

An ARCHEOLOGY of a TOURIST LANDSCAPE

Temporalities and Spatiality in Thinking Maya Culture¹

Unpublished essay by Quetzil Castañeda, originally written in 1993-94 as a chapter for the book, *In the Museum of Maya Culture* (chapter withdrawn from final publication)

There can be no mistake about the character of this [corbelled, ruined] arch; it cannot for a moment be supposed that the Spaniards constructed anything so different from their known rules of architecture; and beyond doubt it formed part of one of those mysterious buildings which have given rise to so much speculation; the construction of which has been ascribed to the most ancient people in the Old World and to races lost, perished, and unknown.

John L. Stephens 1988, vol. I: 64.

If this opinion is correct, and I believe it -- if this skeleton does present the same *type* of physical conformation with all the tribes of our continent -- then, indeed, do these crumbling bones declare, as with a voice from the grave, that we cannot go back to any ancient nation of the Old World for the builders of these cities; they are not the works of people who have passed away and whose history is lost, but of the same great *race* which, changed, miserable, and degraded, still clings around their ruins.

John L. Stephens 1988, vol. I: 181-182; original italics.

ARCHEOLOGIZING TERRITORIES

Travel -- a category in which I include practices of writing, collecting, spatial movement and itineraries, and identity formation -- has become an important topic for critics concerned with culture in relation to colonial discourses (see Hulme 1986; Todorov 1984; Campbell 1988; Bongie 1991; Pratt 1992; van den Abbeele 1992; Spurr 1993; Blunt 1994; Behdad 1994; Kaplan 1996; Clifford 1997; Rojek and Urry 1997). Mary Pratt (1992), for example, argues that travel writing has produced the world. On the one hand, she pursues analyses initiated by Hulme (1986) on how genre/plot schemas provide models of racial and colonial interaction for the practice (and legitimation) of everyday habits and mentalities comprising colonial engagements. On the other hand, she analyzes the descriptive modes of European travelogues for how they constitute landscapes of the non-western Other and how social relations come to reflect and embody these imagined human geographies. The task, then, is to explore this space (and time) between the landscape "as map" and "as practice" in the invention of the tourist topography.

Regarding the "re-invention" of América, Pratt identifies an important tactic in the relations between Indigenous and European peoples:

The European imagination produces archeological subjects by splitting contemporary non-European peoples off from their precolonial, and even their

colonial, pasts. To revive indigenous history and culture as archeology is to revive them *as dead*. The gesture simultaneously rescues them from European forgetfulness and reassigns them to a departed age. (Pratt 1992: 134, original italics.)

Thus, in the first epigraph above, the most famous travel writer of Yucatán reinvents the archeological Maya in a textual event. But, of course, the death of the Indigenous past is a trope in which not only a colonizing desire, but the colonial fear of overthrow is manifested. As Pratt points out, the Indigenous past lives on as a memory that can motivate insurrection. Thus, this past is dead only in specific contexts of representation, such as museums, folklore, national discourse, etc., but it lives also in the colonizer's memory as danger to be continually conquered.

Anderson (1989) also discusses this archeologizing when he outlines the figure of the (national and natural history) museum as a mechanism for the imagining of the nation-state: The production of this contemporary/ancient split in the identity of subordinated communities supplies surpassed (or vestige) and subjugated "stages" in the evolution of the Nation that are displayed for *tourists* as objectified testaments to national integration into an encompassing community. This larger whole is imagined in the figure of Civilization (in whatever guise) and is embodied by the specific nation as its ultimate representation. Thus, the archeologizing tactic operates like a *hinge* whereby the split alternately designates the *continuity* of a primordial patrimony of the nation (a link between the hegemonic culture through the subordinate contemporaries to the *once* glorious *past*) and the *disruption* that disenfranchises the contemporaries as the legitimate heir of that past in terms of political, economic and social rights. The Maya are "cling-ons" of a ruined future and of a present (presence) in ruins. Articulated by this hinge, then, are the tropes of Civilization and Culture: An image of supra-community, Civilization, is forged (in contestation) by the totalization of all subordinate collectivities that are thereby situated as sub-Cultures except the hegemonic national community that has the power to claim its identity with Civilization as its heir. Thus, this archeologizing hinge is not only a textual tactic, a trope of discourse, but a powerful strategy in the struggle to build nations: It operates to landscape the image of an integrated, yet differentiated, Nation that extends into both an appropriated primordial past and the image of universal belonging. It is this archeologized landscape that constitutes the grid of tourism, at least in Yucatán.

In the analyses that follow, we visit several different maps of the tourist geography of Yucatán. The general goal is to provide a genealogy of the present landscape of tourism, that is, an understanding of the history of the way Yucatán has been imagined and practiced by tourism. But, more specifically the task is to identify the central mechanisms by which space has been carved up into places, inscribed with value and identities, organized into sites and networks of activities, and linked up into encompassing circuits of travel practices. In order to more adequately understand the way space is used and made meaningful, here with regard to tourist topography, close attention to time and its complex operations is necessary.

THE NATURE OF ART: OR, "ROMANCING THE STONE(S)" (OF YUCATAN)

Conjure an image, if you will. The jungle trail is aimless and constricted, morning steam rising from compacted vegetation. You pause.... Shafts of light pierce the canopy of trees high as redwoods... a toucan with a banana-yellow beak beats through the still leaves. Monkeys no bigger than fists pirouette and chatter among the branches, black against the filtered sunlight. You press on. Then, dead ahead, an improbable looking tower of massive stone looms. A nearly vertical staircase clambers hundred feet up the face into the pale china sky. Up there, at the top is a temple of carved stone godheads. Finally, you have come to the lost city of your imaginings. But the Yucatán is real, not the flickering fabrication of matinees at the Bijou, neither Tarzan's milieu nor that of the fanciful archeologist called Indiana. The Yucatán exists, right now, a palpable romantic vision.

H.B. Livesey, *Rediscovering Yucatán's Mysterious Ruins and Other Uninhabited Resorts*, 1987:80.

This epigraph is indeed "a winter's tale," or one of its parables: It was put to press in the middle of winter, in the February 1987 edition of TRAVEL AND LEISURE. It forces the reader to ask the question which could be asked of Julio Romano, who -- in the play alluded by name -- composes a statue of the character Hermoine that is so real that it comes to life: "What ever became of the Maya?"

Julio Romano, a real life artist and contemporary of Shakespeare, is deployed by the English author as a character to perform this trick, a ruse, in which art that mimics nature is transformed into nature; art comes alive as nature. After having accomplished this man-made art, Shakespeare has Romano "disappeared" from the drama.² In a similar mode, the author Livesey, following a determinate logic for the understanding of the Maya, has the indigenous "artist" of Yucatán (that is, the Maya) disappear from the art-cum-nature in question. According to the perspective unhesitatingly proclaimed in the epigraph, Yucatán and, by implication, the Maya, exist first and foremost in the western *and romantic* imagination: After all, situated in front of the Euro-gaze, it is dead, "dead ahead." This city, this landscape, is a mausoleum: The inhabitants are only mentioned later with the surprise that the Maya still live today. Through an art, which is conceptually (and erroneously) reduced to vision, specifically the tourist gaze, the west, resurrects the dead in its mausoleum, thereby transforming a decayed nature in a living museum.

According to the logic of this touristic discourse on the Maya, images of the Other selected from the immediate history of the west "naturally" form the matrix in which knowledge of the Maya is possible. Even the effort to leave aside the conjured images of film in order to represent the "real" Yucatán fails, since the author later has recourse to a mythical history and historical metaphor: "... when Hannibal crossed the Alps [Maya civilization's] stunning cities [were] erected and then *mysteriously* deserted long before Columbus" (Livesey 1987: 80-81; italics added). This framing device, which situates the Maya according to Europe and [its] History, heightens the romance of the Maya instead of diminishing it through a comparison with an event of fantastic proportions. The selection of the incredible and audacious act of taking elephants across the Alps seems to be the only comparable event in western history that can measure up against the mystery of the Maya. But this marvel or wonder does not so much locate Yucatán and the Maya in time or history, as it settles them in a place, that is a topos, and a logical category: Situated on the other side of the Alps and under the pale sky of China, it is the "East."

Before Columbus, as Mary Campbell (1988) argues, the East was the name of Elsewhere, the lands populated by the exotic Other. Not only did these hybridized species cause the "wonder" that fill the European imagination and the boundaries of its world, but so did the abundance of material wealth, which awaited plunder and possession (cf. Greenblatt 1992). With Columbus, the East went West (1988: ch 5), and its "wonders" were re-written. The mystery of the Maya descends from this link in the great chain of orientalizing alterity within European discourses of knowledge. Formalized in the Great Debate of 1550³ and continued as the paradigm of 19th and 20th century archeological science, the origin and status of the "New World" populations has been an arena for playing out different political and social struggles in which the changing terms of debate have indicated the shifting stakes involved (Gerbi 1983; Pratt 1992; Pearce 1988; Patterson 1986; Willey and Sabloff 1980; Trigger 1985; Bernal 1980; Barrera Vásquez 1980). From the question of the humanity of these people and the status as civilization of the Aztecs, the question has not dramatically altered: The same *orientalizing* of Indian alterity can be identified as the origins of "New World" peoples are sought, no longer in lost Israelites, but in nomadic big-game hunting Mongolians, and the civilizing impulse is attributed -- *not to the peoples themselves or their ancestors*, but -- to fortuitously shipwrecked Japanese, wandering Southeast Asian priests, survivors of Atlantis, cruising astronauts or other exploratory forms of "higher intelligence" originating from beyond the modern *oikumene*. These displacements of the origin of Indigenous peoples, here especially of the Maya, are mechanisms by which the socio-political disenfranchisement called archeologizing occurs. The "East" or "Elsewhere" remain the generic category to which all of these exogenous sources postulated by scientific and new age discourses belong.

