

**Representations of International Tourism in the Social Sciences: Sun, Sex, Sights, Savings, and Servility**



Malcolm Crick

*Annual Review of Anthropology*, Vol. 18. (1989), pp. 307-344.

Stable URL:

<http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=0084-6570%281989%292%3A18%3C307%3AROITIT%3E2.0.CO%3B2-8>

*Annual Review of Anthropology* is currently published by Annual Reviews.

---

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/about/terms.html>. JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

Please contact the publisher regarding any further use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at <http://www.jstor.org/journals/annrevs.html>.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

---

JSTOR is an independent not-for-profit organization dedicated to creating and preserving a digital archive of scholarly journals. For more information regarding JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

## REPRESENTATIONS OF INTERNATIONAL TOURISM IN THE SOCIAL SCIENCES: Sun, Sex, Sights, Savings, and Servility

*Malcolm Crick*

School of Social Sciences, Deakin University, Victoria 3217, Australia

Travel seems to generate consistently ambivalent or contradictory representations. Why is it that Lévi-Strauss opens his travel autobiography *Tristes Tropiques*, which brought him such fame, by declaring that he hates traveling and travelers (111:15)? Why do so many tourists claim that they are not tourists themselves and that they dislike and avoid other tourists (115:10): Is this some modern cultural form of self-loathing? In *The Innocents Abroad* Mark Twain asserts that "travel is fatal to prejudice, bigotry and narrowmindedness . . ." (198, Vol. 2:407) and yet goes on, page after page, about the daily torture and anxiety involved in foreign travel. Fatigue, and the constant annoyance of beggars and guides "fill one with bitter prejudice" (198, Vol. 1:253), he comments. "Another beggar approaches. I will go out and destroy him and then come back and write another chapter of vituperation" (198, Vol. 1:269). Unlike Malinowski's mythologizing record of participant observation in his professional works, with embarrassing confessions, ambivalence, and hostility confined to his diary (118), Twain serves up the negative, positive, and contradictory in a single work.

Twain traveled and wrote at a time when the foundations of the modern travel industry were being laid; and if in 19th-century creative literature we have images of "travel," in that of the 20th we find portrayed its contemporary degenerate offspring—mass tourism. "Degeneracy" is an image that keeps surfacing, and so not surprisingly representations of tourism are frequently even more hostile than those of travel. As MacCannell puts it, "The term 'tourist' is increasingly used as a derisive label for someone who seems content with his obviously inauthentic experiences" (115:94). John Fowles

puts it more metaphysically, describing a typical scene with a group of tourists, cameras at the ready, watching a collection of locals and their performing scorpion. "There was some kind of triple blasphemy involved; against nature, against humanity, against themselves—man the ape, all the babooneries, the wrong motives of package travel" (61:598–99).

The "blasphemy" Fowles describes is for many other commentators simply appalling bad taste. Surveying literary work on travel in the 1930s, Fussell (63:37) describes his book as a "threnody"—that is, a mourning for a form of experience now beyond our reach. "Real" travel is now impossible; we can only aspire to "touring." A similar cultivated disdain is expressed by Nancy Mitford. Able to enjoy extensive periods overseas while writing her books, she totally dissociates herself from tourists: "The Barbarian of yesterday is the Tourist of today" (130:3). An increase in tourists, "far more surely than any war, will be the end of Old Europe" (130:7).

In his influential book *The Image*, Boorstin also stresses the difference between "traveling" [with its etymological connection to the notion of work (*travail*)] and tourism (the apotheosis of the pseudo, where passivity rather than activity reigns). Tourism is a form of experience packaged to prevent real contact with others (10:91), a manufactured, trivial, inauthentic way of being, a form of travel emasculated, made safe by commercialism (10:109). The Age of Discovery, when explorers lived, passed long ago. The aristocratic *Grand Tour* of the 18th century then gave way to the Age of Industrialism, when middle-class travel became possible. Now this world, too, has died, replaced in a post-industrial age by mass tourism. For Fussell, to write about tourism is necessarily to write satire, for the "travel industry" is a contradiction in terms: Exploration is discovering the undiscovered; travel is at least intended to reveal what history has discovered; tourism, on the other hand, is merely about a world discovered (or even created) by entrepreneurs, packaged and then marketed (63:39). According to Fussell, the tourist—a fanciest temporarily equipped with power—is someone whose essential nature has not been grasped by anthropologists (63:41).

My purpose here is to examine the collective representations of international tourism—often referred to as the "Four S's"—sun, sex, sea, and sand (123:25)—that exist currently in the social sciences. It may seem derogatory to speak of collective social science representations rather than analyses. I do so to raise the issue of whether we yet have a respectable, scholarly analysis of tourism, or whether the social science literature on the subject substantially blends with the emotionally charged cultural images relating to travel and tourists expressed in the literary views above. Mings (127:343), for instance, has analyzed the history of academic writing on tourism in terms of an oscillation between two extreme myths—tourism as a godsend and tourism as evil—so the approach via representations has much to

recommend it. This view is further supported by the comment of social psychologist P. Pearce, who has written much on tourism, that much of the sociology of tourism simply mirrors popular ideas about the subject (148:17) and is perhaps only another example of how sophisticated tourists like to laugh at inferior versions of themselves (148:18). D. Pearce, a geographer examining the literature on tourism speaks of "weak methodologies and a certain degree of emotionalism" (146:43). R. A. Britton rightly points out that some work on tourism by geographers, and especially economists, reads like a series of industry press releases (14:30). Other social scientists can barely disguise their contempt; they disapprove as strongly the economists once approved (9:524).

Ambivalence, sweeping generalizations, and stereotypes abound. Lawson (104:16), commenting on the interminable controversy over the value of tourism to Third World development, writes that the debate has been "intellectually insulting." Titles of well known books on tourism are very revealing. In *The Golden Hordes* (195), Turner & Ash write that tourists are the "barbarians," the suntanned destroyers of culture. Sir George Young, in one of the earliest critical discussions of the subject (213), subtitles his work "*Blessing or Blight?*" Rosenow & Pulsipher, surveying the American scene, write a volume called *Tourism: The Good, the Bad and the Ugly* (167). Britton & Clarke (19), looking at the record of international tourism in small, developing countries edit a collection called *Ambiguous Alternative*. Tourism is referred to as a highly "deceptive" industry (194:259) and such phrases as "malevolent potential of unregulated tourism" (44:122) are not uncommon. Jafari, the founding editor of *Annals of Tourism Research*, wrote: "That 'each man kills the thing he loves,' as Oscar Wilde observed nearly a century ago, should perhaps be engraved over the door of national and regional tourism offices" (93:210). Special Issue 6(3) of *Cultural Survival Quarterly* (1982) is ambiguously entitled "The Tourist Trap—Who's Getting Caught?" Wrote Valene Smith, a leading anthropologist of tourism: "Just as Rousseau decried the rise of industrialization but was powerless to do other than philosophize, so contemporary scientists must accept tourism as an existent major phenomenon" (184:16). No wonder a leading sociologist of tourism, Erik Cohen, could say that the social scientific study of tourism was in a state of crisis (35:5). Ulla Wagner, on the other hand, makes the balanced comment that when looking at an industry involving "individual, local, national, and international levels, as well as economic, social, and cultural aspects, we can hardly expect the impact [on Third World countries] to be uniformly 'good' or 'bad'" (205:192).

By a number of criteria, tourism has a profound importance in the contemporary world. Before the rise in the price of oil in the early 1970s, tourism was the single largest item in world trade (209:274), having grown at a rate of

approximately 10% per annum since the 1960s. Some believe that by the year 2000 tourism will again be the world's largest industry (98:16), though others suggest that the ever-expanding leisure of post-industrial society may not be expended in ways defined as "tourism" (51:13). In the World Tourism Organization (founded in 1975 in succession to the International Union of Official Travel Organizations) was created an international body whose members are sovereign states devoted to the expansion of this single industry. Tourism also represents perhaps the largest movement of human populations outside wartime (74:81). Since anthropology has been much concerned with culture contact and social change one would have expected tourism—obviously a modern form of acculturation (138:207–8)—to receive extensive attention. As Jafari says (96:137), "Today almost every community and nation, large and small, developed or developing, is influenced in varying degrees by tourism." And many a Third World country, of course, has opted for tourism as a central development strategy.

These criteria aside, there is, as MacCannell has argued, much cultural significance in tourism. A trivial activity could not generate such religiously constructed, lopsided, and ambivalent representations as exist about tourism. For MacCannell, tourism is the quest of modern man; the tourist is post-industrial man (114:599; 115:1, 4) doing ritual obeisance to an elaborate and experientially fragmenting division of labor (115:11, 13) that requires the search for authenticity in other cultures (114:589). Using anecdotal, lopsided imagery MacCannell suggests that the tourist centrally symbolizes the world in which we now live. Carroll (26:140, 198–99) claims that tourism is a manifestation of the same restless Western spirit with which the founders of the social sciences were concerned. This point is also made graphically by Horne (87:21), who suggests that "the camera and tourism are two of the uniquely modern ways of defining reality" (87:121). Others (116:669) see tourism as an intense case of "that which regularly occurs in the daily life of modern society—the ordering of relations between strangers."

If tourism tells us something vital about the modern world (67:64), neither this nor its economic, cultural, and demographic magnitude have made it an important focus in social science research or in university social science curricula (67). Jafari might argue that one can scarcely ignore tourism (96:137), but the fact is that a large number of social science disciplines have not paid it the theoretical or empirical attention it deserves. For instance, the first anthropological study of tourism dates from as recently as 1963 (137). The first conference was held in 1974 (122:159). Even at the end of the 1970s most tourism research in the social sciences was incidental to other interests (95:326); there were fewer actual case studies than afterthoughts or spin-offs from other projects (9:524). Cohen dates the first full length sociological study of tourism in the 1960s (39:373). Pi-Sunyer (155:278) comments on

how strenuously anthropological monographs seem to avoid mentioning tourists, as if their authors wished to disassociate themselves from other western intruders. Nuñez (138:207, 212) comments on the same lack of interest, even though almost everywhere anthropologists go they will find tourists, and even be categorized with them by locals. Finney & Watson report (57:470) how tourism research has been looked down upon. L. Mitchell comments on how the study of tourism "gets no respect" in the discipline of geography (129:236). Valene Smith (183:274) reports how her early research interests were actively discouraged. Leiper, (107:392) suggests that as late as 1979 in academe tourism as a focus of research might well be derided. We do now have a small number of collections of anthropological articles on tourism (71, 185) and some overviews (68, 134, 138), but we still lack full length anthropological monographs on the subject. This is the current situation for a phenomenon "sponsored by governments, regulated by international agencies, and supported by multinational enterprises" (181:3-4).

For L. Turner, international tourism is "simultaneously the most promising, complex, and understudied industry impinging on the Third World" (194:253). How are we to explain such a widespread lack of attention to such an evidently significant phenomenon? If it is not a matter of the complexity, then such neglect is itself a fruitful area for the sociology of knowledge. In the case of anthropology, is it that anthropologists, because we study "them" and not "us," have regarded tourists as someone else's concern? Is it that academic personalities find it difficult to take as a serious area of research a phenomenon so bound up with leisure and hedonism? A social psychologist has suggested that the relative neglect of tourism in the behavioral sciences relates to deeply embedded values in Western society concerning work and play (148:1-2). But is there an even more basic emotional avoidance at work for anthropological researchers—namely, that tourists appear, in some respects, to be our own distant relatives? Sensing overlaps here, do we find it too unsettling to pursue the matter further (42)?

Quite apart from the *absence* of attention, we must consider the nature of the collective images of tourism that do exist. Boissevain (9:525) has in this regard usefully set out four distinct types of bias in the academic literature on tourism. One is the grossly inadequate framework of economic analysis. Another is the lack of the local voice. (An anthropologist is bound when reading the literature produced by economists, geographers, and so on, to notice an almost complete silence about what tourism means to the people involved in it—i.e both those on the receiving end and the tourists themselves.) A third bias is the failure to distinguish the social consequences of tourism from other processes of change going on in a society independently. The fourth bias is the noble savage syndrome. Anthropologists with a possessiveness about "their" people and an oversimplified idea of traditional culture

look askance at social change and the hordes of Western intruders "queering their pitch." The anthropologist bemoaning the rampages of tourism, expressing sympathy with the host population and hostility towards tourists (138:212), is, in this view, a Rousseauesque voice bemoaning the romp of technological civilization over traditional ways of life.

