Conceptual Histories of "Tourism": A Transcultural Dialogue

Edited by

Noel B. Salazar
University of Leuven,
Nelson Graburn
University of California, Berkeley
Yujie Zhu
Australian National University

This is a collection of the papers original presented as the plenary session

PL I - Conceptual Histories of "Tourism": A Transcultural Dialogue

As published in the

Conference Proceedings 18Th IUAES World Congress / Anais 18º Congresso Mundial de Antropologia
18th IUAES World Congress:

Conceptual Histories of"Tourism": A Transcultural Dialogue

Noel B. Salazar
University of Leuven,
Nelson Graburn
University of California, Berkeley
Yujie Zhu
Australian National University

Abstract

Today's world, characterized by networked agencies, global flows, cultural hybridity, and movements of people within and across borders, contextualizes tourism in many ways. Paying close attention to the multiple translations and circulations of the concept of "tourism" across the globe, this symposium endeavors to elaborate both the spatial and temporal dimensions of the conceptual history of tourism. With this theme in mind, the symposium will deal with the following questions: How has the western concept of tourism (primarily Anglophone and French) traveled to non-Western contexts in Asia (including the Middle East), Africa, or South America, thereby imposing a discursive hegemony of a conceptual lexicon? Which native/local concepts of hospitality have been displaced by this conceptual globalization or have transformedit? Do newly emerging forms of tourism across the globe contribute to the

intellectual discussionof the "decline of the West" and the "provincialization of Europe," or they are just furtherexamples of westernization?

Keywords: Tourism; theory; concepts; world anthropologies

This collection of papers stems from the Plenary Session I at the 18th IUAES World Congress, in Florianópolis, Brazil. It took place on Monday, 16 July 2018, from 2 to 3.30 PM in the Auditório Garapuvu, UFSC Centro de Cultura e Eventos. The plenary was organized by IUAES-Tourism, namely by the Commission's Chair, Noel B. Salazar, and its Deputy-Chair, Yujie Zhu.

While IUAES was founded in Brussels, Belgium, in 1948, the Commission on the Anthropology of Tourism saw the light during the fourteenth IUAES Congress in Williamsburg, USA (1998). Dr. Valene Smith was the Commission's first Chair. Dr. Gregory Teal took over at the fifteenth IUAES Congress in Florence, Italy (2003). He is succeeded by Dr. Noel B. Salazar, who was elected as new Chair during the seventeenth IUAES Congress in Manchester (2013). The mailing list is currently administered by Vice-Chairs Dr. Yujie Zhu and Dr. Mari Korpela.

The main objective of the Commission is to promote the anthropology of tourism in the fields of research, teaching and public dissemination. The Commission facilitates the networking of people who share this interest across the globe. The Commission's mailing list is open to everyone with an interest in the anthropology of tourism. Membership of IUAES is not required, but strongly recommended.

Since the foundation of the Commission, the interest in the anthropology of tourism has skyrocketed. Evidence of this are the growing number of topically related networks, including the AAA Anthropology of Tourism Interest Group, the SfAA Tourism and Heritage Topical Interest Group, Tourism Research Information Network (TRINET)

and the Tourism-Contact-Culture Research Network. Sister organizations, such as the ISA Research Committee on International Tourism RC50, can count on the active membership of a good number of anthropologists. All these networks serve slightly different purposes and audiences.

The plenary follows earlier IUAES-Tourism initiatives to present and critically analyse the global diversity of scholarship related to the anthropology of tourism. Worth mentioning here is the panel 'Anthropologies of tourism: An epistemological reality or mere wishful thinking?', organized during the IUAES 2016 Inter-Congress in Dubrovnik, Croatia, which was consequently published: Salazar, N. B. (2017). Anthropologies of tourism: What's in a name? *American Anthropologist, 119*(4), 723-747.

The plenary in Florianópolis was meant to enhance the global anthropological dialogue on the conceptual histories of the term 'tourism'. Today's world, characterized by networked agencies, global flows, cultural hybridity, and movements of people within and across borders, contextualizes tourism in many ways. Paying close attention to the multiple translations and circulations of the concept of 'tourism' across the globe, the plenary endeavoured to elaborate both the spatial and temporal dimensions of the conceptual history of tourism. With this theme in mind, the plenary dealt with the following questions: How has the western concept of tourism (primarily Anglophone and French) traveled to non-Western contexts in Asia (including the Middle East), Africa, or South America, thereby imposing a discursive hegemony of a conceptual lexicon? Which native/local concepts of hospitality have been displaced by this conceptual globalization or have transformed it? Do newly emerging forms of tourism across the globe contribute to the intellectual discussion of the 'decline of the West' and the "provincialization of Europe," or they are just further examples of westernization?

Organizer: Yujie Zhu (Australian National University) - Australia
Chair: Noel B. Salazar (University of Leuven) - Belgium
Discussant: Nelson Graburn (University of California, Berkeley) - USA

Speakers: Margarita Barretto (Universidade Federal de Santa Catarina) – Brazil

Evi Eftychiou (University of Nicosia) - Cyprus

Lusha Sa (South-Central University for Nationalities) - China

Jonathan Skinner (University of Roehampton) - UK

The four speakers were asked by the chair of the session to respond to three key sets of questions within the broad topic outlined. Their answers (papers) are presented below in alphabetical order of their surnames, neither the order in which they spoke nor the order that their ideas were discussed by the discussant.

In the interest of speedy publication, all the papers were returned to their authors for slight revisions and the addition of relevant references. No attempt was made to rewrite them for literary style or effect. As an extra, Nelson Graburn was so kind as to provide us with a Portuguese translation of his comments (added here as an appendix).

Recommended literature

Salazar, Noel B. 2010 *Envisioning Eden: Mobilizing imaginaries in tourism and beyond*. Oxford: Berghahn.

2012 Tourism imaginaries: A conceptual approach. *Annals of Tourism Research* 39(2):863-882.

2013 Imagineering otherness: Anthropological legacies in contemporary tourism. *AnthropologicalQuarterly* 86(3):669-696.

2014 To be or not to be a tourist: The role of concept-metaphors in tourism studies. *Tourism Recreation Research* 39(2):259-265.

2017 Anthropologies of tourism: What's in a name? *American Anthropologist* 119(4):723-747.

2018 *Momentous mobilities: Anthropological musings on the meanings of travel*. Oxford: Berghahn.

Salazar, Noel B., and Nelson H. H. Graburn, eds.

2014 *Tourism imaginaries: Anthropological approaches*. Oxford: Berghahn.

Zhu, Yujie, Jin Lu and Nelson Graburn,

2017 "Domesticating Tourism Anthropology in China." *American Anthropologist* 119 (4): 730-35.

"The View from Brazil"

Margarita Barretto, Universidade Federal de Santa Catarina

1. **How has the (primarily Anglophone and French) concept of 'tourism' traveled within/to the context in which you live and/or work? Has it imposed a discursive hegemony of a conceptual lexicon? Have native/local concepts been transformed or displaced by this conceptual globalization?**

How has the (primarily Anglophone and French) concept of 'tourism' traveled within/to thecontext in which you live and/or work?

I have lived in three countries, Argentina, Brazil and Uruguay. About the context
I live in, as far as I am aware, lay people think tourism is business. They even use the
word tourism for both the contingent of tourists arriving to a destination and the social
phenomenon. Common people don´t know anything about the various types of tourism
or types of tourists. Those scholarly categories remain for the university. As for tour
operators, most of them don´t even know we categorize tourists and tourism. Now let us
focus in tourism at the university, that is the place where I work. In Brazil, most universities
have tourism programmes attached to management courses, so management issues are
most relevant. I Argentina they are mostly linked to geography programmes and tourism
environmental impacts are mainstream. In Uruguay there is only one tourism course

and it is attached to social sciences. So the concept ranges from business to environmental dangers to social benefits; I would say the core concept has not changed but at present there is no agreement about the benefits of tourism. Each day more researchers agree that tourism brings problems but since it brings money there is no choice but to let it be. Some nations have tried regulations and they have succeeded a little in environmental issues. About societies, thanks to anthropologists, many communities have been benefited through cultural tourism. They have helped indigenous communities as well the villages of the descendants of Black slaves, to earn some money but better than that, to be proud of themselves and their history.

Has it imposed a discursive hegemony of a conceptual lexicon?
For common citizens the word tourism means people travelling for leisure and fun. It is also associated often with noise, ridiculous clothing and lack of education. Nothing has changed since *The Golden Hordes* was written (Turner and Ash 1976). So people in many destinations may state they hate tourists but they need them (for the money). Even at tourism programmes a lack of agreement in the concept can be detected.

Have native/local concepts been transformed or displaced by this conceptual globalization?
I don´t think so. I think people repeat what media says and since mediatic discourse is that of tourism - people travelling and having fun, and that it is big business. Lay concepts have not changed. At the university, it depends on the paradigms the school follows and the dialog the tourism school has with management, geography or anthropology

2. Very briefly sketch the genealogy of the anthropology of tourism in your country/ region. Which themes are currently "hot" in the anthropology of tourism that you are familiar with? Are there any differences with the dominant (Anglo-Saxon) anthropology of tourism?
Very briefly sketch the genealogy of the anthropology of tourism in your country/region.
I´d rather speak about my three countries, Argentina, Brazil and Uruguay. At present

we can say no doubt Brazil has representative literature on anthropology of tourism.
Five years ago there were one hundred anthropologists and some sociologists directly
or indirectly making research on tourism. Brazil is by far the country where tourism has
been paid most attention. Argentinian universities carry out research on tourism mainly
in geography and economics. Uruguayan researchers in tourism come from anthropology

and also geography. In Brazil the first anthropologists to study tourism were Alvaro
Banducci J, Carlos Steil and Rodrigo Grunewald. Also Carlos Caruso, Audiles Saved and
several others, most followers of Graburn´s works. (See Appendix below a comprehensive
list published in a book organized by myself, Graburn and others). It is quite impossible
to be brief about this issue.

Which themes are currently "hot" in the anthropology of tourism that you are familiar with?
You mean in "my countries" or in the world? I think nowadays here social scientists
and anthropologists are interested in gender issues, food and its meanings, and of
course indigenous people's way of life and handicrafts. At this very meeting only two
of all former Brazilian tourism research anthropologists are present, Adiles Savoldi and
myself. There are many anthropologists here, so I´m afraid that little attention is being
paid to tourism issues by anthropologists as a whole. But as a researcher interested in
the issue I think that there are very important issues that have not been thoroughly
discussed. At the very beginning of XXI century a group of researchers including myself
began studying new paradigms in tourism research. Scientific literature from geography,
sociology and anthropology raises problems ranging from deforestation to the sale of
children for sex tourism. These are the so-called impacts of tourism, which are not exactly
impacts but consequences. At the other end of the spectrum, the scientific literature also
demonstrates the revitalization of material and immaterial cultural heritage thanks to
tourism, the revaluation of nature, the cleaning of polluted seas, the recovery of identity,
showing that tourism also has very positive consequences. And about tourists themselves,
we need to understand the social pressures of the society of origin on the individual
in order to understand their possible misconduct in leisure situations. There is a lot of

research to be done and a change of paradigms is mandatory. At the very beginning of the 21st century a group of anthropologists including myself started to apply concepts like cultural hybridization (or hybridity), reflexivity, cosmopolitism, and reasonable limits of change to analyze tourism related issues.

What to study?

In the area of tourist services, social sciences are fundamental to understand, along with social history, the marks left by slavery in some societies. Professions such as a waiter, cook, maid, cleaning lady, gardener, stewardess or driver, just to name a few in which tourism generates most of the jobs were, up to two hundred years ago, carried out either by slaves or by servants. How can we get quality service providers without working on these historical-cultural issues?

To understand certain reactions to employment opportunities for women and young people in traditional communities, it is important to understand family and gender relations. Tourism demands a lot of female labor, both in the area of manual labor, in the hotel industry, for example, and in the so-called "front line". Receptionists, telephone operators, sales clerks, are mostly female jobs. What happens when, in a traditional community with chauvinist values, tourism promotes the economic independence of wives and daughters? And if jobs for males are offered there is a predominance of demand for young people, because they are more apt to perform heavier jobs, and also because the visual and aesthetic dimension that in tourism has primacy. What happens in patriarchal communities when young people start earning more wages than their own parents? Although it is not common to witness acts of open xenophobia against tourists by service providers, it does exist and often comes in the form of neglect and unwilling service. How has the representation of this "other" in the imaginary of this service provider been constructed socially and historically?

In order to analyze what is desirable in terms of cultural change, it is necessary to understand the concept of citizenship. It must be made clear that, first of all, tourism is not the only factor of cultural change, much less in the current stage of globalization

provided by communication technologies. Secondly, it is necessary to check which values should be preserved for the well-being of human beings and which are to be discussed. Is it right to maintain a population without the contemporary comfort afforded by technology in order to perpetuate an "authentic rural or indigenous culture"? Is it ethically correct to maintain vexatious practices of the human condition to perpetuate an "authentic aboriginal culture"? To understand the resistance to tourism by some sectors of the population (including the academy) and to understand the hostility that is often observed against tourists in some destinations, we need to study the very society in which it operates. Tourists are often seen as futile people, who waste money in superfluous ways, who behave badly, who invade the daily lives of others.