The scientific pursuit of origins and the heterogeneous modes of romanticizing these origins are a transcription, then, of the marvelous alterity of the East: It has resulted in the mysteriousness of the Indian. The Maya have been particularly typed within this category of being, but it operates in distinct ways to all "Indians" and "Native Americans" -- contrast for example Taussig's (1987) analysis of the fabulous power of the Indian shaman and Vizenor's putting under erasure of Indian Portraits with Maya Mysteriousness (Castañeda 1996: chapter 7; Stuart and Stuart 1977). From this angle, then, it is clear that the Maya of the tourist landscape did not so much as cross the Bering Straits, but "Livesey's Alps," that is, the frontier of the Eurocentric imaginary. Here the accessibility to enact carnivalesque techniques of bodily pleasure are valorized as *modern* (better, higher, more *civilized!*) in contraposition to the subordinated forms of alterity, which in turn are hierarchized according to socio-economic markers (work, consumption, class, ethnicity-race, economic development, technology, etc.).

Shakespeare's Tale tells us that art can only become nature, that is, pass itself off as *authentic* and natural, as *real* life, with the disappearance of the artist -- thus, the proliferation of the putative origins from which the Maya were diffused. This *mise-en-scene* of the "artist" allows for others to inhabit and bring to life the artistic representation or cultural construction. Before Mayas are directly mentioned and discussed in this specific text from which the epigraph is taken, the Yucatec landscape is appropriated by (i.e., assigned by the narrative to) agents of the West *as the builders of civilization*. This, after all, is not a New Age or scientific, but a touristic discourse that performs the archeologizing tactic. It is through this Western intervention of economic-touristic development that the otherwise *blank* or *dead*

limestone is brought to "life." In this moment, the Western-touristic experience of the Maya is authenticated as the reality of the terrain: "In the peninsula's interior are towns built by the conquistadores; at its eastern edge, resorts sleek as tomorrow or fetching as a Hollywood South Seas whimsy. And it is *only four hours away from New York by air*" (Livesey 1987: 81, emphasis added). Marked by a temporal distance from Modernity, Yucatán is nonetheless wrenched from historical time and agency, which is only possible with the disappearance or erasure of the Indigenous inhabitants. The Maya, it is presupposed, are totally absent from even the premodern (i.e., colonial) period; quite simply, in this cosmology, they are *Elsewhere*.

But, "where indeed are the Maya?" This question, provoked by the disappearance of the Maya in touristic discourse, is all the more urgent in contexts of politics, state, and modernity. For example, put into place in the aftermath of political operations of genocide and violence that have sought the bodily disappearance of Indigenous culture, such as in Guatemala (1979-1983), the discourses and practices of tourism work a recolonizing strategy. For both modernism and modernization are posited as possible only on the absence of the "Indian." Or, at least this had been the case: Now, with the advent of the *Mundo Maya Project* (see conclusion below), a new governmental attitude began to be formed in Guatemala in the late 1980s when civilian government had been able to assert some autonomous space from the military; in this strategy the Maya Indian becomes, not a detriment to development, but the folkloric vestige of a "surpassed stage" and, thus, a touristic attraction within the museumified representation of the Nation.⁴ The deployment of tourism as the mechanism of the consolidation of the disappearance of the rotten, savage Indian Other is manifest when in May 1998 President Zedillo of México protests against — and even permanently extradites nearly one hundred participants in — the "revolutionary tourism" or "reality tourism" of Global Exchange and of human rights watch groups such as Amnesty International that visit Chiapas. The Maya Zapatistas might be heroic and legendary, but have yet to become quaint folklore. In Yucatán, this double mechanism (bodily disappearance leaving only archeological ruins and reappearance as folkloric vestige) was triggered earlier, in the 19th century, but in a different configuration of power as discussed in the next section.

For the moment, the archeologizing disappearance of the Maya must be detailed within this text of tourism as it constitutes the Mystery of the Maya as attraction. This Mystery is the inversion of the Medieval Wonders of the East: Whereas the wonderful (and imaginary) species were repeatedly deferred to another topos (Campbell 1988; cf. Mason 1991) until they came to rest in a dated belief of a European past, the Maya traveled the opposite route, from the dual position of categorical anomaly of knowledge (and target of a colonizing "romance") to a reappearance as a *mysterious* icon in a speculative geography of tourism and a geometry of domination. In these transcriptions, the trace of Wonder, of the *marvelous*, is nonetheless retained in the figure of Mystery, that speculative maneuver whereby the unintelligible and unruly Maya are effaced in preparation for their reemergence within the epistemological and socio-political control designated by a western apparatus. If domination targets the alterity of bodies as subjects of control, Mystery tabulates subjects in a system of knowledge as disembodied alterity. It, thus, governs the organization, production, and dissemination of knowledge about the Maya.

In returning to the epigraph, the title of the article announces this same point: "Rediscovering Yucatán's Mysterious Ruins and Other Uninhabited Resorts." By selecting discursive elements from an already romanticized understanding, the Maya are reinvented as a mysterious people -- when they finally breach the pages of this tourist text. Through the reinvention of mystery, the Maya are constructed as an attraction which is *to be visited by the reader-who-becomes-tourist*. While the trope of mystery serves to create one of two poles of an attraction (pleasure versus past), the objective is to create tourists from readers. In this touristic construction of the Maya, the trope of mystery provides a screen for a "magic" trick: In the visual gap and discursive space left open with the disappearance of the Maya, the reader is transformed, interpellated, into a tourist, someone who will re-occupy and re-colonize the empty spaces of those "uninhabited" resorts.

It is important to note that the logic of the disappearing artist continues to operate at another level. After the Maya-constructed-landscape of Yucatán becomes naturalized according to the artistic rendition of the western vision, the touristic re-fabulation of the landscape must now come to life as an authentic reality as well: "a palpable romantic vision." Mayanized-Yucatán is naturalized to become a proper object for the romantic gaze of the modernized tourist. Ironically, Yucatán does not fit into the traditional conception of the romantic landscape, since it is a low, flat, dry scrub forest littered with broken rocks and not composed of scenic mountains, rivers, and forest: Only the ghosts of ancient mound-builders inhabiting the cracks in the monotonous and sweltering terrain can make it adequate as a romantic vision.⁵ Thus, the marks and traces of the tourist developer and its image, the figure of the tourist, must be continually hidden and effaced. The anti-tourist ideology espoused by tourists (and by students of tourism)⁶ must be understood to function, in part, within this operation that simultaneously erases and re-writes both the Maya and the tourist into the Yucatec landscape. By (re-)inscription I refer to a process whereby particular meanings and images are written onto select locations of the social and physical environment. Places, people, and physical objects are marked off as foci of attention which in turn operate as a system of signification -- a text -- that orients and organizes social practices.

ON THE HINGE OF ARCHEOLOGIZING THE YUCATEC NATION

After resting and exchanging news with the soldiers at Pisté, the Le Plongeons and their escort continued their march to Chichén Itzá. Long before they reached the site, they could see the tallest pyramid, El Castillo, towering over the green canopy "as a solitary light-house in the midst of the ocean."

Desmond and Messenger, *DREAM OF THE MAYA*, 1988: 27.

In the latter part of the 19th century, travel in Yucatán was severely limited to northwestern corner of the peninsula: Chichén was on the frontier of the Cruzob-Criollo war. In order for the Le Plongeons to conduct their excavations and photographic documentation they worked under a small armed detachment of Yucatec soldiers; when these did not endure the threat of Cruzob attack Pisté locals were anxiously cajoled into service (Desmond and Messenger 1988).⁷ The Le Plongeons were able to work at Chichén

for less time than they expected and were themselves forced to retreat to Uxmal and Mérida. Some thirty years earlier, Stephens and Catherwood had traveled extensively throughout the peninsula without such problems. By the end of the (Yucatec version of the) Mexican Revolution in the early 1920s, travel in Yucatán was liberated from the threat of violence. Nonetheless, between these two moments the social topography had irrevocably changed.

The tourist geography drafted by Stephens is a model of Yucatán through which an authentic Yucatán is invented for its 20th century readership. For immediately after publication Yucatán went under the flames of a total war -- "scorched earth" tactics and "chemical/bacteriological"⁸ warfare were common -- that radically deterritorialized the landscapes. Thus, the "cultural" authenticity invented in the travelogue is predicated on its being forever lost to the forces of history that decimated the cultural milieu of the 19th century. Nonetheless, as a guidebook for (post-Caste War) travelers (Yucatecans, Mexicans, foreigners) it "produced" Yucatán by locating the topoi of authentic culture that could only be visualized through vestige: Places were narrated as the sites of the enactment of specific cultural diagnostics of Yucatecan and Maya Culture; thus, in the 20th century rereading of his travelogue, a landscape of culture topoi is refabricated and reinvented in the imagining of the Lost Maya. But, the authenticating power Stephen's writing and, his companion, Catherwood's drawings lies to a great extent on the fact that the travel itinerary was destined to prefigure the topoi that would comprise the topography of tourism by the end of the 20th century: Mérida was marked as a place of both Maya and Yucatec (creole) culture but *under the sign* of colonial Yucatec society, that is, designated as a *colonial attraction* or *sight*. In a complementary opposition to this was set the Maya countryside that in turn also split into a binary landscape: On the one hand, there are the ruins and towns of the Puuc and in the southern periphery of Mérida as well as to the east as far as Chichén; on the other hand, the entire eastern from Valladolid over to the coastal towns and ruins of Tulum, Cozumel, Catoche, "Kancune" formed a second region (see Stephens, 1988, vol. II). In other words, the same places with the same names would be visited, but now with a *nostalgic* vision that sought the traces of the disappearance of the "culture-traits" described 140 years earlier; no longer could the reader-traveler *participate* (like ethnographers, or a proto-ethnographer like Stephens) in the localized life as practiced, but only imagine the community with an imperialist nostalgia.