In commenting that the social sciences have failed to accord tourism the importance it deserves I am not arguing for the development of a field of touriological studies or the establishment of a tourism science (cf 208:153). Nor do I believe (cf 22:110) that all the literature on tourism should be synthesized into a coherent framework. Over a decade ago Sir George Young commented on the absence of a unified bibliography on tourism, and on the "scrappy" state of the literature scattered through a range of disciplines (213:3). Since tourism is a highly complex system, countless disciplines, from anthropology and sociology, through recreation geography, social psychology, marketing economics, hotel management studies, and so on, all have a view of what goes on. Although social science bibliographies now exist (94), and academic journals such as the *Annals of Tourism Research* concentrate on tourism as a specific subject, I do not envisage a change in the fragmented, multidisciplinary nature of the field. Perhaps tourism is an outcome of the intersection of a number of wider phenomena, themselves the strategic units for analysis—leisure, play, conspicuous consumption, etc. If so, then studies of tourism should certainly not evolve into a science of tourism; instead, touristic phenomena should be absorbed into "leisure studies" or some similarly construed field. I personally doubt that even this will occur, because touristic systems have so many diverse features. At the moment, the approaches of, for instance, economic geography, social psychology, sociology, and econometrics are radically diverse and incommensurable. What is of interest to the specialist in one discipline may be of no interest to investigators in another. Synthesis in such a situation is out of the question.

A final fundamental uncertainty remains—namely, about what a tourist is. There exists an array of definitions and taxonomies (see 14:80–84; 107; 122:10). The new animal—a tourist—was first named early in the 19th century, and for most statistical purposes definitions derived from the 1963 United Nations statement are used. Even at that statistical level, though, variations exist, and so quantitative tourism data are not always comparable. Edwards notes acerbically that "there are far better data on . . . canned fish . . . than on tourism" (51:15). From the viewpoint of the social sciences, however, "passport"-type definitions are of little use (39:374). The notion that a tourist is someone away from his/her residence for over 24 hours, who is traveling for either business or pleasure, conflicts substantially with the normal understanding that pleasure and leisure are tourism's basic motiva-

tions (122:12). We have another obvious difficulty: Does it make sense to call everyone who engages in leisure travel a tourist (39:378)? The hippy, the FIT (Free Independent Traveller), and the working-class family on a cheap package tour for the annual fortnightly holiday, for example, exhibit a vast range of motivations—fun, relaxation, adventure, learning, escape, etc; and each kind of traveler generates a different set of socioeconomic consequences. Typologies abound based on different motivations, levels of affluence, lengths of stay, methods of organization, and so on.<sup>1</sup> Typically, though, these taxonomies are incommensurable, leave out obvious distinctions, and separate phenomena that are clearly fuzzy or overlapping. In addition, as Hermans notes, no one's taxonomy has yet compelled use by others (82:10). Turner & Ash add (195:14) that any unitary phenomenon that may underlie tourism is not in any case constituted by the tourists and their motives but rather by a highly complex set of interlocking structures. Thus to concentrate on the tourist is to miss a great deal about the international tourism system. There is even argument about whether or not tourism is essentially a modern phenomenon, and here perhaps social historians have a vital role in research. Is tourism new? Is it a distinctively 20th-century phenomenon, completely different from the travel, pilgrimage, migration, exploration, and so on, of earlier ages? One encyclopedic survey of travel in the ancient world (27:262, 274, 279, 321–22) suggests that “touristic” motives and behavior have not really changed significantly in 2000 years. If this is so, we must still ask detailed questions about, for instance, the democratization of travel. Are there no significant differences between pre-industrial, industrial, and post-industrial work, play and leisure? Or, is tourism just a contemporary form of an activity that occurs in all societies at all times? One's approach to tourism research depends to some extent on how one answers such questions.

It is therefore something of an understatement to say that the anthropology of tourism is still in its infancy (134:461). Some authors, like Nash (134:467), call for a theoretical framework and want generalizations to start emerging. Others, calling for more detailed comparative empirical studies, protest premature general analytical frameworks. Buck argues that in a new field of study scholars tend to go their own way, so that an integrated body of knowledge is unlikely to arise (23:326). De Kadt argues in regard to the highly evaluative literature on tourism that both pro- and anti- attitudes are worthless without detailed evidence (48:xiv), and Cohen claims that all the generalizations about the sociocultural repercussions of tourism are premature

<sup>1</sup>For taxonomies of tourist types, see references 31, 32, 34 (organized mass tourist, individual mass tourist, explorer, drifter; or recreational mode, diversionary mode, experiential mode, experimental mode, existential mode), and 181 (ethnic, cultural, historical, environmental, recreational).



since there is no such creature as *the* tourist (36:31). We have to know the particular tourist types involved, the numbers present, and the specific eco-cultural niches involved before we can come to any sensible conclusions (35:7, 9).

Given this array of views, I urge theoretical caution. Detailed studies are needed to break the hold of powerful yet insufficiently examined images, and to create bodies of social scientific data distinct from other kinds of cultural representations. Without that effort our academic writings might amount to little more than detailed outpourings simply slipped into preformed and highly evaluative moulds. We should also be wary of any disciplinary imperialism. International tourism is a highly complex system. Indeed, Jafari has commented that there is such a diversity of goods and services involved that tourism is not an industry in the normal sense (91:84). This complexity must be respected, and one way of doing this is to acknowledge that a large range of academic disciplines have an interest in it. The complexity will be fruitfully registered if these disciplines pursue unabashedly their own interests and utilize their own distinctive methodologies.

In the remainder of this article I examine several sets of images and approaches to tourism that have been prominent over the last two decades in the social science literature. Given my anthropological focus, I do not attempt an even, discipline-by-discipline approach (see 14:17–54). Instead, I divide the discussion into three areas: a broadly political-economic view of international tourism, including the issue of development; tourism in relation to meanings, motives, and roles; and lastly, images of tourism as a force in sociocultural change. I emphasize international tourism, particularly in the Third World, even though in monetary terms tourism within the affluent industrial countries is far more significant.

## TOURISM, ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT, AND POLITICAL ECONOMY

An approach to tourism that is recognizably both political and economic has surfaced in recent years. This combination is particularly striking because the first academic representations of tourism were almost exclusively economic—pure and (with hindsight) very simple. International tourism during the 1960s was seen largely in terms of economic development and thus almost entirely in a positive light. This was a time of considerable difficulty for many Third World countries, whose primary produce exports were experiencing a long-term decline in value. International tourism was portrayed as a panacea for the less developed countries, as “manna from heaven” (52, 209). The Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) spoke of the almost limitless growth potential in tourism (141:11–15), and both the World

Bank and the United Nations promoted tourist industries in developing countries. The United Nations declared 1967 to be International Tourism Year. The leisure and travel habits of those in the wealthy countries were to open the doors to the economic advancement of those in the poor nations; foreign exchange for the developing countries could be directly tied, in other words, to the increasing affluence of the developed world (102). Tourism was represented as an easy option for development because it relied largely on natural resources already in place—e.g. sand, sun, friendly people—and therefore required no vast capital outlays for infrastructure (92:227). Some tourism advocates even argued that certain Third World countries might, via tourism, advance from a primary sector-based situation to one based on an expanding service sector, omitting the normal industrial phase of economic growth. Responding to such glaringly positive images, a number of developing countries embarked upon tourism development without adequate feasibility studies, without any sense of opportunity costs (that is, with no sense of what development might be achieved by the employment of resources in alternative ways), and with little planning to integrate tourism into national development more generally. As Mathieson & Wall comment (122:178), a great deal of subsequent tourism policy has been aimed at shutting the stable door after the horse has bolted.

In the last 20 years we have become increasingly aware of the political dimension of such seemingly simple encouragement. Much attention has been devoted to tourism's frequently adverse sociocultural consequences. In addition, scholars have begun to realize that even the economic arguments for tourism are not as sound as was first claimed (14:251). We therefore now read in introductory tourism texts that, in its present form, tourism development is not desirable in many areas (122:177). Tourism is not a secure growth industry (108:753). Not only are there the obvious seasonal fluctuations in arrivals, but the developed economies themselves also go through economic cycles; and during recessions, demand for overseas travel declines (14:150). Vacationing is price elastic, and costs are unstable, given the politics of oil marketing. Pricing in general is beyond the control of the destination countries. Tourists are also faddish in their tastes, so the general growth of international tourism does not mean that any particular Third World destination has a secure future (143). Most Third World tourism destinations are mutually substitutable; travel organizers can easily reroute their clients, leaving many people out of work and much accommodation under-occupied.

Even in good times the record of international tourism is far less spectacular than the original representations predicted (21, 168). To begin with foreign exchange, there is normally a large discrepancy between gross and net receipts as a result of numerous leakages—e.g. repatriation of profits on foreign capital invested. For some economies, like that of Mauritius where the

tourism industry is largely dependent on overseas capital, there have been leaks approaching 90% of foreign exchange (30:31–32, 49). Some countries lose substantial quantities of foreign exchange through black market operations. The high level of vertical integration in the tourist industry (14:168), where foreign airlines own hotel chains and local rental car firms, and so on, means the economic gains to many developing destination countries are much reduced. In 1978, for instance, a mere 16 hotel chains owned over one third of the hotels in developing countries (28:11). Indeed, given the nature of inclusive package holidays where payment for airfares, accommodation, food, and services is made in advance, much foreign exchange does not even reach the destination country (195:116). In many countries, luxury tourism facilities still tend to attract expatriate management, and a high proportion of foreign exchange is expended to import the foodstuffs and facilities the clientele of such establishments expect. Luxury tourism especially may require substantial investment in infrastructure (buildings, transport, etc) that will be little utilized by local people, meaning that locals, in fact, subsidize the holidays of affluent foreigners (213:2, 152). Also, of course, national tourism authorities must spend foreign exchange overseas in order to advertise themselves. Given that many developing countries do not all need tourism as a central growth strategy and can thus allocate scarce resources to other projects, observers (72:122–23) have pointed out what a reprehensible waste international tourism developments can often represent. We must also remember that attracting foreign capital and business normally requires Third World governments to offer very generous financial incentives, such as tax-free profits (209:280–82) for a number of years. Such situations are often believed to lead to widespread political corruption and fraud (18:71–72). Given such factors, plus the fact that the receipt of foreign exchange does not necessarily lead to economic growth, one can see why the foreign exchange argument is not so confidently used nowadays.

Similar difficulties have arisen with regard to other supposed economic benefits. Contrary to predictions, tourism has often proved to be a capital-intensive industry, at least in its development phase (49:549; 194:257). If countries borrow overseas capital to build infrastructure, the continuing interest payments promote dependency rather than the reverse (45:307). Nor has employment been stimulated to the degree expected. Most of the jobs generated are unskilled; tourism can thus breed what one critic (24:2) calls “flunkey training.” Another area where tourism’s record has not lived up to the original promise is that of intersectoral linkage and regional diversification. Tourism, like other economic activities, has ramifications in an underdeveloped economy different from those in a developed one. Where the intersectoral linkages are weak, the multiplier effects expected in a developed system will not occur (113:16). Thus, in Third World conditions, tourism does not always

stimulate local agricultural production; indeed, a rise in the value of land and in the price of food, together with the higher wages often to be found in the tourist sector even for menial work, may lead to the sale of agriculturally productive land, an exodus of labor from the fields, food shortages, and malnutrition (200). Regionally, too, tourism may establish small localized enclaves of activity without affecting activities nearby, thus reproducing the dualistic structure, the plantation system, of the colonial economy (45:314; 48:139). Employment prospects in the immediate locality may not improve if labor is brought in from elsewhere (e.g. to staff high-quality hotels). The lesson has not yet been adequately learned by national tourism authorities that in tourism development Schumacher's dictum "small is beautiful" applies. Grass roots developments are far more likely to lead to local employment, the stimulation of other local activities, and the avoidance of capital indebtedness to overseas concerns that the standard hotel-based industry involves (14:viii).

Tourism may also differentially affect different classes, increasing inequalities of wealth and social stratification (58:225) and thus retarding broadly based national development. Unlike some development strategies, tourism is normally a conservative choice (52:72). Benefits from tourism "unlike water, tend to flow uphill" (165:7). In other words, not only does tourism in the Third World "inject the behavior of a wasteful society into the midst of a society of want" (11:27), but the profits go to the elites—those already wealthy, and those with political influence. Such facts led to analyses of the situation in Fiji, for instance, which suggested that because tourism reinforces existing economic patterns it can only have a negative effect on national welfare (203:96–100). International tourism is a kind of potlatch in someone else's country (Sessa, quoted in 199:85); it is conspicuous consumption in front of the deprived. One American travel writer brings himself to admit that "everywhere in the world, of course, you'll come across occasional gaps in living standards and amenities" (quoted in 14:177); for others, "No printed page, broadcast speech, or propaganda volley can emphasise the inequity in the global distribution of wealth as effectively as tourism can" (14:258). If local people feel resentment at the display of wealth by foreigners, tourism also fuels class resentment (9:523). The poor find themselves unable to tap the flow of resources while the wealthy need only use their existing assets (e.g. ownership of well-positioned real estate, political influence) to gain more. Often small operators in the tourism industries of the Third World face increasingly daunting competition with the enormously powerful local elites and multinational conglomerates (79:110–11); and national tourism authorities, in a desire to maintain a favorable reputation for their countries, frequently sweep human "litter" off the streets; touts, beggars, and street hawkers are treated as so much refuse spoiling things for the visitors (41).

