

WORLD ANTHROPOLOGIES

Foreword

Anthropologies of Tourism: What's in a Name?

Noel B. Salazar

University of Leuven, Belgium

In 2001 a group of engaged anthropologists, the majority from Latin America, launched the Red de Antropologías del Mundo—World Anthropologies Network (WAN 2003). Arturo Escobar defines world anthropologies as “an approach intended to de-essentialize anthropology and to pluralize anthropological inquiry by building on non-hegemonic anthropological practices” (2008, 12). The world anthropologies framework is deeply influenced by the awareness of hierarchical relations in knowledge production marked by the historical construction of canons of expertise established by the powers that be (Ribeiro and Escobar 2006). World anthropologies are contrasted with “national anthropological traditions” (WAN 2003, 266) as “other anthropologies and anthropology otherwise” (Restrepo and Escobar 2005). The various contributions to the World Anthropologies section of *American Anthropologist* and the long bibliography compiled by AAA’s Committee on World Anthropologies (CWA 2016) showcase the various directions in which the ideas of world anthropologies have been taken.

What if we would apply this line of thinking to a subfield of the discipline—namely, the anthropology of tourism? Given that (historical) anthropological ideas have greatly influenced contemporary tourism (Salazar 2013), the question is less trivial than it seems. When consulting books that give an overview of the anthropology of tourism (Chambers 2010; Nash 1996), there seems to be general agreement about a canon of authors and works. Authoritative edited volumes are only slightly more “diverse” (Scott and Selwyn 2010; Smith [1977] 1989; Smith and Brent 2001). Dennison Nash opens *The Study of Tourism: Anthropological and Sociological Beginnings* by stating that “we are dealing here with a small aspect of Western intellectual history” and that “despite an increasing involvement of scholars in the non-Western world, it continues to be dominated by Europeans and North Americans” (2007, 1). The first statement indicates that mainstream scholarship seems mostly unaware of “Other” anthropologies of tourism out there. The second statement is probably true, but it does not justify neglecting nonhegemonic views.

Is it correct to state that “the serious and continuing consideration of tourism as a social scientific subject began only a half century or so ago in the West” (Nash 2007, 20)? What does this geographic marking mean in the context

of people’s mobility across borders? The flagship journal of tourism studies, *Annals of Tourism Research*, was founded in 1973 by Iranian anthropologist Jafar Jafari (a Spanish-language version followed twenty-five years later). Jafari became interested in anthropology while guiding Margaret Mead and Gregory Bateson around Isfahan. Under his inspiration and initiative, the International Academy for the Study of Tourism (IAST) came into being in 1988. While IAST has had members from around twenty different nationalities, almost all speak English as a first or second language (Dann 2009).

In general, language is a major barrier in the circulation of knowledge also concerning anthropology and tourism. English remains the dominant scholarly language with a global reach. This hegemonic position is reinforced by the dominant position and ranking of English-language journals and publishers. Non-native scholars who do not publish and present in English or whose work is not translated will have a limited global audience. Even within the English-speaking world, there are clear hierarchies. Tourism-related work produced in India (Srivastava and Pandey 2012), for example, will receive much less attention than publications from North America, the United Kingdom, or Oceania. This relationship between knowledge and power goes, of course, way beyond anthropology.

When I was a graduate student, I was constantly on the lookout for “alter-native” anthropological sources on tourism. I read many books in French and was particularly inspired by the work of anthropologists such as Jean-Didier Urbain (1994) and Franck Michel (2000). I was glad to discover the overviews by Agustín Santana (1997) and Alessandro Simonicca (1997). Even though both works mainly discussed hegemonic Anglo-Saxon models, at least they offered their own respective Spanish and Italian interpretations of them, occasionally enriched with insights from scholarship produced in their native languages. The book by David Lagunas (2007), published a decade later, showed that the situation had not changed much. Other overviews of the field have appeared around the globe, in countries as diverse as Brazil (Graburn et al. 2009), India (Srivastava and Pandey 2012), Iran (Moghaddam 2012), Mexico (Oemichen 2013), and Poland (Owsianowska and Winiarski 2016). On the invitation of a little-known Colombian journal, I published a review article in Spanish (Salazar 2006). It is widely known and used in the Spanish-speaking world, but hardly outside of it (it was never published in English).

It is difficult to assess the situation globally because anthropology as a discipline is variously positioned and integrated in different countries. In Germany, for instance, ethnology is a more common denominator (GATE 2005), whereas in countries such as Poland, the distinction between anthropology and sociology is not always that clear (Podemski 2004; Rancew-Sikora 2009). This points to the fact that there is not only a language issue. A close analysis of where new theories and methodologies are being produced reveals even more hierarchy and inequality within academia, also within the hegemonic countries. Scholars at top-ranked research-intensive universities have much more time and resources to devote to thinking and writing than those who work at institutions where teaching takes up virtually all the time that is available and research is often done only “on demand” (e.g., by government authorities). In most of the developing world, the latter situation is the norm. This leads to a situation whereby most of what is taught, particularly concerning theoretical frameworks, are translations from works produced at the powerhouses of academia.

While dominant ideas in English circulate more easily, the opposite is true when it comes to the spread of non-hegemonic scholarship (despite the opportunities offered by new information and communication technologies). Moreover, a planet-wide reach is not always envisioned, particularly not when the language community is sufficiently large. Think of Spanish, Portuguese, and French as well as Chinese, Japanese, or Korean. Notable exceptions include the English translation of Shinji Yamashita’s (2003) monograph, *Bali and Beyond*. His Japanese reference work on the anthropology of tourism, however, was not translated (Yamashita 1996). Chinese scholars have been quite prolific (Peng 2004; Zhang and Li 2008), but very little of this is published in languages other than Mandarin. Interestingly, the *International Journal of Tourism Anthropology*, a peer-reviewed English-language journal edited in China, is one of the few venues through which dialogue is possible (but, paradoxically, it gives little room to Chinese colleagues).

There is also the thorny issue of “methodological nationalism” (Amelina et al. 2012). Indeed, there is the implicit assumption that the “differences” in world anthropologies are to be found between nation-states. In reality, the anthropologists who are most active across borders (including “world anthropologists”) are, in many cases, the least “national(istic).” Their career trajectories show increasing transnational academic mobility rather than a firm embeddedness in any “national tradition.” In fact, many have studied at or are affiliated with institutes in countries that are seen as more hegemonic in the world of anthropology. Is it a coincidence that the authors of the pieces that compose this special section on the anthropology of tourism all have personal (hi)stories of academic mobility?

Italian anthropologist Claudio Milano is based in Spain and scrutinizes how Spanish anthropologists have studied tourism (particularly of the community-based kind) in Latin America. His contribution nicely illustrates that academia

has more than one hegemonic center. Mexican anthropologist Ángeles A. López Santillán, currently working in Puerto Rico, describes how the Mexican way of studying tourism has been greatly influenced by the process of nation building and the development of anthropology as a discipline in the country. In the last contribution, a British anthropologist based in the United States (Nelson Graburn) and two Chinese colleagues (Yujie Zhu and Lu Jin), who have all been quite mobile, analyze how processes of pluralization and de-essentialization have enabled Chinese anthropologists to “domesticate” the internationally accepted canon. These three contributions give us just a taste of the diversity of contexts in which anthropologists around the globe are studying tourism (and beyond).

REFERENCES CITED

- Amelina, Anna, Devrim Sel D. Nergiz, Thomas Faist, and Nina Glick Schiller, eds. 2012. *Beyond Methodological Nationalism: Research Methodologies for Cross-Border Studies*. London: Routledge.
- Chambers, Erve. 2010. *Native Tours: The Anthropology of Travel and Tourism*. Long Grove, IL: Waveland Press.
- CWA (Committee on World Anthropologies). 2016. “Bibliography on World Anthropologies.” Washington, DC: CWA Subcommittee on Teaching and Research, American Anthropological Association.
- Dann, Graham. 2009. “How International is the International Academy for the Study of Tourism?” *Tourism Analysis* 14: 3–13.
- Escobar, Arturo. 2008. *Territories of Difference: Place, Movements, Life, Redes*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- GATE (Gemeinsamer Arbeitskreis Tourismus und Ethnologie). 2005. *Ethnologie und Tourismus: Chancen, Perspektiven und Voraussetzungen für eine verstärkte Zusammenarbeit* [Ethnology and tourism: Opportunities, perspectives, and requirements for a stronger collaboration]. Berlin: Gemeinsamer Arbeitskreis Tourismus und Ethnologie.
- Graburn, Nelson H. H., Margarita Barretto, Carlos Alberto Steil, Rodrigo de Azeredo Grünwald, and Rafael José dos Santos, eds. 2009. *Turismo e antropología: Novas abordagens* [Tourism and anthropology: New approaches]. Campinas: Papirus.
- Lagunas, David. 2007. *Antropología y turismo: Claves culturales y disciplinares* [Anthropology and tourism: Cultural and disciplinary keywords]. Mexico City, Mexico: Plaza y Valdés.
- Michel, Franck. 2000. *Désirs d’ailleurs: Essai d’anthropologie des voyages* [Desires of elsewhere: An essay on the anthropology of travel]. Paris: Armand Colin.
- Moghaddam, Amir H. 2012. *Anthropology of Tourism*. Mazandaran: Maziar University.
- Nash, Dennison. 1996. *Anthropology of Tourism*. Bingley: Emerald Group Publishing Limited.
- Nash, Dennison. 2007. *The Study of Tourism: Anthropological and Sociological Beginnings*. Amsterdam: Elsevier.
- Oemichen, Cristina, ed. 2013. *Enfoques antropológicos sobre el turismo contemporáneo* [Anthropological approaches to contemporary tourism]. Mexico City, Mexico: UNAM-IIA.

- Owsianowska, Sabina, and Ryszard Winiarski, eds. 2016. *Antropologia Turystyki* [Tourism anthropology]. Krakow: Wydawnictwo AWF w Krakowie.
- Peng, Zhaorong. 2004. *Anthropology of Tourism*. Beijing: Ethnic Publishing House.
- Podemski, Krzysztof. 2004. *Socjologia Podróży* [Sociology of travel]. Poznan: UAM.
- Rancew-Sikora, Dorota. 2009. *Podróż i Miejsce w Perspektywie Antropologicznej* [Travel and place in anthropological perspective]. Gdansk: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Gdanskiego.
- Restrepo, Eduardo, and Arturo Escobar. 2005. "Other Anthropologies and Anthropology Otherwise': Steps to a World Anthropologies Framework." *Critique of Anthropology* 25 (2): 99–129.
- Ribeiro, Gustavo Lins, and Arturo Escobar, eds. 2006. *World Anthropologies: Disciplinary Transformations within Systems of Power*. Oxford: Berg.
- Salazar, Noel B. 2006. "Antropología del turismo en países en desarrollo: Análisis crítico de las culturas, poderes e identidades generados por el turismo" [Anthropology of tourism in developing countries: A critical analysis of the cultures, powers, and identities generated by tourism]. *Tabula Rasa: Revista de Humanidades* 5:99–128.
- Salazar, Noel B. 2013. "Imagineering Otherness: Anthropological Legacies in Contemporary Tourism." *Anthropological Quarterly* 86 (3): 669–96.
- Santana, Agustín. 1997. *Antropología y turismo ¿Nuevas hordas, viejas culturas?* [Anthropology and tourism: New hordes, old cultures?]. Barcelona: Ariel.
- Scott, Julie, and Tom Selwyn, eds. 2010. *Thinking Through Tourism*. Oxford: Berg.
- Simonica, Alessandro. 1997. *Antropologia del turismo: Strategie di ricerca e contesti etnografici* [Anthropology of tourism: Research strategies and ethnographic contexts]. Rome: Carocci.
- Smith, Valene L., ed. (1977) 1989. *Hosts and Guests: The Anthropology of Tourism*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Smith, Valene L., and Mary Ann Brent, eds. 2001. *Hosts and Guests Revisited: Tourism Issues of the 21st Century*. New York: Cognizant Communication Corporation.
- Srivastava, Anupama, and Keya Pandey. 2012. *Anthropology and Tourism*. New Delhi: Serials Publications.
- Urbain, Jean-Didier. 1994. *L'Idiot du voyage: Histoires de touristes* [The travel idiot: Tourist histories]. Paris: Éditions Payot & Rivages.
- WAN (World Anthropologies Network). 2003. "A Conversation about a World Anthropologies Network." *Social Anthropology* 11 (2): 265–69.
- Yamashita, Shinji, ed. 1996. *The Anthropology of Tourism*. Tokyo: Shinyosha.
- Yamashita, Shinji. 2003. *Bali and Beyond: Explorations in the Anthropology of Tourism*. Translated by J. S. Eades. New York: Berghahn.
- Zhang, Xiaoping, and Wei Li. 2008. *Anthropology and Tourism*. Nankai: Nankai University Press.

Essay

Development, Power, and Exclusionary Politics: Tracing Articulations of Scale in Tourism Production in Mexico

Ángeles A. López Santillán

CIESAS Peninsular, Mexico

Nobody today can avoid recognizing the structural and symbolic power of tourism in constituting different types of modernity. In the past decade, we have seen scholars posing different kinds of epistemological questions within the anthropology of tourism. People have debated the complex structuration and market-driven dynamism of the tourist industry, the varying conditions of its objects of study (such as places, goods, consumers, service providers, and symbolic interactions), the value chains and their markets, and the complexity of the representations that the industry mobilizes, including questions about ethics in patterns of production and consumption. In addition, people have questioned the relevance of theories, methods, and issues related to the public in its generation of knowledge about this phenomenon.¹

But is it possible to speak of epistemic communities when it comes to studies of tourism? Noel Salazar takes up the issue of world anthropologies as articulated by Ribeiro and Escobar (2006) and invites us to discuss the conditions

posed by a plural anthropology and the question of what they term "diversality" in the study of tourism.² In light of this, my essay asks if it is possible to trace the influences of this global phenomenon in this scholarly community just as we trace such things in the social contexts in which tourism materializes itself. Here I approach Mexican anthropology of tourism as a product of situated knowledge (Santos 2006; Ribeiro and Escobar 2006), a kind of knowledge in which we can identify the conditions of tourism on the ground at the same time that it shows the historical characteristics of this epistemic community (cf. Krotz 2006).

I think there is an inextricable connection between the conditions entailed in tourismification as a development project in Mexico and the anthropological foci generated in the process. Even if Mexican anthropology of tourism is a recent field of inquiry, I note here that ethnographic research in this area can be linked to the study of state formation in Mexico and, through this, to the particularities of tourism production. This is a complex trajectory that is inevitably linked to the development of anthropology in Mexico as well. That is, tourism was established as a national development project (Brenner and Aguilar 2002; Bringas 2002;

Clancy 1999, 2001; Jiménez 1992) that built on a previous pattern of solidifying national heritage. This pattern of valuing Mexican heritage pervaded many institutions, especially those state agencies charged with protecting and advancing the patrimony, in which anthropology played a significant role. Here I include the National Institute of Anthropology and History (INAH in Spanish), the former National Indigenist Institute (INI in Spanish), and many other institutions (Florescano 2003; Gamio [1916] 1992; Krotz 2006).

At the same time that the political economy of tourism in Mexico is relevant to anthropological analysis, the main axes of broader disciplinary thought in the country still appear as substantive themes in the subfield of tourism research in Mexico. I therefore suggest that Mexican studies in the anthropology of tourism tend to be concerned with the three main epistemological branches of Mexican anthropology, as suggested by Krotz (2006), which I summarize here as studies of ethnicity and social class, studies of social change, and applied anthropology. Generally, Mexican anthropology has tended to focus on the analysis of the country's cultural diversity and on the conditions of social life and social structure in Mexico, including a long-standing concern with ethnicity and social class. Studies of social change tend to emphasize development and uneven development, and often display angst about the tensions between tradition and modernity, the latter represented as an unstoppable, destructive force. Because Mexican anthropology has maintained itself as a space of criticism, applied anthropology has been held as a field of collaboration between anthropologists and different kinds of institutions or social groups.