This travelogue marks a "cultural watershed" in another way: As quoted in the epithet of this chapter, Stephens argued *against* the then current archeologizing of the Maya landscape with the flip side of this tactic: The ruined cities "are not the works of people who have passed away and whose history is lost, but of the same great *race* which, changed, miserable, and degraded, still clings around their ruins" (Stephens 1988: 182). Within the colonial regime, Landa marks the simultaneous recollection and suppression of the historical continuity of past and present peoples. Why did the end of colonial rule condition or allow for an end of that archeologizing disjunction? More than just independence from Spain 1821 marked the possibility of independence for Yucatán as a sovereign nation. However, in this case, the imagining of such an entity required more than the "governmental tourism" postulated by Anderson (1989): Here, it required a the fabrication of what Geertz called the "primordial origins" of national identity or what in Spanish is simply called "cultural patrimony." The narration of such primordial patrimony of a contested nation would thereby forge its legitimacy and contours beyond a genesis in the illicit violence of the

Spanish invasion and establishment of the colonial regime (cf. Bhabha 1994: 139-170). Thus, the Yucatec creole intelligentsia appropriated this previously heretic idea of a continuity with the precolumbian Maya-Indian civilization as an essential element in the invention of a Yucatec nation and image of a national community (Campos 1987, 1988; Morales V. 1987). In this, Stephens played a key role as transculturator in a way parallel to Humboldt's role in the reinvention of América that Pratt has analyzed (1992). The Stephen's narration of culture-topoi relied extensively on information and assistance provided by local and regional intellectuals, often priests, such as Don Pio Perez, who together constituted an emergent *Yucatec* "anthropology;" in turn, the Yucatecos were in support of and appropriated his well disseminated thesis that the ancient mound builders were Maya. Thus, the *truth* of the archeological continuity was consolidated, the patrimony of the regional culture enriched, the temporal depth of the emergent nation extended into autochthonous and ruined origin, and the contemporary descendents of the civilized Maya were locked into an image of vestige cling-ons.

The Caste War had the effect of reducing, from the Euro-western perspective, the *knowable and civilized* territory. It was as if what had been identified as Maya had gone into hiding: What was Maya, its diagnostics and topoi, had all been placed under a question mark, that is, under the sign and category of uncertain knowledge and, thus, danger (in the sense explained by Mary Douglas). There was a return to the archeologizing that preceded Stephens, but now with a hinge: The historical continuity between contemporary Maya and their precolumbian ancestors was once again severed in certain contexts of ideological domination (e.g., tourism; hacienda life), but in others, the linkage was propagated within specific modes of representation: The Maya became an archeological vestige as ruined artifact and pre-modern (folkloric) holdover. Thus, this archeological hinge was set in place which provided the catapult for both the Yucatec intelligentsia to begin its long romanticization of the Maya as the heart and soul of the nationalistic Yucatec community⁹ and for anthro-archeological science to dig for and "restore" the objects that would be displayed in the museums of Maya Civilization that it would create, such as Chichén Itzá (see Castañeda 1996).¹⁰

With the consolidation of the henequen monoculture, Mérida became an urban center for social and economic significance and the touristic landscape became polarized between this Yucatec core and a Maya hinterland cloaked in Mystery.¹¹ This symbolic opposition is as much at the heart of Redfield's folk-urban continuum (1941; see Strickon 1965 for a proto-dependency/world system revision of this continuum and Castañeda 1995 for a deconstructive implosion of it) as it is the basis for the development of the tourist landscape in the 20th century. Two sites of attraction for the gaze of the tourist/traveler were constituted as noted: Mérida, as the civilized-modern city, and the ruined Maya landscape, which split along a different kind of archeological hinge (that of touristic sight) between Chichén and Uxmal. Tellingly, an artful, tourist map of Yucatán from a 1955 INAH guidebook clearly indicates the evolutionary schema that underlies this network: The then deserted coastal sites of Cozumel (which is east) are on the bottom, important Maya ruins in the middle (which are in the central and western parts of the peninsula) and Mérida (which is at the northwest corner) is at the top of map (see **ILLUSTRATION**). This opposition between Maya ruins and colonial-Porfirian city, structures and sights had dominated, not simply the representation, but the invention, of the Yucatec landscape up until the 1980s,

when, finally in a concerted response to Cancun, the state's beach resources began to be developed through planned government and private intervention. The published maps of the tourist landscape from the 1950s and 1980s attest to this shift in the production of a topography in terms of modernity (see **ILLUSTRATION**).

(COLONIAL) TOWN AND (RUINED) COUNTRY IN A MODERN LANDSCAPE

Progreso was the port of entry into Yucatán for all travel in the 19th and early 20th centuries. A 1927 guidebook written in English by a Yucatec lawyer (Andrade 1927) provides a map of the tourist geography. Well into the body of the text, Andrade discusses "Mérida, the Capital of the State":¹²

Agents of the local express companies meet and board all ships which arrive at Progreso. These concerns transfer the traveler's baggage from the ship at Progreso to his selected hotel in Mérida. This express service is reliable and may be employed with confidence.... The express agent will also purchase for the traveler a first-class railroad ticket for his necessary train trip from Progreso to Mérida. The distance [being] 36 kms. The running time is 50 minutes. At the railroad station in Mérida will be found automobiles and horse-drawn coaches for conveying the guest to his hotel.... The services of any one of them may be safely accepted.... If the guest requires the services of an interpreter the hotel manager can obtain one. (Andrade 1927: 35.)

Once "In the City" (p. 36), Andrade describes various attractions or points of interest for the traveler. Before preceding with these, however, consider how the reader "traveling" in (reading) this text gets to Mérida within narrative sequence of the text. The general introduction presents, along with a map of the state's roads, information on the formation of the political entity and a few statistics on its primary export product, henequen. Proceeding directly to the "Historic Ruins [and] Maya Language" Andrade discusses the Maya civilization as if it were a natural resource (pp. 9-26); indeed, the sections that follow concern "Petroleum, Quarries [and] Copra." The tone, organization and form of the guidebook follows an encyclopedic mapping of the major points of interest as they progress from the general and natural to the specific and the modern. What is striking here is that this early guidebook is dominated by the map, specifically in an encyclopedic genre; the narrative style of the tour is a later development in the history of this writing. Within the opposition of Maya/Modernity, which is cast in a historical progression or sequence, it is the Maya that is symbolically marked in the text as the primary touristic attraction.

Further, this cultural attraction that is cast as a natural phenomena is forged in a trope of mystery. "The tourist has available at Mérida several trips that will carry him to the various ruined cities of the ancient race which inhabited the peninsula, and *which has vanished with nothing to indicate who they were or what became of them* [sic] these great ruins of temples and palaces, and they are only mute witnesses to the fact that a wonderful race *once dwelt* in Yucatán" (Andrade 1927: 17, italics added). In the next section, Andrade is able to discuss the Maya language in terms of hieroglyphs and Landa's alphabet: In other words, at the same time that he recognizes that the Maya is the "unknown" ancient race, he negates this identity and any knowledge about them. This is the irony that underlies the

figure of Mystery and that is always (already) repeated in the tourist literature. Usually it is paired with a romanticism or romantic gaze as mentioned in the opening discussion.

Note how the epigraph by Livesey repeats a structure found in the second epigraph by Desmond and Messenger. Both construct a romantic trope of the Yucatec landscape which derives from the 19th century travelogical invention of América that Pratt (1992) has isolated. Here the source is not Humboldt but the Le Plongeurs' romantic vision - constructed as a "discovery of Chichén." This ironic intertextual invention is romanticized in the trope of the lighthouse in an ocean or its substitute tower cast against the sky.

As part of the natural history, Andrade describes how to visit this naturalized landscape: "To go to Chichén Itzá ruins the traveler takes the eastbound train that leaves Mérida at 5½ A.M., and at ten o'clock A.M. arrives at Dzitas; the distance from this village to Chichén Itzá, twenty kilometers, is covered in forty minutes, by means of automobiles or autobuses, that are always [al]ready at Dzitas waiting for the travelers" (Andrade 1927: 13, 15). "The traveler may go 36 miles from Mérida by train to Muna, spend the night, and next day go horseback 5 miles to Uxmal" (Andrade 1927: 19). Curiously, the narrative sequence of the text is such that the reader is told how to get *to* these places *from* Mérida without yet having *arrived in* Mérida. This textual positioning mimics or reproduces the relationship of the Maya as cultural heritage that had been forged by certain intellectual movements of the 19th and 20th century. This locates the Maya at the margins as origins of both Yucatec society and its tourist geography even as it textualized as the primary sign of its attraction.

At the other end of this geography stands Progreso, Valladolid and Campeche which are discussed in the same style and mode as is Mérida, albeit on a much reduced scale. "Once in the City," Andrade assumes an encyclopedic style of information, of which three types can be identified: practical information for the efficient conduct of travel; a narrative map that locates the "points of interest," i.e., sites invested with specific meaning; and, descriptive information on the history or organization of specific sites/sights of meaning. Lists of parks and their addresses, of bus and railroad timetables, of theaters and sports are made. Descriptions of the museum, the socialist league, the chamber of commerce, the department of public health, and the divorces laws are made. The guidebook then is a combination of a guide, map and ethnography. Whereas the 16th century treatises that "methodize" the arts of travel detail how the traveler should *collect* information on other peoples and places so that their proper place in the universal history of knowledge could be ascertained, the tour guide *provides* information on the "noteworthy" aspects of the visited societies so that the tourist-traveler can simultaneously re/discover and re/produce the place of the Other (see Stagl 1990; Fabian 1983; Horne 1984; Donato 1979; Bennett 1995).