In the 1960s, international agencies spoke of tourism as a force for economic growth and international understanding. By the mid-1970s Levitt & Gulati (112:326–27) were alleging that a powerful metropolitan tourist lobby operates at the national and international level, through the agency of professional consulting firms, essentially to con international organizations like the World Bank into hoodwinking everyone else about the supposed benefits of international tourism. The World Tourism Organization is an “informed cheerleader for the industry and governments interested in tourism”. As Richter notes, the WTO is unlikely to be a critic of the industry (163:18–19). Much technical analysis, too, is highly suspect. For instance, multiplier analysis is used in the literature to generate highly misleading claims about the beneficial effects of tourism on employment and economic growth (30:5; 21:74). Economic representations of this type are attacked now not only for what they omit, but because of the political naïveté inherent in their one-dimensional, asocial, conceptual world. Underneath elaborate cost-benefit analyses there often lurk thinly disguised political values (186).

Commentators now increasingly stress the fact that developing countries must decide on their own tourism objectives (30:103–4, 168) and must integrate them within an overall development plan, for otherwise the industry will get out of control and redress will then be impossible. Some developing areas, particularly small islands, may have no alternatives to tourism (29:294); but where other uses of resources are possible, governments are now being urged to consider the opportunity cost of tourism (82:5). Reports are increasingly hostile to the notion that tourism is beneficial. Harrel-Bond, for instance, claims (80) that the Gambia benefits little from the industry that the World Bank had been energetic enough to set up for it, that such industry rests upon derogatory racist stereotyping of the locals, and that it is a “charlatan development programme” (see also 53, 205). It has, of course, been hard for governments in underdeveloped countries to resist the temptations of tourism. After all, there must be something good in it if the UN, UNESCO, and the World Bank spend vast sums on it and encourage its adoption (53:9). But Third World governments are now somewhat wary. It is indicative of this new skeptical orientation that a modern collection on tourism (48) is quizzically entitled “Passport to Development?” The recommendations made by the participants at the seminar from which the book derives are, for the most, expressions of concern (48:339–47).

Since the 1960s we have realized that concepts (or, perhaps images) like “development,” “modernization,” and “growth” are no longer as clear as was once thought (48:xi–xii). What is development? Development for whom? Are development and growth the same thing? Is the concept of growth of any value without consideration of the distribution of wealth and a whole host of other political and social issues? R. A. Britton, who has written about

international tourism from an explicitly politico-economic viewpoint, notes that to define development simply in terms of indexes such as rising GNP or extra foreign exchange is problematic where other indexes, such as levels of education, health care, sanitation etc, remain static (14:vii). Also, whether a development is beneficial depends on whether one sees it at an international, national, or local level (122:6). Moreover, a country's attempt to tie itself to the affluence of Europe and North America now appears particularly naïve if it is precisely the forces producing their affluence that maintain the underdevelopment of the Third World. The structural dependencies are visible in the case of tourism. One of the rationales for tourism development in the 1960s was export diversification away from reliance on primary products. That reliance itself was largely the consequence of the deformation created in the colonial economy by the many countries now sending tourists. Tourists do not go to Third World countries because the people are friendly, they go because a holiday there is cheap; and that cheapness is, in part, a matter of the poverty of the people, which derives in some theoretical formulations directly from the affluence of those in the formerly metropolitan centers of the colonial system. That affluence now produces conditions of work and life such that leisure activity is prized. And with high levels of disposable income, that leisure can be spent in the impoverished Third World, the source of many of the surpluses that established the affluence. No wonder one representational framework for the analysis of international tourism is that of neo-colonial political economy. Advocates of various forms of "alternative," "fair," or "just" tourism (64, 78, 86, 140, 169, 191) from which local people will benefit while a situation of intercultural understanding develops, suggest that international tourism in the Third World currently enables neither of these things. The 1977 Pacific Area Travel Association slogan "The consumer—the only person who matters" (quoted in 210:567) states exactly what Third World, academic, and religious critics of international tourism increasingly deplore. Whether "alternative" tourism can do much to change the overall nature of international tourism is debatable (40).

I discuss academic and political criticism further below. Here comments from religious organizations deserve noting, for they are by no means simply expressions of moral outrage. Indeed, as the Ecumenical Coalition on Third World Tourism claims (50:3), the prostitution and drugs involved in this industry are not really matters of personal morality at all, being instead bound up with racial exploitation. The Coalition, which monitors developments and produces the journal *Contours*, grew out of meetings of churches concerned with international tourism, the first having occurred at Penang in 1975 (86:6). A second church group, the Christian Conference of Asia (140), met in Manila in 1980, at the same time and place where the Sri Lankan Minister for Tourism told the World Tourism Conference that tourism was a force for

peace and understanding. The church conference claimed that, on the contrary, tourism had "wreaked more havoc than brought benefits to recipient Third World countries. . . . In its present form, linked as it is with transnational corporations, ruling elites and political hegemonies, and totally unmindful of the real spiritual, economic and political and socio-cultural needs of recipient countries, the Workshop seriously questioned whether tourism as it is could be salvaged" (140:3). International tourism had to be rethought outside the normal materialistic framework so that benefits would be shared more equitably. The conference also described the idea that international tourism builds up peace and friendship among people as a "contemporary myth" (140:18). Biddlecomb, another religious writer, suggests that the myth of international amity might have some basis in fact for elites (8:16). The Manila Declaration on tourism produced by the World Tourism Organization spoke of tourism as a part of everyone's heritage, indeed as a "fundamental human right" (211, para. 15). It encouraged all, and especially the young and less affluent, to partake of international tourism, suggesting that this would contribute to a "new international economic order" (212: para. 14). The WTO stressed that international tourism would help to eliminate the widening economic gap between developed and developing countries and would contribute substantially to social development and general progress in the developing countries. The Chiang Mai workshop of the Ecumenical Coalition in 1984, by contrast, was claiming that tourism as it presently exists "is a violation of human rights and the dignity of people" (86:14).

The religious organizations that regularly comment are not simply condemnatory. They are also optimistic that negative factors can be overcome, and that travel can be made an uplifting experience. But a genuinely beneficial outcome, it is argued, involves equality among participants, and this, according to the Chiang Mai workshop, is bound to involve some conflict between governments and the travel industry (86:18). In one of the earliest general works on tourism, Sir George Young made clear his view that there were a number of ways the tourist industry would have to change substantially—and uncomfortably—if it were to have a future (213:81). One such change is precisely the shift to alternative forms of tourism, involving less foreign capital and thus more local people, food, and architecture. It is clear from Sri Lanka (78) and elsewhere that these smaller-scale ventures are not without their practical difficulties; as Hiller comments for the Caribbean, it is difficult to persuade tourism policymakers that a more authentic form of tourism is viable (83:57).

International tourism is political, since the state must be involved in foreign relations, the expenditure of large quantities of capital, and large-scale planning (30:51). But the emerging political-economy framework makes a different point. As S. G. Britton (16, 17) correctly remarks, what is wrong with

many portrayals of tourism and development by economists is that they provide no sociohistorical context to explain the economic inequality between the tourist-generating and tourist-destination countries. In other words, tourism has not commonly been analyzed within the framework of underdevelopment. But as Hiller notes, tourism does tend to "represent the way the powerful nations perceive and relate to the rest of the world" (83:51). Many of the specific relationships between "hosts" and "guests" in tourism are only comprehensible in the context of these wider international relations between the developing world and the affluent West (100:250). Indeed, for some critics of standard international tourism, like those confronting tourism with indigenous value systems such as *ujamaa* in Tanzania, the piecemeal analysis of tourism without the political-economic overview is typical of bourgeois social science and is a strategy often used to avoid real social issues (176:15).

Remedying the shortcomings of such academic representations produces the sort of framework which declares that to "invest in international tourism is to invest in dependence" (85:81) or that "decolonisation and tourist development have antithetical implications" (120:197)—in short, that to opt for tourism as a growth strategy is to ask for continued control by overseas forces (133:35, 45). R. A. Britton sums up this type of representation well when he states that the tourist industry is the "opposite of self-reliant development" (14:207). In certain countries tourist development wholly contradicts proclaimed anticolonial ideologies (210:578, n.49), and as the African socialism debate in Tanzania in the early 1970s makes clear, not all the critics in this vein are Western academics. To cite Shivji:

Tanzania has proclaimed *ujamaa* as its goal. Tourism, therefore, cannot be evaluated in isolation from this goal and from an overall general development strategy to achieve such a goal. Again, cost-benefit analysis does not help much. For economic development in a colonially structured economy calls for radical structural change. Many of these structural changes are inevitably political decisions. . . . To separate politics and economics is therefore a grave error. The justification for tourism in terms of it being "economically good" though it may have adverse social, cultural and political effects, completely fails to appreciate the integrated nature of the system of underdevelopment (176:x).

As the Tanzanian Youth League went on to comment, "It is not a matter of coincidence but a matter of class interest that both the national and international bourgeoisie should show interest in the same field of economic activity. . . . What is more, nothing could be more dangerous than an alliance and consolidation of the class interests mentioned . . . [since] such alliance can completely change the course of our history, and surely not in the direction of socialism." Maluga, as part of the same debate, comments how international tourism contravenes the objectives of self-reliance set out in the Arusha declaration.



Investment in tourism is a lopsided one; it serves a sector that is hardly related to the economic structure of the country. . . . It is above all a risky and temporary industry whose viability and continuity depend on the good will of the tourist generating countries. . . . In order to have a continuous influx of tourists our policies ought to be widely acceptable by the public in the tourist generating countries. If we commit ourselves to make tourism one of the leading industries in the country as it is envisaged in the proposed "ten year plan for tourism," our independence will be at stake. . . . Since the success of tourism depends primarily on our being accepted in the metropolitan countries, it is one of those appendage industries which give rise to a neo-colonialist relationship and cause underdevelopment (119).

Kanywanyi adds interrogatively, ". . . are we not building socialism but helping Western monopoly capitalism to more effectively keep our stagnant economy at a standstill?" (99:65).

I have quoted at length above because the issues have rarely been better stated. If they strike the reader as unduly alarmist, note that the vice-president of Edgar Rice Burrows Inc. once expressed his desire to purchase the whole nation of The Gambia so as to build a series of Tarzan vacation villages. "This is not pie in the sky. We've been talking to the Rothschild Bank in Paris about this. There are a number of very very small African countries that have absolutely nothing. No economy, nothing. All they have is their independence and their UN ambassadors, and the thought is to merchandise the entire country . . . take it over, change the name . . ." (quoted in 14:158-59).

Ruth Young has argued that the structural form of any tourist development necessarily parallels the preexisting socioeconomic structure in a country (214:157). Inevitably, then, the very way a tourism industry is planned and shaped will recreate the fabric of the colonial situation. It is no wonder that, to some, international tourism is pictured as the recreation of a foreign-dominated enclave structure reacting to metropolitan interests and entirely unrelated to the local economy (16:10; 133:35-38; 150:476). In the West Indies, for instance, local writers describe tourism as a reexperience of the race and labor relations of the past, as a meeting of Fanon's "wretched of the earth" and the wealthy (190:217). Whereas tourism makes the Third World a "Garden of Eden" for some (as a local newspaper remarked as far back as 1938), for locals, it is a "Perverved Hell" (190:221, n. 55). Locals, according to the Mayor of Honolulu (quoted in 115:165) are "peasants in Paradise," and many features of the sociology of colonial situations are resurrected. Locals are denied access to their own beaches, people are given jobs according to racial stereotypes (170:205), and humble service roles predominate. In the passage from the cane fields to hotel lobbies the pattern remains basically the same (120:197). We have, in short, "leisure imperialism" (18:38, 84; 45:305; 133:37-38; 159), the hedonistic face of neo-colonialism. International tourism recapitulates a historical process (150:480); areas of one's country are

given over to the pleasure of foreigners, and the rhetoric of development serves as a defence (150:474). To the extent that tourism can undermine the national identity of newly independent countries, it is a case of the cultural imperialism condemned decades ago by such writers as Albert Memmi and Frantz Fanon. As Shivji has remarked, tourism is part of a continuation of the cluster of attitudes that make up colonial social psychology—submissiveness, arrogance, and so on. He goes on to point out that many hotels are in fact Fanon's "settler towns" (176:ix). Indeed, Fanon even spotted the sexual exploitation that would emerge as part and parcel of much tourism development in the Third World.

The settler's town is a strongly built town, all made of stone and steel. It is a brightly-lit town: the streets are covered with asphalt, and the garbage-cans swallow all the leavings, unseen, unknown, and hardly thought about. The settler's feet are never visible, except perhaps in the sea; but there you're never close enough to see them. His feet are protected by strong shoes although the streets of his town are clean and even, with no holes or stones. The settler's town is a well-fed town, an easy-going town: its belly is always full of good things. The settler's town is a town of white people, of foreigners. . . . The national bourgeoisie will be greatly helped on its way toward decadence by the Western bourgeoisies, who come to it as tourists avid for the exotic, for big-game hunting and casinos. The national bourgeoisie organises centres for rest and relaxation, and pleasure resorts to meet the wishes of the Western bourgeoisie. Such activity is given the name of tourism, and for the occasion will be built up as a national industry. If proof is needed of the eventual transformation of certain elements of the ex-native bourgeoisie into the organisers of parties for their Western opposite numbers, it is worthwhile having a look at what has happened in Latin America. The casinos of Havana and of Mexico, the beaches of Rio, the little Brazilian and Mexican girls, the half-bred 13-year-olds, the ports of Acapulco and Copacabana—all these are the stigma of this deprivation of the national middle class. Because it is bereft of ideas, because it lives to itself and cuts itself off from the people, undermined by its hereditary incapacity to think in terms of all the problems of the nation as seen from the point of view of the whole of that nation, the national middle class will have nothing better to do than to take on the role of manager for Western enterprise, and it will in practice set up its country as the brothel of Europe (55:30, 123).