Recent studies show a range of social processes connected to tourism. These works can also be considered pieces of the puzzle presented by the active promotion of tourism as a project of development (understood as operating under the aegis of the state) in Mexico. All of them illustrate the conditions that produce inequality in this arena and a continuum of different forms of articulation among a wide range of social agents.

DISPOSSESSION, UNEVEN DEVELOPMENT, HERITAGE, AND ETHNICITY: THEMES IN THE STUDY OF TOURISM IN MEXICO

Development critique and the commodification of heritage are key issues in the anthropological study of tourism in Mexico. The tourism industry emerged as a national development project in the 1960s when the Inter-American Development Bank recommended that Mexico implement it as a form of economic development and financed projects focusing on Mexico's shores. Since then, the state has taken control over this production at all levels and regions of the country, enabling Mexico to become the only Latin American country appearing on the United Nations World Tourism Organization's (UNWTO) list of top ten global destinations.

Although I only offer a small selection of works in the anthropology of tourism in Mexico here, these studies illustrate the kind of research being done in the field. I

only include works by Mexican authors who study Mexico, including a couple of important dissertations or theses.

Ramírez Sevilla (1992) did a pioneering study of Tenacatita Bay, along the southern coast of the state of Jalisco, analyzing how collective land (*ejido*) tenants in El Rebalsito lost parts of their land after the Mexican government decided to promote the development of beach resorts for big Mexican investors and foreigners. Ramírez focused especially on the conditions that facilitated dispossession of *ejido* plots—namely, the alliances that developed between local elite groups and regional elites, articulated with different authorities in the state of Jalisco. While the Mexican government initially paid compensation to tenants alienated from the land, state authorities began threatening those who resisted dispossession of their plots. The illegal alienation of land occurred at different times, displacing people with long-standing ties to it. Infiltrating and co-opting groups and sending death threats have been common strategies for dispossessing land in Mexico (López Santillán 2010a; Marín 2015). Even though Ramírez, and, subsequently, his daughter, Ramírez Corona (2015), failed to problematize the topic of tourism itself, both show how social groups with scarce accumulated capital become vulnerable to the violence introduced by alliances involving local elites, groups with political power, and real estate businesses throughout the region and the country.³

Del Angel (2005) also found violent dispossession of land in Punta de Mita, Nayarit, a region close to Puerto Vallarta Bay, also in the state of Jalisco. Even though Del Angel fails to develop the regional connections of this phenomenon, he offers eyewitness testimony regarding a violent dawn when people in Corral del Risco were removed from their homes. This small-scale fishing community, consisting of people who lived on coconut and fruit trees as well as general subsistence agriculture, was removed from a paradise-like beach settlement to enable the construction of Four Seasons Punta Mita, now one of the most luxurious hotels in Mexico, which includes a state-of-the-art golf course designed by Jack Nicklaus. While the Four Seasons quickly achieved global fame, Punta Mita fishermen were displaced and sent to a new location lacking access to productive lands. They now earn a living by supplementing fishing with work in nautical tourism. Del Angel's account is important because it highlights the despair of these families caused by their forced relocation and by the subsistence strategies that are now functioning within a highly competitive industry thriving on their precarity.

In my own work on the Mexican Caribbean coast, I find myself participating fully in criticism of development as a relevant paradigm in the analysis of tourism in the euphemistically called "Global South" (López Santillán 2010a; López Santillán and Marín 2010; Salazar 2006). Through historical ethnography, I explain how the production of tourist space is entangled with the historical production of lived space and social relations in Hoyo Oscuro (a pseudonym) (López Santillán 2010a). My study connects with central

axes of Mexican anthropology, namely, its regional focus and its analysis of class and the relevance of social actors as “brokers.” I do this in order to explain the different political and economic articulations that create tourist spaces. These include the market-driven dispossession of ejidos, the commodification of images and experiences, social and economic changes due to local production yielding to the Tertiary Sector, and the coordination of state institutions that reproduce discursive formations like “ecosystem protection” and “wildlife management” that favor businesses and capital connected to tourism (López Santillán 2010a, 2010b).

In my work, I document the hierarchical structure of mediation that shapes tourism (López Santillán 2010a, 29). I look at local brokers trying to articulate their own interests with those of big (national) capital investors while making local people consent to these developments. I argue that this move makes it legally possible for fragmentation, individuation, and alienation of ejidos. At the same time, this negotiation and mediation favors the genesis and consolidation of disputes vis-à-vis dissidents who oppose the corrupt process altogether. While brokers band together to present themselves as promoters of progress and as visionaries who open people’s eyes to “development,” they feed the view that those opposing these plans are “retrogrades.” Money and development are contested values among different groups of local people. The argument has led to continuous hostilities toward those groups that try to assert their right to collective property, environmental concerns, or common benefits over individual sale of land. All these people have also called into question the type of touristic development that was proposed by the investors. In this sense, struggles over space are an expression of struggles over representation (López Santillán 2010a, 423–28).

On the other hand, there are also different anthropological approaches that reveal different conditions of the exercise of power, unequal development, and the microsociety. There are many studies related to ethnicity in general but also in Mexico in particular. However, I want to highlight two significant works. One is representative of work on rural–urban migration and a sociological concern with marginality and poverty. The other focuses on the (re)production of ethnicity in the context of tourism and notes development projects in which there is paternalism and exploitation vis-à-vis said ethnic groups.

Fraga (2012) examines how Mayan migrants from Sotuta, Kantunil, Peto, and Tikul (in the Yucatan) came to settle and change their way of life in Ciudad Chemuyil, on the Quintana Roo coast. Ciudad Chemuyil functions as the “backstage” of tourism along the Riviera Maya. Local politicians call cities like this, including Cancun, “support cities” for centers of tourism. Chemuyil itself is quite disconnected from tourism’s “frontstage” and looks more like a case of peri-urbanization. It is where workers employed at Akumal and another seven nearby tourist locations live. As Fraga describes through the words of an informant, “the

hard work is all done by Mayans.” This includes work as gardeners, cooks, masons, bricklayers, waiters, bellboys, and busboys—work that is made invisible to consumers at the frontstage of tourism where luxury goods and services are offered. In the back, of course, the peri-urban settlement consists of housing without access to health services or schooling and small dwellings without food gardens like they had in their original villages. These people also suffer from living in the midst of general violence and drug dealing.

Especially interesting to Fraga is how these migrants adopt modernity (despite experiencing a number of conflicts as they become deterritorialized) at the same time that they bring with them many expectations of economic progress that are not necessarily met due to their precarious work conditions and their low wages. Nonetheless, the people of Chemuyil have better living conditions (probably because of their extensive support networks) than many other migrants of Mayan origin who settle in Playa del Carmen or Cancun. These are places in which many men who work in the construction industry and the low-paying service sector commit suicide, and this is a phenomenon that no anthropologist or sociologist has tackled.⁴

Fierro (2015) highlights how Mayan traditional handicrafts are commodified in two “classy” spaces close to Merida, Yucatan. Through a microscale analysis, her work alerts us to the contradictory effects of actions taken by hegemonic agents who seek to integrate the female labor force in hacienda touring. Former sisal haciendas in the Yucatan (as well as other kinds of haciendas in the rest of the country) have become high-end boutique hotels. Fierro’s study shows how one of the richest families in Mexico creates and coordinates civil organizations (NGOs) that work to promote women’s labor through artisan work, which is offered for consumption in these tourist venues. Through skill building and social coordination, these artisan women and their handicrafts become part of the scenery (and scene making) in these hotels. Fierro claims this process has empowered women and brought them the possibility of having new positions and conditions of hierarchical interactions in the towns of Temozon and Santa Rosa, though she does not offer us a lot of detail, except that some women learn to use these financial projects to keep their artisanal production groups going.

It is, nonetheless, noteworthy that Fierro found something similar to Lisa Breglia (2006, cited in Fierro 2015, 68)—namely, that the groups of women they studied maintain hierarchical relations of social distance and patronage in their face-to-face relations with the investors and cultural mediators of the NGOs they are associated with at the hotels. Although this is more suggestive than probative, it raises the question of how to value the selective empowerment of different groups given the contexts in which self-subordination and exploitation are connected to an ethnic identity.

A final case I want to mention is work by Zúñiga (2012), who focuses on institutional relations that articulate well with the making of Mexican historical heritage, whether

cultural or intangible. The Totonacapan case from Veracruz described by Zúñiga is unique in demonstrating how a broad region in the state of Veracruz turns into a pastiche of cultural elements and landscapes in which archaic and living Indigenous cultures are treated as symbols of regional and national identity. The northern part of Veracruz includes the Totonac and Huastec cultural regions, and the population of Papantla, in particular, includes El Tajin, one of the most important archaeological sites in the country, which is designated as a UNESCO World Heritage Site. The Totonacapan and Huastec regions function as a tourist cluster offering many things, including coastline, forest/jungle, mountains, magical towns and people, an archaeological site, cultural and gastronomic diversity, ecotourism, adventure tourism, economic traditions (that include the production of vanilla), invented traditions, and ancient traditions (such as the fertility ritual of Voladores in Papantla, designated by UNESCO as intangible cultural heritage). Adding to this, the Tajin Convention (Cumbre Tajin) was created in 2000 as a tourism mega-event to celebrate the region's identity.

Zúñiga does not include local groups' vision of all this, especially how they have been displaced from the whole dynamic of cultural commodification, even though he describes the creation of the Tajin Convention as an identitarian whim developed by the governors of the state of Veracruz and how, through this event, they diversified the landscape and attracted investors. Here the governors of the state of Veracruz and agents of five municipalities present themselves as the main actors in the commercialization of the region. They leave the Indigenous communities at the margins of the whole process, including the benefits that may arise from the use of their own culture in these touristic presentations of the region. In sum, governmental actors benefit financially from the emphasis on national heritage, including the INAH, which made the request to UNESCO and benefits from the celebrations that take place at El Tajin.

These examples illustrate how the geopolitics of tourism transform and reorder social life in different localities, and how, in many cases, they dismiss, displace, or ignore communities' own goods or their conditions of reproduction. In general, local groups maintain high expectations for the productivity of tourism. People tend to believe in the possibility of access to the labor market and modernity, hoping they will leave behind "backwardness" and poverty imposed on them by sociohistorical forces. Undoubtedly, the development of tourism requires one to unravel the mechanisms of insertion, change, and participation of the human groups living in the places in which tourism materializes as a significant force.

FINAL COMMENTS

I want to emphasize one basic idea here: that the analysis of tourism and development is, and will remain, a matter of discussion for the Third World and emerging economies (López Santillán 2010a, 41; López Santillán and Marín 2010). In contrast to what some authors have argued (Meethan 2001), I believe that it is valid and necessary to analyze the issue

of development in studies of tourism. It leads to a better understanding of the role of the state as an agent in tourism production. It takes us away from dislocated subjectivities that are in flux and leads us closer to a direct transformation of the local through analyses of power relations, the real conditions of relations, articulation, and the displacement of particular social groups. This also helps us to identify different conditions in which dispossession of tangible and intangible property happens not only through the exercise of power on the part of powerful groups but also through the fetishizing of commodities and the symbolic appropriation of places by consumers.

Undervaluing the problem of development as a topic of research implies making an argument that comes from a hegemonic position, one that fails to recognize diversity in sociological and epistemological contexts, including the political economy of tourism. Among other things, it segments scholarly work so that it does not fit into the priorities of anthropological analysis. Without framing all of this as relations of the Global North to the Global South, it seems that these arguments come from prioritizing consumers' practices and the symbolic flows of globalization. Thus, the dialectical relationship of the process is best seen through a lens that seems to justify other important questions for other areas of the world. Here I have in mind the fact that tourism is a project of the Mexican government, that it is connected to development in other countries, and that it is based on a specific geopolitics determined by supranational organizations and their marching orders, namely, the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund, and whose logic remains evident through the UNWTO's former slogan: "tourism is wealth." For example, countries in Latin America, like Peru and Colombia, have accelerated their processes of tourismification because of its perceived economic benefits, and in places like Colombia, it has even been used as a discursive tool and political strategy aimed at pacifying the country. Yet development, political economy, and policy implementation remain transcendent topics of discussion, and not just in the hemispheric south. Many countries inside and outside the Eurozone, for example, are investing in tourism as a path to improve or sustain their economies.

In general, tourism continues to be very important in Mexico both because of the geopolitics of the state and because of the conditions under which tourism has developed. It connects with people in complex ways. It also uses a logic of modernization that many social groups relate to and focuses on the development of tourism as a type of realization of the country's potential. This occurs on an ideological level, but the key problem, of course, is not that. The problem is the reproduction of inequality in the type of extraction of goods and in the different groups' conditions of possibility of reproduction itself.

More concretely, in Mexico, we are dealing with how regional oligarchs and national political elites continue to benefit from tourism (including from the kind of exploitation entailed by tourism) (cf. Clancy 1999, 2001). It is a

matter of control and mutual and multiple influences linking governments and their agents with different corporations seeking to commodify paradisaical settings.

NOTES

1. In 2014 two national anthropological forums (one in Spain and one in Mexico) also raised the epistemological question with respect to tourism and especially from a pluralistic viewpoint. Relevant panels were called “Antropologización del turismo y turificación de la antropología” (The anthropologization of tourism and turification of anthropology) that took place at the 13th Congress of the FAAEE [Federación de Asociaciones de Antropología del Estado Español] and “Turismo, globalización y construcción disciplinaria en antropología” (Tourism, globalization, and disciplinary formation in anthropology) that took place at the 3rd Mexican Congress of Social Anthropology and Ethnology.
2. As defined by Ribeiro and Escobar (2006, 34), diversity refers to the abandonment of universals, in order to enhance the dialogic character of the discipline and the plurality of paradigms underlying creativity in anthropological thought.
3. The documentary *Baja All Exclusive* shows this kind of dynamic of dispossession through the perpetration of fear and violence. See <https://vimeo.com/24499601>.
4. Quintana Roo has had the second highest rate of suicide of towns or cities in Mexico for at least a decade. This is not unknown, but it just hasn't been studied by social scientists.