Overall, this 1927 guidebook is more "map" than "tour" due to its encyclopedic art of knowledge (see de Certeau 1984: 118-130; Castañeda 1996: 1-4, 259-260, *passim*). The passages I presented are written in the style of a tour, "from Mérida to," and they express a concern for the practice of traveling versus an emphasis on the place to be visited and its location. However, most of the book is descriptive and ethnographic in its discussion of "attractions" and does not *guide* the reader-traveler in doing, seeing, or going. Unlike the modern tourist guidebook, no hotels, restaurants, types of transportation, or routes of travel are recommended. Attractions are simply listed or described in encyclopedic fashion, but, in either case, without narrative devices that frame them in a hierarchy of importance or a

temporal order for the scheduling of activities. Where it finds a voice directing or guiding the traveler, it more often has to do with business, as is suggested by the advertisements which occupy *every other page of the text* and the type of ethnographic information which is provided. Even the sections on divorce laws -- whose presence is surprisingly indicative in itself -- are written in a factual tone of "what is" that only passively implies "how to" divorce in Yucatán. No mention is made of *when* to visit (what season?) or *when* to see (which day or what part of the day?). A third issue of timing, *when* to travel (what is the schedule and timing of other tourists, places, people?), is only noted in those passages above that are linked to departure times or to duration of transportation. This guide tells us "what is" not "how" nor "when to."

Not only is the dominant narrative mode cast in the form of the map and not of the tour, but it is also not in the form of the guide. What defines the narrative strategy of the guide is an articulation between a totalizing knowledge of places and sights, i.e., a map, and a subjective recounting of movement through space, i.e., a tour, in a framework of moral imperatives that dictate what the tourist should or should not do. Underpinning this moral framework as its logic and presupposed structure is the problem of time, which can be formulated in the three questions just noted. It is this calculation of time that transforms the tourist geography of Yucatán beginning in the 1970s, if not earlier. In the 1950s and 1960s Isla Mujeres and Cozumel become sites woven into the tourist topography (see **ILLUSTRATION**). Nonetheless, up until the 1960s the landscape as charted out by Andrade remains an effective and adequate representation, at least as it concerns the situation of Chichén. With the birth and construction of Cancun at the end of the 1960s and early 1970s (see Collins 1979; García de Fuentes 1979; Lee 1977, 1978; Lord 1979), the tourist geography of the peninsula becomes literally re-oriented and littorally re-inscribed.

MAPS OF MODERN PLEASURE:

ARCHEOLOGICAL BODIES AT THE EDGE OF SEA

Yucatán's history has fascinated the rest of the world since Lord Kingsborough published a study of its ruins in 1831. Just a few years later, New York lawyer John L. Stephens and artist Frederick Catherwood made several trips through Yucatán and Central America. Stephens recorded his adventures in a fascinating series of travel books, decorated by Catherwood's superb drawings, which achieved great, immediate, and lasting popularity. The books still make for wonderful reading, and are available.... Ever since Stephens' adventures, foreigners have been touring Yucatán to view its vast crumbling cities and ponder the fall of a once truly great civilization.

FROMMER'S MEXICO ON \$25 A DAY (Brosnahan 1989: 443).

As if to avoid confusion between white Yucatec society in either its Porfirian or colonial facet, Brosnahan, the author of FROMMER's Mexican guidebook cited above, immediately identifies "the Maya" as the referent to the sign "great civilization." In the context of Yucatán, tourism, like anthropology, is primarily concerned with the Maya (see above; cf. Sarlot C. 1941; Peraza and Rejón 1989). Nonetheless, in representations of

Yucatán, the colonial-Porfirian register is significantly played up to designate proper objects for the tourist gaze and sights for tourist consumption. Whereas the primary sign designated to capture both the attention of the consumer and to encapsulate the tourist product is the "Maya," the colonial-Porfirian configuration is a *necessary* if somewhat still down played element. Just six or seven years earlier, this latter component was not to be found in FROMMER'S representation of the Yucatec tourist product. I suggest that this shift is part of a strategic change in the organization of and investment in tourism in Yucatán: As a result of the state's having lost substantial gains in this market to the Cancun development, Yucatec interests, state and private, found it *imperative* to promote the complementary side of its *already existing* tourist product and to begin creating a sun and sea attraction. The lure of the Maya as Mystery -- i.e., that "voice from the grave" -- is just not strong enough to compete with the Caribbean beaches of México.

Both a model of early 1980s tourism and a model for the 1983-1984 tourists, FROMMER'S presents the following tourist map of Yucatán:

Today most visitors head directly for Mérida, Cancún, of Cozumel, and use those places as home base for further explorations. We'll start our Yucatecan tour in the Yucatecan capital - Mérida - using that city as a base to explore the ancient Maya cities of Uxmal, Mayapan, Kabah, Sayil, Xlapak, and Labná, plus the walled Spanish city of Campeche. Then we'll head east, passing Chichén Itzá and Valladolid on our way to Puerto Juárez, Cancún, and Isla Mujeres. Finally, we'll head down the Caribbean coast for a tour of Cozumel, Tulum, Cobá, Lake Bacalar, and the brash new[!] city of Chetumal, on the Belizean border (Brosnahan and Kretchman 1983: 356).

In this guidebook, Mérida and Cancun are discussed primarily as homebases with relatively equal positions. In tune with the traditional rhetoric of tourist spaces, the former is situated as a core and the latter as an important secondary base within the hierarchy. Campeche, on the other hand, is situated as a definitively peripheral sight of the peninsular geography.

As homebases, Mérida and Cancun are discussed in terms of hotels, restaurants, transportation, and necessary services. There is remarkably little in terms of a description of Mérida and Campeche, in contrast to Cancun, as *sights/sites* of attraction.¹³ Later, the edition for 1989 tours devotes seven pages to colonial and other interests in Mérida (Brosnahan 1989: 461-467) that recalls the flavor of the listing found in Andrade (1928): the four points of the Plaza Mayor (i.e., the Cathedral, the Palacio de Gobierno, Palacio Municipal, and the Palacio Montejo), the market (with discussion of hammocks, Panama hats, and handicrafts in general), Calle 60 (with the parks of Cepeda Peraza, de la Madre, Santa Lucia, the University, and the theater Peón Contreras), the Paseo de Montejo (with the anthropology museum and the Monument to the Nation), the port of Progreso, Dzibilchaltun, and the nightlife.

Campeche, still appended to Yucatán as an excursion, as it was in Andrade's 1927 guidebook, is now given more textual space in order to mention its anthropology museum and colonial fortress. Edzna, alone among the archeological zones of Campeche that is mentioned -- and very briefly in contrast to the publicity received in other contemporary

guidebooks (e.g., Mallan 1986), is described as *being on the road TO Campeche*. Campeche, then, represents a "dead end" or at least a "turning off" from the Maya-Yucatec network and not a link point between Mérida and the rest of the Mexican tourist geography. It physically requires one to read between the lines and chapters to be able find the bus/train/air connection between the Chiapas-Isthmus network, which is composed of San Cristóbal-Palenque-Tuxtla-Villahermosa, and the peninsular tourist networks. Thus, Yucatán's position in the tourist geography of México mirrors its position in the socio-political landscape of the nation: This so called "sister republic" is indeed a "world apart."

In contrast to its subordinate position to Mérida in the 1983 edition, "Cancun and the Caribbean Coast" becomes the subject and title of an independent chapter in FROMMER'S 1989 edition (pp. 490-530). Located in the last chapter on México's tourist regions, Cancun is thus situated rhetorically as the frontier (the "cutting edge") in terms of both economy (specifically the tourist sector) and the discourses of Mexican tourism. In terms of the Yucatec tourist network, it has meant the opening up of a new *entrada*, which can be taken to mean, as in Spanish, a physical and figurative entrance, income generated by such "entrance," and a military incursion of an army. In terms of a "final analysis" it has meant the creation of fierce competitors that have cut into a tourist market once controlled by Mérida based interests.

In the 1965 Official Guidebook put out by the I.N.A.H. (see **ILLUSTRATION**), there are five tourist networks: a) Tabasco, with Villahermosa and Comalcalco as centers; b) Chiapas, with Tuxtla, Palenque, Bonampak, Yaxchilan as centers; c) Campeche, with Campeche and Edzna as centers; d) Yucatán, with Mérida, the Puuc sites (Kabah, Uxmal, Labna, Sayil), Chichén, Dzibilchaltun, Izamal, Mayapan as attractions; and e) Quintana Roo, with Chetumal and Tulum as sites. The last network was billed as an attraction because of its natural properties. At Isla Mujeres, for example, "one could practice fishing and swimming, [and since] there still exists some archeological ruins [one could visit these] that according to the [Maya] chronicles were part of the sanctuary of the goddess Ix Chel (INAH 1965, my translation)." There is also Cozumel, "whose beaches are best suited for water sports and where one can also hunt jaguar and deer (ibid., my translation)." To complete this dry description mention is made of Tulum and Coba, which require a special flight from Mérida and then a special vehicle. The attraction, which is of limited income generating potential, has been the undeveloped (i.e., *un-territorialized*) natural resources (Ellis and Ellis 1964; cf. Mallan 1986).

The construction of Cancun, then, represents a radical and programmed shift in strategy with the development of a pleasure periphery conceived to compete with the Caribbean island resorts.¹⁴ The necessary supporting infrastructure opened up the possibilities for travel. In other words, the unchartered tourists have the option to make a circuit from Chiapas across the base of the peninsula to Chetumal, up the coast, then across to Mérida in the north, and, finally, completing the circle to Campeche-Escarcega and to Villahermosa or Palenque. However, in order to hold on to this potential market, nature tourism as the obvious alternative to the sex-sun-surf complex had to be re-invented. Up until the mid-eighties, Isla Mujeres exercised an important pull on low-budget European travelers and the back-packers of all nationalities by offering a small, semi-developed town as an alternative to skyscraping resorts of both the Caribbean and Cancun. With the illegalization of sleeping on the beach by 1983-84, Playa del Carmen and Tulum took up the

slack, the former becoming the preferred site of European travelers interested in a little nightlife with a lot of "cheap beach" and the latter becoming the center for the minimalist travelers characterized as the back-packing style of hippies. Still today, Tulum is the place for nude swimming and night/drug-life around a campfire. This economic motive to *internally* diversify the tourist market, that is, to differentiate the tourist product, is no doubt an important factor that undergirds the creation and maintenance of the national park of Sian Ka'an as a forest and wildlife reserve located between Chetumal and Carrillo Puerto.