Fanon's analysis was written many years ago, but accurately pinpoints many features of the system of contemporary international tourism. That system does not, for a start, normally express local needs or aspirations, although there are "indigenous collaborative elites" (166) who in tourism, as in other imperialist situations, are linchpins by means of which foreign interests maintain their hold in poor countries. Those with political sway, able to hand out contracts and the like, are the beneficiaries. Local elites may well identify with the consumerist life-style of international tourists rather than with the aspirations of their own people, indeed they may themselves be part of the international jet set. When members of Third World elites encourage tourism as economically beneficial, they may not be suffering from a delu-

sion: They may themselves benefit substantially. However, their own gain and the interests of the nation as a whole are two different things (151:142). As in the previous era, therefore, the periphery is structurally tied to the needs of the metropole; the local and foreign elites gain while deprivation continues to be the lot of the masses (177, 178). Third World politicians who collaborate with metropolitan interests necessarily underwrite underdevelopment (150:478). For S. G. Britton, describing the situation in Fiji, tourism has simply been "grafted onto a once colonial economy in a way that has perpetuated deep-seated structural anomalies and inequalities." The initiative comes from foreigners and "local political and commercial elites in close liaison with foreign capital. . . . The articulation of international tourism with Fiji was based upon the interaction of foreign and local elites in pursuit of their own interests and mutual benefit" (18:v, 2, 31). It was inevitable that overall long-term planning for economic growth would take place in a system where these alliances were already firmly established (18:194-95). This is the sociopolitical reality lying behind the series of ad hoc measures taken to shape the international tourism industry but that seem neither fully to support nor effectively to guide the industry (18:119-20).

An essentially imperialist imagery is evident in much of the recent language social scientists use about international tourism. Bugnicourt, for instance, writes that tourism represents the demands of consumers who, having ruined their own environment, desperately need to take over another (24). MacCannell writes of the affluent middle class that systematically "scavenges" the earth in search of new experiences (115:13). Some see tourism as an expression of that same expansive thrust in Europe that lay behind geographical discoveries and colonialism (68:18). For Cohen "the easy-going tourist of our era might well complete the work of his predecessors, also travellers from the west—the conqueror and colonialist" (31:82). Biddlecomb asks: "If from colonialism and tourism the same implicit models and thought patterns are perpetuated, then what if anything has actually changed in the West's way of relating to the third world?" (8:37). If John Bright was right (quoted in 142:26) in 1859 to claim that imperialism was a "gigantic system of outdoor relief for the aristocracy," one can see why many Third World critics see tourism as just more of the same thing—except that they now have to put up with the wealthy slumming around and the working class lording it over them. And we should not think that this imperialist imagery concerns only relations between the West and the Third World. Many critics of tourism in Thailand and the Philippines see the now rampant Japanese "sex tourism" as a repetition of Japanese military aggression, showing absolutely no respect for the local people. As a Filipino protester put it, "We would like to forget Japanese military imperialism. But now instead of military uniforms, the men come in business suits, dominating Asia through a pernicious form of socio-economic

imperialism, which tramples on the Asian peoples' right to human dignity (quoted in 139:29).

Not only, then, may few people in a destination country benefit from international tourism, they may be forced to "grin and bear it." In the West Indies, as in other areas, national tourism authorities launched "courtesy campaigns," in which citizens were instructed how to be civil to tourists, and beggars were swept out of sight (164:250). International tourism requires, above all, peace and stability. Governments may therefore crack down on the local people in order not to upset a growing tourism industry, suppressing signs of civil disorder and of animosity towards tourists themselves (14: 199; 45:316; 163). The argument is sometimes put that the tourism industry tends to support right-wing regimes (14:190-191). Conrad Hilton is famous for his remark that "each of our hotels is a little America." He added: "We are doing our bit to spread world peace, and to fight socialism" (quoted in 139:50). For the Philippines, L. Richter has shown how the rapid development of tourism facilities after the imposition of martial law by President Marcos in 1972 acted as a message to the international community that life was normal in that country (161; 162:122, 127-28). The World Bank Conference of 1978 was held in Manila. In 1976 12% of the funds of the Philippines Development Bank was devoted to financing hotel room construction, resulting in windfall commissions for those with political influence (14:197). This level of expenditure on hotels in 1976 was 40 times that on public housing. At that time crimes against tourists carried more severe punishments than those against locals, and journalists criticizing tourism risked dismissal (162:244, n. 36, 245, n. 54). Fortunes were made by Marcos supporters in charge of the implementation of tourism policy. Governments sometimes use rough tactics against their own people to safeguard tourism. In Indonesia, for instance, when the government decided to create tourist facilities around the Borobudur Temple, there was much local protest at the sacrilege this involved. Local people were simply moved away and rehoused; then land values skyrocketed (101). In countries like Australia and the United States, tourism has become a force for internal colonialism as peoples of the so-called Fourth World (e.g. Australian Aboriginal groups and American Indian communities) are represented as tourist attractions (62:24; 156). In 1962, for instance, an Australian tourist advisor suggested the removal of a group of Aborigines to a reserve half a day's drive from Adelaide to function as a tourist spectacle (156:88).

Modern political-economic analyses of international tourism suggest that the developing countries have little or no choice. Even where small-scale tourism (in which the less wealthy are actively involved and from which they benefit) makes sense, its success is made unlikely by the industry's high level of vertical integration. Third World economies lack control over the world prices of international tourism (14:124). Although many Third World coun-

tries have a "tourism on *our terms*" policy, demand is largely engendered by tourist agencies and a whole industrial network of image makers overseas. When Tunisia in the early 1970s attempted to better its cut in international tourism vis à vis the overseas operators, in the following year the major European travel agencies simply diverted their customers to other but comparable destinations. Even if developing countries attempted regional cooperation (128:12; 158) in shaping the nature and size of their tourist sectors, international tourism exists primarily to meet the needs of those in the affluent countries (97:232), where most of the control remains (28). For those who hope that the Third World might acquire more control of tourism, or that alternative tourism might begin to encourage cultural understanding, the words of Bugnicourt are worth savoring: "There is no doubt whatever that a change in the overall economic and social relations between industrialized and Third World countries and a consequent evolution of behaviour will be needed before there can be any real prospect of a tourism which no longer leaves itself open to the charge of colonialism, but brings people closer and offers the enriching discovery of new environments and different civilisations (quoted in 14:350).

## TOURISM, MEANINGS, MOTIVATIONS, AND ROLES

International mass tourism today is made possible by some basic material facts about modern industrial societies—among them levels of affluence that free resources for leisure pursuits, compulsory paid annual holidays, and entrepreneurship that invades leisure as well as the work sphere (123). But there is also here an important area for social science research into meanings and motives. What do tourists say about their leisure experiences? What do they learn from other cultures? Why do they go on overseas holidays? In what ways are their ideas and attitudes changed by these experiences? Much of the extant social science literature on tourism does not ask such questions because in most disciplines contributing to the field tourists themselves are not the object of study. Sociology has done some work on meanings but anthropology has tended to concentrate on cultural repercussions in the destination country, and disciplines like geography and economics seldom mention human beings at all. A large area in tourism research has been neglected, although increasing attention is being paid to it by social psychology (56:124; 148).

Clearly the simplistic push and pull factors set out in introductory tourism textbooks (e.g. 88:35) inadequately represent the complexities of tourist behavior, let alone more subjective matters of attitude, learning, and meaning. We have not only the motivational differences between distinct subtypes of tourist (e.g. the wanderer, the person on the package tour, and so on) but also such elements of tourist behaviour as play, regression, ritual, and so on,

which are ripe for detailed empirical investigation. A recent summary of the contributions of social psychology to the study of tourism shows that the psychological way of approaching meaning, motivation, and human behavior, even after the "humanizing" changes within the discipline over the last decade or so, differs from the ways anthropologists would approach the same subject. Anthropologists, however, have not yet studied tourists or the countries that generate them (134:465; 138:209). The omission has long been recognized by perceptive travelers, in fact. Aldous Huxley, for instance, subjected to "infantile" behavior during a tourist cruise in the Gulf of Mexico, wrote "My objection to anthropologists is the same as my objection to missionaries. Why do these two classes of people waste their time converting heathens and studying the habits of blackamoors, when they can find, in their own streets, men and women whose beliefs and behaviour are at least as strange as those of the M'pongos and, so far as we are concerned, painfully and dangerously more significant? Anthropology, like charity, should begin at home" (89:11).

Human migration is often associated with stress, whether resulting from social pressure or natural disaster; and tourism, though voluntary and reversible, is nevertheless a form of migration. Not surprisingly, the images of escape from pressure, alternation, and regression are common in the literature. To be a tourist is to opt out of ordinary social reality, to withdraw from everyday adult social obligations (43:417; 204). Instead of duty and structure one has freedom and carefree fun. In one obvious sense the spectrum of organizational possibilities for tourism—from individual wandering, to an all-inclusive package tour—might represent the ways different personalities endeavor to cope with this alternation, although economics is also relevant here, too. On the one hand, there is the hedonistic regression to drugs and nude sunbathing by tourists in the midst of people who disapprove of such behavior. For others, winding down involves such anxieties that a highly structured package is required, relieving them of decisions and at the same time providing them with an "environmental bubble" (31:166) to prevent confrontation with anything alien at all. With an air-conditioned coach, an expatriate guide, a group of travelers from one's own country, and a stay in a star-classified hotel, the tourist need not feel threatened (136:135; 171:446). Foreign travel can provoke anxiety in many ways: consider the strain of uncertainty, of getting ill, of finding accommodation, and so on (26, 73, 188:222). Moreover, the tourist is "one of the world's natural victims" (195:238). It is no wonder that some forms of tourism cushion the traveler to such an extent that commentators sometimes ask, "Why go at all? Where is the novelty?" This is where the widespread collective representations of triviality, lack of authenticity, and so on, arise.

Such motivations as relaxation, conspicuous spending, having fun, and so on, obviously pose problems for those who represent a search for cultural

authenticity as the single meaning of tourism, let alone for those who espouse such grander themes as world peace and understanding. This theme of travel as ennobling and mind broadening was enunciated by the United Nations Conference on International Travel and Tourism in 1963 (188), and it has been uttered by many other dignitaries before and since (American presidents and popes included) (14:154). The International Union of Official Travel Organizations spoke of travel as "a most desirable human activity deserving the praise and encouragement of all peoples and all governments" (90:105). But the idealistic and the more mundane are intricately tied up in the imagery of tourism. The slogan "World peace through world travel" adopted by the Hilton International company is in fact only a borrowing of a slogan previously used by IBM (193:188).

Little detailed empirical work has been done on the effects of travel on attitudinal change (147:163), but a study by two educational anthropologists (12) concludes with serious reservations about the educational benefits of tourism. Tourists, for a start, are poor "culture-carriers" (108:756), being stripped of most customary roles through which their culture could be understood by others. In any case, for most people tourism involves more hedonism and conspicuous consumption than learning or understanding (195:89-90). T. S. Eliot's dictum that human beings cannot bear too much reality certainly applies in the tourism context (206:430). Wagner raises the issue of how tourism can be about understanding culture when the behavior of so many tourists is so deeply offensive to the people among whom they stay (205). Tourism is very much about *our* culture, not about *their* culture or our desire to learn about it (192:187). This explains the presence in guide books of sites and signs that have little genuine historic or living connection to a culture but that exist simply as markers in the touristic universe. As Barthes remarks perceptively, travel guidebooks are actually instruments of blindness (4:76). They do not, in other words, tell one about another culture at all.

Some regard the "peace and understanding" line simply as high-sounding rhetoric camouflaging economic self-interest (153). During a conference in Manila in 1980, for instance, as delegates enunciated noble themes and spoke of the need to preserve Philippine culture, the city in which the conference was held was estimated to contain 10,000 prostitutes at the disposal of international tourists and members of the local elite (177; 178:3). Delegates to that conference were shielded from the poverty of the local population by huge, white-painted boards that obscured the vast slums that line the roadway from the airport into the city. R. A. Britton points out a further twist to the logic linking reality and image in this industry in his comment that the internationalism bannered by the industry "is consistent with their self-interest since a world without borders is far more conducive to the unfettered movement of capital, manpower, and technology . . ." (14:155).

