

MUTATIONS AND TRANSFORMATIONS: THE CONTESTED DISCOURSES IN CONTEMPORARY CULTURAL TOURISM

Deepak Raj Gupta*, Zubair Ahmad Dada**

Abstract As a global agent of communication, cultural tourism must position itself as an agent of sustainable development, applying itself to the core values of public education, respect for differences, authenticity of projects, and protection of heritage. Many writers have written about important political dimensions of tourism on a range of topics. However, it is being recognized that the political nature of this massive global industry, at both macro and micro political levels, is under acknowledged. Tourism as an international system of exchange displays particular tensions around the interface between space and experience that reaches into the conceptual heart of globalization. The global structural realities of tourism are very much framed by the idea of the nation state and have their roots in the modern political geographies and nation-building agendas of the late 19th, and the first decades of the 20th century. Despite growing interest in the notion of regionalism whereby the region acts as the focal point for 'culture building and identification', it is the idea of the nation that still holds primacy in the metanarratives of international tourism. Each nation, no matter what their position in any notional global political league table, promotes tourism as an actual and potential source of external revenue, a marker of political status that draws upon cultural capital, and as a means to legitimize itself as a territorial entity. The paper provides some degree of context for the concept of cultural tourism and explores the ways in which culture(s) is/are mobilized for tourists and read by tourists within particular settings. In utilizing the term cultural tourism we are explicitly acknowledging both the cultural nature of, and the role of, tourism as a process and set of practices that revolve around the behavioural pragmatics of societies, and the learning and transmission of meanings through symbols and embodied through objects.

Keywords: Conceptual Transformations, Cultural Tourism, Cultural Resourcefulness, National Cultural Projection

INTRODUCTION-TOURISM KNOWLEDGE PRODUCTION AND DISCOURSES

The phenomenal growth of tourism in the past five decades is well documented and as it has burgeoned as an industry, so it has matured as a field of enquiry (Xiao & Smith, 2006, 2007). This has been especially the case in the last two decades, when tourism researchers have reached out to new learnings in the wider social sciences, particularly in post-colonialism, production-consumption and power, practice, and agency. Nonetheless, there remains a crucial challenge to develop conceptualizations of tourisms that encompass multiple worldviews and cultural differences as well as research praxis that recognizes and reflects the plurality of multiple positions, practices and insights.

This can be likened to a series of ebbs and flows where different paradigms, traditions and disciplines have exerted influence, waxing and waning in response to prevailing political and social economies, disciplinary and institutional trends and generational change in the academy. The first surge of work in the field of tourism owes much to its first generation scholars in the 60s and 70s (Jamal & Kim, 2005)—the economists, anthropologists, sociologists and geographers who laid the foundations for the development of tourism as a multidisciplinary field of enquiry (Nash, 2007). Whilst anthropological and sociological perspectives have remained significant in the field, a tidal shift occurred in the 80s and 90s when business and management approaches came to dominate tourism philosophically and institutionally. These approaches are characterised by what Habermas (1987) termed to be a hegemonic system world driven by

* Professor and Dean, Department of Tourism & Travel Management, Central University of Jammu, Jammu, Jammu & Kashmir, India. Email: deepakdma@yahoo.com

** Assistant Professor, Department of Tourism & Travel Management, Central University of Jammu, Jammu, Jammu & Kashmir,, India. Email: zubair.ixr@gmail.com

economically- and technically- oriented imperatives and knowledge.

Indeed, most historiographies of tourism research suggest that scientific- positivistic imperatives continue to dominate its knowledge forcefield (Tribe, 2006) which remains underpinned by neo-liberal values of 'performativity, consumerism and profitability' (Tribe, 2009). This is in no small part due to the location of many tourism researchers in business and management schools, which have themselves been heavily criticised recently for a failure to promote research addressing fundamental social and political questions, preferring to focus instead on small-scale, technically-based problem-solving research (Corbyn, 2008; Tuchman, 2009). Thus many tourism researchers, often numerically outnumbered in academic collectives where technical and instrumental 'knowledge interests' (Habermas, 1987) dominate have little scope for values-based or emancipatory studies.