From both the Cancun and Mérida perspectives, nature or eco-tourism is a necessary supplement that only dates from the later 1980s as a major business endeavor. Yucatán, which has not been able to compete directly with the beach/nightlife attractions of Cancun, has sought eco-tourism as a principal alternative and complement to the Maya-colonial product. Mérida is not able to contract the high-volume charter tours; much of the tourist flow is based on unorganized tourists or small groups that link up with the Chiapas network or a larger tourist circuit. At the same time, of course, there are individuals in and outside of the state tourist offices, who are very concerned with the ecological effects of tourism as is epitomized by Cancun and the destruction of the Lagoon. Thus, many are busy creating strategies for the ecological survival of Yucatán: But in this way *ecoturismo*, i.e., ecological or "eco-tourism," will eventuate in a new touristic settlement of the territory.¹⁵

TIMING (OF) THE TOURIST LANDSCAPE

...the capitalist vanguard made this trip in reverse, relying on the same infrastructure the Spanish had used. [...] Unlike explorers and naturalists, these travelers of the 1820s did not write up realities they took for new; they did not present themselves as discoverers of a primal world; the bits and pieces they picked up were samples of raw materials... what they conquered were destinations, not kingdoms; what are overcome are not military challenges, but logistical ones. The travelers struggle in unequal battle against scarcity, inefficiency, laziness, discomfort, poor horses, bad roads, bad weather, delays. Indeed, Spanish American society is mainly encoded in this literature as logistical obstacles to the forward movement of the Europeans. [...] *Timetabling proliferates...*

Mary Pratt, *IMPERIAL EYES*. 1992: 148 (italics added)

The addition of a new form of travel writing that Pratt analyzes (1992: 144-155) represents a critical re-territorialization not only of the landscape which is to be traveled/seen, but the conception of travel itself as spatial practices shift into modern or capitalist forms of tourism in the latter half of the 19th century. Space and social landscapes become a function of a rationalized temporality, which amounts to a strategy of and for the coordination of practices, of bodies, of space within localities and as the regulating mechanisms by which these are routinized into networks: The capitalist vanguard, then, settles the ground on which a tourist topography, from the smallest topos to the most encompassing, is planted and, not just planted, but *worked* according to a schedule.

In the preceding section I presented a synthesized "map" of Yucatán based on certain representations of its tourist landscape. These representations select certain places and mark

them with particular meanings and significations. These sites once marked as sights within this system of meaning provide an imperative model for the realization of travel activities which are written up in the travel formulas or methods of guidebooks.

The development of these formal models are based on the shift from narrative maps and tours (both early guidebooks and travelogues such as Ocampo [1941]) to texts dominated by the narrative of guiding and time-table. This change of narrative styles is important because it allows for formal definitions of the tourist and the traveler to be constructed in the common knowledge of popular culture. That is, I assert the thesis that the modern tourist as a figure of a mode of experience becomes objectively and subjectively invented through this global shift in the discourse of guidebooks.¹⁶ Underpinning the common-sense opposition of tourist/traveler is the idea that the tourist "goes by the book" while the traveler "improvises" by finding "unmarked" routes to follow.¹⁷ Nonetheless, within the oral discourses and memory of such "original" travelers other imperative models just as formulaic and methodic are forged (see Castañeda 1997). Thus, the written guidebooks that market an audience composed of authentic "travelers," that is, backpackers and the genre of Kerouac tourists, are caught in a textual play between map, tour, and guide.¹⁸

As late as the 1983 guide, FROMMER'S presentation of Yucatán de-emphasized explicit guide formulas. Fluctuating between a map and tour, half day excursions from Mérida to Progreso and Dzibilchaltun were narrated. After these, the full day excursions are mapped: Uxmal and Puuc (Mayapan, Kabah, Sayil, Labna, the Caves of Loltun), Campeche, Chichén and Valladolid. Between this representation and the 1989 FROMMER'S there is a shift in narrative from tour to guide, that is, in the later book an explicit framework of what the tourist should do and see is laid out. Can this shift in textuality and form of representation be associated with a shift in the style and form of the reader-tourist visiting Yucatán? I think yes.

In the section called "Touring Yucatán: Itineraries" three kinds of maps of Yucatán are presented, each under a separate subsection title. One is predominantly in the narrative form of a tour and the other in that of a guide. Positioned between these two, is a narrative map of "Time and Distances" (Brosnahan 1989: 447-448). I quote both in full but in alternating sequence. Note the shifts from the simple one paragraph tour-map in FROMMER'S 1983 which is quoted above. Not only is there an augment in information but a stylistic shift in narrative, whereby the tour-map (presented below under place names) is oriented around the question of time. The guide-map (presented under the combined day-number and place-name) is ostensibly a framework of imperatives governed by a calculation of time:

MÉRIDA: Spend at least overnight here; two full days to see the city would be much better. You can also use Mérida as your base for visits to Chichén Itzá, Uxmal, Kabah, Sayil, Xlapak, Labná, and Loltun, taking an organized tour or renting a car to tour on your own.

Day 1, Mérida: On this day of arrival plan to settle in, get your bearings, perhaps change some money, and adjust to the heat.

Day 2, Mérida: Tour the city, stopping at each of the historic buildings near the Plaza Mayor, and along the Paseo de Montejo. Save some time for the market.

UXMAL: If you get as far as Mérida, seeing Uxmal is an absolute must! Traveling from Mérida, touring the ruins, and returning to the city will take the best part of a day. There are hotels at Uxmal where you can spend the night. Though well worth the money, they do exceed our daily budget limit.

Day 3, Uxmal: If you're driving, you can stop at Mayapan on your way to Uxmal. These two sites, and perhaps a quick stop at Ticul, will fill your day. Return to Mérida for the night, or stay at Uxmal.

KABAH, SAYIL, LABNA, XLAPAK, LOLTUN: These Maya cities, south of Uxmal, demand another full day of touring time. If you stay overnight at Uxmal, you'll save travel time from Mérida.

Day 4, Kabah etc.: Spend the day touring sites of Kabah, Sayil, Labná, Xlapah, and the Grutas (caves) de Loltun. If you're absolutely fascinated by ruins and can't get enough, head for Campeche to spend the night, then spend the next day at Edzná, Dzilibnocac, and Hochob. Otherwise return to Mérida.

CAMPECHE, EDZNA, DZIBILNOCAC, HOCHOB: Campeche, capital of the state of the same name, is a pleasant city with a charming walled colonial center. It's not a necessity on your Yucatán itinerary, but you may want to stay the night here if you're en route between Palenque and Mérida. Campeche is also the most convenient place to stay for those visiting the Maya sites at Edzná and Dzibalchén. [No specific day is provided for these sights.]

CHICHÉN ITZA: This another must see, the most impressive Maya city in Yucatán. You'd be well-advised to spend the night here, as there is a good range of hotels, with several in the budget category. If you take a day tour from Mérida or Cancun, you'll arrive and begin to climb pyramids at the very hottest, most crowded time of day, and you'll climb back into your bus for the two-hour return ride just when the light on the ruins is prettiest and the heat is abating. Plan to spend the night at Chichén Itzá.

Day 5, Chichén Itzá: Ride from Mérida through henequen country to Chichén Itzá. Find a hotel room, have lunch, perhaps take a nap, then hike out to the ruins and tour until closing time.

CANCUN: You'll want to see this world-class resort, but you needn't plan to spend all of your beach time here. Prices are lower on nearby Isla Mujeres, and the skin diving and snorkeling are best on Cozumel (though Cozumel prices rival - even exceed - those of Cancun at times).

Day 6, Cancun: Spend the morning at the ruins of Chichén Itzá, then ride to Cancun in the afternoon. Find a hotel and settle in.

Day 7, Cancun: Put on your bathing suit, catch a city bus, and head out to the Zona Hotelera. Spend the day on one of Cancun's fine beaches. In the evening, wander around the restaurants in town.

ISLA MUJERES: Easily accessible from Cancun by city bus and ferry boat, this small island is great for a day-trip, or even for a stay of several days.

Day 8, Isla Mujeres: Get an early start, and spend the day on Isla Mujeres's [sic] beaches, especially Garrafón, with its good snorkeling and diving. Perhaps stay the night.

CARIBBEAN COAST: You'll certainly want to take a trip along the coast south of Cancun, certainly as far as the beautiful cove of Xelha and the Mayan seaport of Tulum. Inland from Tulum lies the ancient city of Coba, well worth the detour if you have the time.

Day 9, Caribbean coast: Using Cancun or Cozumel as your base, visit Tulum, Xelha, and perhaps other beaches and sites along the coast between Tulum and Cancun. If you have a car, drive inland to Coba also. By bus or hitchhiking, Coba will take at least a full day by itself.

COZUMEL: México's entry into the Caribbean islands competition, it's a skin-diver's paradise, which drives up prices in winter. Though larger than Isla Mujeres, Cozumel does not offer more variety of activities, and it's farther from the mainland.

Day 10, Cozumel: Spend a day on Cozumel, taking the passenger ferry or the shuttle flight from Playa del Carmen, or a flight from Cancun.

Only three comments are necessary. These concern the textual construction of this representation, the styles of touring implied within the text and its readership, and the question of timing that organizes both this textual fragment and the practices to which it has reference.