One might argue that tourism is actually an activity by means of which stereotypes are perpetuated and even reinforced, rather than broken down (180:68). As a commentator on the Fijian situation stated, "today travel, far from broadening the mind, is actually contrived to shrink it" (R. J. Scott, quoted in 170:212): Travelers blindly indifferent to the social reality of their hosts promote mutual contempt, not understanding. No matter how often international tourism is represented as a force for understanding, the empirical evidence suggests that with increasing numbers individual perceptions are replaced by stereotypes. Pi-Sunyer (154:154-55) explains how such national stereotypes of mass tourists in the Catalan area deprive them of an essential human status: They become less than ordinary folk, and this diminution in turn legitimizes hostility towards them, cheating, dual prices levels, and so on: "Contacts between villagers and outsiders have never been greater, but the barriers to understanding have probably never been higher. . . . If tourism commoditises cultures, natives categorise strangers as a resource or a nuisance rather than as people" (154:155). To be sure, the totality of international tourism is not grasped by pointing out the prostitution, servility, exploitation, and so on that are certainly an important part of it. But neither can the "peace and understanding" rhetoric be swallowed wholesale by social scientists studying what goes on, as if this magical phrase captured the essence of the phenomenon. Such rhetoric, disseminated by tourism promoters and some national tourism authorities, should be seen for what it is—a mystifying image that is a part of the industry itself, and not an empirically well-founded comment upon its nature. It would be a disaster, in the early stages of the social scientific study, if such images as "peace and understanding" obstructed a realistic and empirical analysis of this industry and its consequences.

The imagery of international tourism is not, for the most part, about socioeconomic reality at all. It is about myths and fantasies, and in this sense it can harm a country's development efforts precisely because its own image-making creates a false picture of the Third World (15). As Whealen stated (quoted in 14:202), tourism "is a way of providing a simulacrum of [the] world." The places in the glossy brochures of the travel industry do not exist; the destinations are not real places, and the people pictured are false. The Bahamas become the "playground of the Western world"; South America becomes "an enchanted forest where Walt Disney's Bambi lived" (in 14:177); and by a deft piece of geopolitical legerdemain, a Greek fishing village grows up in the Caribbean advertised as "the Best of the Mediterranean on Mexico's Pacific" (14:176). One cannot sell poverty, but one can sell paradise. Those on the receiving end have not always been impressed with how their country's image has been manipulated by overseas commercial interests. As the Premier of St. Vincent once said: "To Hell with Paradise" (quoted in 15:324). In studying tourism one can investigate in concrete detail the links between



power and knowledge, the generation of images of the Other, the creation of "natives" and "authenticity," the consumption of images, and so on. These are basic to the tourism industry as, indeed, they are to the anthropological researcher's ethnographic industry. Foucault (60) and Baudrillard (7) have written at length about these processes, and international tourism would appear to be a rich area in which to extend our insights.

In many areas of the Third World—the West Indies is a leading example—tourism is associated strongly with servility; it reawakens memories of the colonial past (103:139) and so perpetuates resentments and antagonisms (13:271–72). Clearly this background imparts a distinctive characteristic to relationships between tourists and locals. But even where this history of race relations is not so evident in the representations of social interaction in the tourism arena, one still finds characteristic behavior of a very specific kind. While it is important to examine relations here at a concrete level it is also important to see that these specific interactions are particular manifestations of larger state, class, and international politicoeconomic structures. For a start, the organization of the tourist industry (certainly when one is dealing with packaged tours) generally prevents the normal array of social relationships. This is also true of the informal sphere, though to a lesser extent (81:25–26). Van den Berghe has referred to the links between tourists and locals as a "parody" of a human relationship (202:378). Depending on one's values, many social ties could be called parodies of human relationship, but the point here is that use of such an extremely evaluative term is commonplace in tourist studies.

The question of what sort of social relationships grow up in tourism encounters can only be answered by detailed and descriptive studies. Attention to a culture's meaning structures is certainly required, for we need to know how people in other cultures perceive and understand tourists as a species of foreigner, what motivations they attribute to their behavior, and how they distinguish among types of tourist (187:359). When one knows how tourists are classified, one can investigate the rules for relating to such people and compare them to those that structure other social interactions. In the Trobriand Islands the only category the local people had for tourists was *sodiya* (soldier) (106:357). In the Seychelles the word "tourist" was heard as *tous riches* (all wealthy). Other areas of the world present equally interesting examples of classification, and an important area for research is the overlap between tourist identities and the identities established in previous historical periods. In some cultures there may be an explicit parallel drawn to the colonial era, which may significantly affect the way tourists are treated.

The task of documenting the semantics of tourist-local interaction has only begun. We have, for the most part, taxonomies of tourist types and vague generalizations. For instance, the first anthropological collection on tourism

was entitled *Hosts and Guests*, but as has been pointed out (155, 181) both terms in the title may be of dubious value. If tourism is a new activity, one may not find in it anything like customary hospitality or any of the moral norms that apply between hosts and guests. Because of the fleeting nature of tourist relations, a tourist does not become part of any long-term reciprocity structure (47:62). While there are rules for behavior towards strangers in a culture (157), tourists are not of the culture at all and usually know few local rules. Tourists are, as Cohen insists, not guests at all, but outsiders not part of the visited culture's moral fabric (37:220). The concept of stranger has been discussed fruitfully (if erratically) on many occasions in the social science literature (59, 173, 175, 179), and it may be valuable to apply some of the general formulations developed there to the specific situation of tourism to ask what types of stranger tourists may be viewed as (110:31; 133:40) and what rules apply.

No matter how often tourism industry brochures speak of the natural friendliness of people, generosity usually has little to do with the provision of tourism services. As Boudhiba states (in 47:63), hospitality "is just another technique of selling." This assertion may, of course, be far too general and may only be the popular cynical representation that exists alongside the glowing image. Social scientists need to know that rules may be different in different cultures. Different types of tourist may be treated differently, for after all, different types of tourist do affect a culture differently; almost certainly, different classes of people in a culture treat tourists according to different standards. And then there is the "development cycle" aspect of tourist systems. Over the years as the nature of tourism, or the type of tourists, or the quantity of tourists in any area changes, the rules for tourist-local interaction may undergo profound transformation. Hills & Lundgren (84) use the idea of an "irritation index" to monitor the levels of adverse reaction of local people to the influx of tourists over time. Like other analysts, they point to the often cyclical nature of tourism. The way tourists are treated today may differ from the way they were perceived and treated 15 years ago. Apart from the possibility that a different type of tourist may be present, one must remember that tourism, along with a host of other forces, may change the culture itself, create new roles and norms, and so on. As Cohen points out (38:242; cf 154:149), it is not long in most destinations before talk of guests and hospitality becomes inappropriate. Van den Berghe has christened each individual in the touristic arena a "toureé." The toureé identity is brought into being specifically by the presence of tourists (202:378-79), where norms may differ greatly from those operating in other domains in a culture.

The tourist-local relationship is odd in many ways. One member is at play, one is at work; one has economic assets and little cultural knowledge, the other has cultural capital but little money. Not surprisingly, the general image

of "cultural brokerage" has established itself firmly in the literature for the activities of a host of middle men, entrepreneurs, and cultural transformers who try to structure to their own advantage transactions between the two systems brought together by international tourism (38:246; 54:192-93; 138:209-11). In some instances such middlemen may themselves be ethnically marginal (182:69). In the Peruvian case described by van den Berghe, for instance, tour guides are frequently *mestizo*, so tourism is simply another area where they bring cultures together and exploit the indigenous people (202:385-86). Clearly, such entrepreneurship and brokerage in tourism (125) deserves detailed ethnographic investigation.

Anthropology has often been defined as the study of human beings in culture and society. Tourism is thus an odd anthropological object, because international tourists are people *out* of culture in at least two senses. First, they do not belong to the culture of the destination country, and second, they have stepped beyond the bounds of ordinary social reality, into what has sometimes been referred to as a "ludic" or "liminoid" realm (109). Wagner expresses the same notion with her phrases "out of place" and "out of time" (204). Tourism, as a UNESCO report once stated, is "life in parenthesis" (199:85). The semantics and politics of the industry image-makers alter tourists' experience of space and time (2:67, 102). In more theoretical language, tourism consists of meta-social processes, among which ritual and play are common (131:207-8). Wealthy Americans on holiday may play at being "Peasant for a Day," while poorer tourists might like to be "King for a Day" (65). The tourist's world is constructed of many inversions—from work to play, normal morality to promiscuity, conspicuous spending rather than saving, freedom rather than structure, and indulgence rather than responsibility. For some (124:143-44, 152), travel is an escape from real social ties and being communal; it is to be without commitment, to be anywhere rather than somewhere.

Given these inversions (68:21), it is not surprising that a currently prominent representation in the anthropology of tourism should be tourism as a sacred quest—i.e. as a journey similar to and as significant as the pilgrimages of old (66, 68). In a world where play and freedom replace work and structure, such cosmological interpretations have an understandable appeal. Grabum, whose name is closely associated with this approach, sees tourism not as a frivolous pursuit but as "re-creation". He even suggests a neurological foundation: Like play and ritual, it might be a "right-side" brain phenomenon (71:11).

Over the years, others have likened tourism to pilgrimage (see 87:10; 105:359; 197:20).<sup>2</sup> Although some who comment on international tourism from a religious perspective find this parallel unpalatable (139:59), the ethnographic exploration of overlaps between work and play, or among

pilgrimage, ritual, play, and tourism [see Graburn's work on Japan (69)], may be of great value. We should particularly note here the importance of the play concept in post-structuralist thinking. It is interesting that our most stimulating and original general discussion of tourism today— MacCannell's *The Tourist. A New Theory of the Leisure Class* (115)—marshals a vast array of approaches: Marxism, semiotics, dramaturgy, and so on, in what is a very modern-looking analysis. Yet, as Thurot & Thurot claim (192:174), not only is MacCannell behind the times empirically in terms of the contemporary nature of much international tourism, he is also theoretically out of date (201:4). Marxian theory may have been original, but Marx himself retained a somewhat 18th-century concept of human nature in terms of labor and production. We now live in a post-Marxian world of the "political economy of the sign"; the emphasis has shifted away from production itself to image, advertising, and consumption. We are now interested in what Baudrillard has termed the "mirror of production" (6), and tourism, being so much a matter of leisure, consumption, and image, is an essentially (post-) modern activity.

There is a problem, however, in elevating notions of play or sacred quest into a general explanatory framework. Indeed, the complexity of tourism is such that, as Nash felt obliged to state forcefully (135:504–5), scholars will do a "disservice" to the study of tourism if they opt for a single conceptual scheme that may obscure other vital perspectives. As P. Pearce puts it (148:22), we need detailed empirical work on tourist behavior and motivation, not ideological and committed debates about the meaning of tourism. Play itself is a difficult theoretical notion, involving, as Bateson long ago recognized (5:102, 155; sec 196), essentially human creative and reflexive powers. The anthropology of play is still an undeveloped field. Harm might easily be done to the study of play and tourism if they are too closely aligned in the early stages as theoretical leitmotifs. At this stage a very different set of issues must be addressed: For *whom* does tourism mean a sacred quest? Might the appearance of this image represent the anthropologist's craving for meaning rather than a well-thought-out empirical investigation of a highly complex phenomenon? Doesn't such a schema postulate an entity—the tourist—instead of looking realistically at the varied clientele of the international travel

<sup>2</sup>In my article on the "anthropological self" (42:82), I constructed a "*triangle des déplacements*" consisting of tourists, pilgrims, and anthropologists in order to consciously play with the differences and overlaps among these three identities. Leach, writing about anthropologists who attended a Mardi Gras and became participants, speaks of "tourist pilgrims (ourselves included)" (105). The social psychologist P. Pearce (148:32–34) has explored in detail the differences and similarities in behavior and attitudes of a large field of travelers—tourists, anthropologists, migrants, missionaries, pilgrims, and explorers. Peacock (144:51–54, 58–65) similarly discusses the overlaps between anthropological field researchers and other travelers—spies, missionaries, explorers, and so on—but does not include tourists on the list.

industry? Besides, at the concrete level, it is well known that in tourism one does not find neat reversals from ordinary time to structureless *communitas*. The world of tourism is rife with the class distinctions of our everyday world. As MacCannell observes, even the Russian national airline, Aeroflot, makes provision for first- and economy-class travelers (115:177). Some types of tourism, such as the inclusive package tour, involve less freedom and more structure than normal life (171:446). We have also to remember, as Schwimmer puts it (174:223), that tourism is the conspicuous consumption of resources accumulated in secular time; its very possibility, in other words, is securely rooted in the real world of gross political and economic inequalities between nations and classes. In fact, according to van den Abbeele (201:5), international tourism is doubly imperialistic; not only does it make a spectacle of the Other, making cultures into consumer items, tourism is also an opiate for the masses in the affluent countries themselves. The juxtaposition in the essay collection *Hosts and Guests* (185) of Nash's argument that studies of tourism should take place within the conceptual framework of imperialism (133) and Graburn's that tourism is a sacred journey (66) is a good reminder that we are dealing with a highly complex system. That complexity may be best brought out by deliberately cultivating a diversity of investigative approaches.