REFERENCES CITED

- Breglia, Lisa. 2006. *Monumental Ambivalence. The Politics of Heritage*. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Brenner, Ludger, and A. G. Aguilar. 2002. “Luxury Tourism and Regional Economic Development in Mexico.” *Professional Geographer* 54 (4): 500–20.
- Bringas, Nora. 2002. “Baja California and California’s Merging Tourist Corridors: The Influence of Mexican Government Policies.” *The Journal of Environment & Development* 11 (3): 267–96.
- Clancy, Michael J. 1999. “Tourism and Development: Evidence from Mexico.” *Annals of Tourism Research* 26 (January): 1–20.
- Clancy, Michael J. 2001. *Exporting Paradise: Tourism and Development in Mexico*. London: Pergamon.
- Del Angel, Pavel. 2005. *Despojo e ilusiones: Turismo y desarrollo en Punta de Mita, costa sur de Nayarit* [Dispossession and illusions: Tourism and development in Punta de Mita, southern coast of Nayarit]. México: Licenciatura degree thesis, ENAH.
- Fierro, Gabriela. 2015. “Turismo de hacienda e intervención comunitaria en el contexto rural Yucateco: El caso de la Fundación Haciendas del Mundo Maya” [Hacienda tourism and communitarian intervention in rural Yucatan: The case of Haciendas Mundo Maya Fund]. *Desacatos* 47:54–71.
- Florescano, Enrique. 2003. “El patrimonio nacional: Valores, usos, estudios y difusión” [National patrimony: Values, uses, studies, and diffusion]. In *Patrimonio cultural y turismo*, 33–44. CDMX, México: Conaculta.
- Fraga, Julia. 2012. “Migración y turismo en la Riviera Maya a través de dos pueblos del mundo Maya” [Migration and tourism on the Mayan Riviera: Looking at two towns of the Mayan world]. In *Turismo, globalización y sociedad locales en la Península de Yucatán*, edited by G. Marín, A. García, and M. Daltabuit, 45–75. Tenerife: ACA y Pasos RTPC.
- Gamio, Manuel. (1916) 1992. *Forjando patria (pro nacionalismo)* [Forging nationness (pronationalism)]. Mexico: Porrúa Editores.
- Jiménez, Alfonso. 1992. *Turismo: Estructura y desarrollo. La estructura funcional del turismo internacional y la política turística de México: Desarrollo histórico 1945–1990*. [Tourism: Structure and development: The functional structure of international tourism and Mexico’s tourist policies/politics]. CDMX, México: McGraw Hill/Interamericana de México.
- Krotz, Esteban. 2006. “Mexican Anthropology’s Ongoing Search for Identity.” In *World Anthropologies: Disciplinary Transformations within Systems of Power*, edited by Gustavo Lins Ribeiro and Arturo Escobar, 87–112. New York: Berg.
- López Santillán, Ángeles A. 2010a. *Metamorfosis del paraíso: La producción de Isla Holbox como destino turístico del Caribe mexicano* [Metamorphosis of paradise: The production of Holbox Island as tourist destination on the Mexican Caribbean]. PhD dissertation, El Colegio de Michoacán, AC.
- López Santillán, Ángeles A. 2010b. “Globalización, Trabajo y Cambio Sociocultural en contextos de desarrollo de Turismo internacional: El caso de isla Holbox, Q. Roo” [Globalization, labor, and sociocultural change in international tourism contexts: Holbox Island in Quintana Roo as a case study]. In *Lengua, etnia y territorio: El sureste frente a la globalización*, edited by Ricardo López Santillán, 57–78. CDMX, México: UNAM-México.
- López Santillán, Ángeles A., and Gustavo Marín. 2010. “Turismo, capitalismo y producción de lo exótico: Una perspectiva crítica para el estudio de la mercantilización del espacio y la cultura” [Tourism, capitalism, and production of the exotic: A critical perspective for the study of the commodification of space and cultura]. *Relaciones: Estudios de historia y sociedad* 123 (31): 219–58.
- Marín, Gustavo, ed. 2015. *Sin tierras no hay paraíso: Turismo, organizaciones agrarias y apropiación en México* [Without land there is no paradise: Tourism, agrarian organizations, and appropriation in Mexico]. Tenerife: Pasos-RTPC, Colección Pasos Edita.
- Meethan, Kevin. 2001. *Tourism in Global Society: Place, Culture, Consumption*. New York: Palgrave.
- Ramírez Corona, Aura. 2015. “Caciquismo y resistencia: El caso de la disputa por el territorio costero del Rebalito de Apazulco, en el litoral de Jalisco” [Chieftainship and resistance: The case of the dispute over the coastal territory of Rebalito de Apazulco, on the coast of Jalisco]. In *Sin tierras no hay paraíso: Turismo, organizaciones agrarias y apropiación territorial en México*, edited by G. Marín, 59–90. Tenerife: Pasos-RTPC, Colección Pasos Edita, No. 15.
- Ramírez Sevilla, Luis. 1992. “Fuego en el paraíso: Turismo y conflicto en tierras pródigas” [Fire in paradise: Tourism and conflict in prodigal lands]. *Relaciones: Estudios de historia y sociedad* 13 (50): 65–91.
- Ribeiro, Gustavo Lins, and Arturo Escobar. 2006. *World Anthropologies: Disciplinary Transformations within Systems of Power*. New York: Berg.

Salazar, Noel. 2006. "Antropología del turismo en países en desarrollo: Análisis crítico de las culturas, poderes e identidades generados por el turismo" [Anthropology of tourism in developing countries: A critical analysis of the cultures, powers, and identities generated by tourism]. *Tabula Rasa* 5:99–128.

Santos, Boaventura de Sousa. 2006. *Conocer desde el Sur: Para una cultura política emancipatoria* [Knowing from the South: Toward an emancipatory politics of culture]. Lima: Fondo Editorial de la Facultad de Ciencias Sociales UNMSM.

Zúñiga, Federico. 2012. "El patrimonio biocultural frente a los procesos de apropiación turística y mercantilización como estrategia de desarrollo para el Totonacapan veracruzano" [Biocultural heritage confronting the appropriative processes of tourism and commercialization as a strategy for development in the Veracruzian Totonacapan]. In *Turismo y antropología: Miradas del sur y el*, edited by A. Castellanos and A. Machuca, 233–66. CDMX, México: UAM-I.

Essay

Domesticating Tourism Anthropology in China

Yujie Zhu

Australian National University, Australia

Lu Jin

Ningbo University, China

Nelson Graburn

University of California, Berkeley, United States

Anthropology in China, like in countries such as Brazil and India, has been strongly influenced by the hegemonic power of the knowledge system driven by the domination of English and the world institutional hierarchy. Over the last few decades, scholars from many countries (especially "Third World" countries, such as Brazil and some countries in Africa) have raised awareness of the essentialization of global anthropology (WAN 2003) in efforts to de-essentialize it by "building non-hegemonic anthropological practices" (Ribeiro and Escobar 2006). The pursuit of domesticating social science in recent decades has resulted in neither a Sino-centric nor fully Westernized outcome. This result, we argue, reflects Chinese projects of nation-building and modernization. With this in mind, in this essay, we examine the nature of tourism anthropology in China.¹

DOMESTICATING ANTHROPOLOGY IN CHINA

The globalized world of colonialism and mercantilism in the nineteenth century brought anthropology from Europe to the leaders of other civilizations, such as India, Japan, and China. After the Boxer Rebellion (1899–1901), the colonial powers from the United States and Europe used the indemnity money from the Qing dynasty to invest in Chinese education, while a number of academic works were translated into Chinese by Japanese translators (Liang 2015). For instance, the United States founded Tsinghua College in 1911, and European nations followed, eventually prompting a stream of Chinese scholars to enroll in higher education programs in the sciences and humanities (Guldin 1994).

In the 1930s, after completing his PhD in sociology at Columbia University in New York, Wu Wenzao returned to China with the expressed goal of Sinicizing the social sciences (*zhongguohua*, translated as "making it Chinese"). To achieve this goal, he emphasized the importance of studying

historical and social Chinese materials and doing empirical research on local communities. Wu and his student, Fei Xiaotong, who also studied under Malinowski,² came to be called the "Wu School," and they initiated the domestication of anthropology in China.

Since 1949, social sciences in China (including anthropology) have gone through a process of domestication, entailing "de-westernisation in conjunction with the Communist state's ideological and political agenda" (Liang 2016, 464). The Maoist government emulated Stalin's Marxist policies following the principle of "Nationalist in Form and Socialist in Content."³ The ideal was to equalize all the *minzu* (the "Chinese nationalities" or "Chinese races") by maintaining their cultures—their languages, clothing, and traditions—while educating them in modern technology and socialist government. Aligned with other anthropologists, ethnologists, and linguists, Fei turned his Malinowski-style functionalism into pragmatism, facilitating the state's effort to develop the national identification program (*minzu shibie*) and to provide guidance, political identity, and territory to minority peoples under the aegis of the central government.

During the Cultural Revolution, the subject of anthropology was banned by authorities, and Fei was publicly humiliated as a bourgeois social scientist. After 1978, when universities were restored and anthropology was revitalized, he rose to prominence and reacquainted himself with the discipline. Accounts of this period of Chinese anthropology (e.g., Guldin 1994; Liang 2016) describe global influences on Chinese scholars and the development of new social sciences, as scholars adapted anthropology to a China in turmoil. After 1980, many Chinese anthropologists recalled the question of Sinicization and transformed the discourse into the idea of domestication (*bentuhua*). They have attempted to fit anthropology into a Chinese local and historical-philosophical context. For instance, scholars like Wang (2012) and Zhao (2006) engage with the long-standing Chinese philosophical concept of *tianxia* (meaning "all under heaven") to examine the relationships among civilization, cosmology, and political systems. Some of these efforts are indeed responding to the Chinese state slogan of "developing social science with Chinese characteristics." Intertwining with the subject of ethnology (seen as the study of minorities), anthropology in

China still serves the project of nation-building, and tourism anthropology is no exception.

TOURISM ANTHROPOLOGY

Academic tourism research in China has two origins. On one hand, Chinese scholars became aware of foreign research on ethnicity and tourism through studying outside China (Graburn and Jin 2011; Jin and Graburn 2014); starting in the 1990s, some of them had opportunities to study either in the United States or in Japan. On the other hand, tourism research was an outgrowth of ethnographic research on minority communities in China (the people deemed by the central government to be China's non-Han nationalities, or *minzu*). Such research was conducted by Chinese anthropologists and folklorists witnessing the corrosive effects of mass tourism on local cultures.

Although various forms of tourism existed in ancient China, Chinese mass tourism only developed after the economic reforms of the late 1970s.⁴ Since then, China has become one of the world's biggest tourist destinations. International tourists have rushed to China, while domestic tourism has also arisen. The latter happened so quickly that it captured the attention of Chinese academics who were already focusing on economic and development issues. Soon thereafter, more social, cultural, and ecological problems appeared, and scholars began to include the study of tourism in their focus on ethnic groups (Qiu 1994; Wu 1990).

As a pioneer of tourism studies in China, Shen Baojia founded the first Department of Tourism in China at Nankai University in 1982, and he was the first to use the concept of "tourism anthropology" (1996). Since then, a new generation of anthropologists has detailed different views of the relationship between anthropology and ethnic tourism (Li 1997; Peng 1999). Here, and for the sake of illustration, we introduce several scholars who played a significant role in introducing and domesticating tourism anthropology in China.

Wang Zhusheng was born in Guizhou province. He belonged to the generation of Chinese anthropologists who experienced the Cultural Revolution and the gradual liberalization of the economic system. After obtaining his PhD in anthropology at the State University of New York at Stony Brook in 1991, he taught at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, where his wife Yang Hui studied and earned her MA in visual anthropology. In 1993, they returned to Yunnan to teach at the combined History/Anthropology Department in Kunming. Beginning in the early 1980s, Wang (1991, 1997) studied ethnic tourism in Jingpo (Kachin) near Burma. In 1999, Wang's widow Yang Hui organized an international conference on "Tourism, Anthropology, and Chinese Society" in Kunming. As a milestone event of tourism anthropology in China, a number of international and domestic scholars attended the event and discussed tourism as part of social and cultural lives (Tan, Cheung, and Yang 2001; Yang, Chen, and Zhang 2001).

Since Wang's work, tourism anthropology (especially in minority regions) has continued to gain popularity in China. After attending Nelson Graburn's seminars on tourism anthropology at the University of California, Berkeley, Zhang Xiaoping from Yunnan University published several works in tourism anthropology (2000, 2001, 2009). Other scholars, such as Han (1997), received training at the University of Tokyo and joined efforts to expand tourism anthropology in China while working at the National Museum of Ethnology in Japan. In the meantime, Zong Xiaolian from Minzu University showed great interest in studying cultural transition in ethnic regions (2001). Based on her long-term ethnography in Yunnan Province, Zong (2006) illustrated how the local Naxi community has adapted to tourism and negotiated with modernity to pursue their lives. Later, she moved to Japan and wrote (in Japanese) "A Review of the Studies on Anthropology of Tourism in China" (2009), which sought to describe the development of tourism anthropology in China.

In recent years, as the subfield of tourism anthropology has become more established in China, Chinese scholars working in the field have become more reflexive, looking back on their scholarship and increasingly comparing their research methods and results with those of non-Chinese anthropologists. Because homegrown scholars are increasingly aware of the importance of getting government funding for their projects, their research has been affected by official state priorities embedded in the ideas of development and "serving the people." Most researchers have thus embraced the ethnographic and analytical methods of international scholars while, nonetheless, attempting to develop research concepts (like *tianxia*, mentioned above) that are self-consciously homegrown.

Peng Zhaorong of Xiamen University is one of the key scholars working to domesticate tourism anthropology in China by rethinking the value of Chinese classics of philosophy and literature. Peng studied anthropology abroad. After returning to China, he set up the Centre of Tourism Anthropology at Xiamen University and published the seminal book, *Tourism Anthropology* (2004). Scholars like Peng advocated that tourism anthropology in China should combine with *minzu* studies, focusing on ethnic tourism rather than on other forms of leisure travel. They were nostalgically concerned with the corrosive impact of tourism on the recognized cultures of "their" people (Peng 2002, 2005).

Above all, Chinese anthropologists play multifaceted roles in the process of domesticating tourism anthropology in China. Some scholars, like Peng, have started to approach Chinese thought and philosophical understanding of culture and nature; others, like Sun Jiuxia from Sun Yat-sen University (2004, 2009), apply anthropological theories and methods to serve ordinary people and the development of society at the same time. In particular, Zhang Xiaosong of Guizhou Normal University has developed a romantic, almost nationalist, approach to the history, ethnography, and touristic promotion of Guizhou's minority in a volume that

won a prestigious national book award (Zhang 2006). All of these approaches contribute to the development of epistemological approaches to tourism anthropology without being trapped in classical tourism theory, whether from the North Atlantic or from other fields.

TWO EXAMPLES OF DOMESTICATION

The most recent developments in Chinese anthropology represent further attempts to domesticate discussions of the presumably global anthropology of tourism. They pay attention to the sociocultural and economic transformations of Chinese society in recent years. Here we address two main topics in tourism-related research: ethnic tourism and heritage. Both reflect how presumably global anthropological theories and practices have been adapted, reinterpreted, and transformed by colleagues in China.

Ethnic Tourism

As we stated above, tourism anthropology in China has been largely focused on ethnic tourism and its impact on local societies. In particular, ethnic tourism coupled with the official central government's policies concerning minority nationalities have arguably made this field of study rather different from most other anthropologies of tourism. Since the 1980s, many international scholars (perhaps especially US scholars) have portrayed the political situation of Chinese minorities in derogatory ways, as colonized or internally Orientalist (Diamond 1988; Gladney 1994; Schein 1997). Chinese anthropologists have countered that ethnic groups have various responses to official top-down ethnic policies of the state (L. Yang 2011) and that ethnic tourism has become a mediator of it all—either reinforcing China's central government's nation-building project or functioning as a local strategy to increase autonomy.

Increasingly, Chinese anthropologists have realized that tourism is one of the critical components of any cultural transition in non-Han regions or communities. Young urban Han Chinese, driven by dissatisfaction with their stressful and mundane city lives, now frequently pursue alternative experiences when they participate in domestic tourism (Zhu 2015). Chinese scholars are also now keenly aware of this transition and pay more attention to various tourism productions than they used to. Included here are staged performances (Zhu 2012b), theme parks (Yang 2011), rural tourism (Chio 2014), and romantic affairs (Xu and Ye 2016). These practices are now embedded in China's tourism policies. Although they were formerly classified as superstitious, these practices are now part of national policies that seek to promote ethnic traditions (Sofield and Li 1998).

Tourism anthropology facilitates Chinese ethnic tourism on the ground by engaging with applied and development projects. Some anthropologists get their inspiration from Chinese history or long-standing ideas deemed traditional, or they at least invoke them in order to enrich the paradigm of tourism anthropology. For instance, in tracing the roots

and transformations of Tibetan silver from cultural objects to souvenir art, Li Fei (2016) offers a historical approach that situates materiality in the framework of imagination and the construction of China as a nation-state that contains multiple ethnicities. She emphasizes that the sociocultural meaning of tourism practices cannot be isolated from deep discursive investigation of Chinese ethnicity in its historical context. This may not be all that different from work done by anthropologists of tourism elsewhere, but it is definitely work that makes a difference in China itself.