Whilst tourism researchers' engagement with plural approaches is growing, the hierarchies which serve as the field's academic gatekeepers have rarely been subject to scrutiny (Hall, 2004). Extant research suggests that tourism tribal elders whose headdresses are adorned with feathers of esteem (Tribe, 2005, p. 372) exhibit little diversity. Gatekeepers have traditionally been male, first generation scholars grounded in the Western, Anglocentric epistemic research traditions and located in business, geography or (in the USA) recreation departments. This we claim affects both the accessibility and renewal of the field of research. This situation exemplifies that in order to gain access to and be recognised as part of the research community, one must perform research in recognisable ways, not only in terms of one's language, writing and researching, but also in terms of one's gender, social class and race. Collectively, the gatekeepers of the tourism academy are responsible for setting the 'parameters in which individuals are encouraged to work if they wish to be at the centre of issues in their discipline' (Spender, 1981). This continues to impact the production of tourism knowledge and the occlusion of particular voices is evidenced in the Eurocentric practitioners, practices and epistemologies which continue to shape and dominate tourism scholarship. Indeed, Tribe (2006) notes how the tourism academy evidences 'an overwhelming patriarchal power at work'. However, he goes on to observe how, in the spirit of 'Foucauldian notions of resistance', gender research is evident within tourism inquiry; as indeed, we would argue so too are alternatives to the field's dominant technically-oriented research agenda.

Is it even correct to speak of one research community? Indeed, the tourism research field has been often characterized as a divided community, based on those who are oriented towards or against business management approaches (Hollinshead, 2007). Tribe (2010) identifies two deep knowledge networks

in tourism (social science and business) but recognizes the emergence of others such as sustainable tourism and critical tourism researchers. The latter has developed as second and third generation scholars engage with the 'reflexive turn' and with the challenges of creating a more sustainable, equitable and secure world. Indeed, Ateljevic, Pritchard and Morgan (2007) have labelled this 'hopeful tourism scholarship', arguing it is a values-based, life-world approach which embraces culturally critical and reflexive scholarship; it is enquiry which requires the researcher to reconceptualise ways of researching and dealing with new local- global challenges' (Jamal & Everett, 2007). Recently, however, there have been calls for more dialogue across tourism's perceived knowledge divide, emphasizing the need to move away from such straight-jacketing dualism (Pritchard & Morgan, 2007).

Cultural Tourism: Meanings and Reflexivity

The term 'cultural tourism' is subject to many definitions (Sofield & Birtles, 1996) and much confusion (Hughes, 1996) and is symptomatic of Tribe's (1997) 'indiscipline' of tourism. In her seminal book, *Hosts and Guests*, Valene Smith (1978) differentiates between ethnic and cultural tourism: 'ethnic tourism is marketed to the public in terms of quaint customs of indigenous often exotic peoples'. Wood (1984) further defined ethnic tourism by its focus on people living out a cultural identity, whose uniqueness is being marketed to tourists. The focus of tourists' visits is on cultural practices according to Wood, and on 'native homes and villages, observations of dances and ceremonies and shopping for curios' (Smith, 1978).

Firstly, both Wood (1984) and Smith (1978) differentiate between ethnic and cultural tourism, whereas in fact a continuum exists (Cole, 1997). Secondly, the use of the term ethnic is problematic. The popular use of the term ethnic implies a minority, a framing of the 'other'. The nostalgic longing for untouched primitive peoples' (Mowforth & Munt, 1998) in the minds of the tourists is part of the process of 'othering' (MacCannell, 1984). 'Othering' is thus a prerequisite aspect and consequence of tourism (Cole & Viken, 1998). Most tourists have an ethnocentric view of the societies and cultures they visit (Laxson, 1991). Selwyn (1996) asserts that 'it is widely accepted by anthropologists of tourism that much of contemporary tourism is founded on the 'Quest for the Other''. The Other belongs to a premodern, precommodified, imagined world and is authentically social (Selwyn, 1996).

Tourism transforms difference into the global discourse of consumerism, a process by which 'otherness' becomes a commodity to be consumed. This is 'a kind of institutional racism that celebrates primitiveness' (Munt & Mowforth, 1998) as suffering and poverty have become aestheticised

by tourists' accumulation of images of the poor. Human practices are redefined as commodities as tourists are exposed to cultural differences and local cultural variation is confirmed. This leads to differentiation and a revival of culture and ethnicity (Walters, 1995).