## TOURISM AND SOCIOCULTURAL CHANGE

During the 1970s the Greek Orthodox church recommended a new prayer:

Lord Jesus Christ, Son of God, have mercy on the cities, the islands and the villages of this Orthodox Fatherland, as well as the holy monasteries which are scourged by the worldly touristic wave. Grace us with a solution to this dramatic problem and protect our brethren who are sorely tried by the modernistic spirit of these contemporary Western invaders (quoted in 180:55).

While the creation of a new prayer in response to international tourism may be a rare occurrence, the expression of such hostile sentiments is not. Tourism is unique as an export industry in that the consumers themselves travel to collect the goods (164:250; 48:x). This presence of the customer creates a set of sociocultural consequences missing from other export activities. Considerable impact (160) may occur even without actual contact between tourists and locals.

We now have several general surveys of the sociocultural repercussions of tourism (14:252ff; 25; 29:383-88; 122; 199). Such surveys tend to be critical, contrasting starkly with the earlier optimistic, quantitative accounts by economists from which qualitative cultural data were usually absent (58). It may well be, as Graburn suggests (67), that the other social sciences became

interested in tourism precisely because of the inadequacy of the economic approach. No adequate evaluation of tourism can be based simply on economic criteria, let alone on a single indicator such as foreign exchange earnings (3:66-67). Of course, how to integrate quantified and nonquantifiable material remains a difficulty.

Most academics writing about sociocultural change and tourism from sociological and anthropological viewpoints have adopted a negative stance. In this they contribute to the mounting condemnation of Third World tourism by intellectuals, church leaders, and radicals in the Third World itself, where images of disintegration, pollution, decay, and so on, abound. Is the social science literature distinct from these other representations? If not, what is missing—analytically and descriptively—from the social science work?

For a start, the effects of tourism are rarely convincingly distinguished from those of other contemporary forces for social change (9:524; 146:61). Authors write about the repercussions of tourism with little close attention to the historical processes at work and fail to specify precisely the links involved (145:70). Wood has added that much writing is not just sloppy, it is ethnocentric (210:564). Given that social change in the Third World is highly complex, the attribution of adverse changes to tourism rather than to urbanization, population growth, the mass media, etc., often appears arbitrary. As several authors have recently argued (30:72; 56:134; 117:365; 181:13), tourists may have been chosen as conspicuous scapegoats. Writers claim to observe, for example, a "demonstration effect": Locals imitate the behavior of tourists, to their own detriment. Close analysis, however, reveals many problems. For instance, some have commented that the frivolity witnessed in contemporary pilgrimages in Sri Lanka, where youths carry transistor radios and so on, is evidence of Western contamination of a traditional activity; but as Pfaffenberger makes clear, such behavior is not new: pilgrimages have always been accompanied by ludic activity (152:61). Likewise, in Bali the presence of tourist money is sometimes said to be responsible for an upturn over the last decade in ritual performances. Again, close attention suggests other factors may be responsible. For Acciaioli the ceremonial efflorescence is, to a degree, being encouraged by Jakarta. The Indonesian state is hostile to regionalist sentiment, and the encouragement of ceremonials confines expression of such sentiment to the area of aesthetic culture where it is politically inconsequential (1:158-62).

Referring to the cultural consequences of the economic changes brought about by tourism, Turner & Ash (195:197) claim that tourism is the enemy of authenticity and cultural identity. Others, though less extreme, likewise use emotive labels to refer to the replacement of traditional life, with its customary exchange and obligation structure, by the cash nexus of industrialized society (58:222). One proposed term for this overall cultural process is

“commoditization” (76). Forster has referred to “phoney folk culture” (58:226) and others to the “staging” of events for tourists.

Culture is being packaged, priced and sold like building lots, rights of way, fast food, and room service, as the tourism industry inexorably extends its grasp. For the monied tourist, the tourism industry promises that the world is his/hers to use. All the “natural resources,” including cultural traditions, have their price, and if you have the money in hand, it is your right to see whatever you wish. . . . Treating culture as a natural resource or a commodity over which tourists have rights is not simply perverse, it is a violation of the peoples’ cultural rights (76:136–37).

For Greenwood, this “commoditization” is simply the logic of tourism as an identifiable example of capitalist development.

Moral and behavioral changes are certainly occurring, but we must be careful not to indulge in romanticism and ethnocentrism by setting our descriptions against some Rousseauesque idyll of traditional life. For a start, in most cases we are dealing with societies with centuries of exposure to a whole range of economic, political, and cultural influences from the West. Long before tourism, those cultures were changing, including in directions that reflected their own understandings of the nature of Western societies (121). Besides, what in a culture is *not* staged? What does cultural authenticity consist of? As Greenwood states, all cultures “are in the process of ‘making themselves up’ all the time. In a general sense all culture is ‘staged authenticity’ ” (77:27). That being so, if change is a permanent state, why should the staging bound up in tourism be regarded as so destructive, and why should the changes be seen in such a negative light? The very concept of authenticity requires much closer attention in the arena of tourism; it requires close empirical work on tourist behavior, motivations, expectations, and the meanings attributed to experience (149). One might additionally ask what is so abhorrent about inauthentic phenomena? As Simmel, a lucid explorer of modernity, noted, phenomena we are disposed to call inauthentic or superficial very often reveal the nature of social reality (in 171:465–66). If we turn to another aspect of the negativism surrounding tourism and social change, we must be careful not to contrast an expanding sphere of monetary relations with some ideal image of a nonmercenary, traditional culture. How non-economic and uncalculating were traditional norms of reciprocity? A similar lack of clarity obtains with expressions such as “demonstration effect.” We need detailed work showing how new activities affect cultural behavior and what the particular mechanisms of change are.

When social scientists have turned from general cultural consequences to analyzing specific areas of change, “consistently contradictory” (82:5, 10) patterns have emerged. For almost any effect of tourism discovered in one case, one can find a counterexample. For instance, tourism ought to have a

symbiotic relationship with the environment: An area often becomes a tourist destination precisely because of its scenic beauty, wildlife, and so on (88:218–19). That attractiveness must survive to lure tourists. Some studies show that tourism indeed preserves wildlife (132:36), but many others report that tourism has ruined the very environment that created it (207). Likewise tourism is said to weaken tradition; but it may also, by raising historical consciousness, lead to restoration of ancient monuments and the like (33:218–19). Ethnic art (70) tells a similarly two-faced story, for tourism brings both the degradation of traditional technique for the mass production of airport art, and the reinvigoration of artistic skill (46). McKean, in fact, has protested at the general image of decay and argues, using Balinese material, that tourism can produce a general process of cultural involution whereby tradition, cultural pride, and identity are strengthened and standards of artistic creativity are consciously maintained (126:103–4). Swain, whose study of the effects of tourism on Cuna women in Panama captures the contradictory aspect of tourism well, remarks that tourism “simultaneously encourages the maintenance of traditions and provides many stimuli for change” (189:71). In a study of Fijian fire walkers, Brown (20:224) argues that tourism does not undermine local culture, but rather provides an extra resource with which traditional forms can be continued. (In this sense international tourism subsidizes a form of ethnic conflict between Indians and Fijians.) Other cases indicate further the contradictory potential of international tourism. For instance, some studies argue that tourism distributes money within a community; others emphasize how tourism reinforces existing inequality by channeling money to the elites. Some argue that tourism stimulates domestic agriculture, others that it leads to people leaving the land and, in some areas, to serious malnutrition. Obviously tourism may have different effects in different regions. And also, as was clear in Spain (75), one might get a short-term positive effect on local agriculture, to be followed in the medium term by a set of negative consequences. Other accounts are contradictory not because the facts are so but because authors approach their studies with different values. It is also conceivable that international tourism sets in motion, or at least reinforces, different and even antithetical patterns of change.

Given that tourism has a range of potentials, it can be a source of social divisiveness and conflict. Crystal (44:119–22) explains how tourism initially strengthened the solidarity of the Tana Toraja in Sulawesi because it emphasized their cultural particularity. Later, however (44:123), as tourism began to be a force for the commercialization of religious ceremonies, stripping them of local meaning, conflicts between traditionalists and modernists were created. Crystal is ultimately uncertain (44:125) whether tourism will turn out to be a source of economic development or a prime cause of cultural dissolution. Far more negative is Greenwood’s analysis of the *Alarde* ritual in Fuenterra-



bia. This was a ritual essentially for local participants, not for outsiders. When the Spanish tourist authorities decided that the spectacle could be a tourist attraction, volunteer performers were not forthcoming. If a culture is an integrated system of meanings, Greenwood argued, selling local culture in tourism will be destructive. "Making their culture a public performance took the municipal government a few minutes: with that act, a 350-year-old ritual died" (76:137). Ironically the *Alarde*, which commemorates local resistance to foreign invasion, crumbled in the modern touristic economy. This case of repeating a ceremony for tourists, like other touristic accommodations—shortening or rescheduling cultural performances so that they are more palatable to tourists in a hurry—is not unique. The authorities could have chosen differently; Crystal notes that the outcome for the Tana Toraja will depend in part on the attitude of the national tourism planners. Tourism clearly opens up the possibility of new conflicts within small communities and between such communities and larger, embracing political structures.

As Cohen insists, only detailed ethnographic study will enable us to compare data on different types of cultures, different types and numbers of tourists, different types of touristic niches, and so on, so that the concrete social processes operating in any particular case can be analyzed. Perhaps tourism is a contradictory phenomenon. Perhaps tourism, like capitalism, has within it the seeds of its own destruction, as two early writers on the subject argued (164:250; 213:2). If so, then international tourism is no manna from heaven, no easy passport to development. But we must again be careful to see whose perceptions and evaluations we are dealing with. It is striking that in many social science disciplines (e.g. economics and geography) we rarely hear the local voice on these issues. Nor does that voice often enrich anthropological writings (172:255). Perhaps this state of affairs would be rectified if tourism became an explicit focus for ethnographic research rather than an incidental afterthought to other projects. Without close attention to the local voice (*voices*, for tourism produces a range of local reactions), our social scientific work risks being descriptively poor and ethnocentric. We need to know the local perceptions and understandings of tourism, we need to know the local perceptions of change and continuity, and we need to recognise that any culture is likely to have contradictory things to say about both. International tourism may be about *our* culture rather than that of the destination country (192:187); and unless the anthropological approach to international tourism accords a crucial status to the full range of local voices, it risks putting itself in the same position.

#### ACKNOWLEDGMENT

This paper first appeared in 1988 under a slightly different title in Vol. 1, No. 1 of *Criticism Heresy and Interpretation*, Department of Asian Languages and Anthropology, University of Melbourne.

## Literature Cited

1. Acciaoli, G. 1985. Culture as art: from practice to spectacle in Indonesia. *Canberra Anthropol.* 8:148-72
2. Bail, M. 1980. *Homesickness*. Melbourne: Macmillan
3. Baretje, R. 1982. Tourism's external account and the balance of payments. *Ann. Tourism Res.* 9:57-67
4. Barthes, R. 1972. *Mythologies*. London: Jonathan Cape
5. Bateson, G. 1973. *Steps to an Ecology of Mind*. London: Paladin
6. Baudrillard, J. 1975. *The Mirror of Production*. St. Louis: Telos Press
7. Baudrillard, J. 1983. *Simulations*. New York: Semiotext(e) Inc.
8. Biddlecomb, C. 1981. *Pacific Tourism. Contrasts in Values and Expectations*. Suva: Pacific Conf. Churches
9. Boissevain, J. 1977. Tourism and development in Malta. *Dev. Change* 8: 523-28
10. Boorstin, D. 1972. *The Image. A Guide to Pseudoevents in America*. New York: Atheneum
11. Boudhiba, A. 1981. Mass tourism and cultural traditions. *People's Bank Econ. Rev.* (Sri Lanka). August: 27-29
12. Brameld, T., Matsuyama, M. 1977. *Tourism as Cultural Learning. Two Controversial Case Studies in Educational Anthropology*. Washington: University Press of America
13. Britton, R. A. 1977. Making tourism more supportive of small state development: the case of St. Vincent. *Ann. Tourism Res.* 4:268-78
14. Britton, R. A. 1978. *International tourism and indigenous development objectives: a study with special reference to the West Indies*. PhD thesis, Univ. Minnesota
15. Britton, R. A. 1979. The image of the Third World in tourism marketing. *Ann. Tourism Res.* 6:318-28
16. Britton, S. G. 1980. A conceptual model of tourism in a peripheral economy. In *Tourism in the South Pacific*, ed. D. Pearce, pp. 1-17. Paris: UNESCO/Dept. Geography. Univ. Christchurch
17. Britton, S. G. 1982. The political economy of tourism in the third world. *Ann. Tourism Res.* 9:331-58
18. Britton, S. G. 1983. *Tourism and Underdevelopment in Fiji*. Dev. Stud. Cent. Monogr. No. 31. Canberra: ANU
19. Britton, S. G., Clarke, W. C., eds. 1987. *Ambiguous Alternative: Tourism in Small Developing Countries*. Suva: Univ. South Pacific
20. Brown, C. H. 1984. Tourism and ethnic competition in a ritual form. The firewalkers of Fiji. *Oceania* 54:223-44
21. Bryden, J. M. 1973. *Tourism and Development. A Case Study of the Commonwealth Caribbean*. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press
22. Buck, R. C. 1978. Towards a synthesis in tourism theory. *Ann. Tourism Res.* 5:110-11
23. Buck, R. C. 1982. On tourism as an anthropological subject. *Curr. Anthropol.* 23:326-27
24. Bugnicourt, J. 1977. Tourism with no return. *Dev. Forum* 5(2):2
25. Butler, R. W. 1974. The social implications of tourist developments. *Ann. Tourism Res.* 2:100-11
26. Carroll, J. 1980. The tourist. In *Sceptical Sociology*, J. Carroll, pp. 140-49. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul
27. Casson, L. 1979. *Travel in the Ancient World*. London: Allen & Unwin Ltd.
28. Centre on Transnational Corporations. 1982. *Transnational Corporations in International Tourism*. New York: United Nations
29. Chib, S. N. 1980. Tourism and the Third World. *Third World Q.* 11:283-94
30. Cleverdon, R. 1979. *The Economic and Social Impact of International Tourism on Developing Countries*. London: Economist Intelligence Unit Ltd.
31. Cohen, E. 1972. Towards a sociology of international tourism. *Soc. Res.* 39:164-82
32. Cohen, E. 1974. Who is a tourist? A conceptual clarification. *Sociol. Rev.* 22:527-55
33. Cohen, E. 1978. The impact of tourism on the physical environment. *Ann. Tourism Res.* 5:215-37
34. Cohen, E. 1979. A phenomenology of tourist experiences. *Sociology* 13:179-201
35. Cohen, E. 1979. The impact of tourism on the Hill Tribes of Northern Thailand. *Int. Asienforum* 10:5-38
36. Cohen, E. 1979. Rethinking the sociology of tourism. *Ann. Tourism Res.* 6:18-35
37. Cohen, E. 1982. Marginal paradises. Bungalow tourism on the islands of Southern Thailand. *Ann. Tourism Res.* 9:189-228
38. Cohen, E. 1982. Jungle guides in northern Thailand—dynamics of a marginal occupational role. *Sociol. Rev.* 30:236-66
39. Cohen, E. 1984. The sociology of tourism: approaches, issues, and findings. *Ann. Rev. Sociol.* 10:373-92
40. Cohen, E. 1987. "Alternative tour-