I wonder the extent to which this image was created by films which feature romantic tours in a world of glamor and easy money? On the other hand, tourists who believe they have the right to invade, who believe that, since they are paying, they have all rights and no duties, should be studied in the light of the social history of tourism. The first tourists, between the sixteenth and eighteenth centuries, were noblemen who, in fact, enjoyed all the rights of their class and had few duties. And in those days, there were also conflicts between hosts and guests. The travel reports of the time account of duels in which many young people died.

Contemporary tourism, which began in about 1950, is practiced by a middle class with a lot of purchasing power who visit mainly poor or impoverished countries: the Caribbean, the West Indies, and Polynesia. Any kind of relationship, in these circumstances, is asymmetrical. Currently, the international tourist movement is carried out by 10% of the world's population, which continues to place tourists in a privileged position, despite the so called democratization of tourism since the beginning of the 19th century. Like any other product of the consumer society, tourism is sold to those who have money. Sold without any social consciousness regarding everything, travel, stay, people. To say that alternative forms of tourism (alternatives to mass tourism and the model of the resort) promote "exchange" is to assume that tourism happens between equals, something that, today, several anthropologists argue.

Dann (1992) demonstrates, with a study of more than five hundred cases in Barbados,

the different reactions of tourists when invited to visit the homes of local residents. Besides theaccurate research, the author's report provokes further reflections. He reports that touristsvisit the homes of the natives out of curiosity to see how they live, a reminder of Urbanowicz's(1989, 113) warning about the transformation of native populations into a cultural zoo.

The relationship continues to be asymmetrical despite the centuries that have passed.

At present there is a consensus among researchers and analysts of the phenomenon of

tourism in a broad sense, that the sustainability of this has to be achieved under various

aspects: economic sustainability, environmental sustainability (taking into account

culture and nature) and political sustainability. A fully preservationist enterprise as a

rule is economically unfeasible, but can be politically interesting. It may also not be if

the community is awaiting solutions for economic development. There should be an

assessment of the extent to which a business can be environmentally sustainable without

harm to the economy, and the appropriate policy strategy to benefit as many people as

possible. How to make this assessment without of social sciences?

Finally, in order to try to improve relations in tourism, it is necessary to take into

account the great paradox of the tourist-host relationship. Although there is not much

systematic research on the subject, the few existing ones show that, in fact, the inhabitants

of tourist places that benefit economically from the presence of tourists, are not exactly

interested in receiving tourists, but tourists' money. Tourists become a necessary evil. Evil

because their presence is annoying. Necessary because their money is needed. Tourists, in

turn, see in the local inhabitant only an instrument for their purposes. *The great paradox of*

Helping to understand the psycho-social processes triggered by tourism, *tourism is that this*

activity puts in contact people who do not see themselves as people, but as carriers

of a precise and determined function.

Theexpectations, desires, satisfactions and frustrations of both, host populations and tourists,the motivations to act in one way or another, the search undergoing beyond the simpletrip, the cultural dynamics in that tourism is embedded, the diversity of interests and

socialneeds that tourism ultimately affects, its dilemmas and paradoxes would be an enormouscontribution of the social sciences to the balanced planning of **responsible** (with consciousresponsibility) tourism (another concept I want to discuss instead of sustainable tourism).

Are there any differences with the dominant (Anglo-Saxon) anthropology of tourism?

I don´t think so.......People continue to follow Anglo-Saxon school in this matter.

3. ***Do newly emerging tourism practices across the globe contribute to the intellectual discussion of the "decline of the West" and the "provincialization of Europe," or they are just further examples of westernization? Which future role do you see for anthropology and anthropologists in relation to tourism?***

Do newly emerging tourism practices across the globe contribute to the intellectual discussion of the "decline of the West" and the "provincialization of Europe," or they are just further examples of westernization?

I am not sure about that. I should research before answering. But I strongly believe we should use the rhizome paradigm to try to understand the way tourism spreads in societies. Rhizome spreads in uncontrollable ways, with no structure; it has nodes and each one turns into a new plant. Michael Hall in New Zealand and myself in Brazil have proposed tourism to be "modelled" in that way instead of the dominant systems theory model often applied to tourism studies.

Which future role do you see for anthropology and anthropologists in relation to tourism?

I truly believe it is impossible to understand tourism as it is at present without anthropological knowledge. How do people relate with each other, how can we understand the relation tourist-local people, what happens when rich boys come in contact with poor boys the same age that are waiting their tables and what happens when local indigenous people are transformed in an anthropological zoos as Urbanowicz first detected in 1989 in a Pacific Rim island and other anthropologists continued to find ten years later among Norwegian fishermen? Those are only some of the questions we should address.

Tourism researchers (geographers, economists and anthropologists) in Argentina and Uruguay

There are no rigid disciplinary boundaries when it comes to tourism research, because –as we have already said previously (Barretto; Otamendi, 2010) tourism is a "total social phenomenon", in the sense attributed by Mauss (1968), as a phenomenon in which all the institutions are involved then the study requires the assistance of various disciplinary approaches. For Argentine we must mention researchers from human geography like Rodolfo Bertoncello, of the University of Buenos Aires and his advisees, Claudia Troncoso, or Analía Almirón who have made an invaluable contribution to the anthropological studies of tourism; also Emilce Cammerata (now retired) of the National University of Misiones. Other names are Patricia Ercolani, María del Carmen Vaquero and Adriana Otero from the Universidad del Comahue. I will mention bachelors in tourism that have also done a lot of research in anthropology for doctoral studies, especially in heritage issues. Just to mention some names, I should say the broad investigation that Beatriz Rivero (Universidad Nacional de Misiones) is carrying out with her team on the Jesuit missions is one of the most important tourism researches in the country. It is mandatory to mention Regina Schlüter with her tireless work in the quarterly Estudios y Perspectivas that will be thirty years soon. Other names are Hilda Puccio regarding regional development, María Daniela Rodríguez, who studies the relations between tourists and Mapuche (native people from southern Argentina) communities, as well as Marcelo Impemba. Another researcher worthy of mention is Maximiliano Korstanje. Some other names are Germán Pinque, Diego Kuper, Fabián Flores, Mora Castro, Julia Pieiro Carreras, Patricia Torres Fernández, Enriqueta Ciarlo Bonanno and Noemí Gutiérrez and Graciela Maragliano. We can say that 2008 assists the consolidation of the tourist field in anthropology in Argentina, with the work of Sofia Cecconi on Tango (now world heritage) as a cultural event framed in the policies of the city of Buenos Aires and that of Vivian Irene Arias with the first work of analysis of tourism in the provinces of northern Argentina. Lia Nakayama and Susana Marioni introduced in Argentina the studies on Amenity Migration building the bridge between migration studies and tourism On the other side of the river (Rio de la Plata), in the last decade of the century Gabriela

Campodónico and Rossana Campodónico both anthropologists, Monica Maronna historian, and Alvaro López Gallero geographer, made their contribution, directly or indirectly, to the anthropology of tourism, followed a short time later by the archaeologists Leonel Cabrera, Carmen Curbelo and the anthropologists Martín Gamboa and Isabel Barreto as well as Paula Florit, Jorge Leal and Alfredo Falero, sociologists. This research goes only up to 2009 so I know many people should be mentioned and I apologize for not doing it.

APPENDIX

Anthropologists studying tourism issues at 2009 in Brazil

Tourism and Gender (including sex tourism)

Adriana G. Piscitelli (Unicamp); Alipio de Sousa Filho (Universidade Federal do Rio Grande do Norte.); Cecília Maria Cacellar Sardenberg (UFBA); Marion Teodósio de Quadros (Universidade Federal de Pernambuco); Marcelo Henrique Ferreira Franco (Dom da Terra); Thaddeus Gregory Blanchette (Universidade Federal Fluminense).

Tourism and Religion

Antonio Mendes da C. Braga (sem inf.) Bruno Ribeiro Marques (Universidade Federal do Rio Grande do Sul); Carlos Alberto Steil (Universidade Federal do Rio Grande do Sul); Deis Elucy Siqueira (Universidade de Brasília); Edwin Boudewijn Reesink (UFBA); Fernando Antonio Domingos Lins (Faculdades Integradas de Vitória de Santo Antão); Jeanne Almeida Dias (UFBA); Marcelo Ayres Camurça (UFJF); Misia Lins Reesink (UFBA); Mundicarmo Maria Rocha Ferretti (UFMA), Rodrigo Toniol (UFRGS), Sandra de Sã Carneiro (UERJ)

Tourism Experiences

Agatha Alexandre Santos (Fundação Educacional do Governo do Distrito Federal); Carla Borba (Doutoranda Universidade Federal de Pernambuco- UFPE); Ceres Karam Brum (Universidade Federal de Santa Maria); Delma Santos de Andrade (União de Ensino Superior de Brasília), Fernanda C. Nunes (FGV), Larissa Brito Ribeiro (UFU). Paulo Roberto A. Nery (Universidade Federal de Uberlandia) Wladimir da Silva Blos

(sem inf.)

Tourism and Native Peoples Culture

Adiles Savoldi (Universidade Comunitária Regional de Chapecó); Ana Lúcia

Eduardo Farah Valente (UnB); Flávia Lac; José Glebson Vieira (Universidade do Estado

do Rio Grande do Norte); Rodrigo de Azeredo Grünewald (Universidade Federal de

Campina Grande); Rodrigo Pádua Rodrigues Chaves (UniP)

Tourism and Identity

Alvaro Banducci Jr. (Universidade Federal de Mato Grosso do Sul); Carlos A. Caroso

Soares (Universidade Federal da Bahia); Carmen Silvia Rial (Universidade Federal de Santa

Catarina); Celso Corrêa Pinto de Castro (Centro de Pesquisa e Documentação de História

Contemporanea do Brasil (CPDOC) da Fundação Getúlio Vargas); Fabiana de Oliveria Lima

(FACHO); Julia D. E. Brussi (UnB), Mara Coelho de Souza Lago (Universidade

Federal de Santa Catarina); Marisa Barbosa Araujo Luna (sem inf.); Roque Pinto da

Silva Santos (Universidade Estadual de Santa Cruz); Thereza Cristina Cardoso Menezes

(UFAm).

Tourism and Heritage

Ana Paula de P. L. de Oliveira (Universidade Federal de Juiz de Fora); Carla Mary

da Silva Oliveira (Universidade Federal da Paraíba); Cristina Aparecida Vilas Bôas (PUC

Minas); David Ivan Rezende Fleischer (Doutorando na State University of New York);

Fábio Vergara Cerqueira (Universidade Federal de Pelotas); Heitor Frúgoli Jr (USP);

Izabella Lacerda Pimenta (UFF); Marco Aurélio Nadal de Masi (Unisul); Margarita

Barretto (Furb); Maria José Reis (Universidade do Vale do Itajaí) (Universidade Federal

de Santa Catarina); Marilda Rosa Galvão Checcucci Gonçalves da Silva (FURB); Pedro

Paulo de Abreu Funari (USP); Silvana Barbosa Rubino (Unicamp); Walter Fagundes

Morales (UESC).

Tourism and Images

Edson Bertin Dorneles (Prefeitura Municipal de Porto Alegre); Euler David de

Siqueira (Universidade Federal de Juiz de Fora); Flavio Leonel Abreu da Silveira (UFPA);

Goli Almerinda de Sales Guerreiro (Universidade Salvador) (Faculdade Social da Bahia);

Margarete Fagundes Nunes (Centro Universitário Feevale)

Tourism and Society

Adão José Vital da Costa (UFPel); Andrea Ciacchi (UFPB); Angela Maria de Souza (Univali); Bianca Freire-Medeiros (Centro de Pesquisa e Documentação de História Contemporanea do Brasil (CPDOC) da Fundação Getúlio Vargas); Denize Genuína da Silva Adrião (Faculdade Integrada Brasil Amazonia); Dilson Rufino (UFSC), Edmilson Lopes Jr (UFRN); Edson Silva de Farias (Universidade de Brasília) (Universidade Federal da Bahia) (Universidade Estadual do Sudoeste da Bahia); Ellen Fensterseifer Woortmann (UnB); Emerson José Sena da Silveira (Faculdade Machado Sobrinho); Euler David Siqueira (UFJF), Giancarlo Moser (FAMESUL); Helena Doris de Almeida Barbosa Quaresma (Museo Paraense Emílio Goeldi); Jeanette Viegas (UFPE), Joao Luiz de Moraes Hoefel (Universidade São Francisco) (Pesquisador visitante da Universidade Estadual de Campinas) (Universidade de São Paulo); José Rogério Lopes (Universidade do Vale do Rio dos Sinos); Karyn Nancy Rodrigues Henriques (Universidad de La Laguna); Márcia Regina Calderipe Farias Rufino (Universidade Federal do Amazonas); Marco Aurélio Pedrosa de Melo (UE Goiás); Margarete Penerai Araújo (Feevale); Maria Amália Silva Alves de Oliveira (UniRio); Maria Conceição de Oliveira (Uniplac); Matías Godio (UFSC); Nelson Antonio Quadros Vieira Filho (Centro Universitario UNA); Rafael José dos Santos (Universidade de Caxias do Sul); Rosane Manhães Prado (Universidade do Estado do Rio de Janeiro); Scott William Hoefle (Universidade Federal do Rio de Janeiro); Tereza C. M. de Mendonça (UFRJ), Vera Guimarães (UFJF), Yolanda Flores e Silva (Universidade do Vale do Itajaí),

Anthropological Theory and Tourism

Antonio Carlos Motta de Lima (Universidade Federal de Pernambuco) (Universidad de Salamanca); Edgar Rodrigues Barbosa Neto (UFPel); Salvio Alexandre Muller (Fundação Universidade Regional de Blumenau).