The dichotomy between ethnic and cultural tourism, where the former is used for the 'primitive other' and the latter for the high arts in developed nations (Richards, 1996), serves to entrench inequalities between the rich and poor. MacIntosh and Goeldner (1990) use the concept of 'cultural distance' to refer to the extent a tourist's home culture differs from that of the area being visited. At present, Western academics use the term 'ethnic tourism' when the cultural differences are great and 'cultural tourism' when they are less so. All communities have culture; the further removed that culture is from the tourist, the more exotic it will appear. It would be interesting to ask those who see a difference whether they would consider tourism in Lapland, on the fringe of Europe, as ethnic or cultural tourism. A similar question could be asked about township tourism that includes visits to the homes of some of Africa's poorest communities and at the same time an understanding of the burgeoning middle-class Black communities living in townships, certainly no single ethnic group is being represented as the term ethnic would suggest.

Furthermore, the term ethnic group is usually used to define a specified racial or linguistic group. If ethnicity and identity are seen as processional, contested and changing, it is inappropriate for the groups and their ethnonyms to be reified by tourism. Local groups creatively use well known ethnonyms for their benefit. MacCannell's (1984) analysis of ethnic tourism suggests that 'touristified ethnic groups are often weakened by a history of exploitation, limited in resources and power, and they have no big buildings, machines, monuments or natural wonders to deflect the tourists' attention away from the intimate details of their daily lives'. Furthermore, the economic structure of ethnic tourism is such that most of the money involved does not change hands at the site, resulting in little economic advantage for such groups. Cohen's more recent analysis also stresses that underdevelopment is a group's resource. However, he makes a number of further important points: it is a group's marginality that is their major source of attractiveness, and preservation of their distinctiveness is a crucial precondition of the sustainability of their tourism. Their representation tends towards essentialisation as homogenous entities, marked by distinct, easily recognisable traits (Cohen, 2001).

In considering the evolution of ethnic tourism, Cohen (2001) suggests that the tourists become active agents, achieving a degree of empowerment while gaining little financial reward, mainly through the sale of crafts. He goes on to suggest that, as tourism matures, some inhabitants accumulate some

capital and gain familiarity with the tourists' tastes and increasingly gain a share of tourists' expenditure. Hospitality, performance and the arts then become commodified or at least reorientated towards outsiders. MacCannell (1984) suggests that when a group sees itself as an ethnic attraction the group members begin to think of themselves as representatives of an ethnic way of life, and any change has economic and political implications for the whole group. The 'group is frozen in an image of itself or museumised' (MacCannell, 1984: 388). As Butcher (2001) discusses, cultural tourism can create a straightjacket for communities. Their culture becomes cast in stone. Furthermore, when levels of economic development are seen as part of culture and inequality becomes reinterpreted as 'cultural diversity', tourism can preserve poverty.

The Challenge of Balancing Socioeconomic Integration with Cultural Distinction

There is a paradox central to cultural tourism development in peripheral areas. To develop is to modernise; if a remote cultural tourist destination modernises, it is no longer 'primitive' and it loses its appeal. The challenge of balancing socioeconomic integration with cultural distinction (Li & Butler, 1997) is a challenge fraught with conflict. As cultural assets are refined as consumerables for tourists, culture becomes commodified. As the destination modernises, a process, many suspect, of becoming more like the Western tourist's society, it becomes less different and distinct. The destination appears less authentic and so the value of the tourism product is reduced (Dearden & Harron, 1992; Go, 1997; Swain, 1989).

While cultural globalisation results in the homogenisation of cultures around the world, it simultaneously brings about increasing cultural differentiation. People can use cultural commodification as a way of affirming their identity, of telling their own story and establishing the significance of local experiences (McDonald, 1997). Far from rendering culture superficial and meaningless, commodification can be seen as 'part of a very positive process by which people are beginning to reevaluate their history and shake off the shame of peasantry' (Abram, 1996). In the case of the Lappish community a village museum stimulated the collection of historic objects and stories. The villagers not only preserved their local culture and heritage but also created a feeling of togetherness and an appreciation of local traditions. In Kiltimagh, Western Ireland, improving the town's appearance and recreating the 19th century market town was an important aspect of creating a sense of 'pride of place', a vital part of the community's empowerment. In Soweto, tourism has been liberating for the residents who have had an opportunity to share visions of their past oppression, and

the role residents played in the struggle for freedom. The residents have become proud of their 'struggle' heritage and want visitors to understand and share it.