One, the overall effect of these two series of texts is a map representing a totalized knowledge based on the synthesis of multiple tours. It is a map that answers four questions: Where do I go? How do I get there? When should I go? What should I do when I get there? A fifth, the question of tourist motivation, "why?" is already presupposed (the socially construed "need" for recreation, leisure, etc.) and reinforced and implicitly addressed by the *guiding* answers that *shape* and *regulate* practice. In the first series of texts marked under place-names, the tour form of narrative mediates between the backgrounded map of physical space and the manifest (cosmological) map of imperatives. For example, compare fragments under *Caribbean Coast* and *Day 9, Caribbean Coast*. The description of how to move from one place to another (tour) presupposes fixed physical points in space (map); thus, in case this implicit map is not seen, a narrative description of "Time and Distances" in Yucatán follows the tour. Readers read/travel through the tours to get at the spatial map (the implicit map, the narrated map) as a way to familiarize themselves with the spatial arrangement of the landscape. On this basis, choices and plans are made. Notice how Campeche is listed and described as a possible place to tour, but then is excluded from what ought to be toured according to the 10 day schedule. This formal written model already

leaves space for the self-ascribed "traveler" to encounter another experience than the already charted/traveled. The tour and the map locate and then mark places according to the sights that are situated there, forging a site of attraction. Overlaying the tour and the map in effect and style, although ostensibly following in terms of the labeled texts, the narrative of the guide organizes what to do with an all-knowing calculation of time. The imperatives of the guide ("tour the city," "save time for the market," "Put on your bathing suit," "spend the day") construe temporal order of actions within an already constructed spatial order: In the proper place a properly timed act of tourism is designated. In this way a cosmology (a moral order) is inscribed on the tourist landscape on the basis of the inter-play between three maps.

Two, between the charter-tourist and the traveler-tourist a mediative style of tourism is designated. At any moment FROMMER'S ideal traveler-tourist can opt out for a packaged experience instead of having to construct their own "original" tour. Travel agencies in Mérida, both independent and owned by major corporations such as the Barbachano company or other national companies, sell day tours, as well as the complete package, that match FROMMER'S descriptions for the daily excursions. These three styles of touring, charter, traveler and group-traveler, are fundamentally the same practice enacting the same movements and experiences according to the same itinerary and timing schedule.

Three, in this 10 day tour of the peninsula, five days are slotted for the state of Yucatán and five for the Quintana Roo network of coastal sites. A five day tour for charter groups is a standard package with Mérida based agencies. For example the Barbachano firm, which owns and operates a travel agency and various hotels in Yucatán and Quintana Roo, sells a five day package with a Thursday or Friday arrival and Monday or Tuesday departure. This includes two nights in Mérida, with one overnight stay at each of Chichén, Uxmal and the Barbachano resort at Sisal. [Sisal is the 19th century port for Mérida located an hour to the west.] In other words this tour package is based on the same formula presented in FROMMER'S. The key difference is the addition of one day and night at the beach. This turns out to be a strategic addition to make the traditional and classic Yucatec landscape competitive with the Cancun network.¹⁹ That is, Barbachano decided in the late 1980s to create a beach resort on this undeveloped west coast so as to compete with both Cancun and Mérida's traditional weekend beach site of Progreso.

Modern tourism, of course, is linked to the historical processes of industrial capitalism: The widespread resistance to industrial work-discipline initiated long struggle to create "leisure" time (that is, holidays or to phrase it in the usual manner, shorter work weeks); leisure time required appropriate activities that were rationalized, spatialized, and temporalized according to capitalist logic. In this context, then, tourism in its modern, "democratized" or capitalist, form presents itself as "ways of escape" (cf. Rojek 1993) from economic regimentation, but is instead directly tied to capitalist production and becomes a growing apparatus of ideological and disciplinary control for this economic and social system.²⁰ Thus, the greatest parameter that organizes the time of tourism (or, its orchestrating time table) is the work-leisure regime of the principal societies from which most tourists originate, that is, the first world core of the global economy. The tourist seasons are the months of summer (June, July, and August), winter (mid-December through early January), and spring (March and April) vacations.

In Yucatán, the high season of winter (beginning in late November) blends into that of spring. This two phased high season dramatically ends with the completion of Holy Week vacation. Tourist influx does not pick up again until after mid-June when the Mexican summer vacation. This second high season reaches its apogee between mid-July and the first or second week of September when Europe and the U.S.A. go on vacation en masse. This global parameter of tourist time does implicate seasonal changes in the intensity of activity. However, the practical, daily timing of tourism remains fairly constant: Simple hour adjustments are made according to season. At the ground level, the international scheduling of tourist seasons does not directly organize and regulate practices: It is necessary to look at the landscape itself to find the strategy of timing that designates the daily and weekly schedules in which practices are realized. This strategy derives from the combination of the physical characteristics (distances and the transportational infrastructure) and the symbolic investment of sites as marked places in a hierarchy of attractions.²¹

An account of a typical schedule and itinerary of a charter group organized by Opus Dei²² through its Oasis Resort Hotel in Cancun provides a more detailed picture of the importance of timing. Opus Dei, a transnational owned by the Vatican, sent in 1990 two charter flights a day to Cancun, each with roughly 400 persons. These tourists, some on complete tour and others on a simple flight-hotel package, stayed at the Oasis, which has approximately 2,000 rooms. The following summarizes a complete tour package. [The source is an interview with a tour guide (Ethnographic Fieldnotes, August 12, 1990).]

I First Day/ TUESDAY -- Arrival:

- (1) Morning to mid-day arrival.
- (2) Reception in the airport by bi-lingual hosts.
- (3) Transportation to and check in at the hotel.
- (4) Cocktail and briefing in the hotel by hosts who explain the schedule of tours and activities as well as general information or "tips" on Cancun.
- (5) Late afternoon and evening free.

II Second Day/ WEDNESDAY -- City Tour:

- (1) Morning free for breakfast and beach.
- (2) Noon-2:00. Group is assembled and loaded onto bus(es) to see Hotel Zone and the Convention Center with its Anthropology Museum. May include 30 minute stop at the nearby tianguis or "traditional" market for shopping handicrafts if guides and/or conductor receive commission on purchases.
- (3) 2:00-3:00. Drive through downtown Cancun along the Tulum and Yaxchilan Avenues with explanation of the history of City. Optional stop at the downtown handicraft market, "Kiwik."
- (4) 3:00-3:45/4:00. Lunch stop at designated restaurant.
- (5) 4:00 on. "Free time" with tourists given the option to return to hotel on the bus or to stay in the city to explore it on their own.

III Third Day/ THURSDAY -- Tour of Tulum:

- (1) 7:30-10:00/10:30. Bus leaves hotel for Tulum with 30 minute stop at a designated tienda de artesanías (e.g., Xpuha or Kantena) for buying handicrafts, restroom service, snack and drink. Handicraft store, again, is usually selected by the guide where they receive commission.
- (2) 10:00/30-11:30/Noon. Arrival in and tour of Tulum in a 1½ hours. The independent handicraft venders are usually not slotted any time.

- (3) 11:30/Noon. Leave Tulum for Xelha (15 minute drive).
- (4) Noon-2:00. Arrival in Xelha for snorkeling, swimming, sun, snack.
- (5) 2:00/30-3:00/30. Departure for Akumal (1½ hour drive).
- (6) 3:00/30-5:00. In Akumal lunch is allotted 2 hours maximum at the restaurant/hotel with tour of the museum and a lecture on the history of Gonzalo Guerrero and the conquest of Yucatán.
- (7) 5:00-6:00/30. Departure for Cancun for 6 or 6:30 p.m. arrival in hotel.
- (8) Evening free.

IV Fourth Day/ FRIDAY -- Free Day/ Pirate Night:

- (1) Free day. Optional beach, bar and poolside activities organized by the hotel, e.g., the Oasis has an "Ibero Olympics" a half-day recreational event.
- (2) 6:00 pm-11:00 p.m.. Group assembles at Playa Tortugas for "Pirate Night": A 300 person cruise to Garifona Beach on Isla Mujeres includes buffet dinner, open bar, disco and limbo dance.

V Fifth Day/ SATURDAY -- Cozumel:

- (1) 10:00-11:15. From Playa Linda (Cancun) to Cozumel by boat.
- (2) 11:15-Noon. Bus Cozumel dock to either Chankanab Lagoon for snorkeling or Arrecifes Palancar beach and swimming.
- (3) Noon-2:00. Designated activity -- swimming or snorkeling at site selected by the tourist.
- (4) 2:00-4:00. Lunch at Chankanab.
- (5) 4:00-6:00pm. Downtown Cozumel to see the Coral Factory (store). Previously tours used to include the city Museum.
- (6) 6:00-7:00. Return boat ride to Cancun.
- (7) 8:00/30-11:00 and beyond. Folklore Dinner and Ballet, "Noche Mexicana." Dinner starts at 9pm with variety show including the folkloric ballet until 11 p.m. when disco opens and the tour formally ends.

VI Sixth Day/ SUNDAY -- Tour of Chichén:

- (1) 7:30/8:00. Begin rounding up tourists for departure.
- (2) 8:00-11:00/30. Drive Cancun to Chichén, with 30 minute stop at agency designated or guide selected tienda de artesanías (e.g., Tikuch, Catzin, El Sacbe).
- (3) 11:30-2:00/2:30. Tour of Chichén in 2½ hours plus 30 minutes of bathroom/rest and roundup time. [See chapter 6 for description of the tour.]
- (4) 2:30/3:00-3:30/4:00. Lunch in one hour maximum at selected restaurant in Pisté or Chichén.
- (5) 3:30/4:00. Departure from Pisté-Chichén. Return drive includes another 30 minute stop at tienda de artesanías en route.
- (6) 7:00/30. Arrival in Cancun.

VII Seventh Day/ MONDAY -- Departure:

- (1) Morning free from organized activities.
- (2) Mid-day to early afternoon check-out and bus to airport.
- (3) Departure from Cancun airport.