Other tourism scholars in China pay attention to the complex power dynamics of ethnic tourism. They have demonstrated that it is often the local authorities—hand in hand with external entrepreneurs—who benefit from the tourism industry, while ethnicity becomes the main cultural resource for marketing and branding people and their things (Bao and Sun 2006; Zhu 2012b). Other studies in China show that ethnic tourism could function as a platform for intellectuals studying ethnic culture (Liu, Liu, and Wall 2005) or a laboratory to display and export ethnic handicrafts that might alleviate poverty (Zhang and Li 2008; Zhang and Lu 2006). Instead of simply borrowing theories and applying them to case studies, all of these studies stress the importance of offering a more complex picture of the politics of ethnic tourism in China.

Cultural Heritage

Cultural heritage is another good example illustrating how the internationally dominant discourse is being domesticated in the Chinese system. Since China ratified the UNESCO Heritage Convention in 1985, there have been numerous efforts to promote and preserve cultural heritage in China. A number of policies and practices have been put into place at national and local levels (Nitzky 2012; Zhu and Li 2013). The heritage-ranking system authorized by the Chinese government reflects long-standing Chinese logics of governance that generate categorizations, classifications, and hierarchies (Ryan, Gu, and Zhang 2009). At the same time, the nationwide "heritage fever" motivates homegrown scholars to study cultural heritage. Both the government and the heritage industry increasingly provide funding opportunities on a scale never seen before.

In a broader sense, research on heritage often refers to the Chinese value and rhetoric of loving the past—in other words, to a sense of collective nostalgia. *Huaijiu* or *huaiyu* (both Chinese words for nostalgia) is not new to China. It can be traced back to the eleventh century, when intellectuals went on a retreat to search for China's roots and its "glorious antiquity" (Wang 1985). This passion for the past has been inherited by the nationwide heritage tourism industry. Many historic sites have been (or are being) redesigned to invoke the themes of different ancient Chinese eras. For instance, "roots tourism" was organized in recent years as a way for tourists to visit Qufu, the birthplace of Confucius. But it is important to note that such approaches are not limited solely to antiquity. Recent years have also seen the development of

“red tourism” as an official (and organized) way for tourists to visit patriotic sites and memorials that commemorate anti-aggression wars, the communist revolution, and other socialist developments (Han 1997; Li and Hu 2008). These new tourism practices attempt to interpret historic narratives (either ancient or recent) as part of the central government’s nation-building efforts to feed tourists’ imaginations with ideas about their ancient, civilized, and powerful country.

Though many European conservation concepts have been translated into Chinese, heritage practices have often been diversified at the ground level (Zhu 2016). The scholarly debates around authenticity—a concept from the European traditions of museums and conservation—illustrate such processes. In order to provide material evidence, heritage planners and tourism operators often restore, reconstruct, and even rebuild heritage to meet tourists’ demands. Such practices do not follow Eurocentric conservation ideology; instead, they are tailored to fulfill Chinese economic and aesthetic demands. The notion of authenticity (*zhen*) has been interpreted in the contemporary Chinese context as pursuit of the natural, the romantic, the exotic, and the ethnic (Zhu 2012a). Again, some of these notions exist and circulate elsewhere, but in China the point is to have a homegrown anthropology of tourism alongside the development of domestic tourism.

DISCUSSION

Tourism anthropology was introduced into China after the 1980s by Chinese scholars who were trained either in the United States (such as Wang Zhusheng, Zhang Xiaoping, and Yang Hui) or in Japan (such as Han Min and Sidney Cheung). Since then, more than in Brazil, Russia, or other multicultural nations, including the United States, advocacy for a “Chinese” anthropology of tourism, focusing mainly on ethnic tourism, has emerged. The following factors led to these processes of domestication.

First, domestication of tourism anthropology in China is strongly influenced by its social and political context. Since the 1990s, national priorities for development of the rural and marginal areas encouraged anthropology to “serve” the minority/non-Han nationalities areas. Educational expansion after 1978 stimulated the establishment of institutes and programs focusing on tourism, especially in anthropology, sociology, and geography. Minority (non-Han) people in anthropology programs at institutions of higher education began to study their own cultures, often using a comparative framework with dominant Chinese cultural formations.

In recent years, there has been a national interest in developing Chinese scholarship over foreigners’ research on minorities, the latter of which is often seen by the state as hostile or too critical. Consequently, central and local governments and universities have supported applied research on how to achieve the national socioeconomic goals of development and social stability. Popular keywords for research projects now include state slogans, such as “Harmony Soci-

ety” (*hexie shehui*), “Develop the West” (*xibu dakaiifa*), and, more recently, “Chinese Dream” (*zhongguo meng*) and “One Belt One Road” (*yidai yilu*), which all refer to various projects of nation-building.⁵

Second, boosting economic development is another motive for the domestication of tourism anthropology. Since the “Develop the West” campaign in 1999, ethnic tourism has become a major component of poverty alleviation and social development in western regions of China. With its great contribution to local economies and huge impact on people’s daily lives, tourism has become a central subject in anthropology. Supported by local governments and other stakeholders, many scholars now offer advice to various stakeholders about economic development and social stability, especially in minority (non-Han) regions.

Third, there has been a noticeable increase in the number of minority (non-Han) scholars (certainly in anthropology) and, we argue here, this has also accelerated the domestication of tourism anthropology. Few other countries have such a large number of minority scholars now working in the anthropology of tourism (Graburn, in press). This has clear consequences. Pursuing academic careers as tourism anthropologists has become part of their own professional assimilation. These colleagues are motivated to study anthropology in prestigious universities, become elites living in cities, and take their homelands as research objects. They have much better access to the field than Han Chinese or foreign scholars. Nevertheless, because of their minority (non-Han) identities, their research activities are monitored more closely by the authorities, and this, too, has clear consequences. To maintain funding support and job security, we know that some of them adhere to long-standing normative theories of Chinese society (such as the very idea of *minzu* and the *tianxia* system) that fit official Han and central-government discourses.

So what is the outcome of the domestication of tourism anthropology in China? As Yamashita, Bosco, and Eades (2004) argue, language, the intended audience, and the context of consumption often affect the process of domestication of anthropology in Asia. Our brief overview of tourism anthropology in China illustrates that this also applies to China. Unlike foreign scholars working in China, most Chinese anthropologists (both Han and minority scholars) publish journal articles, books, and chapters in Chinese. Their work does not target an international anthropological audience but aims mainly for Han Chinese consumption (Mathews 2016). In particular, their research implicates national and humane motivations that aim to develop, enrich, and protect Chinese heritage cultures. Consequently, tourism anthropology, respected by many other scholarly and applied disciplines, has become a prestigious discipline in China.

“Chinese” tourism anthropology also fosters the development of homegrown Chinese concepts and theories. Chinese scholars try to “localize” presumably global concepts and give them Chinese characteristics. Good examples are Zhu’s (2016) work on authenticity and Nitzky’s (2012)

and Jin's (2014, 2016) work on ecomuseums. Some anthropologists resist concepts used by foreign scholars to describe Chinese minority politics. This includes, for example, the concept of "internal Orientalism" (even Orientalism itself). Following popular sociopolitical trends, some Chinese scholars utilize long-standing Chinese concepts, such as *tianxia*, studying Chinese philosophy or geographic histories, and invoking Chinese intellectual thought. Others (such as Gao Bingzhong from Peking University) have suggested "overseas ethnography" (*haiwai minzuzhi*), shifting the Chinese scholar's role from the "object of study" to the "studying subject" (Liang 2015, 468).

Above all, tourism anthropology in China is neither strictly a derivative model of "Western" scholarship nor an entirely Sino-centric, homegrown field. We argue that Chinese domestication efforts do not really produce a Chinese anthropology, as such, but implicate a plural hegemonic discourse of nation-building and modernization, incorporating both distinctive homegrown Chinese scholarship (*guoxue*) and ideas of progress rooted in the North Atlantic. This hybrid outcome reflects a powerful rising nation, representing its desire to take stock of, and record, the vanishing past as part of its vision of its place in the contemporary world order.

NOTES

1. The authors would like to thank Noel Salazar and Virginia R. Dominguez for their advice and encouragement.
2. Fei's doctoral thesis, "Peasant Life in China," became one of the best examples of "community studies" in China.
3. Stalin, a Georgian, was appointed commissar for nationalities in 1919. His evolution-based policy advanced all ethnic minorities through Communism, education, and modern technology.
4. Some ancient travel writing (*youji*) exists in Chinese history, including *The Travel Diaries Xu Xiake* from the late Ming period (1368–1644). These writings are often classified as "travel record literature."
5. These are various terms or initiatives that are used by Chinese leaders for the purpose of nation building.

REFERENCES CITED

- Bao, Jigang, and Jiuxia Sun. 2006. "社区参与旅游发展的中西差" [A contrastive study on the difference in community participation in tourism between China and the West]. *地理学报* [Acta geographica Sinica] 4:401–13.
- Chio, Jenny. 2014. *A Landscape of Travel: The Work of Tourism in Rural Ethnic China*. Seattle: University of Washington Press.
- Diamond, Norma. 1988. "The Miao and Poison: Interactions on China's Southwest Frontier." *Ethnology* 27 (1): 1–25.
- Gladney, Dru C. 1994. "Representing Nationality in China: Refiguring Majority/Minority Identities." *Journal of Asian Studies* 53 (1): 92–123.
- Graburn, Nelson. In press. "Epilogue: Indigeneity, Researchers and Tourism." In *Cultural Tourism Movements: New Articulations of Indigenous Identity*, edited by A. Bunten and Nelson Graburn. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Graburn, Nelson, and Lu Jin. 2011. "中国旅游人类学的兴起" [The rise of Chinese tourism anthropology]. *青海民族研究* [Nationalities research in Qinghai] 22 (2): 1–11.
- Guldin, Gregory E. 1994. *The Saga of Anthropology in China: From Malinowski to Moscow to Mao*. Armonk, NY: M. E. Sharpe.
- Han, Min. 1997. "Tourism in Shaoshan, Mao Zedong's Home Village: From Revolutionary Memorial to Multi-Purpose Tourist Attraction." In *Tourism and Cultural Development in Asia and Oceania*, edited by Shinji Yamashita, Kadir H. Din, and J. S. Eades, 141–63. Bangi, Malaysia: Penerbit Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia.
- Jin, Lu. 2014. "生态博物馆理念: 功能转向及中国实践" [The theory of ecomuseum: The change of its function and the practice in China]. *贵州社会科学* [Guizhou social sciences] 294 (6): 46–51.
- Jin, Lu. 2016. *遗产·旅游·现代性: 黔中布依族生态博物馆的人类学研究* [Heritage, tourism, and modernity: An anthropological research on a Buyi ecomuseum in central Guizhou]. Hangzhou, China: Zhejiang University Press.
- Jin, Lu, and Nelson Graburn. 2014. "人类学视野下的少数民族旅游与遗产: 中国和西方的比较研究" [Ethnic tourism and heritage in the perspective of anthropology: China and the West]. *百色学院学报* [Journal of Baise University] 27 (6): 56–62.
- Li, Fei. 2016. "In the Name of 'Zangyin': Materiality and Identity in Ethnic Tourism of Contemporary China." Paper delivered to the Tourism Studies Working Group, Berkeley, CA. May 13.
- Li, Shizhong. 1997. "人类学视野中的旅游现象" [Tourism phenomena in anthropological view]. *探索与争鸣* [Exploration and free views] 11:32–33.
- Li, Yiping, and Zhiyu Hu. 2008. "Red Tourism in China." *Journal of China Tourism Research* 4 (2): 156–71.
- Liang, Hongling. 2015. "The 'Chinese Century' and Dynamics of Knowledge in a Longue Durée." *Cultural Dynamics* 27 (2): 227–39.
- Liang, Hongling. 2016. "Chinese Anthropology and its Domestication Projects: De-Westernisation, *Bentuhua*, and Overseas Ethnography." *Social Anthropology* 24 (4): 462–75.
- Liu, Pei-Lin, Abby Liu, and Geoff Wall. 2005. "生态博物馆理念及其在少数民族社区景观保护中的作用—以贵州梭嘎生态博物馆为例" [Ecomuseum conception and Chinese application: A case study in Miao villages, Suoga, Guizhou Province]. *长江流域资源与环境* [Resources and environment in the Yangtze Basin] 14 (2): 253–57.
- Mathews, Gordon. 2016. "Between World Anthropology and World Anthropologies: An American Anthropologist in East Asia as Gatekeeper/Interpreter." *American Anthropologist* 118 (4): 845–47.
- Nitzky, William. 2012. "Mediating Heritage Preservation and Rural Development: Ecomuseum Development in China." *Urban Anthropology* 41 (2–4): 367–417.
- Peng, Zhaorong. 1999. "参与观察"旅游与地方知识系统" [Participant observation, tourism, and local knowledge system]. *广西民族研究* [Guangxi ethnic studies] 4:35–39.