- ism"—a critique. *Tourism Recreation Res.* 12:13-18
41. Collignon, R. 1984. La lutte des pouvoirs publics contre les "encombrements humains" à Dakar. *Can. J. African Stud.* 18:573-82
  42. Crick, M. 1985. "Tracing" the anthropological self: quizzical reflections on fieldwork, tourism and the ludic. *Soc. Anal.* 17:71-92
  43. Crompton, J. L. 1979. Motivations for pleasure vacations. *Ann. Tourism Res.* 6:408-24
  44. Crystal, E. 1978. Tourism in Toraja (Sulawesi, Indonesia). See Ref. 185, pp. 109-25
  45. Davis, D. E. 1978. Development and the tourism industry in third world countries. *Soc. Leisure* 1:301-22
  46. Deitch, L. I. 1978. The impact of tourism upon the arts and crafts of the Indians of the Southwestern United States. See Ref. 185, pp. 173-92
  47. de Kadt, E. 1978. The issues addressed. See Ref. 48, pp. 3-76
  48. de Kadt, E., ed. 1978. *Tourism. Passport to Development? Perspectives on the Social and Cultural Effects of Tourism in Developing Countries.* New York: Oxford Univ. Press
  49. Diamond, J. 1977. Tourism's role in economic development. The case reexamined. *Econ. Dev. Soc. Change* 25: 539-53
  50. Ecumenical Coalition on Third World Tourism. 1983. *Tourism Prostitution Development.* Bangkok: ECTWT
  51. Edwards, A. 1982. *International Tourism to 1990.* Economist Intelligence Unit, Spec. Ser. 4. Cambridge, MA: Abt Books
  52. Erbes, R. 1973. *International Tourism and the Economy of Developing Countries* Paris: OEDC
  53. Esh, T., Rosenblum, I. 1975. *Tourism in developing countries—trick or treat? A report from the Gambia.* Res. Rep. No. 31. Uppsala: Scand. Inst. African Stud.
  54. Evans, N. H. 1976. Tourism and cross cultural communication. *Ann. Tourism Res.* 3:189-98
  55. Fanon, F. 1974. *The Wretched of the Earth.* Harmondsworth: Penguin
  56. Farrell, B. H. 1979. Tourism's human conflicts. Cases from the Pacific. *Ann. Tourism Res.* 6:122-36
  57. Finney, B. R., Watson-Gegeo, K. A. 1979. A new kind of sugar. Tourism in the Pacific. *Ann. Tourism Res.* 6:469-71
  58. Forster, J. 1964. The sociological consequences of tourism. *Int. J. Comp. Sociol.* 5:217-27
  59. Fortes, M. 1975. Strangers. In *Studies in African Social Anthropology*, ed. M. Fortes, S. Patterson, pp. 229-53. London: Academic
  60. Foucault, M. 1979. *Power Truth Strategy* (ed. M. Morris, P. Patton). Sydney: Feral Publications.
  61. Fowles, J. 1978. *Daniel Martin.* London: Panther Books
  62. French, L. 1979. Tourism and Indian exploitation. A social indictment. *Indian Hist.* 10(4):19-24
  63. Fussell, P. 1980. *Abroad. British Literary Travelling Between the Wars.* New York: Oxford Univ. Press
  64. Gonsalves, P., Holden, P., eds. 1985. *Alternative Tourism. A Resource Book.* Bangkok: Ecumenical Coalition on Third World Tourism
  65. Gottlieb, A. 1982. Americans' vacations. *Ann. Tourism Res.* 9:165-87
  66. Graburn, N. H. 1978. Tourism: the sacred journey. See Ref. 185, pp. 17-31
  67. Graburn, N. H. 1980. Teaching the anthropology of tourism. *Int. Soc. Sci. J.* 32:56-68
  68. Graburn, N. H. 1983. The anthropology of tourism. *Ann. Tourism Res.* 10:9-33
  69. Graburn, N. H. 1983. *To Pray, Pay and Play: The Cultural Structure of Japanese Domestic Tourism.* Ser. B, No. 26. Aix-en-Provence: Cent. Hautes Etud. Touristiques
  70. Graburn, N., ed. 1976. *Ethnic and Tourist Arts. Cultural Expressions from the Fourth World.* Berkeley: Univ. Calif. Press
  71. Graburn, N. H., ed. 1983. The anthropology of tourism. *Ann. Tourism Res.* 10(1):Spec. Issue
  72. Gray, H. P. 1982. The contribution of economics to tourism. *Ann. Tourism Res.* 9:105-25
  73. Greenblatt, C. S., Gagnon, J. H. 1983. Temporary strangers. Travel and tourism from a sociological perspective. *Sociol. Perspect.* 26:89-110
  74. Greenwood, D. 1972. Tourism as an agent of change: a Spanish Basque case. *Ethnology* 11:80-91
  75. Greenwood, D. 1976. The demise of agriculture in Fuenterrabia. In *The Changing Faces of Rural Spain*, ed. J. B. Acheves, W. A. Douglas, pp. 29-44. Cambridge, MA: Schenkman Publ. Co.
  76. Greenwood, D. 1978. Culture by the pound. An anthropological perspective on tourism as cultural commoditization. See Ref. 185, pp. 129-38
  77. Greenwood, D. 1982. Cultural "authenticity". *Cult. Survival Q.* 6(3):27-28
  78. Haas, H. 1984. A decade of alternative

- tourism in Sri Lanka. See Ref. 86, pp. 1/1-1/17
79. Hannerz, U. 1973. Marginal entrepreneurship and economic change in the Cayman Islands. *Ethnos* 38:101-12
  80. Harrell-Bond, B. E., Harrell-Bond, D. L. 1979. Tourism in the Gambia. *Rev. African Polit. Econ.* 14:78-90
  81. Hassan, R. 1975. International tourism and intercultural communication. The case of Japanese tourists in Singapore. *Southeast Asian J. Soc. Sci.* 3(2):25-38
  82. Hermans, D. 1981. Consistently contradictory. Economic and social impacts of tourism on host societies. Unpublished.
  83. Hiller, H. L. 1979. Tourism: development or dependence? In *The Restless Caribbean*, ed. R. Millett, W. M. Will, pp. 51-61. New York: Praeger
  84. Hills, T. L., Lundgren, T. 1977. The impact of tourism in the Caribbean. *Ann. Tourism Res.* 4:248-57
  85. Hoivik, T., Heiberg, T. 1980. Centre-periphery tourism and self-reliance. *Int. Soc. Sci. J.* 32:69-97
  86. Holden, P., ed. 1984. *Alternative Tourism*. Bangkok: Ecumenical Coalition on Third World Tourism
  87. Horne, D. 1984. *The Great Museum. The Representation of History*. London: Pluto Press
  88. Hudman, L. E. 1980. *Tourism. A Shrinking World*. Columbus, Ohio: Grid Inc.
  89. Huxley, A. 1955. *Beyond the Mexican Bay. A Traveller's Journal*. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books
  90. International Union of Official Travel Organizations. 1974. Tourism. Its nature and significance. *Ann. Tourism Res.* 1(4):105-12
  91. Jafari, J. 1974. The components and nature of tourism. The tourism market basket of goods and services. *Ann. Tourism Res.* 1(1):73-89
  92. Jafari, J. 1974. The socio-economic costs of tourism to developing countries. *Ann. Tourism Res.* 1(7):227-62
  93. Jafari, J. 1978. Editor's page. *Ann. Tourism Res.* 5:210-11
  94. Jafari, J. 1979. Tourism and the social sciences. A bibliography 1970-78. *Ann. Tourism Res.* 6:149-78
  95. Jafari, J. 1981. Editor's page. *Ann. Tourism Res.* 8:323-27
  96. Jafari, J. 1982. Comment. *Curr. Anthropol.* 21:137
  97. Jenkins, C. L. 1982. The effects of scale in tourism projects in developing countries. *Ann. Tourism Res.* 9:229-49
  98. Kahn, H. 1980. Tourism and the next decade. In *Tourism Planning and Development Issues*, ed. D. Hawkins et al, pp. 3-20. Washington, DC: George Washington Univ.
  99. Kanywanyi, J. L. 1973. Tourism benefits the capitalists. See Ref. 176, pp. 52-65
  100. Karch, C. A., Darrn, G. 1981. Close encounters of the Third World. *Hum. Relat.* 34:249-69
  101. Kelompok Studi dan Bantuan Hukum/Lembaga Bantuan Hukum. 1982. *Voices from Under Borobodur*. Yogyakarta: KSBH Info. Courier
  102. Krause, W., Jud, G. D., with Joseph, H. 1973. *International Tourism and Latin American Development*. Austin: Bur. Business Res., Univ. Texas
  103. La Flamme, A. 1979. The impact of tourism. A case from the Bahama Islands. *Ann. Tourism Res.* 6:137-48
  104. Lawson, R. W. 1983. Tourism research—break for thought. *Dev. Forum* 11(5):16
  105. Leach, E. R. 1984. Conclusion. Further thoughts on the realm of folly. In *Text, Play and Story. The Construction and Reconstruction of Self and Society*, ed. S. Plattner, E. M. Bruner, pp. 356-64. Washington, DC: Am. Ethnol. Soc.
  106. Leach, J. W. 1973. Making the best of tourism: the Trobriand situation. In *Priorities in Melanesian Development*, ed. R. J. May, pp. 357-61. Canberra: Aust. Natl. Univ./Port Moresby: Univ. Papua New Guinea
  107. Leiper, N. 1979. The framework of tourism. Towards a definition of tourism, tourist, and the tourism industry. *Ann. Tourism Res.* 6:390-407
  108. Lengyel, P. 1975. Tourism in Bali—its economic and social impact. A rejoinder. *Int. Soc. Sci. J.* 27:753-57
  109. Lett, J. W. 1983. Ludic and liminoid aspects of charter yacht tourism in the Caribbean. *Ann. Tourism Res.* 10:35-56
  110. Levine, D. N. 1979. Simmel at a distance. On the history and significance of the sociology of the stranger. See Ref. 175, pp. 21-36
  111. Lévi-Strauss, C. L. 1976. *Tristes Tropiques*. Harmondsworth: Penguin
  112. Levitt, K., Gulati, I. 1976. Income effect of tourist spending: mystification multiplied. A critical comment on the Zender report. *Soc. Econ. Stud.* 19:325-43
  113. Liew, J. 1980. Tourism and development. A reexamination. In *Tourism in the South Pacific. The Contribution of Research to Development and Planning*, ed. D. Pearce, pp. 13-17. Christchurch: UNESCO/Dept. Geography, Univ. Christchurch
  114. MacCannell, D. 1973. Staged authentic-