While it is not possible, on the basis of this text only, to fully chart the strategy of time as a mode of social control of tourist practices and persons, a basic outline can be drawn. As already noted, the yearly schedule is the widest parameter of regulatory control. Within the cycles of low and high seasons, the week, with its three and five day variants, represents a

major cycle that structures movements and activities. The standard tour of Yucatán the peninsula, as recommended by FROMMER'S, is ten days, but only five of which are for Yucatán the state. The Cancun network is structured on a seven day week, although there are three/four night options. For example, Iberojet, a Spanish subsidiary of Opus Dei, had a three day (Friday-Monday) package with an Isla Holbox option to Cozumel and an overnight in Valladolid for the Light and Sound Show of Chichén Itzá. Isla Holbox represents an attempt to lock onto a European/traveler style tourist, since Holbox is a large island with extensive deserted beaches that counts with only a fishing village of no more than 200-300 inhabitants. Just as in the discussion of FROMMER'S maps of Yucatán, in the sample tour package can be identified formulas that provide models for those tourists that follow touring styles other than the complete charter package.

These multiple and overlapping possible tours, conducted according to different styles or combinations, structure the experience of the tourist by structuring the day into a hierarchized series of activities. These activities in turn mobilize an infrastructure of bodies, sites, services and facilities in the peripheral attractions, particularly in the subordinated beach sites and archeological zones. To argue this point decisively requires the daily schedules, nicely arranged in Hagerstrand's time-space charts, of all the activities at Chichén, Tulum, Akumal, Garrifon Beach (Isla Mujeres), Chankanab and Arrecifes Palancar (Cozumel), Valladolid and Chichén-Pisté. A more decisive argument would also require a detailed ethnography of the daily timings of touristic practices in Cancun City and the Hotel Zone as these correlate to the same quotidian schedules in places such as Valladolid, Chichén-Pisté, Uxmal, and along down the coastal strip from Isla to Tulum. Although this is not the place for that, nonetheless, it can be mentioned that the staff of the restaurant sponsoring the "Noche Mexicana" must orchestrate the hotels/agencies that schedule the Mexican Night for their groups: In other words, the promoters of this attraction schedules the different charter groups on particular days of the week according to the proper *time slot*.

A NEW CARTOGRAPHY: EL MUNDO MAYA

The *Mundo Maya*, mentioned above, is the second or applied version of an old idea that was recently re-packaged and disseminated in a special issue of National Geographic (Garrett 1989; see **ILLUSTRATION**). In that travelogical archæo-ethnographic narrative devoted to the Maya, it was suggested that a *Ruta Maya* be formalized, whereby the whole landscape of archeological and living Maya would be developed as a tourist attraction with a unified infrastructure that would allow tourists to freely traverse Guatemala, Honduras, Belize, El Salvador, and Mexico. A semi-independent tourist region would be created on the model of a unified Europe, that is, a kind of free trade zone across parts of these five countries would be created to facilitate development of transportation, service centers, attractions and, finally, tourist movement. The ideal route, proposed in the articles, by which to cite-see the entire Maya civilization was based on the *entradas* ("military incursions") of the Spanish Conquistadores. In an ironic and poetic in/justice, the image of the Tourist as Destroyer of "authentic" cultures was consolidated in this promotional figure of Tourist as Conquistador.

At first hesitant to enter into a joint effort after failures that go at least as far back as 1821 if not 1492, the governments of the five countries formed an organization, backed with

an initial grant of 2 million dollars from the E.E.C., that would develop the project. Since 1990 the *Mundo Maya Organization* has been ironing out the formidable snags that this project entails. The point, here, is not so much to open a discussion on this topic,²³ but to use this future prospect as way to conclude the analyses already presented: This international development project augurs untold, but wildly imaginable, transformations.

As for Yucatán, it seems likely that the topoi of sights will not shift, nor expand much (at least at first) -- there is too much capital already invested in existing sites, but their *orchestration* within encompassing *strategies of time* will. In this way, the topography will be altered. However, the alteration of topography entails not simply a transformation of the geometric space of social practices, but the discursive space of text *in which knowledge exists and is communicated*. Thus, I "prophesize" that the acceleration of this project must necessarily entail the radical re-working of the anthropological-historical apparatus of knowledge that targets the Maya. That is, not simply a paradigm shift in Maya studies as practiced by anthropologists and (ethno-)historians, but an "infrastructural" change that would lean not towards a "postcolonial" but a "recolonizing" institution.

On the other hand, to pursue more prophecies, other certain ramifications of the *Mundo Maya* would be an intensified use of archeologizing strategies (in which I include folklorizing) by which to transform Maya, Maya Culture and Maya Civilization into *more mysterious*, more alluring and more authentic objects of touristic consumption and political control. But, this key strategy through which national communities are imagined would be recontextualized in a situation of intensified and intersecting competition/cooperation between nations of longstanding rivalry. How are these nations to re-invent themselves vis-a-vis each other and in relation to a now implicitly recognized Maya *territory? community? nation?* Will it be possible for supra-communities of localized Maya communities to forge new types of imaginary communities? What roles will anthropology and anthropologists play in that war?

Putting aside that issue and turning again to Yucatán and Mexico, the shape of the future is already emerging: In a multilayered strategy that addresses several objectives of distinct dimensions, it seems that these two communities, one national and one "national," are re-imagining themselves as the legitimate continuity of precolumbian Civilization. On the one hand, the state authorities, under the governorship of Maria Dulce Suárez, began to decorate the political theatre of the state with the shamanic performances by Maya healers, spiritualists, and diviners. On the other hand, the federal government, through the INAH, has been investing heavily in the restoration of ancient ruins, and not only in Mexico City: At the end of 1992, Salinas de Gortari authorized five thousand, million pesos (an estimated 1.7 million U.S. dollars at an exchange rate of 3,000 to one) for repairs and exploration at Chichén Itzá, which in 1989 had been designated by the UNESCO as a Patrimonio de la Humanidad (Patrimony of Humanity). Already, then, the topography is shifting and has shifted as the local, regional, national, international, and transnational communities are being rewritten, reinvented, reimagined.

ENDNOTES ARCHAEOLOGY AND THE TOURIST LANDSCAPE OF YUCATAN

¹ The subtitle alludes to the landmark study by the Mexican scholar, Miguel Leon-Portilla, on *Time and Reality in Maya Thought*.

² I am indebted Jay Indik and his feminist reading of *A WINTER'S TALE* (unpublished manuscript, University of Wisconsin Theater Dept.) for this analysis.

³ This was the Spanish debate between Gínez de Sepúlveda and Bartólome de las Casas on the status of the Aztecs and Amerindians as civilized peoples (see Pagden 1982; Mason 1992; Castañeda 1996: 131-151).

⁴ See Carmack (), Fabri (1994) on the institutions of violence in Guatemala.

⁵ On tourist gazes see Urry (1990). Although the construction and practice of vision within tourism is important, most analyses of the tourist gaze, such as Urry's, are susceptible to the critique that a disembodied, masculinist, imperialist "eye" (see Veijola and Jokinen 1994; Pratt 1992; Castañeda 1996: 107-201) underwrites the analyses and theory. Thus, what is left out of such discussions is any actual discussion of how vision, fields of vision, sights, and visual practices are constituted in corporeal and linguistic practices that exist and have effect in time and temporalities. While many in the study of tourism (Urry, MacCannell, Bruner, Graburn) can be cited as prominent examples, this also occurs in the para-touristic work of *theoreticians* — or speculating spectators — such as Baudrillard and Eco.

⁶ Crick (1989: 307-314) offers, in a useful review of the different positions "for" and "against" tourism, a discussion of this tourist ideology that informs the social scientific study. His point, which has been expressed before, is that tourist studies convert into analytical principles certain elements and attitudes, whether positive or negative, from the non-academic discourses on tourism. Many have pointed out that these discourses or ideologies (depending upon your theoretical frame) are part of the phenomenon that is to be studied when analyzing tourism: The social scientific study of tourism seems directly and indirectly oriented towards the production of practical knowledge that serves pragmatic interests in the continued development of tourism.

The important work by Stagl (1990, 1995) provides a genealogy of social scientific methodologies, in particular ethnographic methods, and their beginnings in the 16th century "methodising" of travel. Stagl carefully elaborates in his theory of travel how the humanists involved in this project found it prudent to recite the arguments, which can be found in Greek sources, for and against travel. In favoring travel they found it necessary to differentiate and exclude the travel of vagabonds from that of proto-tourists, in that the latter were motivated by the goal of enriching the fund of knowledge about other peoples, nations and cities. The binary has continued to operate as an effective trope for the organizing of travel practices and their ideologies however much the substantive distinctions have changed.

⁷ In order to help fortify the nerves of the Pisteleños he had hired against the fear of Cruzob *entrada*, Augustus Le Plongeon impressed upon the workers the similitude of his face with that of a personage engraved in the door jamb of the Temple of Kukulcan. When a small band of Cruzob soldiers finally did surprise these early archeologists, Augustus repeated the

gesture in an attempt to create the idea that he was the re-incarnation, if not of Kukulcan, then of an ancient Maya lord-priest. I recount this episode (cf. Desmond and Messenger 1988), since it seems to be one of those events that have the status of myth: The event itself is lost from the oral memories of Pisté even though it resonates in folkloric relations between Maya and the North American foreigner: What link could this episode have to the Maya notion of U.S. nationals as the "red men" that have "eyes like bees?" (see Redfield and Villa Rojas 1934: appendix on myths). Is this a source of a Maya association of Anglo-Americans with the ancient Itzá? An impossible question to investigate, but how does this fortuitous and superfluous incident relate to the encounter between the Cruzob and the Carnegie anthropologists lead by S.G. Morley (Sullivan 1989)?

⁸Maya strategically polluted water sources with dead bodies when giving up towns to the White enemy (Reed 1964). This was a most effective tactic in terms of morale during a war fought in a famously water scarce land.