- Peng, Zhaorong. 2002. “东道主”与“游客”:一种现代性悖论的危险——旅游人类学的一种诠释 [“Hosts” and “tourists”: A danger of modern paradox—interpretations from the perspective of tourism anthropology]. *思想战线* [Ideological front] 28 (6): 40–42.
- Peng, Zhaorong. 2004. *旅游人类学* [Tourism anthropology]. Beijing: Minzu Press.
- Peng, Zhaorong. 2005. “现代旅游中的符号经济” [Symbolic economy in modern tourism]. *江西社会科学* [Jiangxi social sciences] 10:28–34.
- Qiu, Taoying. 1994. “湖南少数民族特色工艺品在旅游市场中的需求分析” [An analysis on demands of ethnic handicrafts in tourism market in Hunan]. *旅游学刊* [Tourism tribune] 1:49–52.
- Ribeiro, Gustavo Lins, and Arturo Escobar, eds. 2006. *World Anthropologies: Disciplinary Transformations within Systems of Power*. Oxford: Berg.
- Ryan, Chris, Gu Huimin, and Zhang Wei. 2009. “The Context of Chinese Tourism: An Overview and Implications for Research.” In *Tourism in China: Destination, Cultures and Communities*, edited by Chris Ryan and Gu Huimin, 327–36. New York: Routledge.
- Schein, Louisa. 1997. “Gender and Internal Orientalism in China.” *Modern China* 23 (1): 69–98.
- Shen, Baojia. 1996. “国外旅游研究进展(连载之一)” [The development of research on tourism overseas]. *旅游学刊* [Tourism tribune] 11 (1): 62–67.
- Sofield, Trevor, and Sarah Li. 1998. “Tourism Development and Cultural Policies in China.” *Annals of Tourism Research* 25 (2): 362–92.
- Sun, Jiuxia. 2004. “旅游人类学在中国” [Anthropology of tourism in China]. *广西民族大学学报* [Journal of Guangxi University for nationalities] 29 (6): 2–11.
- Sun, Jiuxia. 2009. *旅游人类学的社区旅游与社区参与* [Tourism anthropology: Community tourism and community participation]. Shanghai: The Commercial Press.
- Tan, Chee-Beng, Sidney C. H. Cheung, and Hui Yang, eds. 2001. *Tourism, Anthropology and China*. Bangkok: White Lotus Press.
- WAN (World Anthropologies Network). 2003. “A Conversation about a World Anthropologies Network.” *Social Anthropology* 11 (2): 265–69.
- Wang, Gungwu. 1985. “Loving the Ancient in China.” In *Who Owns the Past?: Papers from the Annual Symposium of the Australian Academy of the Humanities*, edited by Isabel McBryde, 175–95. Melbourne: Oxford University Press.
- Wang, Mingming. 2012. “All Under Heaven (Tianxia): Cosmological Perspectives and Political Ontologies in Pre-Modern China.” *HAU: Journal of Ethnographic Theory* 2 (1): 337–83.
- Wang, Zhusheng. 1991. “Road of Change: A Jingpo Village on China’s Border.” PhD dissertation, SUNY Stony Brook.
- Wang, Zhusheng. 1997. *The Jingpo: Kachin of the Yunnan Plateau*. Tempe: Arizona State University Program for Southeast Asian Studies.
- Wu, Hongli. 1990. “开发桂林民族风情旅游之我见” [My opinion on developing ethnic tourism of Guilin]. *旅游学刊* [Tourism tribune] 4:46–48.
- Xu, Honggang, and Tian Ye. 2016. “Tourist Experience in Lijiang—the Capital of Yanyu.” *Journal of China Tourism Research* 12 (1): 1–18.
- Yamashita, Shinji, Joseph Bosco, and J. S. Eades. 2004. *The Making of Anthropology in East and Southeast Asia*. New York: Berghahn Press.
- Yang Hui, Zhiming Chen, Zhanhong Zhang, eds. 2001. *旅游, 人类学与中国社会* [Tourism, anthropology, and Chinese society]. Kunming: Yunnan University Press.
- Yang, Li. 2011. “Ethnic Tourism and Cultural Representation.” *Annals of Tourism Research* 38 (2): 561–85.
- Zhang, Xiaoping. 2000. “纳尔逊·格雷本的旅游人类学” [Nelson Graburn’s anthropology of tourism]. *旅游学刊* [Tourism tribune] 26 (4): 47–50.
- Zhang, Xiaoping. 2001. “旅游人类学在美国” [Tourism anthropology in the US]. *思想战线* [Ideological front] 27 (2): 65–68.
- Zhang, Xiaoping. 2009. *民族旅游的人类学透视* [Anthropological perspectives on ethnic tourism]. Kunming: Yunnan University Press.
- Zhang, Xiaoping, and Wei Li. 2008. *旅游人类学* [Tourism anthropology]. Tianjin: Nankai University Press.
- Zhang, Xiaosong. 2006. *符号与仪式: 贵州山地文明图典* [Symbols and rituals: An illustrated introduction to the civilization of the Guizhou mountains]. Guiyang: Guizhou Renmin Press.
- Zhao, Tingyang. 2006. “Rethinking Empire from a Chinese Concept ‘All-under-Heaven’ (Tian-xia).” *Social Identities* 12 (1): 29–41.
- Zhu, Yujie. 2012a. “Performing Heritage: Rethinking Authenticity in Global Tourism.” *Annals of Tourism Research* 39 (3): 1495–513.
- Zhu, Yujie. 2012b. “When the Global Meets the Local in Tourism—Cultural Performances in Lijiang as Case Studies.” *Journal of China Tourism Research* 8 (3): 302–19.
- Zhu, Yujie. 2015. “Cultural Effects of Authenticity: Contested Heritage Practices in China.” *International Journal of Heritage Studies* 21 (6): 594–608.
- Zhu, Yujie. 2016 “Authenticity and Heritage Conservation in China: Translation, Interpretation and practices.” In *Aspects of Authenticity in Architectural Heritage Conservation*, edited by K. Weiler, 187–200. Heidelberg: Springer.
- Zhu, Yujie, and Na Li. 2013. “Groping for Stones to Cross the River: Governing Heritage in Emei.” In *Cultural Heritage Politics in China*, edited by Tami Blumenfeld and Helaine Silverman, 51–72. New York: Springer.
- Zong, Xiaolian. 2001. “西方旅游人类学研究述评” [A review of research on anthropology of tourism in the West]. *民族研究* [Ethno-national studies] 3:85–94.
- Zong, Xiaolian. 2006. *旅游开发与文化变迁——以云南省丽江市纳西族文化为例* [Tourism development and cultural change: A case study of Yunnan Province, Lijiang County Naxi culture]. Beijing: China Tourism Press.
- Zong, Xiaolian. 2009. “中国における観光人類学の誕生と発展” [A review of the studies on anthropology of tourism in China]. *白山人類学* [White Mountain anthropology] 12:3.

Essay

Otherness Anthropologies: Toward Ibero-American Anthropologies of Tourism

Claudio Milano

Ostelea School of Tourism and Hospitality, University of Lleida, Spain

The purpose of this essay is to address the renewed debate concerning Ibero-American anthropologies of tourism. On one hand, this essay focuses on the language barrier faced by Ibero-American academics. On the other, the discussion focuses on debates within the thriving Ibero-American anthropologies of tourism. The term Ibero-American is a complex historical, ideological, and political construction. I mobilize the phrase Ibero-American anthropologies to refer to the introduction, since the last decade, of a better and more horizontal conversation between anthropologists of tourism from the Spanish- and Portuguese-speaking countries of the Iberian Peninsula and Latin America. I take into account the colonial nuance and criticism levied at the use of this phrase but use it nonetheless because this is work done in Spanish and Portuguese, not English, and it is a phrase used by others as well (Mazín Gómez 2007; Rojas-Mix 1991). Moreover, following the Chilean historian Miguel Rojas-Mix (1991), among the hundred names given to America, “Ibero-American” undoubtedly captures the relevant history of Spanish and Portuguese colonialism and subsequent criticism, a history we certainly cannot ignore.

Anglophone work in tourism studies has clearly influenced Ibero-American anthropologies of tourism, especially with its emphasis on critique and interest in the impact of tourism on host societies, focusing more on locals than on tourists (Cohen and Cohen 2012; Stronza 2001; Wallace 2005). But critique of Anglophone work has been voiced since at least the 1970s in Spain, for instance, and might help to shape Ibero-American anthropologies of tourism as well. Spanish anthropologist Susana Narotzky (2006) described the controversial debate between Anglophone scholars and Spanish anthropologists, especially Isidoro Moreno (1975). In the 1970s, Moreno had labeled two types of colonization: one spatial and the other theoretical. He decried that foreign anthropologists (mainly in the United States) conceived of Spain as an object of study and a territory of informants, while he criticized local Spanish anthropologists for mechanically applying concepts and theories developed by Anglophone scholars.

Narotzky’s article was included in the World Anthropologies Network (WAN) project. Ribeiro and Escobar (2006) defined WAN as “an experiment in global cooperation” that sought to articulate the need to diversify the hegemonic North Atlantic-centric discourses within anthropology and avoid a pattern in which a Global North produces

theory and a Global South only produces data. I think this has consequences for the anthropology of tourism and the global tourism phenomenon in all its complexity.

There is indeed a language barrier within and among anthropologies of tourism, but it is definitely more than something related to language fluency. Inherent are the inequalities in the power of different languages in relation to the dominant forms of discourse (Asad 1986). Ribeiro and Escobar (2006) argued, after all, that linguistic diversity is part of any world anthropologies project, and although English has become the dominant language of the sciences in much of the world and the main form of global intellectual communication, this should not lead to ignoring the existence and importance of the role of intellectual production in Spanish, Arabic, or Chinese, to name but a few good examples. In a supportive but also critical work, Virginia García Acosta (2008) stated that the challenge for the world anthropologies project is to broaden existing concentric circles in order to cover exchanges with other geographical spaces of knowledge production. A large amount of scholarly work—which is not published in one of the languages of the hegemonic centers, particularly in English—is invisible to Anglophone scholars. A pioneering and barrier-breaking example of the possibilities of making much more work visible was the translation into Spanish in 2008 of Ribeiro and Escobar’s *World Anthropologies: Disciplinary Transformations within Systems of Power*.

Encouraging, however, is the increasing scholarly community that crosses Spanish- and Portuguese-language barriers—a community that crosses continents as well. The publication in Portuguese of Agustín Santana Talavera’s 2009 revised book is a good example of that. It has led to a productive dialogue among Ibero-American anthropologists. Breaking language barriers has been encouraged by Hispanophone and Lusophone academic institutions. Granted, this might be due to pressure from academic institutions on faculty members to publish in Anglophone journals. If we survey the academic production of work by Ibero-American anthropologists in Anglophone journals before 2010, we find almost none (Hernández-Ramírez 2015). But this decade has been quite different, with numerous Ibero-American scholars—from Spain, Portugal, and parts of Latin America—publishing in English in Anglophone journals. There is no longer a one-way flow. But it is also true that we are now witnessing a generational shift in which older scholars publish in their native languages and younger scholars publish in foreign languages. Another upshot of the institutional pressure to go international has been greater communion among Spanish- and

Portuguese-speaking anthropologists, and tourism research has been an area of particularly productive coming together.

In sum, it is true that Ibero-American anthropologies of tourism have been influenced by the Anglophone traditions of scholarship, but it is also true that Ibero-American anthropologies of tourism have been alive and present even beyond the Spanish and Portuguese language barrier.

CHALLENGING HEGEMONIC KNOWLEDGE PRODUCTION THROUGH IBERO-AMERICAN DIALOGUE

Far from being an object of ridicule (Salazar 2006), today the anthropological study of tourism is frequent and of widespread interest among Spanish- and Portuguese-language anthropologists. In 2015 a Spanish journal (*PASOS. Journal of Tourism and Cultural Heritage*) published a special issue dedicated to cutting-edge anthropological work on tourism in certain Latin American and Iberian countries. Titled “Overview of Anthropology of Tourism from the South” (Hernández-Ramírez, Pereiro Pérez, and Pinto 2015), this special issue included contributions deemed significant to the anthropological study of tourism in Argentina, Brazil, Portugal, Spain, and Uruguay. In this special issue, “South” referred to the anthropological studies of tourism in Hispanophone and Lusophone academia compared to Anglophone academia. It also considered the anthropological production on “Southern” tourism as it relates to other anthropologies of tourism.

It is worthwhile reflecting at this moment on the role and power of hegemonic centers within the academy, in general, and the anthropologies of tourism scholarship, in particular. Consider, for example, the Argentinian journal, *Estudios y Perspectivas en Turismo (Studies and Perspectives in Tourism)*. Since the 1990s, this journal has functioned as a meeting point across various disciplines and has included transdisciplinary discussions taking place among Anglophone and Hispanophone or Lusophone anthropologists and scholars interested in tourism. This was due also to the increase in the amount of work being carried out on tourism. Yet the journal, like other Spanish- and Portuguese-language journals, has suffered from its lack of representation in the Scopus or Web of Science databases prior to the twenty-first century. Consequently, dissemination has been limited, restricting these works’ spheres of influence and generating low “impact factors.” In fact, a Mexican tourism scholar recently (and in this same Argentinian journal) broached the controversial subject of inequality between international “Northern” and “Southern” open-access journals. She argued that “Southern” universities’ encouragement of their scholars and researchers to publish in the highest-impact Anglophone journals has further marginalized local and regional journals (Osorio García 2016).

Despite the low “impact factors” of “Southern” journals, during the last decade the anthropological tourism debates have occupied considerable space in Hispanophone and Lusophone “Southern” journals. It is worthwhile mentioning

some Ibero-American anthropological journals that have dedicated special issues to anthropology of tourism debates: *Ankulegi Revista de Antropología Social (Ankulegi Social Anthropology Journal)*, *NAYA: Noticias de Antropología Y Arqueología (NAYA: News in Anthropology and Archaeology)*, *Revista De Antropología Experimental (Journal of Experimental Anthropology)*, *Gazeta De Antropología (Anthropology Gazette)*, *Quaderns del Institut Catalán de Antropología (Journal of the Catalan Institute of Anthropology)*, and *Horizontes Antropológicos (Anthropological Horizons)*. Some tourism journals also helped to spread a transdisciplinary approach in tourism studies among Ibero-American anthropologists and scholars—for example, *Estudios y Perspectivas en Turismo (Studies and Perspectives in Tourism)*, *PASOS. Journal of Tourism and Cultural Heritage, Investigaciones Turísticas (Journal of Touristic Research)*, *Cuadernos de Turismo (Tourism Notebooks)*, *Revista Brasileira de Pesquisa em Turismo (The Brazilian Journal of Tourism Research, or RBTUR)*, *Revista Turismo & Desenvolvimento (Journal of Tourism & Development)*, and *El Periplo Sustentable (The Sustainable Journey)*.

In 2003 the Brazilian journal *Horizontes Antropológicos (Anthropological Horizons)*, published by the Federal University of Rio Grande do Sul (UFRGS), put out an issue titled “Anthropology and Tourism,” focusing on the Ibero-American research group on Culture, Tourism, and Society (Cultus) created in 2002. Ibero-American anthropologists published essays in Spanish, Portuguese, and English. This was probably the dawn of the transversal discussion among anthropologists of tourism writing mostly in Spanish or Portuguese.

The most recent *PASOS* special issue (Hernández-Ramírez et al. 2015) set out to investigate whether there was a special Ibero-American approach to tourism research deriving from specific theoretical stances or particular issues, or if, on the contrary, they investigated topics and theoretical frameworks that replicate work derived from the longer tradition of tourism studies in Anglophone countries. The authors and editors of that special issue argued that the example of the Ibero-American anthropology of tourism shows how a field of study went from nonexistent (or at best marginal) to something that is now standardized and institutionalized. I agree and argue that the *PASOS* special issue not only marked but also helped to establish that field, one I would prefer to call “Ibero-American anthropologies of tourism.”

The special issue provided a historical look at each Ibero-American anthropological tradition and its approach to tourism studies. It is true, of course, that this field in Spain, Portugal, and some Latin American countries has reproduced international (mostly Anglophone) anthropological theories, traditions, and paradigms (Hernández-Ramírez, et al. 2015). In fact, taking into account work in the anthropology of tourism in Spain, Antonio Miguel Nogués-Pedregal (2011) has argued that the current place of tourism within the Spanish-speaking anthropological world has much to do with the translation of Anglophone classics in the study of tourism (i.e., MacCannell [1976] 2003, [1992]

2007; Smith [1977] 1992; Turner and Ash [1975] 1991). Yet in the wider Ibero-American context, it might be relevant to notice that each national anthropological tradition has been influenced by different theoretical approaches.

STRENGTHENING IBERO-AMERICAN ANTHROPOLOGIES OF TOURISM

Let's now observe the evolution of some Iberian and Latin American anthropological studies of tourism included in the *PASOS* special issue. If this special issue has been considered the inception of Ibero-American anthropologies of tourism, it would be worthwhile to observe the evolution of those Ibero-American anthropologies considered as the starting point (e.g., Argentina, Brazil, Portugal, Spain, and Uruguay).

If we consider the evolution of the anthropology of tourism in Spain, it was only in the 1970s that we saw the beginnings of such an anthropology, when Oriol Pi-Sunyer, Antonio Mandly, and Francisco Jurdao wrote ethnographies focusing on "hosts" and "guests" (Pi-Sunyer 1973) and on acculturation and touristification processes (Jurdao 1979; Mandly 1977). Some of this work resonated with early Anglophone work on tourism, and it is no surprise that Pi-Sunyer, who developed his academic activity in United States, was included in Valene Smith's English-language *Hosts and Guests: The Anthropology of Tourism* (1977).

Since then, Agustín Santana Talavera and Antonio Miguel Nogués-Pedregal have effectively taken over (Palou 2014). Two decades after Valene Smith's landmark work, Santana Talavera published *Antropología y Turismo. ¿Nuevas Hordas, Viejas culturas? (Anthropology and Tourism: New Hordes, Old Cultures?)*, (1997). This work broached theoretical approaches to the study of tourism based on Anglophone theories for the first time in Ibero-American anthropology. Seminal and inspiring, Santana Talavera's work introduced ways for anthropologists to teach and research tourism. In addition, that work reached out to institutions and the private sector linked to tourism, therefore serving as applied anthropology as well.

