context, Royal Tourism as a form of popular cultural tourism needs to be recognised as a means of reinforcing rather than challenging dominant power structures. It places monarchy as a central attraction or nucleus whereby interpretations are framed by traditional, conservative social structures. Thus, it may be argued that this type of tourism serves as a tool for social continuity and the reinforcement, reproduction and maintenance of inequities, certainly in terms of power.

Deeply rooted notions of self- and social identity may also be recognised to be confronted in the performative aspects of being a royal tourist (or anti-royal tourist) whereby individuals do not simply appear to be consuming events or products. Rather, they are attempting to satisfy and confirm or disconfirm notions of self, linked to status and prestige. Tourism producers and marketers, through engagement with royal endorsement, are buying into an ‘ideal’ of superiority, aspirations and prestige grounded essentially through a class-based system (in a British context, at least). This suggests that far from merely being a niche form of tourism, Royal Tourism needs to be seen as a complex case – one that illustrates the ability of tourism to both reflect and perpetuate more fundamental social issues.
Our suggestions for directions for future research on Royal Tourism that we proposed in our 2008 book still stand. These include firstly, studying the roles performed by royal personages past and present in the conduct of their travels on official state tours and visits and as travellers at leisure, something that a number of royal individuals engage in to a large and more or less continuous and conspicuous extent (Reed, 2016). Popular, local histories of royal associations and their identifications with particular places may contribute to such research.

The powerful and controversial part that royalty plays in shaping historical and contemporary national, regional and local identities and the place of tourism promotional agencies in their use, interpretations and representations of royalty also warrants further study. In this context and conversely, what part may be played by apparently 'anti-royal' tourism that celebrates regicide and republicanism represented, for example in the English town of Huntingdon's 'Cromwell Trail'? How may royal jubilees and other major events be subject to 'alternative' readings and performances by tourists that deviate from 'official' versions of events? Royalty as tourism product and marketing opportunity may also be examined. What are the brand values of the House of Windsor and of individual royal family members, for example? Management and marketing perspectives may also be applied to royal tourism sites, locations, routes and events. What processes of consultation and negotiation take place between tourism interests and royal households in the designation, interpretation and sale of such ‘products’? (Balmer, 2011; Ornes and Maclaran 2016)

Media representations of royalty, in mass print, broadcast and on-line forms and in specialised, celebrity oriented media and the implications of these for potential tourist audiences may also be usefully examined in relation to the ways in which these may be scripted and ‘read’ by audiences and potential tourists. There is scope to explore further the extent to which a growth in celebrity culture threatens to overshadow a more traditional role of royal families as national figureheads and role models. Perhaps also, in the case of Britain, the celebration of individual royal family members is open to further examination, with for example no apparent wane in media and tourist interest and press reporting in the twenty years since the death of Princess Diana.

The motivations, behaviours and experiences of both casual and dedicated 'royal tourist' visitors to royal events and sites and in the presence of royalty would also bear analysis in seeking to understand how monarchy is consumed and interpreted by both domestic and international visitors. Consumption and the meanings of the material cultures and souvenir manifestations of royalty that are designed for tourists may also be explored in this context. What aesthetic considerations may be applied to these souvenir items and what meanings do they convey to the tourist?

A number of methodological considerations are also suggested. Accessing and analysing archival, documentary sources; ethnographic, observational studies, and surveys of tourist information staff and royal enthusiasts/tourists and other approaches, such as critical discourse analysis and various approaches to visual/media analysis may also contribute to further research in this area. The extent to which the future of Royal Tourism is intertwined with the future of monarchy is contentious. In Britain, at least, the relative popularity of Royal Family members has been laid open to question, though the institution as a whole appears to be under no serious threat. For example, an abdication of Queen Elizabeth II, if highly unlikely, would generate some very real issues for British society, and, in turn, some would argue, British tourism (both in terms of the supply of and demand for that tourism).
There is little research on the tourism connections with monarchies past and present in Asian, Middle Eastern and African settings (Spellman, 2001). The formal, ritual dimension of royalty in diverse social, cultural and political contexts offers a potentially rich seam for anthropologists of tourism, for example. It is hoped that other researchers will come forward to address the numerous gaps in the literature that are suggested above. Hopefully, research on ‘Royal Tourism’ is far from dead.
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