Other related issues

Carlos Alberto Máximo Pimenta (Universidad de Taubaté); Luciana Duccini (UFBA), Márcia Merlo (PUCSP); Maria Eduarda Noura Céu Rodrigues Rittiner (Universidade

Nova de Lisboa, Doutoranda); Marielys Siqueira Bueno (UMA).

References

Barretto, M., Otamendi, A.

2015 Antropologia y turismo en los países del Plata (Argentina y Uruguay). *Pasos Revista de Turismo y Patrimonio Cultural*. [ULL, Tenerife, Spain]. Vol.13, n. 2. Special issue, pp. 283-294

Barretto, M.

2010 *Turismo, Reflexividad y Procesos de hibridacion cultural en America del sur Austral*. Tenerife,

Colección Pasos. N 4. Universidad de la Laguna (Tourism, Reflexivity and Hybridization in Latin America) E-book available from https://issuu.com/pasosonline/docs/psedita41

Dann, Graham,

1992 *Socio-cultural Impacts of Tourism in Saint Lucia* (Studies in Tourism No. 3). Port of Spain, Trinidad: United Nations Commission on Latin America and the Caribbean

Graburn, N., Barretto, M., Steil, C., Grünewald, R., Santos, R.

2009 *Turismo e Antropologia. Novas Abordagens*. Campinas, Ed. Papirus.

Turner L, and J. Ashe,

1976 *The Golden Hordes: International Tourism and the Pleasure Periphery*. London: Constable

Urbanowicz, Charles

1989 "Tourism in Tonga Revisited: Continued Troubled Times?" pp. 105-118 in Valene Smith Ed. *Hosts and Guests; the Anthropology of Tourism*. [Second edition] Philadelphia: U of Pennsylvania Press

"The View from Cyprus"

Evi Eftychiou, University of Nicosia

1. How has the (primarily Anglophone and French) concept of 'tourism' traveled within/ to the context in which you live and/or work? Has it imposed a discursive hegemony of a conceptual lexicon? Have native/local concepts been transformed or displaced by this conceptual globalization?

It is truly my pleasure and honor participating in this plenary session, since one of my main research interests is the conceptual history of tourism as a discourse and as a practice.

My research focuses on tourism discourses in Cyprus, a small island in the Mediterranean Sea, which was colonized by the British in 1878 and later gain its Independency in 1960. I argue that the emergence of tourism as a discourse and practice in Cyprus is interconnected with the complex interplay of the global and local power relations. The Anglophone and French discourse of tourism not only defined but also reversed the definition of tourism and its practices in Cyprus, in such a way that its

hegemony is still maintained.

British colonization contributed significantly to the development of tourism as a discourse and as a leisure activity in early 20th-century Cyprus. The concept of 'leisure time' was introduced by the British, along with other 'modern' ideas such as the idea that work should be disconnected with leisure, fixed working schedule and salary. British colonial governmental officials were the first to establish tourist resorts (Ioannides, 1992: 718). Although, a small number of local elites joined the leisure class of tourists, we cannot claim that tourism was a well-established institution in colonial Cyprus.

In postcolonial Cyprus (after 1960s), local elites were running the newly founded state. Native elites reproduced the western discourse of tourism linked with 'development', 'progress' and 'modernity', as expressed in Europe after the Second World War. I will selectively discuss 4 cultural changes, to illustrate how Cypriots, as relatively powerless actors, attempted to create cultural bonds with the West by adopting and reproducing the symbols and discourses of more powerful societies.

1. The first change is the development of mass tourism by following the so called "successful tourism model" that emerged in initially in Northern Europe. It seems that local elites were unable to think or even consider an alternative model of development.

2. The second change is the emergence of Mediterraneanist discourse in Northern European societies, which contributed to the construction of an essentialized vision of 'Mediterranean' space and culture, which was internalized by locals to a great extent.

3. The third change is the transformation in the dominant beliefs of Europeans about the beach, which was linked with pleasure and enjoyment. These traits were diffused in Cyprus and contributed to the development of Cyprus as a primarily 'sun and sea destination'.

4. Lastly, native elites envisioned to 'modernize' and rapidly 'develop' Cyprus according to the modernist paradigm as it emerged in the West in the post-war era. Rural areas were ignored 'traditional' and 'backward' and nature was often, approached as an obstacle to achieving further development.

The dominant tourism discourse was challenged again by the local elites in the late 1980s and 1990s.What is important to emphasize, is that this change reflects the change in the discourse of Northern European societies in the late 1960s and 1970s. New concepts and ideas were introduced that emphasized the importance of safeguarding the natural environment and cultural heritage. The meaning and definition of modernity was now reversed and a new discursive conceptual lexicon was imposed by the native elites, which included concepts such as sustainable development, environment, small scale tourism, cultural tourism, authenticity, rurality and cultural heritage. The real modern man was the one who strives for the protection of tradition and environment, instead of the early version of modernity.

I do not suggest that hegemonic ideas are accepted and not challenged or negotiated by locals. Although, there are multiple meanings of modernity, is seems that the hegemonic ideas as defined by Northern Europeans are not fundamentally challenged.

2. Very briefly sketch the genealogy of the anthropology of tourism in your country/ region. Which themes are currently "hot" in the anthropology of tourism that you are familiar with? Are there any differences with the dominant (Anglo-Saxon) anthropology of tourism?

The anthropology of tourism is very underdeveloped in Cyprus at the time being. The vast majority of the literature dealing with tourism in Cyprus was authored in the late 1980s and 1990s. In these works the subject of tourism is usually investigated from the wider perspective of economics, management and planning perspective (Andronicou 1983; 1986; 1987, Kammas 1991, 1993; Witt 1991; Ioannides 1992, 1995, 1999; Godfrey 1996; Sharpley 2000, 2001, 2003; Louca 2006; Ivanov & Webster 2007), with only a handful of authors adopting a social science standpoint and even fewer adopting an anthropological approach. For example, Toufexis-Panayiotou (1989) focuses on tourists themselves and the factors influencing their decision to visit Cyprus, while Akis, Peristianis and Warner (1996) employ a quantitative approach to examine attitudes to tourism development

among Greek Cypriots and Turkish Cypriots. Altinay and Bowen (2006) evaluate the

impact of nationalism and politics on tourism in the context of a potential federal solution,

and Scott (1997; 2001; 2001b; 2003; 2005) focuses primarily on tourism development

and gambling on the northern side of the island. Similarly, a recent study by Farmaki

(2012a) considers the motivations of tourists visiting rural settings, with a particular focus

on the Troodos region. In another article Farmaki (2012b) identifies and compares the

projected and perceived images of Cyprus following the repositioning from the Cypriot

tourism authorities. Perhaps the most relevant contributions to this body of literature

are the publications by Welz (2004), Welz and Andilios (2004) and Michael (2005). The

first two works examine the relation between food culture, industrialization and tourism,

while the latter investigates the uses of the past in the formation of contemporary Greek

Cypriot identity.

Overall, there are only four anthropologists working on tourism related subjects

and only two of them who focus on the anthropology of tourism as their main research

interest. Julie Scott and Gizela Welz studied relevant to tourism subjects such as intangible

heritage, oral history, gambling, environmental conflict and food heritage. The two

anthropologists who focus predominantly on the anthropology of tourism is Pauline

Georgiou and myself. In 2013, I completed my PhD thesis on tourism and identity

politics in rural Cyprus by exploring the conflict between native elites and locals over the

definition of modernity. I focused on the disputed identity of rural Cyprus by exploring

the conceptual history of tourism discourse in Cyprus, as discussed in the first part of

this session. It is an ethnographic study on tourism that argues that the power of western

hegemony, not only defines but also reverses the definition of 'modern' identity in the

cultural setting of Cyprus in a way that its authority is maintained and legitimized. Pauline

Georgiou completed her PhD a couple of months ago and her thesis focuses on "Domestic

Tourism in a Divided Land". The research investigates the fundamental relationship

between people and place in Cyprus. Cyprus' unique political situation generates space

for inquiry on themes such as identity formation and boundaries and the production and

consumption of cultural heritage.

Concerning the question whether there are any differences between the anthropology of tourism in Cyprus with the dominant (Anglo-Saxon) anthropology of tourism the simple answer is that there are not. Scott and Welz were trained in UK and Germany respectively. Even the two native anthropologists, Pauline Georgiou and myself were trained in UK, so our readings and theoretical approaches are highly influenced by the dominant Anglo-Saxon scholars.

3. *Do newly emerging tourism practices across the globe contribute to the intellectual discussion of the "decline of the West" and the "provincialization of Europe," or they are just further examples of westernization? Which future role do you see for anthropology and anthropologists in relation to tourism?*

Cypriots, like many other colonized people, have embraced the idea that western culture is superior to their own and thus endeavour to achieve 'modernity' using the 'more advanced' countries of the West as a benchmark. The native elites' 'truth' is already defined and constrained by the power of western hegemony, to the degree that the western model is considered the 'natural' and 'rational' way forward, even as it is reversed over time. As Argyrou (2005, p. 160) argues, hegemony is 'consent based on the socio-historical unconscious – the taken-for-granted, the undisputed and undiscussed, what goes without saying because it appears natural and necessary'. The power of western hegemony is evident in this case, since native elites were unable to think of an alternative model and discourse to the one proposed by the West.

As a rule, more powerful cultures have the authority to define the 'socio-historical unconscious'. It seems that for now, the West holds the power to define the dominant discourse, according to which western civilization is superior to Others. Hegemony constitutes itself as extremely difficult to challenge by what Foucault calls 'process of

division' (Rabinow 1984, p. 8). During this process, the groups who have the power to define concepts, objectify and categorize the world around them, based on binary systems of thought, such as West/East, First World/Third World, modern/traditional, developed/underdeveloped, progressive/backward and urban/rural. Based on this classification system, the world acquires meaning and social attitudes are been regulated. Following Foucault, I claim that Cypriots have constituted themselves as subjects of western hegemony, by adopting and reproducing the discourse of modernity and development as evolved in the West.

Following Argyrou (2005), the emergence of mass tourism discourse in the 1960s and its transformation into reflexive tourism discourse in the late 1980s is a reproduction of the 'same paradigm', namely the western paradigm. Hence, Cyprus and its people are involved in a vicious cycle of self-victimization and self-reproduction of the cultural conditions that constitute them as subjects of the West.

The role of anthropology and anthropology of tourism in the future is crucial and extremely important. It is one of the fields that can bring to the surface this process of 'division' and self-victimization in the context of western hegemony and thus create awareness in relation to the power and authority of the so called "more advanced countries" to define our socio-historical unconscious'. By being aware, we create the cultural conditions in which the 'unthinkable' will be more approachable in the future.

References

Altinay L. and D. Bowen. (2006) Politics and tourism interface: The case of Cyprus. *Annals of Tourism Research* 33(4), pp. 939-56.

Andronikou A. (1983) Case studies: Selecting and planning for tourists – the case of Cyprus. *Tourism Management* 4(3), pp. 209-11.

Andronikou A. (1986) Report: Cyprus – management of the tourist sector. *Tourism Management* 7(2), pp. 127-9.

Andronikou A. (1987) *Development of Tourism in Cyprus: Harmonization of Tourism with the Environment.* Nicosia: Cosmos Ltd.

Argyrou V. (2005) *The Logic of Environmentalism: Anthropology, Ecology and Postcoloniality*. New York and Oxford: Berghahn Books.

Eftichiou E. (2013) *Power and Tourism: Negotiating Identity in Rural Cyprus.* PhD Thesis, University of Hull

Farmaki A. (2012) An exploration of tourist motivation in rural settings: The case of Troodos, Cyprus. *Tourism Management Perspectives* 2-3, pp. 72-78.

Georgiou P. (2018) *Domestic Tourism in a Divided Land*, PhD Thesis, University of Goldsmith

Godfrey K. B. (1996) The evolution of tourism planning in Cyprus: Will recent changes prove sustainable? *Cyprus Review*, 8 (1), pp. 111-33.

Ioannides D. (1992) Tourism development agents: The Cypriot resort cycle. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 19, pp. 711-31.

Ioannides D. (1995) A flawed implementation of sustainable tourism: The experience of Akamas, Cyprus. *Tourism Management*, 16 (8), pp. 583-92.

Ioannides D. and Apostolopoulos Y. (1999). Political instability, war and tourism in Cyprus: Effects, management and prospects of recovery. *Journal of Travel Research*, 38, pp. 51-56.

Ivanov S. and Webster G. (2007) Measuring the impact of tourism on economic growth. *Tourism Economics*, 13 (3), pp. 379-88.

Kammas M. (1991) Tourism development in Cyprus. *Cyprus Review*, 3 (2), pp. 7-26.

Kammas M. (1993) The positive and negative effects of tourism development in Cyprus. *Cyprus Review*, 5 (1), pp. 70-89.

Louca C. (2006) Income and expenditure in the tourism industry: Time series evidence from Cyprus. *Tourism Economics*, 12 (4), pp. 603-17.

Michael A. S. (2005) *Making Histories: Nationalism, Colonialism and the Uses of the Past on Cyprus*. Unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Glasgow.