Spanish interest in the anthropology of tourism has come in three stages. The first came before the 1990s and consisted of Spanish anthropologists beginning to analyze and identify tourists as outsiders who visit and alter the cultural balance of host societies. Then gradually in the 1990s we saw some conceptualization and theorization of the nature of the tourism phenomenon itself. Finally, now, in the twenty-first century we see a clear and comprehensive anthropological approach to the complex study of tourism in all its practices (Nogués-Pedregal 2011). Only now at this third stage do we see a definitive increase in academic production in Spanish of anthropological work on tourism, and we see this even in Latin American scientific journals (Hernández-Ramírez 2015). Recent contributions, such as work by Milano (2016), Nogués-Pedregal (2009, 2011), Palou (2014), and Hernández-Ramírez (2015), have clarified the state of the art in the anthropological study of tourism in

Spain and, in work by Martínez Mauri (2013, 2015), its relationship with the anthropology of development.

Argentinian and Uruguayan anthropologists of tourism (whose work is mostly written in Spanish) began to publish around 1990 and were heavily influenced by geographers' studies of tourism in neighboring Brazil. Mobility, modernity, and postmodernity, topics favored by Anglophone work on tourism, clearly influenced those colleagues in Argentina and Uruguay. However, the classic Anglophone literature on tourism is hardly widespread in regional academic centers (Barretto and Otamendi 2015).

In neighboring Brazil, anthropologists have begun to study tourism only more recently (Banducci 2001, 2002; Banducci and Barretto 2001; Barretto 2003, 2009; Steil 2002), following interest among geographers in the 1980s. According to Álvaro Banducci Jr. (2001), most anthropological studies up until the beginning of this last decade were focused on Brazil's political economy and were concerned with the implementation of tourism projects in small communities. The anthropology practiced in Brazil would be part of what Stocking (1983) called an "anthropology of nation building state," and the most relevant research on tourism has been marginalized relative to the studies financed by public development agencies (Pinto 2015).

Anthropological interest in tourism in Portugal started in the mid-1990s and generally followed trends in international anthropology. As in Spain, the first anthropologist interested in tourism, Eugene L. Mendonsa, came from the United States (Pereiro and Fernandes 2015).

Last, in this special section of *American Anthropologist*, Ángeles A. López Santillán analyzes the Mexican tradition of anthropology of tourism, including the close connection that has developed between anthropology of tourism in Mexico and development anthropology in Mexico.

I am clearly not exhausting the subject matter here, and this exploration needs to be continued (with other countries included and developments addressed). In all these cases, each national anthropological tradition has winked at Anglophone theoretical and methodological traditions but has, nonetheless, developed its own literature and thematic studies. Moreover, despite that Ibero-American anthropologies of tourism come from different traditions, since the last decade some of the Ibero-American anthropologies have come together in a reciprocal space of debate in order to build a shared conceptual framework for the comprehension of tourism in all its complexity. In the last decade, we have seen an increase in conferences, discussions, and debates among Ibero-American anthropologists, including the first two international conferences in 2015 and 2016 organized by the Network of Ibero-American Anthropologists (AIBR) as well as several panels and reports that have focused on anthropological interest in tourism. While the first two conferences took place in Spain, the one in 2017 will take place in Mexico.

All of this argues for a broader world anthropologies framework in the anthropology of tourism. I think

two of the main objectives of the world anthropologies project suggest as much: the development of a plural landscape of anthropologies and the fostering of conversations among anthropologists from various regions of the world (Ribeiro 2006). The special issue of *PASOS* and this issue of *American Anthropologist* certainly serve to advance the idea of a plural landscape for the anthropologies of tourism. So far, *PASOS* (among other Ibero-American journals and networks) has allowed Ibero-American anthropologists to interact and discuss issues in Spanish (and at times Portuguese) without having to deal with English as a barrier to communication. But there is more. There are now two networks, Redalyc and Latindex, created for scientific journals in Latin America and the Caribbean as well as Spain and Portugal. Cooperation and participation between researchers will grow and advance scholarly debates and enrich the interpretation of ethnographic case material. I hope that this cooperation and participation will facilitate greater depth in our work and help to increase collaboration among Spanish, Portuguese, and Latin American anthropologists and research groups as well as with transdisciplinary tourism scholars, and that this will enrich knowledge production in Ibero-American anthropologies of tourism. Several studies organized by Iberian and Latin American scholars and research groups have already led the way.¹ This cooperation among scholars might be able to avoid the spatial and theoretical colonization that Moreno (1975) described. There would be a muting of the historical hegemony of Spanish and Portuguese anthropologies in Latin America and improved transnational academic mobility that would help us all increase horizontal conversations within anthropologies of tourism and the highly developed Ibero-American anthropologies of tourism themselves.

NOTE

1. See, for example, Pereiro Pérez and De León Smith Inawinapi (2007); Ruiz-Ballesteros and Solis Carrión (2007); Ruiz-Ballesteros and Vintimilla (2009); Pastor Alfonso and Gómez López (2010a, 2010b); Pereiro, Ventocilla Cuadros, and Martínez Mauri (2010); Pereiro et al. (2012); Pinto and Pereiro (2010); Pastor Alfonso, Gómez López, and Espeso-Molinero (2012); Hernández-Ramírez et al.; Pérez Galán and Fuller (2015); Suárez et al. (2016).

REFERENCES CITED

- Acosta, Virginia García. 2008. "Presentación" [Presentation]. In *Antropologías del mundo: Transformaciones disciplinarias dentro del sistema de poder*, edited by Gustavo Lins Ribeiro and Arturo Escobar, 17–21. Popayán: RAM-WAN.
- Asad, Talal. 1986. "The Concept of Cultural Translation in British Social Anthropology." In *Writing Culture: The Poetics and Politics of Ethnography*, edited by James Clifford and George E. Marcus, 141–64. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Banducci, Álvaro, Jr. 2001. "Turismo e antropologia no Brasil: Estudo preliminar" [Tourism and anthropology in Brazil: A preliminary study]. In *Turismo e identidade local: Uma visão antropológica*, edited by Álvaro Banducci Jr. and Barretto Margarita, 21–48. Campinas: Papirus.
- Banducci, Álvaro, Jr. 2002. "Turismo y antropología en Brasil: Un estudio preliminar" [Tourism and anthropology in Brazil: A preliminary study]. *Estudios y perspectivas en turismo* 11 (1): 9–26.
- Banducci, Álvaro, Jr., and Margarita Barretto, eds. 2001. *Turismo e identidade local: Uma visão antropológica* [Tourism and local identity: An anthropological vision]. Campinas: Papirus.
- Barretto, Margarita. 2003. "O imprescindível aporte das ciências sociais para o planejamento e à compreensão do turismo" [The indispensable contribution of the social sciences to the planning and understanding of tourism]. *Horizontes antropológicos* 9 (20): 15–30.
- Barretto, Margarita. 2009. "Os estudos antropológicos sobre turismo no Brasil: Uma história recente" [Anthropological studies on tourism in Brazil: A recent history]. In *Turismo e antropologia: Novas abordagens*, edited by Nelson Graburn, Margarita Barretto, Carlos Alberto Steil, Rodrigo de Azeredo Grünwald, and Rafael José dos Santos, 53–66. Campinas: Papirus.
- Barretto, Margarita, and Alejandro Otamendi. 2015. "Antropología y turismo en 'los países del plata' (Argentina y Uruguay)" [Anthropology and tourism in "the countries of silver" (Argentina and Uruguay)]. *PASOS. Revista de turismo y patrimonio cultural* 13 (2): 283–94.
- Cohen, Erik, and Scott A. Cohen. 2012. "Current Sociological Theories and Issues in Tourism." *Annals of Tourism Research* 39 (4): 2177–202.
- Hernández-Ramírez, Javier. 2015. "El turismo como objeto de estudio. Análisis de la producción bibliográfica de los antropólogos españoles del turismo" [Tourism as an object of study: An analysis of the bibliographic production of Spanish anthropologists of tourism]. *PASOS. Revista de turismo y patrimonio cultural* 13 (2): 305–31.
- Hernández-Ramírez, Javier, Xerardo Pereiro Pérez, and Roque Pinto. 2015. "Panorama de la antropología del turismo desde el Sur" [Overview of the anthropology of tourism from the South]. *PASOS. Revista de turismo y patrimonio cultural* 13 (2): 277–83.
- Jurdao Arrones, Francisco. 1979. *España en venta. Compra de suelos por extranjeros y colonización de campesinos en la Costa del Sol* [Spain on sale: The purchase of land by foreigners and the colonization of peasants on the Costa del Sol]. Madrid: Ayuso.
- MacCannell, Dean. (1976) 2003. *El turista: una nueva teoría de la clase ociosa* [The tourist: A new theory of the leisure class]. Barcelona: Melusina.
- MacCannell, Dean. (1992) 2007. *Lugares de encuentro vacíos* [Empty meeting grounds]. Barcelona: Melusina.
- Mandly Robles, Antonio. 1977. *Costa del Sol. Retrato de unos colonizados* [Costa del Sol: A portrait of the colonized]. Madrid: Campo Abierto Ediciones.
- Martínez Mauri, Mònica. 2013. "La investigación en turismo y desarrollo en España. Una mirada antropológica" [Research on tourism and development in Spain: An anthropological perspective]. In *Cooperación en turismo: Nuevos desafíos, nuevos debates*, edited by Jordi Gascón, Soledad Morales, and Jordi Tresseras, 85–105. Barcelona: Universitat Oberta de Catalunya.
- Martínez Mauri, Mònica. 2015. "Una mirada sobre la turistificación de la antropología del desarrollo en el estado Español" [A look at the touristification of the anthropology of development in the

- Spanish state]. *PASOS. Revista de turismo y patrimonio cultural* 13 (2): 347–58.
- Mazín Gómez, Óscar. 2007. *Iberoamérica: Del descubrimiento a la independencia* [Ibero-America: From discovery to independence]. Mexico: El Colegio de Mexico AC.
- Milano, Claudio. 2016. “Antropología, turismo y desarrollo en cuestión: El turismo comunitario a debate” [Anthropology, tourism and development in question: A focus on community based Tourism]. *Quaderns de l’Institut Català d’Antropologia* 32: 145–68.
- Moreno, Isidoro. 1975. “La investigación antropológica en España” [Anthropological research in Spain]. In *Primera reunión de antropólogos españoles*, edited by Alfredo Jimenez, 325–33. Sevilla: Universidad de Sevilla.
- Narotzky, Susana. 2006. “The Production of Knowledge and the Production of Hegemony: Anthropological Theory and Political Struggles in Spain.” In *World Anthropologies: Disciplinary Transformations within Systems of Power*, edited by Gustavo Lins Ribeiro and Arturo Escobar, 133–56. Oxford: Berg.
- Nogués-Pedregal, Antonio Miguel. 2009. “Genealogía de la difícil relación entre antropología social y turismo” [Genealogy of the difficult relationship between social anthropology and tourism]. *PASOS. Revista de turismo y patrimonio cultural* 7 (1): 43–56.
- Nogués-Pedregal, Antonio Miguel. 2011. “Prólogo a la edición Española: La antropología entre lo cultural y el turismo” [Prologue to the Spanish edition: Anthropology between culture and tourism]. In *Lidiar con turistas: Reacciones europeas al turismo de masa*, edited by Jeremy Boissevain, 9–25. Barcelona: Editorial Bellaterra.
- Osorio García, Maribel. 2016. “Revista estudios y perspectivas en turismo: Calidad científica y editorial, temáticas e indicadores bibliométricos” [Review of studies and perspectives in tourism: Scientific and editorial quality, thematic and bibliometric indicators]. *Estudios y perspectivas en turismo* 25 (4): 539–57.
- Palou, Saida. 2014. “The Anthropological Study of Tourism in Spain: Notes about a Brief Anthropological Culture Dedicated to the Study of Tourism.” *Anthropology News* 55 (9–10): 31.
- Pastor Alfonso, María José, and Domingo Gómez López. 2010a. “Impactos socioculturales en el turismo comunitario: Una visión desde los pueblos implicados (Selva Lacandona, Chiapas, México)” [Sociocultural impacts of communitarian tourism: A view from the people involved (Selva Lacandona, Chiapas, México)]. Alicante, Spain: Editorial AguaClara.
- Pastor Alfonso, María José, and Domingo Gómez López. 2010b. “Cooperación interuniversitaria al desarrollo local mediante el apoyo a los modelos de turismo en la Selva Lacandona” [Interuniversity cooperation in local development by supporting tourism models in the Lacandon Jungle]. In *Turismo, cooperación y desarrollo: Actas I Congreso COODTUR*, edited by Marta Nello Andreu and Lorena Beas Secall, 37–38. Tarragona, Spain: Universitat Rovira i Virgili.
- Pastor Alfonso, María José, Domingo Gómez López, and Pilar Espeso-Moliner. 2012. “Turismo comunitario y sus consecuencia entre los lacandones de Chiapas. Organismos y sistemas de apoyo” [Communitarian tourism and its consequences among the Lacandones of Chiapas: Organisms and systems of support]. In *Responsabilidad y turismo*, edited by Agustín Santana Talavera, Alberto Jonay Rodríguez Darias, and Pablo Díaz Rodríguez, 23–44. Tenerife: La Laguna.
- Pereiro Pérez, Xerardo, and Cebaldo De León Smith Inawinapi. 2007. *Los impactos del turismo en Kuna Yala (Panamá). Turismo y cultura entre los Kuna de Panamá* [The impacts of tourism in Kuna Yala (Panama): Tourism and culture among the Kuna of Panama]. Madrid: Editorial Ramón Areces.
- Pereiro, Xerardo, Jorge Ventocilla Cuadros, and Mònica Martínez Mauri. 2010. “Turismo étnico: El caso de Kuna Yala (Panamá)” [Ethnic tourism: The case of Kuna Yala (Panama)]. *Journal of Tourism and Development* 13:143–49.
- Pereiro, Xerardo, Cebaldo De León, Mònica Martínez Mauri, Jorge Ventocilla, and Yadixa Del Valle. 2012. *Los turistas kunas. Antropología del turismo étnico en Panamá* [Kuna tourism: Anthropology of ethnic tourism in Panama]. Palma, Spain: Universitat de les Illes Balears, Edicions UIB.
- Pereiro, Xerardo, and Filipa Fernandes. 2015. “Antropologia e turismo: Dos trilhos, atores e espaços à genealogia da turistificação da antropologia em Portugal” [Anthropology and tourism: From rails, actors, and spaces to the genealogy of the touristification of anthropology in Portugal]. *PASOS. Revista de turismo y patrimonio cultural* 13 (2): 333–46.
- Pérez Galán, Beatriz, and Norma Fuller. 2015. “Turismo rural comunitario, género y desarrollo en comunidades campesinas e indígenas del sur del Perú” [Rural communitarian tourism, gender, and development in peasant and Indigenous communities of the south of Peru]. *Quaderns de l’Institut Català d’Antropologia* (31):95–119.
- Pi-Sunyer, Oriol. 1973. “Tourism and its Discontents: The Impact of a New Industry on a Catalan Community.” *Studies in European Society* (1):1–20.
- Pinto, Roque. 2015. “O turismo na tradição antropológica brasileira” [Tourism in the Brazilian anthropological tradition]. *PASOS. Revista de turismo y patrimonio cultural* 13 (2): 295–304.
- Pinto, Roque, and Xerardo Pereiro. 2010. “Turismo e antropologia: Contribuições para um debate plural” [Tourism and anthropology: Contributions to a plural debate]. *Revista turismo & desenvolvimento* 1 (13): 447–54.
- Ribeiro, Gustavo Lins. 2006. “World Anthropologies: Cosmopolitics for a New Global Scenario in Anthropology.” *Critique of Anthropology* 26 (4): 363–86.
- Ribeiro, Gustavo Lins, and Arturo Escobar, eds. 2006. *World Anthropologies: Disciplinary Transformations within Systems of Power*. Oxford: Berg.
- Ribeiro, Gustavo Lins, and Arturo Escobar, eds. 2008. *Antropologías del mundo: Transformaciones disciplinarias dentro de sistemas de poder* [World anthropologies: Disciplinary transformations within systems of power]. Popayán, Colombia: CIESAS-Envión Editores.
- Rojas-Mix, Miguel. 1991. *Los cien nombres de América: eso que descubrió Colón* [The hundred names of America: What Colón discovered]. San Pedro, Costa Rica: Editorial Universidad de Costa Rica.
- Ruiz-Ballesteros, Esteban, and Doris Solís Carrión, eds. 2007. *Turismo comunitario en Ecuador. Desarrollo y sostenibilidad social* [Community-based tourism in Ecuador: Development and