- ity: arrangements of social space in tourist settings. *Am. J. Sociol.* 79:589-603
115. MacCannell, D. 1976. *The Tourist. A New Theory of the Leisure Class*. New York: Schocken Books
116. Machlis, G. E., Burch, W. R. 1983. Relations between strangers: cycles of structure and meaning in tourist systems. *Sociol. Rev.* 31:666-92
117. MacNaught, T. J. 1982. Mass tourism and the dilemmas of modernization in Pacific island communities. *Ann. Tourism Res.* 9:359-81
118. Malinowski, B. 1967. *A Diary in the Strict Sense of the Term*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul
119. Maluga, A. P. 1973. Tourism and the Arusha Declaration. A Contradiction. See Ref. 176, pp. 44-48
120. Manning, F. E. 1978. Carnival in Antigua. An indigenous festival in a Tourist Economy. *Anthropos* 73:191-204
121. Marcus, G. E. 1980. The ethnographic subject as ethnographer: a neglected dimension of anthropological research. *Rice Univ. Stud.* 66:55-68
122. Mathieson, A., Wall, G. 1982. *Tourism. Economic, Physical and Social Impacts*. London: Longman
123. Matthews, H. G. 1977. *International Tourism. A Political and Social Analysis*. Cambridge, MA: Schenkman Publ. Co.
124. McHugh, P., et al. 1974. *On the Beginnings of Social Inquiry*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul
125. McKean, P. F. 1976. An anthropological analysis of the culture-brokers of Bali: guides, tourists and Balinese. Paris: UNESCO/IBRD
126. McKean, P. F. 1978. Towards a theoretical analysis of tourism. Economic dualism and cultural involution in Bali. See Ref. 185, pp. 93-107
127. Mings, R. C. 1978. The importance of more research on the impacts of tourism. *Ann. Tourism Res.* 5:340-44
128. Mitchell, F. 1970. The value of tourism in East Africa. *East African Econ. Rev.* 2:1-21
129. Mitchell, L. S. 1979. The geography of tourism. An introduction. *Ann. Tourism Res.* 6:235-44
130. Mitford, N. 1959. The Tourist. *Encounter* 13:3-7
131. Moore, A. 1980. Walt Disney World: Bounded ritual space and the playful pilgrimage center. *Anthropol. Q.* 53:207-18
132. Myers, N. 1975. The tourist as an agent for development and wildlife conservation: the case of Kenya. *Int. J. Soc. Econ.* 2:26-42
133. Nash, D. 1978. Tourism as a form of imperialism. See Ref. 185, pp. 33-47
134. Nash, D. 1981. Tourism as an anthropological subject. *Curr. Anthropol.* 22:461-81
135. Nash, D. 1984. The ritualisation of tourism. Comment on Graburn's *The Anthropology of Tourism*. *Ann. Tourism Res.* 11:503-7
136. Nettekoven, L. 1979. Mechanisms of intercultural interaction. See Ref. 48, pp. 135-45
137. Nuñez, T. 1963. Tourism, tradition, and acculturation. *Weekendismo* in a Mexican village. *Southwest. J. Anthropol.* 34:328-36
138. Nuñez, T. 1978. Touristic studies in anthropological perspective. See Ref. 185, pp. 207-16
139. O'Grady, E. 1982. *Tourism in the Third World. Christian Reflections*. New York: Orbis Books
140. O'Grady, R., ed. 1980. *Third World Tourism*. Singapore: Christian Conf. Asia
141. Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development. 1967. *Tourism Development and Economic Growth*. Paris: OECD
142. Palmer, A., Palmer, V. 1976. *Quotations in History*. Harrocks: Harvester Press
143. Papson, S. 1979. Tourism. World's biggest industry in the twenty-first century? *Futurist* 13:249-57
144. Peacock, J. L. 1986. *The Anthropological Lens. Harsh Light, Soft Focus*. London: Cambridge Univ. Press
145. Pearce, D. 1980. Tourism and regional development. A genetic approach. *Ann. Tourism Res.* 7:69-82
146. Pearce, D. 1981. *Tourist Development*. London: Longmans
147. Pearce, P. 1982. Perceived changes in holiday destinations. *Ann. Tourism Res.* 9:145-64
148. Pearce, P. 1982. *The Social Psychology of Tourist Behavior*. Oxford: Pergamon
149. Pearce, P., Moscardo, G. M. 1982. The concept of authenticity in tourist experiences. *Aust. N. Z. J. Sociol.* 22:121-32
150. Perez, L. A. 1973. Aspects of underdevelopment. Tourism in the West Indies. *Sci. Soc.* 37:473-80
151. Perez, L. A. 1975. Tourism in the West Indies. *J. Commun.* 25:136-43
152. Pfaffenberger, B. 1983. Serious pilgrims and frivolous tourists. The chimera of tourism in the pilgrimages of Sri Lanka. *Ann. Tourism Res.* 10:57-74
153. Pihlstrom, B. 1980. Greater values at stake. *Ann. Tourism Res.* 7:611-12
154. Pi-Sunyer, O. 1978. Through native

- eyes. Tourists and tourism in a Catalan maritime community. See Ref. 185, pp. 149-55
155. Pi-Sunyer, O. 1981. Tourism and anthropology. *Ann. Tourism Res.* 8:271-84
  156. Pittock, A. B. 1967. Aborigines and the tourist industry. *Aust. Q.* 39(3):87-95
  157. Pitt-Rivers, J. 1968. The Stranger, the guest and the hostile host. Introduction to the study of the laws of hospitality. In *Contributions to Mediterranean Sociology*, ed. J. Persistiany, pp. 13-30. The Hague: Mouton
  158. Popovic, V. 1972. *Tourism in East Africa*. Munich: Weltforum
  159. Rajotte, F., Crocombe, R., eds. 1980. *Pacific Tourism: As Islanders See It*. Suva: S. Pacific Soc. Sci. Assoc./Univ. S. Pacific
  160. Richter, D. 1978. The tourist art market as a factor in social change. *Ann. Tourism Res.* 5:323-38
  161. Richter, L. 1980. The political uses of tourism: a Philippine case study. *J. Dev. Areas* 14:237-57
  162. Richter, L. 1982. *Land Reform and Tourism Development. Policy-making in the Philippines*. Cambridge, MA: Schenkman Publishing Co Inc.
  163. Richter, L. 1984. The political and legal dimensions of tourism. See Ref. 86, pp. 18/1-18/21
  164. Rivers, P. 1973. Tourist troubles. *New Soc.* 539(Feb. 1):250
  165. Rivers, P. 1974. Misguided tours. *New Int.* Feb.:6-9
  166. Robinson, R. 1972. Non-European foundations of European imperialism: sketch for a theory of collaboration. In *Studies in the Theory of Imperialism*, ed. R. Owen, B. Sutcliffe, pp. 117-42. London: Longman
  167. Rosenow, J. E., Pulsipher, G. L. 1979. *Tourism. The Good, the Bad and the Ugly*. Lincoln: Century Three Press
  168. Sadler, P. G., Archer, B. H. 1975. The economic impact of tourism in developing countries. *Ann. Tourism Res.* 3(1): 15-32
  169. Saglio, C. 1979. Tourism for discovery. A project in Lower Casamance, Senegal. See Ref. 48, pp. 321-35
  170. Samy, L. 1975. Crumbs from the table. The worker's share in tourism. In *The Pacific Way. Social Issues in National Development*, ed. S. Tupouniua, R. Crocombe, C. Slatter, pp. 205-14. Suva: S. Pacific Soc. Sci. Assoc.
  171. Schmidt, C. J. 1979. The guided tour. Insulated adventure. *Urb. Life* 7:441-67
  172. Schudson, M. S. 1979. Review essay: on tourism and modern culture. *Am. J. Sociol.* 84:249-58
  173. Schutz, A. 1976. The stranger. An essay in social psychology. In *Collected Papers*, Vol. 2, *Studies in Social Theory*, ed. A. Brodersen, pp. 91-105. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff
  174. Schwimmer, E. 1979. Feasting and tourism: a comparison. In *Semiotics of Culture*, ed. I. Portis-Winner, J. Umiker-Sebeok, pp. 221-35. The Hague: Mouton
  175. Shack, W. A., Skinner, E. P., eds. 1979. *Strangers in African Societies*. Berkeley: Univ. Calif. Press
  176. Shivji, I. G., ed. 1973. *Tourism and Socialist Development*. Dar-es-Salaam: Tanzania Publ. House
  177. Shoemsmith, D. 1980. *Tourism in Asia. Questions of Justice and Human Dignity*. Sydney: Asia Partnership Hum. Dev.
  178. Shoemsmith, D. 1980. *Tourism in the Philippines: Towards a Case Study*. Sydney: Asia Partnership Hum. Dev.
  179. Simmel, G. 1908. The stranger. In *On Individualism and Social Forms*, ed. D. Levine, pp. 143-49. Chicago: Chicago Univ. Press
  180. Smith, M. A., Turner, L. 1973. Some aspects of the sociology of tourism. *Soc. Leisure* 5:55-71
  181. Smith, V. 1978. Introduction. See Ref. 185, pp. 1-14
  182. Smith, V. 1978. Eskimo tourism. Micro models and marginal men. See Ref. 185, pp. 51-70
  183. Smith, V. 1978. Hosts and guests. *Ann. Tourism Res.* 5:274-77
  184. Smith, V. 1980. Anthropology and tourism. A science-industry evaluation. *Ann. Tourism Res.* 7:13-33
  185. Smith, V., ed. 1978. *Hosts and Guests. The Anthropology of Tourism*. Oxford: Blackwell
  186. Stewart, F. 1975. A note on social cost-benefit analysis and class conflict in LDCs. *World Dev.* 3:31-39
  187. Stringer, P. F. 1981. Hosts and guests. The bed and breakfast phenomenon. *Ann. Tourism Res.* 8:357-76
  188. Sutton, W. A. 1967. Travel and understanding. Notes on the social structure of tourism. *Int. J. Comp. Sociol.* 8:218-23
  189. Swain, M. B. 1978. Cura women and ethnic tourism. A way to persist and an avenue to change. See Ref. 185, pp. 71-81
  190. Taylor, F. F. 1973. The tourist industry in Jamaica 1919-1939. *Soc. Econ. Stud.* 22:205-28
  191. Tevi, L. 1985. Alternative tourism.

- Some ethical considerations for western tourists visiting Third World countries. *Contours* 2(2):10-17
192. Thurot, J. M., Thurot, G. 1983. The ideology of class and tourism. Confronting the discourse of advertising. *Ann. Tourism Res.* 10:173-89
  193. Turner, L. 1974. Tourism and the social sciences. From Blackpool to Benidorm and Bali. *Ann. Tourism Res.* 1:180-205
  194. Turner, L. 1976. The international division of leisure: tourism and the Third World. *World Dev.* 4:253-60
  195. Turner, L., Ash, J. 1975. *The Golden Hordes. International Tourism and the Pleasure Periphery.* London: Constable
  196. Turner, V. 1982. *From Ritual to Theatre. The Human Seriousness of Play.* New York: Performing Arts Journal
  197. Turner, V., Turner, E. 1978. *Image and Pilgrimage in Christian Culture. Anthropological Perspectives.* Oxford: Blackwell
  198. Twain, Mark, n.d. (orig. publ. 1869) *The Innocents Abroad.* New York: Harper & Row
  199. UNESCO. 1977. The effects of tourism on socio-cultural values. *Ann. Tourism Res.* 4:74-105
  200. Urbanowicz, C. F. 1978. Tourism in Tonga. Troubled times. See Ref. 185, pp. 83-92
  201. van den Abbeele, G. 1980. Sightseers: the tourist as theorist. *Diacritics* 10:3-14
  202. van den Bergh, P. L. 1980. Tourism as ethnic relations: a case study of Cuzco, Peru. *Ethnic Racial Stud.* 3:375-92
  203. Varley, R. C. G. 1978. *Tourism in Fiji. Some Economic and Social Problems.* Bangor: Univ. Wales Press
  204. Wagner, U. 1977. Out of time and place—mass tourism and charter trips. *Ethnos* 42:38-52
  205. Wagner, U. 1981. Tourism in the Gambia. Development or dependency? *Ethnos* 46:190-206
  206. Weales, G. 1968/9. The stranger came. *Antioch Rev.* (Winter):427-34
  207. Wenkham, R. 1975. The Pacific tourist blight. *Ann. Tourism Res.* 3(2):63-77
  208. Wild, R. A. 1980. Review of *Hosts and Guests*. *Oceania* 51:153
  209. Wood, R. E. 1979. Tourism and underdevelopment in S. E. Asia. *J. Contemp. Asia* 9:274-87
  210. Wood, R. E. 1980. International tourism and culture change in S. E. Asia. *Econ. Dev. Cult. Change* 28:561-81
  211. World Tourism Organisation. 1980. *Manila Declaration on World Tourism.* Madrid: WTO
  212. World Tourism Organisation. 1986. *Tourism bill of rights and tourist code.* *Contours* 2(5):18-22
  213. Young, Sir G. 1973. *Tourism. Blessing or Blight?* Harmondsworth: Penguin
  214. Young, R. C. 1977. The structural context of the Caribbean tourist industry. A comparative study. *Econ. Dev. Cult. Change* 25:657-71.