⁹On the Yucatec romancing of the Maya beginning in the early 20th century see: Abreu Gomez (1983), Baqueiro López (1983), Caceres Carezo (1990), Campos García (1989), Díaz Bolio (n.d., 1957, 1972, 1982), Marcos de Chimay (1981), Mediz Bolio (1973, 1987a, 1987b), Varios Autores (1990). Some interesting English language divergences can be found in: Arvigo (1994), Ediger (1971), Luxton (1982, 1985), E.H. Thompson (1932), J.E.S. Thompson (1963), Willard (1926).

¹⁰ On museums see Karp and Lavine 1991), Karp, Kraemer and Lavine (1992), Bennett (1995), Horne (1984), Clifford (1997), and Donato (1979). On the archeological construction of modern ruins in Yucatán, see Ediger (1971), Ewing (1972), Littlehales (1961), Davalos Hurtado (1961), Folan (1970), Erosa Peniche (1937), Gilpin (1948), Piña Chan (19), Bernal (1980), Barrera Vásquez (1980), Cirerol Sansores (1951), Hunter (1986), Desmond and Messenger (1988) and the Archeology Research Reports for the Middle American Research Division in the annual Carnegie Yearbook (19914-1956).

¹¹ Between the Yucatec world of the Maya that Stephens visited and the Mexicanized Maya world of Yucatán that Andrade plotted in an ideal touristic universe, there were primarily two kinds of travelogical imaginings of Yucatec landscape, one by Anglo-American visitors brought by economic interests, such as Mason 1927, Arnold and Frost 1909, Mercer 1896, and the anthropological ancestors (i.e., Maudsley, Le Plongeon, Edward Thompson, Charnay, Maler, and so on) whose narrative-adventures (see Hulme 1986: on Robinson Crusoe) have been memorialized in a multitude of meta-travelogical syntheses that have worked to create the mythos of the Heroic Archeologist Jungle Adventurer (e.g., Von Hagen 1947, Wauchope 1965, Adamson 1975). More recent versions of this narrative, for example by Coe (1992), only trim the adventure and add more discursive grappling for the symbolic capital of academic "firsts." The anthropological tourism of the Maya does not begin and end with the archeological romanticization and mysterio-ization, but rather extends and pervades the founding moments of — or "unfinished conversations" (Sullivan 1989) within — the ethnographic study of the Maya. From Redfield's attraction to the Maya of Chan Kom being attracted to the Anglo-archeologists at Chichén (Castañeda 1995), Villa Rojas' pretending to be merchant so as to conduct fieldwork (see Sullivan 1989), Yucatecos braving Mexicans and jungle (Pacheco Cruz), Zimmerman (1963), Larsen (1964), all the way to Castañeda (1996), the spatializing practices of ethnographic encounter are cast

within the pervasive operations of tropes, rhetorics, and epistemes of travel and tourism. The anthropological romance with the Maya must be comprehended within a travelogical episteme.

¹² After having developed this essay with its regional focus, it occurs to me that a major and interesting analytical detour would be to compare the touristic descriptions of Mérida by Andrade and others (e.g., Ocampo 1941) with the roughly contemporaneous ethnographic description that was initiated by Asael Hansen (1934, 1980) within Redfield's sociological project but that was only completed post mortum through the editorial assistance by a famous Yucatec scholar (Hansen and Bastarrechea Manzano 1984). A third discourse to juxtapose against these would be the urban ethnography constituted over the ages in the *Diario de Yucatán*.

¹³ It is not until 1988 that bi-monthly tourist guide for the city of Mérida begins publication. For a startling contrast, see the emphasis of the sights/sites within the city of Mérida represented in the bi-monthly tourist guide, YUCATAN TODAY: Guide to the Best Vacation of Your Life. Any given issue of this newspaper/guide, which is published in both English and Spanish, is virtually identical to any other in terms text and even advertisements. The table of contents is organized by specific topoi, "general information," "Mérida," "Pisté," "Progreso," and "Valladolid;" yet, this series is forged by a distinction between the archeological attractions, forms of beach recreation, and the colonial sights and cultural activities of Mérida. On page 9 (1989, vol. 2, #7) can be found a description of the special touristic activities of the day that the county of Mérida has established as a way to lock into the tourist market.

¹⁴ See Collins (1979), García de Fuentes (1979), Lee (1977, 1978), and Lord (1979) for discussion of tourist geography and political economy in the planning and execution of the Cancun project. For "before" Cancun rendtions of Quintana Roo see Wadgymer (1976) of the of the economics of tourism in México see Jud (1974). With regard to the highly debated questions of tourist development, see Bryden (1973) for an early Caribbean critique of the "multiplier effect" and Hiller (1979). Discussion of center-periphery models of pleasure/tourism emerged early in this field of study see Turner (1976), Turner and Ash (1974), and Hoivik and Heiburg (1980); also see Enloe's (1989), whose specific contribution to this debate is a brief feminist analysis of sex-tourism given that her focus is more on a general, "world-system" framework of gender relations. While this kind of modeling of the political economy has receded along with the world system model that underpinned it, binary modeling of the spatialization of the cultural forms of tourism ("north-south" pleasure-periphery analyses) has continued (e.g., Rojek 1993; Shields 1991; Root 1996).

¹⁵ At Uxmal in the spring of 1989 a conference called "Ecoturismo" (Ecotourism) was sponsored in part by CULTUR, SECTUR, the I.N.A.H., and private interests. The central question concerned the protection of the ecology at the same that it becomes commoditized as a tourist product. Falling within this problematic, among other issues, is the conservation and maintenance of the archeological zones. The publication by Smith and Eadington (1992) marks a watershed in the emergence of the discursive practices organized by concerns for sustainable and ecologically sound tourism development.

¹⁶Compare with Pratt's (1992) and Hulme's (1986) discussion of plot/genre of colonial encounters as establishing modalities of subject positioning. Other key studies in the question of modes of subjectivity in travel practices understood as primarily discursive-textual spatializations are Kaplan (1996), Behdad (1994), Clifford (1997), Culler (1981), and Van Den Abbeele (1992). Baudrillard's excursions to his America and the diasporic-exilic literatures (including studies of) that have had a privileged location in 1990s cultural studies could also be cited here for comparative purposes of contrast.

¹⁷Pratt's analysis of how explorers, naturalists and others write the place of the other as an empty landscape goes a long way to explain how it is possible that in the 20th century there had been a tourist/travel ethos in which the "undiscovered" and the "untouched" were and are sought out. Such touristic utopias (i.e., "no-places") and the ethic of such "utopian" travel are the invention of the fables she analyzes. Today, they exist only in the fictions or myths of tourist advertising, such as Livesey's text or the promotions of Club Med.

¹⁸As noted above, the distinction underlying that between travelers and tourists is an opposition that dates to the Greeks via 16th century travel methodologies (Stagl 1990; cf. Urry 1984). Instead of holding such distinctions as fundamental premises by which to theorize tourism and the tourist (e.g., Graburn 1977, 1983), it seems more fruitful to presuppose the unity of these stylistic variations thereby allowing for both a more comprehensive (versus "holistic") framework and a historical perspective. In other words, typologies of tourists, whether in terms of motives, income, styles, and so on, seem only to be effective tools for the doing of tourism development, not for critical cultural or social analyses.

¹⁹After establishing financially secure businesses in Quintana Roo's tourism, e.g., a hotel in Playa del Carmen, the Barbachano family has initiated a strategy to develop both the Yucatec tourist network and the Barbachano stake in it (field interview with family member, March 1989). For example the family has developed a resort hotel at Sisal and has initiated renovation and expansion of the Hotel Mayaland at Chichén. These strategic investments must take into account, at least to some degree, the opening of the deep-water port at Progreso, but probably bank to a greater extent on arranging contracts with European and Canadian agencies to send charter groups.

²⁰See Urry (1990: 16-39) for a summary of tourism in relation to the English working class, MacCannell (1976) for a theorization of tourism as a theory of modernity, Rojek (1985) on the general relations between capitalism and leisure, While analytical studies of tourism generally take into account of the seasonality of tourism (e.g., Shields 1991; Urry 1990; Rojek 1993), there is yet to be a work that dismantles the multiple temporalities, times, durations that constitute touristic practices in multiple registers of operation. The absence of such work is related to the privilege given to vision, the thingness of tourist "sights," and abstractness (versus material corporeality) of practices.

²¹This would be an appropriate point from which to launch a debate on the theorization of tourism. Many have linked modern tourism to work as its structural antithesis. Variations on this basic point lead to definitions of tourism as a structure of alienation which leads to the construction of "authentic" experiences (MacCannell 1976), as leisure, or as a practice structured around a search for *extra*-ordinary experiences (Urry 1990), among other

possibilities. I prefer to argue differently, in part due to my interest in linking the histories of anthropology and tourism, but also because I feel that a broader conceptualization allows for more fruitful analyses of concrete relations. Stagl's (1990; see Fabian's comments [1983: intro, passim]) shows that at the heart of tourism (as well as specific social sciences) is an attempt to methodologize travel as both experience and reconnaissance of information on the Other. It seems advantageous to follow up this lead by looking at the specific practices of tourism/travel as their relationship to the Other is modified, shifted and transformed. Just as in anthropology (e.g., Marcus and Fischer 1986), the Other that is constituted within touristic practices is constructed as historically particular mirrors through which the Self can take tangible forms and contents. Working class leisure at British seaside resorts, the Grand Tour, and middle class vacations can equally be analyzed from this perspective, yielding greater insights into both local and global processes of the construction of cultures and social groups.

²²According to an informant, other agencies owned by Opus Dei include Iberojet (Spanish), Turin (Italian), and Caribe Maya (Mexican). Iberojet is itself a major corporation that owns Tour Africa, Aspel and Viatour, Atlanta Vacations, Friendly Holidays.

²³The organization has been constantly holding meetings and conferences to develop agreements, strategies, etc. However, very little is known about the project except by those few anthropologists and archeologists that are currently conducting work in relation to the project. In an attempt to disseminate knowledge and foment interest about this international development project a session of the American Anthropology Association was devoted to this topic (see Castañeda 1992).