- social sustainability]. Quito, Ecuador: Abya-Yala, Universidad de Cuenca.
- Ruiz-Ballesteros, Esteban, and María Augusta Vintimilla, eds. 2009. *Cultura, comunidad y turismo. Ensayos sobre el turismo comunitario en Ecuador* [Culture, community, and tourism: Essays on communitarian tourism in Ecuador]. Quito, Ecuador: Abya-Yala, Universidad de Cuenca.
- Salazar, Noel. 2006. "Antropología del turismo en países en desarrollo: análisis crítico de las culturas, poderes e identidades generados por el turismo" [The anthropology of tourism in developing countries: A critical analysis of tourism cultures, powers and identities]. *Tabula Rasa* (5):99–128.
- Santana Talavera, Agustín. 1997. *Antropología y turismo: ¿Nuevas hordas, viejas culturas?* [Anthropology and tourism: New hordes, old cultures?]. Barcelona: Ariel.
- Santana Talavera, Agustín. 2009. *Antropología do turismo: Analogias, encontros e relações* [Anthropology of tourism: Analogies, encounters, and relations]. São Paulo: Aleph.
- Smith, Valene, ed. 1977. *Hosts and Guests: The Anthropology of Tourism*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Smith, Valene, ed. (1977) 1992. *Anfitriones e invitados: La antropología del turismo* [Hosts and guests: The anthropology of tourism]. Madrid: Endymion.
- Steil, Carlos Alberto. 2002. "O turismo como objeto de estudos no campo das ciências sociais" [Tourism as an object of study in the field of social sciences]. In *Turismo rural: Tendências e sustentabilidade*, edited by Mário Riedl, Joaquim Anécio Almeida, and Andyara Lima Viana, 51–80. Santa Cruz do Sul: EDUNISC.
- Stocking, George. 1983. "Afterword: A View from the Center." *Ethnos* 47 (1): 172–86.
- Stronza, Amanda. 2001. "Anthropology of Tourism: Forging New Ground for Ecotourism and Other Alternatives." *Annual Review of Anthropology* 30:261–83.
- Suárez, Laura Paola Vizcaíno, Rocío Serrano Barquín, Graciela Cruz-Jiménez, and María José Pastor Alfonso. 2016. "Teorías y métodos en la investigación sobre turismo, género y mujeres en Iberoamérica: Un análisis bibliográfico" [Theories and methods in research on tourism, gender, and women in Ibero-America: A bibliographic analysis]. *Cuadernos de Turismo* 38: 485–501.
- Turner, Louis, and John Ash. (1975) 1991. "La horda dorada. El turismo internacional y la periferia del placer" [The golden hordes: International tourism and the pleasure periphery]. Madrid: Endymion.
- Wallace, Tim. 2005. "Tourism, Tourists, and Anthropologists at Work." *Napa Bulletin* 23 (1): 1–26.

Commentary

On the Production of Knowledge and the Anthropology of Tourism

Jasmin Habib

University of Waterloo, Canada

The papers in this section ask us to consider whether "mainstream scholarship seems mostly unaware of 'Other' anthropologies of tourism" (a question Noel Salazar asks in his foreword), and I think that the answer is an emphatic "yes!" I read the papers in this special section on the anthropologies of tourism with great interest. I have long had interest in the topic, and have written both a book (*Israel, Diaspora, and the Routes of National Belonging*, 2004) and several papers that consider others' practices along with my own (e.g., Habib, 2007, 2013). But the question—or indeed the answer—actually warrants further thought.

For example, in my own experience, as someone who published a scholarly book in Canada (Habib 2004), there is little question that even though I was among the first to have completed a study that was based, in part, on organized travel to Israel and the relationships that travelers had to Israel and Palestine, none of the (male) colleagues situated in the United States did so much as acknowledge the work for its insights or even the very structure of the analysis, which were subsequently replicated in their respective texts. Although my work was cited, it was not discussed. As such, it comes

as no surprise that the voices of "Other" anthropologists are barely making it into the discussions framed by the dominant discourse.

Perhaps one needs to reflect more generally on the practices of citation in the academic world, a discussion that feminist scholars have long engaged in, noticing (and arguing) that male authors, usually located in the United States or the United Kingdom, are cited more often, both by male and female scholars, with scholarly recognition often relying on these citations (Chibnik 2014, 2016; Confraria, Godinho, and Wang 2017; Dominguez, Gutmann, and Lutz 2014; Hicks 2004; Hicks et al. 2015; Lutz 1990; Merritt 2000; Malesios and Psarakis 2014; Petersen et al. 2014; Radicchi, Fortunato, and Castellano 2008). If one were to broaden the issue beyond gender, as some postcolonial and Indigenous scholars have advocated, one might see the essays in this section as examples of articles not routinely published, read, cited, taught in the classroom, or appearing on lists of readings for comprehensive examinations and in reference bibliographies. It would not surprise any of us to learn that networks of scholars promote the work of those within their own networks, but I wonder if they do so consciously, whether they reflect upon whom and what has been omitted, and/or if they have any awareness of the effects of such

omissions? To put it starkly: To what extent are discussions about how such networks affect the very production of knowledge (and not simply its reception) a part of our training, of discussions at editorial board meetings or within hiring and promotion committees, and the like? How often do we find ourselves discussing citation practices in those meetings? The anthropology of tourism may indeed be a great example of why we must have these sorts of discussions.

My first reaction to reading these papers was surprise that the authors gathered here by Noel Salazar seem to have assumed their readers would know the “classics” of tourism studies. Had they, in effect, and perhaps inadvertently, privileged an Anglophone literature and de facto assumed that a small number of scholars in primarily “Western” universities had discovered tourism as a topic, pioneered the key ideas that all of us must follow or at least debate, and determined what needed to be studied?

Following that realization, I began to think about practices one might need to adopt for anything to change. For example, what if authors were to adopt the practice of never citing the US or UK “classics” (also known as a self-perpetuating “canon”)? Would their papers get past the reviewers of *American Anthropologist*, or would reviewers insist that US scholars be cited and discussed for the paper to be considered complete? I wonder if reviewers would even think much about their own assumptions and how those have come about. What if every journal’s editorial board adopted the practice of sending papers for review to at least one reader outside of the UK and US orbits? Would that broaden the range—even the style—of scholarly debate and discussion? Would that move introduce readers to a much wider range of literatures and perspectives?

Having said that, I also think there are issues to be raised about the anthropological study of tourism as it has been framed here. The essays gathered here are obviously insightful. Each engages its readers and alerts us to a series of barriers the authors feel or have noticed. Some of these are language barriers that might prevent some scholars from reading and learning from colleagues writing in languages other than English. Some of these are barriers to promotion. Absent references, topics of research not vetted by known scholars in a field or subfield, and scholarship that is not recognized as important or influential, all lead to the dismissal or denigration of research and publication outside the “known” or “privileged” world. These practices then become largely self-fulfilling. They affirm the value of some scholarship and devalue much other work. Those of us outside the United States and United Kingdom know this issue well, even if it is not specifically about tourism or the anthropology of tourism itself. To what extent do some scholars knowingly follow what our US or UK colleagues do and value, and to what extent do some stand apart, even if in limited ways? Examples include making decisions about where to publish, what colleagues choose to read, and for which journals they agree to review manuscripts. Academics could decide that

publishing in their national disciplinary journals is just as important as publishing in journals and presses in the centers of empire (the United States and United Kingdom). But that is currently not the case in Canada, despite public debates about these very issues.

I do not want to get into a discussion of metropolises and margins here, but I do have a sense that this is getting reproduced in the academic realm and that it is problematic for many of our colleagues in the Spanish-speaking world, the Chinese-speaking world, and many other communities of scholars. It is perhaps ironic that each of us has been given the opportunity to express that distress in one of those top journals, *American Anthropologist*—indeed, a US journal that most anthropologists around the world would see both as very American and very much at the heart of the discipline’s Anglophone power and domination. It may well suggest an awareness of the issue, but perhaps it also signals genuine anxiety among those at that center, even within the context of anthropology. At my most skeptical I think the question behind the World Anthropologies section of *AA* over the past several years might be based on the perennial question: “Is there something that we (as in the royal ‘we’) are missing?” It could also mean that there is increasing awareness that there is important knowledge that has not made it to the center. Doubts about *AA*’s motivation may exist out there, and in many settings, though so far few such expressions have made it into essays in this section (with the December 2016 issue being the most openly critical).

Yet Claudio Milano takes up the question of impact factors—and, I would add, the audit culture that has introduced and reinforced the importance of a single factor for consideration when it comes to measuring the contribution and quality of scholarly research. As editor-in-chief of *Anthropologica*, the journal of the Canadian Anthropology Society (and long seen as a local/regional/national journal), this worries me as well. It is critically important for all of us to acknowledge the extent to which some of our colleagues have become implicated in the very practices that have marginalized or even delegitimized the work of the local (and in this case, clearly also the national). It has become even clearer to me that they have pressured new scholars (as well as those seeking promotion) to attend to the concerns, themes, and interests of those at the center, even if they themselves criticize the extent to which US and UK scholarship dominates the discussion. That contradiction is common and very complicated for those outside that center.

But allow me, nonetheless, to offer a critique of the papers that have been shared in this issue and to contemplate their consumption here. Each article carefully considers a very narrow set of questions that leaves much out. These essays all seem primarily framed by political economic issues—local, national, regional, and global—and I wonder where that comes from, how to interpret it, and whether these truly are different conversations within anthropology concerning tourism or if they are simply reproducing

recognizable debates from a series of different locales/locations. I would ask why there are so few questions raised about actual tourist practices—about the tourists themselves, their experiences, transformations, ideas, and motivations. I have a particular interest in this area, to be sure, so I was looking to these papers to offer some insight. In the main, however, the essays seem to focus on issues that were once described within the realms of comparative development research and political economy, and that, in most cases, focus primarily on the role of the state.

While Milano offers some overview (listing the work of scholars working in the Ibero-American “worlds”), I was not entirely sure what it was that each had to offer to the larger discussion of tourism or research on tourism. Are there particularly interesting critiques of what Milano describes as the “Anglophone theoretical and methodological traditions” that these works have “winked at” but not fully considered? In what ways do these works force us to think otherwise about tourism studies? Are there arguments that are particularly interesting that need to be considered and that scholars reading *AA*, for example, would not have had direct access to because they have not been published by those at the center? Or is it the case that the work has been accessed but still rarely been fully appreciated or properly acknowledged (as per my argument above)? Or might it be even more problematic because accessing it this way has allowed it to be consumed but without a full engagement with the argument or its authors?

I find the paper on China by Yujie Zhu, Lu Jin, and Nelson Graburn to be the most provocative because it focuses on something called “ethnic tourism” and clearly relates how this is connected to Chinese state practices and nation building (perhaps also engaging its readers in the production of “Chinese” nationalism). That tourism should be promoted in particular ways within one’s country is not entirely new, of course: Canadian anthropologists know well how the promotion of Canada’s parks as *terra nullius* has had direct effects on Indigenous communities and their practices, and how that very economy helped to circulate a certain version of Canada that the Group of Seven painters, for example, helped to promote and to produce. However, by understanding the Chinese cases, we come to appreciate the state’s interests in such transformations of people and of place.

Yet all of the essays here seem to place a priority on the state and development. Are these contributions to theory or to practices in particular countries? The authors describe either the work of others or their own work in relation to other anthropologists’ work on tourism, and they hint at some complicity on the part of many anthropologists in the development policies of their countries’ governments. Perhaps because my own work draws on cultural studies, architecture and planning, feminist studies, postcolonial studies, and the critical race theory literature, this link to “development” has not always been at the center of my analysis, but I also have to imagine that this is a limited view of what has been produced by “worldly” anthropologies of tourism and

that this is simply the orientation of those who were invited to write for this special section of the journal. That is, I wonder if this just captures well the important work of Noel Salazar and his own vision of what needs to be highlighted in an anthropology of tourism that appears in English-language journals or if this orientation says something about the place of anthropology in those particular locations. I can certainly appreciate the pressures and the expectations—especially where government and corporate interests are involved in funding research—to find ways to “apply” one’s knowledge in those locations as well as to find ways where sharing one’s knowledge can work for the national interest and/or at the community level. What appears consistent is the critique of most tourist development with some praise reserved for those few projects that involve local communities and exhibit some independence from the state.

In the end, however, I am left with questions about anthropological thought and its political economies. All the papers omit the toured and not just the tourists. Is that not an area of interest or much studied in the Chinese anthropology of tourism, the Iberian anthropology of tourism, or the Latin American anthropology of tourism, and is it because the state and development are deemed more important areas for scholarly inquiry? I am left to wonder why exactly these particular scholars of tourism and tourism studies want to engage with the applied and policy fields in anthropology and less so with those who focus their attention on tourist sites and popular cultural practices, for example.

I see a good deal here that defines the anthropology of tourism as primarily a study that is political and economic, but I wonder if this is because some scholars identify themselves with a particular area of study, such as tourism, and if this particular framing is being reproduced by those who contribute to certain journals? As someone who has long cared about tourism, tourists, and the toured, I also wonder if political economy can mean something very different in these colleagues’ worlds than in mine. Nevertheless, even if the questions I have raised about the anthropology of tourism may not be theirs, I know that there are things I have learned and that I will continue to learn from each of them.

REFERENCES CITED

- Chibnik, Michael. 2014. “Gender and Citations in *American Anthropologist*.” *American Anthropologist* 116 (3): 493–96.
- Chibnik, Michael. 2016. “Assessing the Quality of Scholarly Journals.” *American Anthropologist* 118 (1): 7–11.
- Confraria, Hugo, Manuel Godinho, and Lili Wang. 2017. “Determinants of Citation Impact: A Comparative Analysis of the Global South Versus the Global North.” *Research Policy* 46 (1): 265–79.
- Dominguez, Virginia R., Matthew Gutmann, and Catherine Lutz. 2014. “Problem of Gender and Citations Raised Again in New Research Study.” *Anthropology News* 55 (3–4): 29–30.
- Habib, Jasmin. 2004. *Israel, Diaspora, and the National Routes of Belonging*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

- Habib, Jasmin. 2007. "Memorialising the Holocaust in Israel: Diasporic Encounters." *Anthropologica* 49 (2): 245–56.
- Habib, Jasmin. 2013. "On the Narratives of Return to Israel/Palestine: Autoethnographic Reflections." In *Ethnographic Encounters in Israel: Poetics and Ethics of Fieldwork*, edited by Fran Markowitz, 156–70. Bloomington: Indiana University Press
- Hicks, Diana. 2004. "The Four Literatures of Social Science." In *Handbook of Quantitative Science and Technology Research*, edited by Henk F. Moed, Wolfgang Glänzel, and Ulrich Schmoch, 473–96. Netherlands: Springer.
- Hicks, Diana, Paul Wouters, Ludo Waltman, Sarah de Rijcke, and Ismael Rafols. 2015. "Bibliometrics: The Leiden Manifesto for Research Metrics." *Nature* 520 (7548): 429–31.
- Lutz, Catherine. 1990. "The Erasure of Women's Writing in Sociocultural Anthropology." *American Ethnologist* 17 (4): 611–27.
- Malesios, Chrisovaladis, and Stelios Psarakis. 2014. "Comparison of the H-Index for Different Fields of Research Using Bootstrap Methodology." *Quality & Quantity* 48 (1): 521–45.
- Merritt, Deborah Jones. 2000. "Scholarly Influence in a Diverse Legal Academy: Race, Sex, and Citation Counts." *Journal of Legal Studies* 29 (S1): 345–68.
- Petersen, Alexander Michael, Santo Fortunato, Raj K. Pan, Kimmo Kaski, Orion Penner, Armando Rungi, Massimo Riccaboni, H. Eugene Stanley, and Fabio Pammolli. 2014. "Reputation and Impact in Academic Careers." *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 111 (43): 15316–21.
- Radicchi, Filippo, Santo Fortunato, and Claudio Castellano. 2008. "Universality of Citation Distributions: Toward an Objective Measure of Scientific Impact." *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 105 (45): 17268–72.