Peristianis N., Akis S. Warner and J. (1996) Residents' attitudes to tourism development: The case of Cyprus. *Tourism Management*, 17(7), pp. 481-94.

Rabinow P. (1991) [1984] *The Foucault Reader: An introduction to Foucault's Thought.* London: Penguin Books.

Scott J. (1997) Chances and choices: Women and tourism in Northern Cyprus. In T. Sinclair

(ed.) Gender, Work and Tourism. London: Routledge.

Scott J. (2001) Gender and sustainability in Mediterranean island tourism. In *Sustainable Tourism in Mediterranean Islands: Policy and Practice*, Ioannides D., Apostolopoulos Y. and Sonmez S. (eds). London: Continuum International.

Scott J. (2003) Coffee shop meets casino: Cultural responses to casino tourism in Northern Cyprus. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 11 (2&3), pp. 266-79.

S J. (2005) Reconfiguring paradise in Cyprus. *Cyprus Review*, 17 (1), pp. 37-58.

Sharpley R. (2001) Tourism in Cyprus: Challenges and opportunities. *Tourism Geographies* 3(1), pp. 64-86.

Sharpley R. (2002) Rural tourism and the challenge of diversification: The case of Cyprus. *Tourism Management* 23 (3), pp. 233-44.

Sharpley R. (2003) Tourism, modernization and development on the island of Cyprus: Challenges and policy responses. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism* 4 (3), pp. 20-22.

Toufexis-Panayouitou M. (1989) Travel and tourism in Cyprus: A study of the travel decision process. *Cyprus Review*, 1 (1), pp. 111-34.

Welz G. (2004) Cyprus Meze: Transformations of a local culinary practice in the context of tourism. In *Local Food & Tourism International Conference*, World Tourism Organization, pp. 39-48.

Welz G. (2015) *European Products: Making and Unmaking Heritage in Cyprus*. London: Berghahn

Welz G. and AndiliosN. (2004) Modern methods for producing the traditional: The case of making halloumi cheese in Cyprus. In *Changing Tastes: Food Culture and the Processes of Industrialization*, Lysaght P. and Burckhardt-Seebass C. (eds). Schweizerische Gesellschaft für Volkskunde / The Department of Irish Folklore. Basel: University College Dublin.

Witt S. F. (1991) Tourism in Cyprus: Balancing the benefits and costs. *Tourism Management*, 12, pp. 37-46.

"The View from China"

Lusha Sa □□□ South-central University for Nationalities, Wuhan

1. How has the (primarily Anglophone and French) concept of 'tourism' traveled within/ to the context in which you live and/or work? Has it imposed a discursive hegemony of a conceptual lexicon? Have native/local concepts been transformed or displaced by this conceptual globalization?

Etymologically, the word 'tourism' derived from western lexicon. It is formed from the word '*tour'*, which is derived from European roots of "turn" The European "Grand Tour", mainly upper class educational travel by horse drawn coaches from the North, to Rome, Greece and the classical Mediterranean, emerged from the 1660s on, and provided a models for the growing middle classes of the industrial revolution and later rail travel.

As one of the ancient civilizations in the world, China has thousands of years' history in ancient travel behavior. In ancient China, the practice was largely confined to the emperor's parade, pilgrimage, intellectual sightseeing, as we can find in classics of Chinese literature, e.g., poetry in Tang, Song, Yuan Dynasty and travel notes in Ming

Dynasty (Xu Xiake).

However, the modern domestic tourism in China only developed after the *Opening up and Reform policy* in 1978. Leisure travel outside one's home region was severely restricted till 1978. Since then, China has gradually become one of the world's biggest tourist destinations, dominated by burgeoning domestic tourism in the 1990s. Largely influenced by western concept of mass tourism developed during the second half of the 19th century in Europe, the tourism industry in China boomed over the last thirty years. According to the statistics from Ministry of Culture and Tourism of the People's Republic of China, tourism revenue totaled RMB 5.4 trillion in 2017, tourism industry made up 11.04% GDP gross, tourism employment made up 10.28% of the employment population. Imposed by conceptual globalization, the traditional concept and practices transformed in various dimensions, government policies, tourism companies, hospitality industry, transportation, etc.

In recent decades, the development of mass tourism has also elaborated into numerous specialty forms of tourism. Tourists, especially domestic tourists travelling in groups, are not only interested in natural landscapes and historical sites – "scenic spots" - as traditional destinations, but also pursue niche tourism derived from the west, the most characteristic forms of niche tourism in China include:

1. *Heritage tourism*. Since China ratified the UNESCO Heritage Convention in 1985, the 53 places of heritage in the World Heritage List became hot destinations for tourists, the passion for the past everywhere, especially "intangible cultural heritage" has been inherited by the nationwide heritage tourism industry.

2. *Ethnic tourism*. Covering 64% of national territorial area, 8.49% population in China (114,000,000 people), the distinctive ethnic cultures among 55 ethnic minority groups became attraction to Han tourists as well as international tourists, seeking for "others". Following the *Develop the West Policy* in 1999, ethnic tourism coupled with the official central government's policies experiencing a rapid growth in recent two decades.

3. *Red tourism*. As part of the central government's nation-building efforts, 'red

tourism' is an official way for tourists (especially communist party members)
to visit patriotic sites and memorials that commemorate anti-colonialism, antiaggression
wars, the communist revolution and other socialist developments.

4. *Nong Jia Le* ["Peasant family happiness"], kinds of "Agritainment" – (peasant
restaurants and bed & breakfast) tourism. Short breaks from urban environment
and lifestyle, experiencing simple country foods or "farm stay" with sense of
nostalgia, a new kind of rural tourism with village and natural sources, has
become popular among urban residents over the last twenty years.

The development of global tourism also produced other forms of tourism in China,
such as ecotourism, religious tourism, business tourism, seasonal tourism, sex tourism,
sports tourism, medical tourism, etc.

As we can see, influenced by western tourism culture, the concept of tourism in
China has experienced great transformation, generating essential differences from the
traditional concepts. However, we should also realize the modern tourism in China also
inherited traditional Chinese cultural connotations, generating tourism culture hybridity
with distinctive Chinese characteristics under globalization.

2. Very briefly sketch the genealogy of the anthropology of tourism in your country/region.
Which themes are currently "hot" in the anthropology of tourism that you are familiar with?
Are there any differences with the dominant (Anglo-Saxon) anthropology of tourism?

First it must be pointed out that in post-1949 China anthropology has been
designated as the study of minority, mainly rural, *minzu* peoples, with majority (Han,
urban) society left to sociology (and folklore). The development of anthropology of
tourism in China can be seen as three different periods, the first period is the emergence
of tourism anthropology, in the late 1980s and 1990s, when Chinese scholars Wang
Zhusheng, Yang Hui, Wang Ning, Zhang Zhanhong became aware of foreign research
on ethnicity and tourism through studying Anthropology and Sociology abroad and
encountered the impacts of nascent tourism in the ethnic villages where they studied.
In 1999, as a milestone event of tourism anthropology in China, an international

conference on "Tourism, Anthropology, and Chinese Society" was held in Kunming, with a number of international anthropologists participating in, like Prof. Nelson Graburn, Erik Cohen, and Edward Bruner. Domestic scholars began to realize the importance of tourism anthropology in China. The second period is disciplinary growth of tourism anthropology in the first decade of the 21st century. A number of scholars went abroad, receiving training in tourism anthropology systematically. Zhang Xiaoping, Yang Hui, Peng Zhaorong visited University of California, Berkeley, made in-depth research on tourism anthropology under the guidance of Prof. Nelson Graburn. In the meantime, a series of western publications on tourism anthropology was translated into Chinese: *The Tourists—A New Theory of the Leisure Class* (Dean MacCannell).*Anthropology and the Age of Tourism* (Nelson Graburn). *The Tourist Gaze: Leisure and Travel in Contemporary Societies* (John Urry). *Routes: Travel and Translation in the late Twentieth Century* (James Clifford), *Hosts and Guests—the Anthropology of Tourism* (Valene L. Smith). *Anthropology of Tourism;* (Dennison Nash). The first four were part of a translation series planned by Prof Peng Zhaorong and Nelson Graburnduring his sabbatical visit to U C Berkeley in 2001-2. With systematic theory of western anthropology background,tourism anthropology in China grew to a new stage. The third period can be seen asthe integrated development of tourism anthropology in China in the recent ten years.

Hundreds of anthropologists from Zhongshan University, Xiamen University, Yunnan University, South-central University for Nationalities, Guizhou Minzu University and other institutes made in-depth researches on tourism anthropology, abundant research works and publications are produced, meanwhile, interdisciplinary research also shows unprecedented prosperity. The biennial national Tourism Summit Forum during the last ten years has witnessed the integrated development of tourism anthropology in China. Applying the western theoretical concepts, like commodification, authenticity, ritual, tourist gaze, symbols...The contemporary tourism anthropology also generates some new themes: tourism development in ethnic areas, culture and heritage protection in ethnic tourism, socio-cultural change and reproduction, community participation, tourism impacts and conflict, ethnic identity, etc.... After the 18th and 19th National

People's Congress in 2012 and 2017, new themes arisen in relation to the national strategy of rural revitalization, supply-side reform, targeted poverty alleviation, well-off society construction... researches on tourism anthropology thus shifted to cultural revitalization, ecotourism and ecological construction, rural reconstruction, rustic landscape, featured ethnic village construction, etc., one of the major goals being slowing urban migration by providing livelihood and healthy communities in marginal rural areas.

Differences from the dominant anthropology of tourism:

1. *Research Objects*: Mainly focus on ethnic culture and ethnic tourism inside China, especially the southwest ethnic area with distinctive ethnic culture.

2. *Research Methodology*: Applying western anthropological theory, tourism anthropology focuses on applied research and empirical research, aims at the economic and sociocultural development in ethnic areas, providing countermeasures and proposals for the central government.

3. *Research Teams*: Enormous collection of overseas returnees, MA and PhD. candidates in key universities, professors and researchers in many renowned institutions. More important, numbers of minority anthropologists (indigenous scholars) take their homelands as research object, initially engaging in tourism anthropology research in their own ethnic groups, and often becoming fully fledged professionals studying other groups as well.

4. *Language*. Most Chinese anthropologists publish journal articles, books and chapters in Chinese, their work does not target an international audience but aims mainly for domestic consumption.

3. Do newly emerging tourism practices across the globe contribute to the intellectual discussion of the "decline of the West" and the "provincialization of Europe," or they are just further examples of westernization? Which future role do you see for anthropology and anthropologists in relation to tourism?

The newly emerging tourism practices across the globe do not show the "decline of the West" and the "provincialization of Europe", on the contrary, it gives full expression to

westernization. In the 21st century, the Internet industry has greatly transformed tourism by social media. The pervasive interactions between advanced technology and social values and performances have pervaded tourists everywhere, also emerged new kinds of tourism practices: like cyber tourism, smart tourism and "contents tourism" (starting in Japan and Korea, followed quickly by China mainland, Taiwan, Hong Kong). As a matter of fact, all these newly emerged tourism practices are at least in part the outcome of western culture and westernization. The connotation of western culture embodied in modern transportation, the hospitality industry, tourism management, even tourism products among tourists destinations everywhere. Meanwhile, internet technology accelerates the spread of western culture via various kinds of social media and websites. On the other hand, some non-western culture element (Chinese cuisine, Japanese cosplay, Buddhist culture in Southeast Asia, etc.) have been added to supplement or embellish western culture, making it more globalized. We have to realize, national culture and ethnic culture have become elements of world culture, and local culture has become global culture shared by mankind, often called "glocalization." (Min and Graburn 2009). The global tourism promoted the integration of national culture, ethnic culture, local culture and western culture, but more importantly, it also promoted the westernization of non-western culture.

The cultural hybridity and integration should be the concern and research objectives for anthropologists. Anthropologists now play multiple roles in global tourism, we are not only the scholars in research of tourism practices, we should also shoulder the responsibility as the cultural transmitters and cultural ambassadors.

References

Clifford,J.1997. *Routes: Travel and Translation in the Late Twentieth Century.* Harvard University Press.

Cohen,E. 1988. 'Authenticity and Commoditization in Tourism', *Annals of Tourism Research* 15.

Graburn,N. 1983. 'The Anthropology of Tourism', *Annals of Tourism Research10:9-33.*

Graburn, N.ed.1976. *Ethnic and Tourist Arts: Cultural Expressions from the Fourth World.*Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.

Graburn, N. and Lu Jin .2011. "□□□□□□□□□□" ['The Rise of Chinese Tourism Anthropology"], *Qinghai Journal of Ethnology* 22(2):1-11.

Han Min, Graburn, N. (eds.) 2010. *Tourism and Glocalization: Perspectives on East Asian Societies*. Suita, Osaka: National Museum of Ethnology, Senri Ethnological Studies 76.

MacCannell, D. 1976.The *Tourist: a New Theory of the Leisure Class*, New York: Schocken.

Nash, D. 1996. *Anthropology of Tourism*, Tarrytown, NY: Pergamon.

Salazar, N. B. and N. Graburn, 2014. *Tourism Imaginaries: Anthropological Approaches*, London: Berghahn.

Smith, V. (ed.).1977. *Hosts and Guests: The Anthropology of Tourism*□Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Turner, V. 1969. *The Ritual Process*, Chicago: Aldine.

Urry, J. 1990. *The Tourist Gaze*, London: Sage.

Yang Hui, Zhiming Chen, Zhanhong Zhang,eds. 2001. *Tourism, Anthropology and Chinese Society*. Kunming: Yunnan University Press.

Yujie Zhu, Lu Jin & Nelson Graburn. 2017. 'Domesticating Tourism Anthropology in China', *American Anthropologist* 119(4): 730-735.

Chinese Editions:

□□□□□□□□□□——□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□ 2008 □□[MacCannell1976, translated by Zhang Xiaoping, Guangxi Normal University Press]

□□□·□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□ 2009 □□ [Nelson Graburn: *Anthropology in the Age of Tourism*, translated by Zhao Hongmei, Guangxi Normal University Press.

□□□·□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□ 2006 □□□[Nash 1996 translated by Zong Xiaolian, Yunnan University Press].

□□·L .□□□□□□□□□□□□□——□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□ 2007 □□□[Smith 1989, translated by Zhang Xiaoping, Yunnan University Press]

□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□ 2009 □□□[Urry 1990, translated by Yang Hui, Guangxi Normal University Press].

"The View from the UK"

Jonathan Skinner, University of Roehampton

1. *How has the (primarily Anglophone and French) concept of 'tourism' traveled within/ to the context in which you live and/or work? Has it imposed a discursive hegemony of a conceptual lexicon? Have native/local concepts been transformed or displaced by this conceptual globalization?*

Pilgrims to the anthropology of tourism

I am delighted and honoured to be speaking at the opening plenary of the IUAES in Florianopolis, and my apologies to the translators for the late comments, and the lack of Portuguese. It is an interesting and important topic for consideration, the conceptual history of tourism, one that Noel notes is Anglophone and French and one that has travelled, been challenged and perhaps even recently eclipsed, so the questions allude. It is important to consider tourism in anthropology – often a neglected or marginalised area, the anthropology of tourism or tourism anthropology that is so close to the anthropologist's Self that they dislike the clear anthropological Other to study.

The concept of tourism has travelled. It has a mobility to it, and an interpretive resonance and context that varies from destination to destination and from Grand Tour traveller to tourist to backpacker to Victor Turner's pilgrim-slash-tourist (Turner and

Turner 1978: 20). As a Caribbeanist, someone who did initial fieldwork on the island of Montserrat working on carnival and colonial-postcolonial expressions of resistance, it is interesting to note the conceptualization of my fieldsite, the geographical region of the Caribbean, as one of those 'pleasure peripheries' (Turner and Ash 1975) that got me my first job teaching a tourism module – not because of my research topics but because of my research fieldsite. I worked in the Caribbean ergo - according to my first employer - I worked on tourism when I was always being told off by the members of the Montserrat Tourist Board for not visiting the beach or tanning and so going home whiter than when I had left it – a bad marketing example for them!

Teaching the anthropology and sociology of tourism at the University of Abertay, Dundee, I first introduced students to the history and development of tourism in the UK from Grand Tour to the continent as a finishing school process for the leisured class, to the explosion of leisure for all in the mass tourism visits to the beaches of Brighton and Blackpool even the Isle of Man as the Victorian working class gained a leisure time in their work cycle. Mid-twentieth century and the advances in transport and fuel prices facilitated overseas tourism – the package holiday to Spain, Greece, or Portugal. This was followed by the individualisation, the differentiation of the vacation as holidays become a right for all, and a diverse one at that. Tourism massified to tourism individualised.

Tourism as a genre practice remained stable, however: as a concept of movement more than 24hrs away from home (internal to the nation or external and international, volunteer based, sustainable eco-tourism, beach tourism), and conceptually as the leisured use of a liminal space in a liminal time as identified by Graburn (1989) though, as Sheller (2009) points out, in the new digital architecture of the Caribbean paradise, tourist space and informational space converge.

In the Caribbean - besides the high-end long term residential tourism to houses overseas (Weaver 1995), or the yacht tourism quartering in the Leewards or Windwards (Lett 1983) - is generally the all-inclusive resort tourism. This is aptly referred to as *Last Resorts* tourism by Polly Pattullo (1996), or *Paradise Lost* to invoke Milton, as tourism sustains the economy as a necessary evil; tourism as neo-colonialism – the white man still being served

by the black to stereotype the practice. On Montserrat, the all-island slogan across the airwaves and in the newspapers and classrooms used to be "Tourism is Everybody's Business" (Skinner 2004). There is further equivalence here when one thinks of the all inclusive resort super-imposing itself on top of the awful estate and plantation model.

Whilst not the UN's 'Passport to Development' (de Kadt 1984), the trend in tourism is to continue to be enjoyed and even fantasized about – now in 'terminal excessiveness' of Lacanian *jouissance*. (cf. Kingsbury 2005: 123).

2 Very briefly sketch the genealogy of the anthropology of tourism in your country/region. Which themes are currently "hot" in the anthropology of tourism that you are familiar with? Are there any differences with the dominant (Anglo-Saxon) anthropology of tourism?

Disciplining Anthropology: the anthropology of tourism

The conditions of anthropology's disciplinary reproduction are contradictory.

"The discipline", Giri (1998) notes in a lead-in article to Strathern's *Audit Culture*, is a modern mode of inquiry, one of boundedness, closure and specialisation. As such it is associated with modernity: disciplines produce knowledge capital and act as cultural frames, but also, Giri adds, they become locations of social identity. 'Academic disciplines not only help us classify the world but also classify ourselves' (Giri 1998: 380): in the UK the RAI, Royal Anthropological Institute's tourism committee takes the lead on maintaining and developing the anthropology of tourism. SOAS, until recently, had a Masters on the anthropology of tourism set up by Tom Selwyn and inherited by Naomi Leite; and Roehampton used to put on a travel and travel writing tourism masters run by anthropologists Garry Marvin and John Eade. Many anthropologists in the UK are based in other disciplinary warehouses – tourism departments and business schools for instance with Hazel Andrews and Les Roberts being a leading presence from Liverpool.

Smith's 1977 *Hosts & Guests* volume, updated in the 1989 revision, was based upon proceedings from a panel in the 1974 Mexico City meeting of the American Anthropological Association (Smith 1989: ix). It often marks the emergence of the subdiscipline the anthropology of tourism, when a corpus of scholarship focused

on knowledge production in a particular niche became apparent. Nelson Graburn, a contributor to Smith's original volume, suggested in a Special Issue on the anthropology of tourism in *Annals of Tourism Research*, that 'the anthropology of tourism is a recently developed field' (1983: 9), one unified, for him topically around the study of tourists and the impact of tourism; conceptually through anthropological notions of ritual, play and pilgrimage; and methodologically through distinct ethnographic fieldwork. Thirty five years later, it perhaps came of age with the recent publication of Owsianowska and Banaszkiewicz's (2018: 1) *The Anthropology of Tourism in Central and Eastern Europe:Bridging Worlds*, an explicit attempt 'to dispose of limitations on the anthropological study of tourism', no longer the preserve of the West. As part of a world anthropologies movement, this – also with a contribution from Graburn - rebalances the 'geopolitics of knowledge' (5) in the anthropology of tourism with scholarship both of and from Central and Eastern Europe. The attention to the particular political context in the production of anthropological knowledge production decolonises the discipline, opening it out to Hispanophone and Lusophone 'anthropologies of tourism scholarship' (Milano 2017: 737), to anthropologies of tourism, even, that link to the development of the nation-state such as China with the rise of national interest in ethnic tourism (cf. Zhu, Jin and Graburn 2017). This scholarship extends the anthropological canon and is considered in detail by Sa Lusha in this panel.

3. ***Do newly emerging tourism practices across the globe contribute to the intellectual discussion of the "decline of the West" and the "provincialization of Europe," or they are just further examples of westernization? Which future role do you see for anthropology and anthropologists in relation to tourism?***

Critics of the anthropology of tourism subdiscipline suggest that it is not there yet in terms of its development, that there is no clearly defined or delimited academic area. This makes it difficult to articulate a clear future role for anthropologists working on tourism. Kaaristo contends that this is a difficulty with tourism studies in general as a subject area approached from anthropology but also a bevy of subjects including management,

sociology, cultural studies, development studies, psychology and political science. This is the 'indiscipline' of studying tourism (Tribe 1997). Anthropologists working on tourism need to be making a more distinct theoretical contribution for a subdiscipline to live up to its claim: '[t]here is [...] a need for more theorizing in the field, in order for it to be fully realized as a subdiscipline', Kaaristo (2018: 73) qualifies. This suggests that external recognition and a clear theoretical territorialisation of knowledge are some sort of litmus tests for the subdiscipline in general. It should also have a recognised nucleus for disseminating best practice: dedicated journals, book series, conferences and associations, all of which are emerging, especially the Anthropology of Tourism Interest Group in the American Anthropological Association (ATIG in the AAA), and the Commission on the Anthropology of Tourism in the International Union of anthropological and Ethnological Sciences (AoT in the IUAES). Graburn, himself, readily accepts this developmental position: publishing a half-way position with Naomi Leite (2009: 35) in the *SAGE Handbook of Tourism Studies*, they expressed their work as 'anthropological interventions in Tourism Studies' rather than an anthropology of tourism because of the need for 'coherence' but also the advantage of not having to re-frame work for a different, non-anthropological audience. This is after presaging this anthropological turn to tourism decades earlier as an inevitable new direction when he wrote in 1980 about first teaching an anthropology of tourism class. Then, tourism was a new topic for anthropology as the core discipline shifted emphasis away from taxonomy to engage more with contact and change, 'from the study of classification and structure to that of process and interaction' (Graburn 1980: 65). They conclude that suggest that future research directions can be 'postdisciplinary' (Leite and Graburn 2009: 54).

What constitutes tourism anthropology or the prefix 'the anthropology of' plus a subject area, as in 'the anthropology of tourism, is the focus of Les Roberts and Hazel Andrews' article '(Un)Doing Tourism Anthropology: Outline of a Field of Practice' (2013). This is a particular 'model of intellectual taxonomy' (Roberts and Andrews 2013: 14) for them. The question for them is what constitutes the doing of the anthropology of tourism as a field of practice. What are its parameters and how stable are they, to which we can

add the extent of collaboration? Anthropology is the discipline and tourism is the subject matter with the two being able to be tacked together or there can be an 'anthropology of ' all sorts of subject matters as though anthropology has the (st)ability to colonise and grow subject areas. It begs the question why it is not doing anthropology as though the two can be explicitly framed differently – anthropology from the anthropology of tourism. To use a spatial metaphor, there are 'striations' (Roberts and Andrews 2013: 32) associated with these types of confined interdisciplinary pathways. For Roberts and Andrews (2013: 13) doing - as well as undoing - a tourism anthropology is 'in part the practice of reinforcing the anthropos while at the same time looking critically askance at the category of "the tourist"'. This is bringing the anthropological gaze to the tourist gaze, if you will; using an anthropological imagination and methodology to the tourist and tourism, cognizant of a particular subdisciplinary lineage (from Smith to Graburn, including Victor Turner, Edward Bruner and more recently Noel Salazar) to the main disciplinary canon.

References.

De Kadt, Emanuel,

1984 *Tourism: Passport to Development?* Oxford: OUP.

http://documents.worldbank.org/curated/

en/223271468141894689/pdf/multi-page.pdf.

Giri, Ananta K.,

1998 "Transcending Disciplinary Boundaries Creative experiments and the critiques of modernity." *Critique of Anthropology*. https://doi.org/10.1177/0308275X9801800402.

Graburn, Nelson,

1980 "Teaching the Anthropology of Tourism." *International Social Science Journal* (U.N.E.S.C.O., Paris) 32:1:56-68.

------, 1989 "Tourism: The Sacred Journey." Pp. 21-36 in Valene Smith (ed.) *Hosts and Guests: The Anthropology of Tourism*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Graburn, Nelson (ed.)

1983 "The Anthropology of Tourism." Special edition, *Annals of Tourism Research* 10 (1).

Kaaristo, Maarja,

2018 "Engaging with the Hosts and Guests: Some Methodological Reflections on the Anthropology of Tourism." Pp. 73 in Owsianowska, Sabina and Magda Banaszkiewicz, (eds.) *The Anthropology of Tourism in Central and Eastern Europe: Bridging Worlds.* Oxford: Lexington Press.

Kingsbury, Paul,

2005 "Jamaican tourism and the politics of enjoyment." *Geoforum* 36: 113-132.

Lett, James,

1983 "Ludic and liminoid aspects of charter yacht tourism in the Caribbean." *Annals of Tourism Research* 10(1): 35-56.

Leite, Naomi and Nelson Graburn,

2009 "Anthropological Interventions in Tourism Studies." Pp. 35-64 in Mike Robinson and Tazim Jamal (eds.). *Handbook of Tourism Studies*. London: Sage.

Milano, Claudio,

2017 "Otherness Anthropologies: Toward Ibero-American Anthropologies of Tourism." *American Anthropologist* 119(4): 736-741.

Owsianowska, Sabina and Magda Banaszkiewicz, (eds.)

2018 *The Anthropology of Tourism in Central and Eastern Europe: Bridging Worlds*. Oxford: Lexington Press.

Pattullo, Polly,

1996 *Last Resorts: The Cost of Tourism in the Caribbean*. London: Cassell.