Commentary

Anthropologies of Tourism: A Project Toward a Global Anthropology

Shinji Yamashita

The University of Tokyo/Teikyo Heisei University, Japan

In his introduction to this special section on world anthropologies of tourism, Noel Salazar quotes Arturo Escobar, who defines world anthropologies as "an approach intended to de-essentialize anthropology and to pluralize anthropological inquiry by building on non-hegemonic anthropological practices" (Escobar 2008, 12; see also Ribeiro and Escobar 2006). The world anthropologies framework is, Salazar writes, "deeply influenced by the awareness of hierarchical relations in knowledge production marked by the historical construction of canons of expertise established by the powers that be." Motivated by this world anthropologies approach, Salazar brings together three papers addressing the anthropologies of tourism: Claudio Milano's paper on the possibility of Ibero-American anthropologies of tourism, Angeles López-Santillán's paper on the Mexican way of studying tourism, and a paper on the anthropology of tourism in China written jointly by Yujie Zhu, Lu Jin, and Nelson Graburn. These papers illustrate both the status quo and the possibilities of the world anthropologies of tourism. My comments emerge from my work as an anthropologist of tourism based in Japan, aiming to achieve a global anthropology.

Let me start with López-Santillán's paper on the anthropology of tourism in Mexico. She argues that the Mexican anthropology of tourism is deeply involved in national development projects. She has been particularly concerned with the political economy of tourism development in Mexico. In her own work on the Mexican Caribbean coast, she found herself "participating fully in criticism of devel-

opment as a relevant paradigm in the analysis of tourism in the euphemistically called 'Global South.'" The other focus of Mexican anthropology of tourism is the issue of ethnicity. Ethnicity is produced and reproduced in the context of tourism in which indigenous cultures are treated as symbols of local and national identity. In this context, the actors from state sectors get benefits by stressing national heritage, as is the case with the National Institute of Anthropology and History (Instituto Nacional de Antropología e Historia, or INAH). This national institute supports the research, conservation, and protection of the historical heritage of Mexico, particularly in relation to the UNESCO World Heritage Program. López-Santillán argues that the Mexican anthropology of tourism is thus a product of "situated knowledge" in the context of Mexican national development.

"Situated knowledge" may be one of the key concepts for the making of world anthropologies in general. Anthropological knowledge is produced through the interaction with the natural and cultural environments in a particular society. The Mexican anthropology of tourism has been shaped in the context of situated knowledge production in Mexico. The paper is in this way an important contribution to the world anthropologies of tourism from Mexico, where tourism, anthropology, and national development are closely connected.

In China, too, tourism and anthropology are deeply involved in national developmental projects. Zhu, Jin, and Graburn write: "Intertwining with the subject of ethnology (seen as the study of minorities), anthropology in China still serves the project of nation building, and tourism anthropology is no exception." In this context, the anthropology of tourism is "domesticated" to achieve China's national goals.

Here, too, as in the case of Mexico, the “domestication” follows two axes: ethnic tourism and cultural heritage. Cultural heritage, particularly the UNESCO World Heritage Program, has become one of the central concerns for cultural policy in China. This context shapes how Chinese heritage planners and tourism operators provide material evidence of authenticity: they “often restore, reconstruct, and even rebuild heritage to meet tourists’ demands.” The authors see this as an example of the Chinese “domestication” of the “Western” concept of authenticity to fulfill Chinese economic and aesthetic demands. The authors then argue that “Chinese domestication efforts do not really produce a Chinese anthropology as such, but implicate a plural hegemonic discourse of nation-building and modernization, incorporating both distinctive homegrown Chinese scholarship (*guoxue*) and ideas of progress rooted in the North Atlantic.”

Interestingly, “domestication” here is taken as a process of “glocalization” (Robertson 1992). It also results in the hybridization of scholarship. We may note that Japanese scholarship since the Meiji Restoration (1868) has likewise been formed under the influence of the “Western” hegemonic centers in the modern academic world system. As a result, Japanese anthropology is actually a hybrid product emerging from this ongoing process of Japan’s encounter with “the West” (Yamashita 2006b, 177–78; Yamashita, Bosco, and Eades 2004, 2–10). Therefore, “hybridization” is another key concept for the world anthropologies project.

Claudio Milano’s paper is directed not toward a national anthropology but supranational (or transnational) anthropologies. He uses the term “Ibero-American anthropologists” to refer to those from the Iberian Peninsula and the Spanish- and Portuguese-speaking countries of Latin America. Ibero-American anthropology aims to achieve a better and more horizontal conversation between anthropologists of tourism from Ibero-America. Because this work is done in Spanish and Portuguese, it challenges hegemonic English-language knowledge production. The paper is thus an interesting attempt to transcend national anthropologies in order to make a regional anthropology from an Ibero-American perspective. This has become possible by common languages and through the partially shared history of colonization. I appreciate this kind of regional coalition as an important step toward a world anthropology of tourism. However, a regional anthropology in Asia may take a different form.

Now let me turn to Japan, where I am based. In 2003 Prime Minister Jun’ichirō Koizumi declared that Japan should be a tourism-oriented country (*kankō rikkoku*). Since then, the government has attempted to promote tourism, particularly inbound tourism. As a result, the number of international tourists to Japan has increased greatly, from five million in 2003 to twenty-four million in 2016. At the same time, more importantly, we have seen the rise of tourism studies in Japanese universities. Before Koizumi’s tourism-promotion policy, there were only a few universities that had tourism studies departments, but now more than eighty

universities have tourism studies programs. Tourism studies are now booming in Japan.

I came across the theme of tourism in the latter half of the 1970s, when I was carrying out fieldwork among Toraja people of Sulawesi, Indonesia. The local government at that time had adopted a policy of tourism development. During my fieldwork period, many international tourists visited Toraja land to see their unique cultural performances. For me, as an anthropologist who wanted to study Toraja “traditional culture,” the tourists were an eyesore. So I chose a village that tourists did not visit. However, I later realized that I was wrong because it was not possible to understand the contemporary society of Toraja without taking tourism into consideration. I became much more aware of this point after my encounter with the anthropology of tourism during my study abroad at Cornell University in the United States (1981–83). Therefore, in my PhD dissertation (Yamashita 1988), I added one chapter discussing tourism development in Toraja. This may be one of the first serious anthropological studies on tourism in Japan. Then, in the late 1980s, I shifted my fieldwork site from Toraja to Bali, the most famous international tourist site in Indonesia, so that I could concentrate my study on the relationship between tourism and culture (Yamashita 1999, 2003). Further, in the 2000s, I extended my research to ecotourism, long-stay/lifestyle tourism, and heritage tourism in Indonesia, Malaysia, and Japan (Yamashita 2009).

Overlapping partly with my personal research career, the history of anthropology of tourism in Japan dates back to the latter half of the 1980s. At that time, some anthropologists who were concerned with tourism collaborated on a research project on travel and tourism at the National Museum of Ethnology, Osaka, under the leadership of Shūzō Ishimori. The project was carried out for a period of six years, from 1988 to 1994. We discussed a number of issues around tourism, sometimes inviting renowned scholars of tourism, such as Nelson Graburn, Dean MacCannell, and Erik Cohen. Following this project, in the mid-1990s, I edited the first book in Japan to use the phrase “anthropology of tourism” (*kankō jinruigaku*) in its title (Yamashita 1996). The book was translated into Korean in 1997 and into Chinese in 2012. I also coedited a book in English on tourism and culture in Asia and Oceania based on an international conference held in Kanazawa, Japan (Yamashita, Din, and Eades 1997). Regarding the development of anthropological study on tourism in Japan, see also Nobukiyo Eguchi (2011), who has written an article with an annotated bibliography.

I want to draw attention to two things of note in the anthropology of tourism in Japan. One is related to the Japanese concept of tourism. *Kankō*, a Japanese word for tourism, is literally translated as “seeing light.” The word is originally from the Chinese classic, *I Ching* (*Yi Jing*), or *The Book of Changes*, in which kings/political leaders show “a nation’s light (pride).” Interestingly, the word was lost to the Chinese languages, while it is preserved in Japanese. In

present everyday use, *kankō* has the sense of “pleasant travel” used to connote the visiting of scenic or historic places. This valence of the term spread, particularly in the 1930s with the development of the railroad. Before that, the word *tabi*, which originally implied “painstaking travel,” was used. This change in the use of words may parallel the shift from English “travel” to “tour” in the nineteenth century. The English word “travel” has the common etymological root of the French *travail* (labor), while “tour” is etymologically related to Latin *turnos* (to turn). If we could establish the anthropology of tourism based on this kind of conceptual difference (and similarity) in Japan, China, and “the West,” it would be a great contribution toward making the anthropologies of tourism a project of a global anthropology. Actually, Noel Salazar and I once attempted this on the panel on “Keywords of Human Mobility: A Comparative Cultural Perspective” at the International Union of Anthropological and Ethnological Sciences (IUAES) Congress at Makuhari, Chiba, Japan, in 2014.

Another thing to note is the Asian context of Japanese tourism. Even in the age of “global” tourism, people often move only regionally. In Japan’s international tourism, more than 70 percent of Japanese outbound tourists go to Asian countries, and about 80 percent of inbound tourists to Japan are from Asian countries. Against this background, one may create “Asian” anthropologies of tourism by promoting dialogue among anthropologists based in the Asian region—a project that I once called “interactive anthropology” (Yamashita 2006a, 2006b). It may be somewhat different from Claudio Milano’s Ibero-American anthropologies because in Asia we do not have a common language. Therefore, the language of Asian anthropologies would be not Japanese or Chinese, but English. In a sense, English may be a transnational language in common for Asian anthropologists seeking to facilitate an interactive anthropology in the region.

Criticizing hegemonic anthropology in the academic world system of knowledge production, the world anthropologies project pluralizes anthropological practices. The collection of papers in this special section on the world anthropologies of tourism eloquently demonstrates this point. However, we should not be satisfied with “the periphery” striking back at the hegemonic anthropology of the “Western”—particularly US, UK, and French—centers. Instead, we should seek to enlarge the anthropological horizon (Restrepo and Escobar 2005). Therefore, even though there are national and regional differences, we may go beyond differences to achieve a world anthropology in the singular form rather than world anthropologies in the plural (Mathews 2016).

The question, then, is how to achieve this goal. In his introduction to this special section, Salazar states that “the anthropologists who are most active across borders (including ‘world anthropologists’) are, in many cases, the least ‘national(istic).’ Their career trajectories show increasing

transnational academic mobility rather than a firm embeddedness in any ‘national tradition.’” Then he writes, “the authors of the pieces that compose this special section on the anthropology of tourism all have personal (hi)stories of academic mobility.” They are an exemplary model of world/global anthropologists. Following them, what is required is promoting academic mobility/interaction between hegemonic centers and peripheries to make the discipline truly global.

Writing from Japan, and from Asia, last, I want to draw attention to two recent developments. One is that the Japanese government recently launched a new project to globalize Japanese universities in 2014. Money from the project is being used to boost exchanges with foreign universities, both of students and of teaching staff. Certainly, there is skepticism/criticism about this, but it is clear that we cannot maintain national isolation (*sakoku*) in the current process of globalization (Yamashita 2015, 377). The second development is that the Centre for Asian Tourism Research at Chiang Mai University in Thailand recently set up the *Asian Journal of Tourism Studies*, inviting not only Asian researchers but also “Western” scholars who study tourism in Asia. Although based in Japan/Asia, we are interconnected throughout the world. By dismantling the East-West dichotomy (Hendry and Wong 2006) in this way, we could pursue a global anthropology of tourism.

REFERENCES CITED

- Eguchi, Nobukiyo. 2011. “Kankō no bunkajinruigaku” [Cultural anthropological study on tourism]. In *Kankō kenkyū refarensu dētabēsu: Nihonhen* [Reference database for tourism studies in Japan], edited by Eguchi Nobukiyo and Masami Fujimaki, 42–70. Kyoto: Nakanishiya-Shuppan.
- Escobar, Arturo. 2008. *Territories of Difference: Place, Movements, Life, Redes*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Hendry, Joy, and Heung Wah Wong, eds. 2006. *Dismantling the East-West Dichotomy: Essays in Honor of Jan van Bremen*. New York: Routledge.
- Mathews, Gordon. 2016. “Between World Anthropology and World Anthropologies: An American Anthropologist in East Asia as Gatekeeper/Interpreter.” *American Anthropologist* 118 (4): 845–47.
- Restrepo, Eduardo, and Arturo Escobar. 2005. “‘Other Anthropologies and Anthropology Otherwise’: Steps to a World Anthropologies Framework.” *Critique of Anthropology* 25 (2): 99–129.
- Ribeiro, Gustavo Lins, and Arturo Escobar, eds. 2006. *World Anthropologies: Disciplinary Transformations within Systems of Power*. Oxford: Berg.
- Robertson, Roland. 1992. *Globalization: Social Theory and Global Culture*. London: Sage.
- Yamashita, Shinji. 1988. *Girei no seijigaku: Indonesia Toraja no dōtaiteki minzokushi* [Politics of rituals: Dynamic ethnography of Toraja, Indonesia]. Tokyo: Koubundou.
- Yamashita, Shinji, ed. 1996. *Kankō jinruigaku* [The anthropology of tourism]. Tokyo: Shin-yo-sha.

- Yamashita, Shinji. 1999. *Bali: Kankō jinrui-gaku no ressun* [Bali and beyond: Explorations in the anthropology of tourism]. Tokyo: The University of Tokyo Press.
- Yamashita, Shinji. 2003. *Bali and Beyond: Explorations in the Anthropology of Tourism*. Translated by J. S. Eades. Oxford: Berghahn Books.
- Yamashita, Shinji. 2006a. "Reshaping Anthropology: A View from Japan." In *World Anthropologies: Disciplinary Transformations within Systems of Power*, edited by Gustavo Lins Ribeiro and Arturo Escobar, 29–48. Oxford: Berg.
- Yamashita, Shinji. 2006b. "Somewhere in Between: Towards an Interactive Anthropology in a World Anthropologies Project." In *Dismantling the East-West Dichotomy: Essays in Honor of Jan van Bremen*, edited by Joy Hendry and Heung Wah Wong, 177–82. New York: Routledge.
- Yamashita, Shinji. 2009. *Kankō jinrui-gaku no chōsen: "Atarashii chikyū" no ikikata* [The challenge of the anthropology of tourism: The way of living on the "new globe"]. Tokyo: Kodansha.
- Yamashita, Shinji. 2015. "East Asian Anthropology: A Japanese Perspective." *American Anthropologist* 117 (2): 376–77.
- Yamashita, Shinji, Joseph Bosco, and J. S. Eades. 2004. *The Making of Anthropology in East and Southeast Asia*. Oxford: Berghahn Books.
- Yamashita, Shinji, Kadir H. Din, and J. S. Eades, eds. 1997. *Tourism and Cultural Development in Asia and Oceania*. Bangi: Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia Press.