Sheller, Mimi,

2009 "Infrastructures of the imagined island: software, mobilities, and the architecture of Caribbean paradise." *Environment and Planning A* 41: 1386-1403.

Skinner, Jonathan,

2004 *Before the Volcano: Reverberations of Identity on Montserrat*. Kingston, Jamaica: Arawak Publications.

Smith, Valene (ed.)

1989 *Hosts and Guests; the Anthropology of Tourism*. [Second edition] Philadelphia: U of Pennsylvania Press.

Roberts, Les and Hazel Andrews,

2013 "(Un)Doing Tourism Anthropology: Outline of a Field of Practice" *Journal of Tourism Challenges and Trends* 4(2): 13-38.

Turner, Louis and John Ash,

1975 *The Golden Hordes: International Tourism and the Pleasure Periphery*.

London: Constable & Robinson Limited.

Turner, Victor and Edith Turner,

1978 *Image and Pilgrimage in Christian Culture: Anthropological Perspectives*.

New York: Columbia University Press.

Tribe, John,

1997 "The Indiscipline of Tourism." *Annals of Tourism Research* 24(3): 638-57.

Weaver, David,

1995 "Alternative tourism in Montserrat." *Tourism Management* 16(8): 593-604.

Zhu, Yujie, Lu Jin and Nelson Graburn,

2017 "Domesticating Tourism Anthropology in China." *American Anthropologist* 119(4): 730-35.

"Inside and Outside the Anglophone Snake; Tourism Research, Alterities & Hegemonies"

Nelson Graburn, University of California, Berkeley and Tourism Studies Working Group[1]

I am grateful for the invitation to comment on these stimulating papers in the IUAES Plenary session "The Conceptual Histories of Tourism". This paper explores the structure of world anthropologies of tourism and the globalisation of the tourism concept, through the papers presented and through personal experience.

I was educated in the Anglophone establishment of the Kings School, Canterbury, Cambridge, McGill and the University of Chicago. However, due to my English families exogamy, I had close family relationships in Malaya, Singapore, Ceylon [Sri Lanka] and Sicily, I was also exposed to and identified with 'alterity' impelling me towards anthropology, after a successful scholastic career in the Natural Sciences. Since then I have had major engagements with the anthropology of tourism in Japan since 1974 and China since 1991, and Eastern Europe since 2014 and to a lesser extent in France (1980 on) and Brazil (2007).

Let me start by commenting briefly on the variety of responses to each of the three questions. I will supplement this by reference to Japan which has a more resistant set of concepts and a more self-sufficient anthropological profession than the four cases

---

1(www.tourismstudies.org)

presented so far.

1. How has the (primarily Anglophone and French) concept of 'tourism' traveled within/ to the context in which you live and/or work? Has it imposed a discursive hegemony of a conceptual lexicon? Have native/local concepts been transformed or displaced by this conceptual globalization?

I was surprised by the relative uniformity of the answers here. The general Anglo/ French concept of tourism applies unmediated in all four countries, Brazil, China, Cyprus and the United Kingdom. Skinner points out the evolution of the concept over time, as tourism became massified and individualized at the same time, paralleling Sa Lusha's account of the proliferation of niche tourisms in China: heritage tourism, ethnic tourism, 'Red" (patriotic) tourism and agrotourism. Only Dr. Sa brings in the role of traditional local elements in creating hybridities. Eftichiou illuminates the picture by stressing Western modernity's new concepts of time use, such as the idea of **leisure** separate from work, and Northern European creation of the Mediterranean imaginary. Most people, it appears, see tourism as a business, a necessary evil to be tolerated for its economic contributions. Eftichiou stresses, as do other speakers at a later point, the emergence of pro-active efforts to counter the evils and promote sustainability, to protect cultural and natural heritages, and to seek authenticity (rather than mere fun) especially in natural and rural environments.

Japan has remained less influenced by Western concepts (Graburn 1983, 1995, 1998, 2008; Yamashita, Eades and Bosco 2004). With a long history of well-structured secular and religious tourism, Japan still uses the concepts of *kanko* (visual tourism, literally to throw light *on the gazed*), *kenbutsu* (sight-seeing), *tabi* or *ryoko* (a trip, voyage) as well as *junrei* or *henro* (pilgrimage) often used in secular settings as in English. Though Japanese incorporates a huge number of foreign words, the word *tourism*, pronounced *tsurisum* is usually only used for 'modern' forms such as overseas tourism or internet-related tourisms

(see later). The big change in the past three decades has been from the overwhelming peer group tourism usually by public transport and buses, to small-group/family tourism by car (*maicar* = personal car).

2. Very briefly sketch the genealogy of the anthropology of tourism in your country/region. Which themes are currently "hot" in the anthropology of tourism that you are familiar with? Are there any differences with the dominant (Anglo-Saxon) anthropology of tourism?

Here the stories differ most. Skinner identifies the massive and hegemonic mainstream of European and American tourism and academic developments, as a subdiscipline or a set of approaches which have been diffused to non-Anglophone countries.

Eftichiou answers that the small ex-colony of Cyprus knows no other tradition to follow, as their anthropologists all come from or are educated in Northern Europe. Like them, they have begun to examine issues of heritage, the environment and politics and power.

Barretto presents a rich and complex picture for Brazil (and Argentina and Uruguy) with over one hundred active researchers. In the past two decades, without a predominance of overseas Euro-American education, they have become more reflexive and concerned with the limits to change and development. They have raised critical concerns with cultural revivals and preservation, and anti-pollution measures. Perhaps more critically than the others they have closely examined labour issues and anti-tourism sentiments But she avers that in general they follow the Anglo-Saxon intellectual model.

Prof. Sa presents a mixed picture from China showing that up to 1999 leading scholars encountered ethnic tourism in the field and heard of Anglophone tourism anthropology developments. In 1999 they organized a huge conference on Tourism, Anthropology, China, inviting Erik Cohen, Ed Bruner and Graburn, which started and legitimized the field of the Anthropology of Tourism (Tan, Cheung and Yang 2001; Yang, Chen and Zhang 2001). Many major scholars went to the USA and some to Europe and immediately translated and began to modify the concepts they learned, publishing many articles and textbooks on the tropic (Peng 2004; Zhang 2009). Within ten years, hundreds of researchers were trained in Kunming, Xiamen and Guangzhou etc., producing an academic stream which began to domesticate (*bentuhua*)

foreign concepts, and to direct the anthropology of tourism towards Chinese needs (Zhu, Jin and Graburn 2017).

As elsewhere these involved the protection and preservation of ethnic and cultural heritages, combined with applied efforts at reconstruction, revitalization, museum-building and ethnic performances in the service of cultural and economic development of ethnic and other marginalized minorities who lagged behind the rapid education and enrichment of the Han majority. One notable feature is the education and promotion of ethnic minority *minzu* peoples as professional anthropologists themselves, to teach, research and work on development through tourism (Graburn 2018a; Sa and Graburn 2018).

Japanese anthropologists cater to a relatively larger home public than in the West, and the vast majority of them are not trained abroad. Nearly all publication is in Japanese and not aimed at global cosmopolitan academics. Though it started, as in central and Eastern Europe, as a nationalist discipline (*minzokugaku* 民俗学, usually translated as Native ethnology of Folklore)searching for the origins and essence of Japaneseness, that ceased abruptly in 1945 because it was a component and supporter of the Imperialist war effort. After that, they broadened to a new discipline (also *minzokugaku*, 民族学 spelled with different characters, usually translated as Ethnology of Anthropology). But soon the Japanese were trained in the USA and took up the then prevalent psychological anthropology; they changed the name to *Jinruigaku*, 人類学 or Anthropology).

Like their western models, they began to massively pursue research overseas at the very time when Japanese were exporting all over the world. The earlier *minzokugaku* became known as Folklore or Native Anthropology. In the 1980s Japanese anthropologists abroad saw that Western anthropologists were studying the ubiquitous Japanese tourists as well as other tourists. So Prof. Shuzo Ishimori started a 3-year national seminar, for which I was employed in Osaka for over a year, to develope an anthropology of tourism so that Japanese could be the 'studying subject' and not just the 'studied object.'(Ishimori 1989, 2006). Other scholars such as Shinji Yamashita have taken the topic to a world level (1996; see also later) and most anthropologists of tourism are trained in Japan, but may pursue research overseas, including on heritage and tourism in England (Shioji 1997, 2003)!

3. *Do newly emerging tourism practices across the globe contribute to the intellectual discussion of the "decline of the West" and the "provincialization of Europe," or they are just further examples of westernization? Which future role do you see for anthropology and anthropologists in relation to tourism?*

None of our speakers suggests that Europe is being provincialized or that the West is in (academic) decline. The Cypriots, a former British colony, identify with the Anglophone mainstream and, if anything, reproduce themselves as victims of colonization. Eftichiou suggests that anthropologists may break this simple model by introducing reflexive awareness and opening new views. Barretto goes far beyond the purview of just Brazil and suggests that tourism and the study of tourism have spread rhizomatically, that is, without structure or boundaries, and that anthropologists can be the key people to follow and understand these postmodern developments. Skinner is more critical, noting that anthropologists often lose out to other more overt disciplines such as economics or development planning, because we have not developed a clear visible disciplinary or subsisciplinary vision of what we want to do. I suggest some of the answers may be found on the new book *Tourism Imaginaries at the Disciplinary Crossroads* (Gravari-Barbas and Graburn 2016)!

Prof. Sa also denies the decline of the global Western system. She asserts that technical advances, in transportation, accommodation and the internet, have hybridized most forms of tourism everywhere, leading to regional varieties of a universal system, which some call globalization. She suggests that anthropologists have already expanded their multiple roles into research, teaching, leadership and decision-making, and that they should also take up new roles as cultural transmitters and ambassadors. The strong and popular discipline of anthropology in Japan is perhaps a leader in many fields which, though held back by the esoteric uniqueness of the Japanese language, are models for the global profession.

I suggest just three:

a) *Research on Tourism and Disaster*, spurred by the 2011 Fukushima disaster, entails both the role of disaster as deterrent and as an attraction (e.g. massive volunteer tourism), and an Asia-wide project to pre-emptively research disaster preparedness for not only earthquakes, but tsunami, terrorism, fire and epidemics, spear-headed by a team led by Prof Shinji Yamashita (2012, 2016).

b) *'Contents Tourism'* – a Japanese word for internet-mediated tourisms based on popular-culture, folklore and history, such as *anime*, imagining virtual worlds and characters which young 'fans' may impose on unwary real places, then often coopted by commercial and municipal organizations. The key research unit in Hokkaido, led by Prof. Takayoshi Yamamura, is a model for collaborative research as this very creative tourism is spreading rapidly to Korea, China, Taiwan and the Americas, with fans and researchers also coming from as far as Europe and Brazil (Yamamura 2008, Seaton et al. 2017).

c) *Green- or Agro-tourism* is a special form of rural tourism, accommodating Japan's contemporary circumstances of weakened agriculture, aging populations and abandoning the countryside.Prof. Megumi Doshita has called this *sato-yama* [village-mountain] tourism because it focusses on the human-nature interface and tries to preserve village cultural and agricultural traditions as well as the knowledge and wise use of the forests beyond (Doshita 2012, 2014). I suggest that here, as in the previous two topics, Japan is a leader whose research as needed and is beginning to heard to in other countries such as China and Korea – and perhaps Europe - with the same future predicaments – a Non-Western source of globalization.

Conclusions

The "critical turn" in the social sciences and tourism studies, has identified the power differentials, the central sources and structural marginalization of certain segments. I called the cultural-geographical core the "Anglophone snake" – the remnants of Empire, as the academic network stretching through Scotland, England, Canada, United States, Hong

Kong, Australia, New Zealand and perhaps Israel (Graburn 2018b). One may suggest that the international Jewish academic network contributes to the expansion of this academia; it is one of the few which has consistently crossed linguistic boundaries especially in Europe and North America. One may say somewhat the same of the more educated strata of other former colonies including India, Pakistan, Malaysia, the Caribbean, parts of Africa and of Polynesia and Melanesia. Historically the Francophone world has collaborated with the Anglophone core, through translation and key bilingual persons. In the past three decades the non-Anglophone Europeans have almost universally became fluent enough to read English works and understand talks, whereas the reverse, Anglophone bilingualism, has sadly diminished. The Iberian world (Spanish and Portuguese speakers) ably represented here by multi-national Professor Margarita Barretto, resides mainly in the New World, and has been more attached to the francophone world, but, like China and Japan, it has its own 'critical mass' of teaching and research institutions and publications (Graburn, Barretto et al. 2009).

The non-Western (or non-European) educated, those trained outside the cosmopolitan educational systems, was previously known as the Developing World, but the concept of 'development' itself has come under severe criticism (Escobar 2011). It was also known as the III World, referring to the non-Western and the Non-Communist blocs in the Cold War. Recently North and South have become the relevant adjectives for this vague division. The post-colonial criticism of this world order has brought forth countermovements against "World Anthropology"; this movement is being taken very seriously through IUAES here and by the American Anthropological Association, which sponsored a volume with chapters each devoted to a regional/national "subaltern" anthropologies of tourism (Dominguez and Salazar 2017). The most resistance to "World Anthropology"comes from anti-colonial or anti-Western intellectuals who had to struggle to assert independent political power and to free themselves from the "Snake" and want to Retainthe leadership they achieved. This is not strongly represented here today.

Though Latin-Americans are leaders* who proposed independent non-hegemonic regional anthropologies, in the Anthropology of Tourism, the Spanish and Portuguese

world now has the self-confidence and numbers to form a critical but not antagonistic world of research and scholarship. In Cyprus, the miniscule anthropological tourism team encourages new paths to critical thinking. China is in part dependent on Western (Anglophone) training and ideas for tourism research, though now they are sending a few people to France. But, again, the critical mass is capable to adapting to China's particular needs in a huge country with its own problems of unequal development, heritage loss and fears of disunity. Japan, though once dependent on US hegemony, remains strong and is providing regional and world leadership in areas of heritage and tourism research where is already excels. Does this make Europe provincial or the West in decline? They do not think so, but they no longer feel dependent either.

References

Dominguez, Virginia and Noel Salazar (eds.)

2017 Special Issue on "Anthropologies of Tourism." *American Anthropologist* 119 (4).

Doshita, Megumi,

2012 *Satoyama kanko no shigen jinruigaku: Kyotofu miyamamachi no chiiki shinko*. [Resource management anthropology of Countryside Tourism: the Real Region of Miyama Town, Kyoto Prefecture]. Tokyo: Shin'yosha

2014 'Re-evaluating rural environments: rural tourism development in Japan', *Journal of Tourism Consumption and* Practice 6(1), p.28-51

Escobar, Arturo,

2011 Encountering Development: the making and unmaking of the third world. Princeton NJ: Princeton University Press

Graburn, Nelson

1983 *To Pray, Pay and Play: the Cultural Structure of Japanese Domestic Tourism*. Aix-en-Provence: Centre des Hautes Etudes Touristiques

1995 "The Past in the Present in Japan: Nostalgia and Neo-Traditionalism in Contemporary Japanese Domestic Tourism" Chapter 4, pp. 47-70 in Richard W. Butler and Douglas G. Pearce (eds.) *Changes in Tourism: People, Places, Processes* London: Routledge

1998 "Work and Play in the Japanese Countryside." In *The Culture of Japan as Seen Through Its Leisure*. Sepp Linhart and Sabine Freusteuck (eds.) New York: SUNY Press, pp. 195-12

2008 "The Past and the Other in the Present: *Kokunai kokusaika kanko* --'Domestic International Tourism'." Pp. 21-36 in Sylvie Guichard-Anguis and Moon, Ok Pyo (eds.). *Japanese Tourism and Travel Culture*. London: Routledge

2018a "Epilogue: Indigeneity, Researchers and Tourism" In *Cultural Tourism Movements: New Articulations of Indigenous Identity* U. Toronto Press. Alexis Bunten and Nelson Graburn (eds.)

2018b "Inside and Outside the Anglophone Snake."Pp. 27-48 in Magdalena Banaszkiewicz & Sabina Owsianowska (eds). *Anthropology of Tourism in Central and Eastern Europe Bridging Worlds*. **Boston:**Lexington Press

Graburn, Nelson, Barretto, Margarita, Carlos Alberto Steil, Rodrigo de Azeredo Grunewald; Rafael José dos Santos,

2009 *Turismo e antropologia: novas abordagens*. [Tourism and Anthropology: New Frontiers] Campinas: Papirus, (Cole..o Turismo)

Gravari-Barbas, Maria and Nelson Graburn (eds.)

2016 *Tourism Imaginaries at the Disciplinary Crossroads: Places, Practices, Media*. London: Routledge

Ishimori, Shuzo,

1989 "Popularization and Commercialization of Tourism in Early Modern Japan." Pp. 179-194 in Umesao, Tadao, M. Fruin and N Hata (eds.) *Japanese Civilization and the Modern World IV. Economic Institutions*. National Museum of Ethnology, Senri Ethnological Studies no. 26.

Ishimori, Shuzo (ed.).

1996 *Kanko no 20 seikai*. [Tourism in the 20th Century].Tokyo: Domesu Shuppan

Peng, Zhoarong,

2004 *Tourism Anthropology* [□□□□□] Beijing: Minzu Press [□□□□□]

Philip Seaton, T. Yamamura, Akiko Sugawa-Shimada and Kyungjae Jang,

2017 *Contents Tourism in Japan: Pilgrimages to "Sacred Sites" of Popular Culture*. Amherst: Cambria Press.

Sa Lusha and N Graburn, (2018) "Minority Scholars in Multi-cultural Nations." Gallery paper presented at the American Anthropological Association meetings, San Jose

Shioji, Yuko

1997 Myths of the English countryside: An Interpretation of the Language and Images of Tourist Brochures. *Language and Culture* 8: 183-200.
2003 *The Creating Englishness: Sensing boundaries and the Preservation of Cultural Heritage in the Cotswolds of England*. Tokyo: Akashi Shoten. [in Japanese]
Tan C. B., S. Cheung and Yang H. (eds.)
2001 *Tourism, Anthropology and China.* Bangkok: White Lotus Press
Yamamura, Takatoshi,
2008 'Study of birth and development of "sacred place for anime fans"." *Journal of International Media, Communication, and Tourism Studies* 7: 145-164.
Yamashita, Shinji,
2012 The Public anthropology of disaster: An introductory note. *Asian Anthropology* 11: 21-25.
2016 Disaster and Tourism: Tourism in the Aftermath of the Great East Japan Earthquake. *Asian Journal of Tourism Research* 1(2) 37-62 2016
1996 *Kanko Jinruigaku* [The Anthropology of Tourism] Tokyo: Shinyosha.
Yamashita, Shinji, J. S. Eades and Joseph Bosco (eds)
2004 *The Making of Anthropology in East and Southeast Asia*. New York: Berghahn
Yang Hui □□, Chen Zhiming □□□ et Zhang Zhanhong □□□(eds.),
2011 *Luyou, renleixue yu Zhongguo shehui* □□□□□□□□□[Tourism, Anthropology and China]. Kunming: Yunnan Daxue chubanshe.
Zhang, Xiaoping,
2009 *Anthropological Perspectives on Ethnic Tourism* [□□□□□□□□□], Kunming: Yunnan University Press.
Zhu, Yujie, Jin Lu and Nelson Graburn,
2017 "Domesticating Tourism Anthropology in China." *American Anthropologist* 119 (4): 730-35.

"Dentro e Fora da Cobra Anglófona - Alteridades e Hegemonias "

Nelson Graburn, U. da California, Berkeley e Tourism Studies Working Group

Muito obrigado por me convidar para comentar esta sess.o sobre "As Histórias Conceituais do Turismo". Este artigo explora a estrutura das antropologias mundiais do turismo e a globaliza..o do conceito de turismo, através dos trabalhos apresentados e através da experiência pessoal. Fui educado no estabelecimento anglófono da Kings School, em Canterbury, Cambridge, McGill e na Universidade de Chicago, embora tivesse rela..es familiares próximas em Malaya, Cingapura, Ceil.o [Sri Lanka] e Sicília, também fui exposto e identifiquei-me com ' alteridade' impelindo-me para a antropologia, depois de uma bem-sucedida carreira escolar nas Ciências Naturais. Desde ent.o tenho tido grandes compromissos com a antropologia do turismo no Jap.o desde 1974 e a China desde 1991, e a Europa Oriental desde 2014 e em menor medida na Franca (1980 em diante) e no Brasil (2007).

Deixe-me come.ar comentando brevemente sobre a variedade de respostas para cada uma das três perguntas. Eu complementarei isso com referência ao Jap.o, que tem um conjunto de conceitos mais resistentes e uma profiss.o antropológica mais autosuficiente do que os quatro casos apresentados até agora.

1. Como é que o conceito de turismo (principalmente anglófono e francês) tem viajado dentro de/para o contexto em que você vive e / ou trabalha? Ela impôs uma hegemonia discursiva de um léxico conceitual? Os conceitos nativos / locais foram transformados ou deslocados por essa globalização conceitual?

Fiquei surpreso com a relativa uniformidade das respostas aqui. O conceito geral

de turismo anglo / francês aplica-se sem media..o em todos os quatro países. Skinner aponta a evolu..o do conceito ao longo do tempo, à medida que o turismo se massificou e individualizou ao mesmo tempo, em paralelo à explica..o de Sa Lusha sobre a prolifera..o de nichos turísticos na China: turismo patrimonial, turismo étnico, turismo "vermelho" (patriótico) e agroturismo. Só ela traz o papel de elementos locais tradicionais na cria..o de hibridismos. Eftichiou ilumina o quadro enfatizando os novos conceitos de uso do tempo da modernidade ocidental, como a idéia de **lazer** separado do trabalho e a cria..o do imaginário mediterraneo no norte da Europa. A maioria das pessoas, ao que parece, vê o turismo como um negócio, um mal necessário a ser tolerado por suas contribui..es económicas. Eftichiou enfatiza, como fazem outros oradores posteriormente, o surgimento de esfor.os pró-ativos para combater os males e promover a sustentabilidade, proteger heran.as culturais e naturais, e buscar autenticidade (mais do que mera divers.o) especialmente em ambientes naturais e rurais.

O Jap.o permaneceu menos influenciado pelos conceitos ocidentais (Graburn 1983, 1995, 1998, 2008; Yamashita, Eades and Bosco 2004). Com uma longa história de turismo secular e religioso bem estruturado, o Jap.o ainda usa os conceitos de *kanko* (turismo visual, literalmente para iluminar *os olhados*), *kenbutsu* (passeio turístico), *tabi* ou *ryoko* (passeio, viagem) e também *junrei* ou *henro* (peregrina..o), muitas vezes usado em contextos seculares como em inglês. Embora o japonês incorpore um grande número de palavras estrangeiras, a palavra turismo, pronunciado *tsurisumis*, geralmente é usada apenas para formas "modernas", como turismo no exterior ou turismo relacionado à internet (ver adiante). A grande mudan.a nas últimas três décadas tem sido do esmagador turismo coletivo, geralmente por meio de transporte público e .nibus, até o turismo de carro em grupo pequeno / familiar de carro (maicar = carro pessoal).

2. Faça um breve esboço da genealogia da antropologia do turismo em seu país / região.

Quais temas estão atualmente "quentes" na antropologia do turismo com a qual você está familiarizado? Existem diferenças com a antropologia dominante (anglo-saxônica) do turismo?

Aqui as histórias diferem mais. Skinner identifica o *mainstream* – corrente principal - maci.o e hegem.nico do turismo europeu e americano e os desenvolvimentos acadêmicos, como uma sub-disciplina ou um conjunto de abordagens que foram difundidas para países n.o-anglófonos. Eftichiou responde que a pequena ex-col.nia de Chipre n.o conhece outra tradi..o, já que seus antropólogos vêm ou s.o educados no norte da Europa. Como eles, eles come.aram a examinar quest.es de património, meio ambiente, política e poder. Barretto apresenta um retrato rico e complexo para o Brasil (e Argentina e Uruguai) com mais de cem pesquisadores ativos. Nas últimas duas décadas, sem o predomínio da educa..o euro-americana no exterior, elas se tornaram mais reflexivas e preocupadas com os limites da mudan.a e do desenvolvimento. Eles levantaram preocupa..es críticas com renascimento cultural e preserva..o, e medidas anti-polui..o. Talvez mais criticamente do que os outros examinaram de perto quest.es trabalhistas e sentimentos anti-turismo. Mas ela afirma que, em geral, seguem o modelo intelectual anglo-sax.o.

Dra. Sa apresenta um quadro misto da China, mostrando que até 1999 os principais academicos encontraram o turismo étnico no campo e ouviram falar dos desenvolvimentos da antropologia do turismo anglófono. Em 1999 eles organizaram uma enorme conferência sobre Turismo, Antropologia, China, convidando Erik Cohen, Ed Bruner e eu, que iniciaram e legitimaram o campo da Antropologia do Turismo (Tan, Cheung and Yang 2001; Yang, Chen and Zhang 2001). Muitos dos principais academicos foram para os EUA e alguns para a Europa e imediatamente traduziram e come.aram a modificar os conceitos que aprenderam, publicando muitos artigos e livros didáticos sobre o tópico (Peng 2004; Zhang 2009). Em dez anos, centenas de pesquisadores foram treinados em Kunming, Xiamen e Guangzhou etc., produzindo uma corrente acadêmica que come.ou a domesticar (*bentuhua*) conceitos estrangeiros e a direcionar a antropologia do turismo para as necessidades chinesas (Zhu, Jin and Graburn 2017). Como em outros lugares, envolveu a prote..o e a preserva..o de heran.as étnicas e culturais, combinadas com

esfor.os aplicados na reconstru..o, revitaliza..o, constru..o de museus e performances étnicas a servi.o do desenvolvimento cultural e económico de minorias étnicas e outras minorias marginalizadas que ficaram para trás da educa..o rápida e enriquecimento da maioria Han. Uma característica notável é a educa..o e promo..o de minorias *minzu* como antropólogos profissionais próprios, para ensinar, pesquisar e trabalhar no desenvolvimento através do turismo (Graburn 2018a).

Os antropólogos japoneses atendem a um público maior em casa do que no Ocidente, e a grande maioria deles n.o é formado no exterior. Quase toda publica..o é em japonês e n.o direccionados à académicos cosmopolitas globais. Embora tenha come.ado, como na Europa central e oriental, como uma disciplina nacionalista (*minzokugaku*) em busca das origens e da essência da japaneidade, isso cessou abruptamente em 1945, porque era um componente e um defensor do esfor.o de guerra imperialista. Depois disso, os japoneses foram formados nos EUA, iniciando uma nova disciplina (*minzokugaku*, soletrada com caráteres diferentes) e assumiram a antropologia psicológica ent.o predominante; eles come.aram a procurar massivamente pequisa no estrangeiro ao mesmo tempo em que os japoneses exportavam para todo o mundo. O *minzokugaku* anterior ficou conhecido como Antropologia Folclórica ou Nativa. Nos anos 80, antropólogos japoneses no exterior viram que os antropólogos ocidentais estudavam os onipresentes turistas japoneses, assim como outros turistas. Assim, o Prof. Shuzo Ishimori iniciou um seminário nacional de 3 anos, para o qual trabalhei em Osaka por mais de um ano, para desenvolver uma antropologia do turismo para que os japoneses pudessem ser o 'sujeito estudado' e n.o apenas o 'objeto estudado' (Ishimori 1989, 2006). Outros academicos, como Shinji Yamashita, levaram o tópico a um nível mundial (veja mais adiante) e a maioria dos antropólogos do turismo s.o formados no Jap.o, mas podem fazer pesquisa no exterior, incluindo heran.a e turismo na Inglaterra (Shioji 1997, 2003)!

3. As novas práticas de turismo em todo o mundo contribuem para a discussão intelectual

do "declínio do Ocidente" e da "provincialização da Europa", ou são apenas mais exemplos de ocidentalização? Qual o papel futuro que você vê para antropologia e antropólogos em relação ao turismo?

Nenhum dos nossos oradores sugere que a Europa está sendo provincializada ou que o Ocidente está em declínio (académico). Os cipriotas, uma antiga colónia britanica, se identificam com o *mainstream* anglófono e se alguma coisa se reproduzem como vítimas. Eftichiou sugere que os antropólogos podem quebrar esse modelo simples ao introduzir a consciência reflexiva e abrir novas vis.es. Barretto vai muito além do alcance de só Brasil e sugere que o turismo e o estudo do turismo se espalharam rizomaticamente, isto é, sem estrutura ou fronteiras, e que os antropólogos podem ser as pessoas-chave a seguir e entender esses desenvolvimentos pós-modernos. Skinner é mais crítico, observando que os antropólogos muitas vezes perdem para outras disciplinas mais evidentes, como a economia ou o planejamento de desenvolvimento, porque n.o desenvolvemos uma vis.o disciplinar ou sub-disciplinar clara e visível do que queremos fazer. Sugiro que algumas das respostas possam ser encontradas no novo livro *Tourism Imaginaries*, *do Discplinary Crossroads* editado por mim e pela Maria Gravari-Barbas (2016)!

Sa Lusha também nega o declínio do sistema ocidental global. Ela afirma que os avan.os tecnológicos, no transporte, no alojamento e na internet, hibridizaram a maioria das formas de turismo em todos os lugares, levando a variedades regionais de um sistema universal, que alguns chamam de globaliza..o. Ela sugere que os antropólogos já expandiram seus múltiplos papéis em pesquisa, ensino, lideran.a e tomada de decis.es, e que eles também devem assumir novos papéis como transmissores e embaixadores culturais. A disciplina forte e popular da antropologia no Jap.o é talvez um líder em muitos campos que, embora limitados pela singularidade esotérica da língua japonesa, s.o modelos para a profiss.o global.

Eu sugiro apenas três:

a) *Pesquisa sobre Turismo e Desastres*, estimulada pelo desastre de Fukushima em 2011, envolve tanto o papel do desastre como desencorajador e atra..o (por exemplo, turismo voluntário em massa) e um projeto que abrange toda a ásia

para pesquisar preventivamente a prepara..o para desastres, n.o apenas para terramotos, mas também para tsunamis, terrorismo, incêndios e epidemias, equipa liderada por Shinji Yamashita (2012, 2016).

b) *"Contents Tourism"* - uma palavra japonesa para turismos mediados pela Internet baseados em cultura popular, folclore e história, como *anime*, muitas vezes imaginando mundos virtuais e personagens que os jovens "f.s" podem impor em lugares reais, ent.o frequentemente cooptados por organiza..es comerciais e munícipais. A principal unidade de pesquisa em Hokkaido, liderada pelo Prof. Takayoshi Yamamura, é um modelo de pesquisa colaborativa, pois esse turismo muito criativo está se espalhando rapidamente para a Coréia, China, Taiwan e Américas, com f.s e pesquisadores também vindos da Europa e Brasil (Yamamura 2008, Seaton et al. 2017).

c) *O turismo "verde" ecológico ou agro-turismo* é uma forma especial de turismo rural, acomodando as circunstancias contemporaneas do Jap.o de agricultura enfraquecida, envelhecimento das popula..es e o abandono do campo. Profa Megumi Doshita chamou este turismo *sato-yama* [aldeia-montanha] porque se concentra na interface homem-natureza e tenta preservar as tradi..es culturais e agricuturais das aldeias, bem como o conhecimento e uso sábio das florestas além (Doshita 2012, 2014). Sugiro que aqui, como nos dois tópicos anteriores, o Jap.o é um líder cuja pesquisa é necessária e está come.ando a ser ouvida em outros países, como China e Coréia - e talvez na Europa - com os mesmos problemas futuros - uma fonte n.o-ocidental da globaliza..o.

Conclusões

A "virada crítica" nas ciências sociais e estudos do turismo, identificou os diferenciais de poder, as fontes centrais e a marginaliza..o estrutural de certos segmentos. Eu chamei o o núcleo cultural-geográfico de "cobra anglófona" - os remanescentes do Império, como a rede académica que se estende pela Escócia, Inglaterra, Canadá, Estados Unidos, Hong

Kong, Austrália, Nova Zelandia e talvez Israel (Graburn 2018b). Pode-se sugerir que a rede acadêmica judaica internacional contribui para a expans.o dessa academia; é um dos poucos que atravessou fronteiras linguísticas de maneira consistente, especialmente na Europa e na América do Norte. Pode-se dizer um pouco o mesmo dos estratos com mais educa..o de outras ex-colónias, incluindo a índia, o Paquist.o, a Malásia, as Caraíbas, partes da áfrica, Polinésia e Melanésia. Historicamente, o mundo francófono colaborou com o núcleo anglófono, através da tradu..o e povos bilingues chaves. Nas últimas três décadas, os europeus n.o-anglófonos quase que universalmente se tornaram fluentes o suficiente para ler obras inglesas e entender as palestras, enquanto o inverso, o bilinguismo anglófono, infelizmente, diminuiu. O mundo ibérico (falantes de espanhol e português) habilmente representado aqui pela multinacional Margarita Barretto, reside principalmente no Novo Mundo, e tem sido mais ligado ao mundo francófono, mas, como a China e o Jap.o, tem sua própria 'massa crítica' de institui..es de ensino e pesquisa e publica..es (Graburn, Barretto et al. 2009).

Os educados n.o-ocidentais (ou n.o-europeus), aqueles treinados fora dos sistemas educacionais cosmopolitas, eram anteriormente conhecidos como o Mundo em Desenvolvimento, mas o próprio conceito de "desenvolvimento" sofreu severas críticas (Escobar 2011). Era também conhecido como o III Mundo, referindo-se aos blocos ocidentais e n.o-comunistas na Guerra Fria. Recentemente, o Norte e o Sul tornaram-se os adjetivos relevantes para essa divis.o vaga. A crítica pós-colonial desta ordem mundial tem trazido contra-movimentos contra a "Antropologia Mundial"; Este movimento está sendo levado muito a sério através do IUAES aqui e da American Anthropological Association, quepatrocinou um volume com capítulos dedicados a antropologias "subalternas" regionais /nacionais do turismo (Dominguez and Salazar 2017). A maior resistência à "Antropologia Mundial" vem de políticas anti-coloniais ou intelectuais anti-ocidentais que tiveram que lutar para afirmar o poder político independente e libertar-se da "Cobra" e querem manter a lideran.a que alcan.aram. Isto n.o é fortemente representado aqui hoje.

Embora os latino-americanos sejam líderes que prop.em antropologias regionais n.o hegemónicas independentes, na antropologia do turismo, o mundo espanhol

e português agora tem a autoconfian.a e os números para formar um mundo crítico, mas n.o antagónico, de pesquisa e estudo. Em Chipre, a minúscula equipe de turismo antropológico incentiva novos caminhos para o pensamento crítico. A China depende, em parte, da forma..o e das idéias ocidentais (anglófonos) para a pesquisa em turismo, embora agora estejam enviando algumas pessoas para a Fran.a. Mas, novamente, a massa crítica é capaz de se adaptar às necessidades específicas da China em um país enorme, com seus próprios problemas de desenvolvimento desigual, perda de património e temores de desuni.o. O Jap.o, embora antes dependente da hegemonia dos EUA, continua forte e está fornecendo lideran.a regional e mundial em áreas de pesquisa de património e turismo, onde já é excelente. Isso faz a Europa provincial ou o Ocidente em declínio? Eles n.o pensam assim, mas já n.o se sentem dependentes também.

Referências citadas

Graburn, Nelson, Barretto, Margarita, Carlos Alberto Steil, Rodrigo de Azeredo Grunewald; Rafael José dos Santos,

2009 *Turismo e antropologia: novas abordagens*. [Tourism and Anthropology: New Frontiers] Campinas: Papirus, (Cole..o Turismo)

Dominguez, Virginia and Noel Salazar (eds.)

2017 Special Issue on "Anthropologies of Tourism." *American Anthropologist* 119 (4

Doshita, Megumi,

2012 *Satoyama kanko no shigen jinruigaku : Kyotofu miyamamachi no chiiki shinko*. [Resource management anthropology of Countryside Tourism: the Real Region of Miyama Town, Kyoto prefecture]. Tokyo: Shin'yosha

2014 'Re-evaluating rural environments: rural tourism development in Japan', *Journal of Tourism Consumption and* Practice 6(1), p.28-51

Escobar, Arturo,

2011 Encountering Development: the making and unmaking of the third world. Princeton NJ: Princeton University Press

Graburn, Nelson

1983 *To Pray, Pay and Play: the Cultural Structure of Japanese Domestic Tourism*. Aix-en-Provence: Centre des Hautes Etudes Touristiques

1995 "The Past in the Present in Japan: Nostalgia and Neo-Traditionalism in Contemporary Japanese Domestic Tourism" Chapter 4, pp. 47-70 in Richard W. Butler and Douglas G. Pearce (eds.) *Changes in Tourism: People, Places, Processes* London: Routledge

1998 "Work and Play in the Japanese Countryside." In *The Culture of Japan as Seen Through Its Leisure*. Sepp Linhart and Sabine Freusteuck (eds.) New York: SUNY Press, pp. 195-12

2008 "The Past and the Other in the Present: *Kokunai kokusaika kanko* --'Domestic International Tourism'." Pp. 21-36 in Sylvie Guichard-Anguis and Moon, Ok Pyo (eds.). *Japanese Tourism andTravel Culture*. London: Routledge

2018a "Epilogue: Indigeneity, Researchers and Tourism" In *Cultural Tourism Movements: New Articulations of Indigenous Identity* U. Toronto Press. Alexis Bunten and Nelson Graburn (eds.)

2018b "Inside and Outside the Anglophone Snake." Pp. 27-48 in Magdalena Banaszkiewicz & Sabina Owsianowska (eds). *Anthropology of Tourism in Central and Eastern Europe Bridging Worlds*. Boston: Lexington Press

Gravari-Barbas, Maria and Nelson Graburn (eds.)

2016 *Tourism Imaginaries at the Disciplinary Crossroads: Places, Practices, Media*. London: Routledge

Ishimori, Shuzo,

1989 "Popularization and Commercialization of Tourism in Early Modern Japan." Pp. 179-194 in Umesao, Tadao, M. Fruin and N Hata (eds.) *Japanese Civilization and the Modern World IV. Economic Institutions*. National Museum of Ethnology, Senri Ethnological Studies no. 26.

Ishimori, Shuzo (ed.).

1996 *Kanko no 20 seikai*. [Tourism in the 20th Century].Tokyo: Domesu Shuppan

Peng, Zhoarong,

2004 *Tourism Anthropology* [□□□□□] Beijing: Minzu Press [□□□□□]

Philip Seaton, T. Yamamura, Akiko Sugawa-Shimada and Kyungjae Jang,

2017 *Contents Tourism in Japan: Pilgrimages to "Sacred Sites" of Popular*

Culture. Amherst: Cambria Press.

Shioji, Yuko

1997 Myths of the English countryside: An Interpretation of the Language and Images of Tourist Brochures. *Language and Culture* 8: 183-200.

2003 *The Creating Englishness: Sensing boundaries and the Preservation of Cultural Heritage in the Cotswolds of England*. Tokyo: Akashi Shoten. [in Japanese]

Tan C. B., S. Cheung and Yang H. (eds.)

2001 *Tourism, Anthropology and China*. Bangkok: White Lotus Press

Zhang, Xiaoping,

2009 *Anthropological Perspectives on Ethnic Tourism* [□□□□□□□□□], Kunming: Yunnan University Press.

Zhu, Yujie, Jin Lu and Nelson Graburn,

2017 "Domesticating Tourism Anthropology in China." *American Anthropologist* 119 (4): 730-3