In order to grasp how culture is changed as a result of globalizing forces including tourism, it is helpful to recognise that traditions are creations in the present, socially constructed in an on-going process (Wood, 1993). Culture is a tool kit or a template (Wikam, 1990) that is used by people to suit their requirements. The questions that need to be asked are not about how tourism impacts on a culture but how tourism is used and how the facets of culture are articulated in the face of increased tourism. As Wood discusses, 'the central questions to be asked are about process, and about the complex ways tourism enters and becomes part of an already on-going process of symbolic meaning and appropriation' (Wood, 1993).

For many commentators, globalisation generates ambivalence and uncertainty and leads individuals to emphasise their identity and security of their location (O'Riordan & Church, 2001). This emphasis on the local or localisation is considered 'inextricably bound together' (Featherstone, 1996) with globalisation. They are two sides of the same coin. The search for identity is pursued in terms of ideas about tradition, history, locality and community (Robertson, 1992). The affirmation of local identity and the creation of ethnicity can be a response to and consequence of difference and 'otherness' becoming consumable tourist commodities. By understanding ethnicity as 'a set of social relationships and processes by which cultural differences are communicated' (Hitchcock, 2000), ethnicity can be understood as a resource to be mobilised. Tourism thus has important consequences for identity and ethnicity. 'A distinct cultural identity is a marketable resource for a tourism destination' (Scott, 1995). Elements of culture may be commodified through tourism, but self-conscious awareness of traditional culture as something local people possess, that attracts tourists, can bring political legitimacy (where traditional culture and the identity associated with it has hitherto been debased). Tourism can thus provide marginalised communities with political capital to manipulate (de Burlo, 1996).

Cultural Building and Identification of the Contexts

Contexts are important, not only because they embed specific phenomena in more general historical circumstances, but because they themselves change both in a temporal sense and also in their social and political validity as interpretative frameworks for actions and events. In this vein it is useful to acknowledge the normalizing perspective of Levi-Strauss (1988), which recognises the implicitness of culture not as something set against life, or overlain over it, but as substituting itself to life as a constructing power and

transformational process which is processual, and practical; life builds culture, builds life. Tourism, as an expression and experience of culture, fits within this form of historical contextualisation and also assists in generating nuanced forms of culture as well as new cultural forms. In this sense it is not difficult to see that use of the term 'cultural tourism' is problematic. As Urry (1995) suggests, tourism is simply 'cultural', with its structures, practices and events very much an extension of the normative cultural framing from which it emerges. Cultural tourism is far more than production and consumption of 'high' art and heritage. It reaches into some deep conceptual territories relating to how we construct and understand ourselves, the world and the multilayered relationships between them.

Tourism as an international system of exchange displays particular tensions around the interface between space and experience that reaches into the conceptual heart of globalisation. The global structural realities of tourism are very much framed by the idea of the nation state and have their roots in the modern political geographies and nation-building agendas of the late 19th, and the first decades of the 20th century. Despite growing interest in the notion of regionalism whereby the region acts as the focal point for 'culture building and identification' (Frykman, 2002), it is the idea of the nation that still holds primacy in the metanarratives of international tourism. Each nation, no matter what their position in any notional global political league table, promotes tourism as an actual and potential source of external revenue, a marker of political status that draws upon cultural capital, and as a means to legitimise itself as a territorial entity. Thus, national governments have offices for tourism that quite willingly promote the idea of a national 'brand'. Wandering around the World Travel Market in London, or the International Travel Convention in Berlin, one can be forgiven for thinking that ideas of mobility, transnational flows and deterritorialisation had no currency whatsoever. Exhibition stands forcefully exist as microcosms of nations, albeit with regional and subregional constituent parts. Tour operators act as buyers of essentially 'national' products. Developers negotiate with national government offices under national legislative frameworks. National airlines retain highly visible and symbolic meaning for both host community and tourists, and despite the presence of multinational hotel chains, many hotel groups remain firmly structured around particular national characteristics and ideologies.

Of course, a 'tourism of nations' perspective is riven with the fault lines of conflict and contestation. Nevertheless, it is a reality that maps onto Westernised cognitive frameworks of cultural resemblance, which have themselves been shaped by essentialising histories of the nation state. Counter, and in parallel, to this metastructural view, are the social realities of 'doing' tourism and 'being' a tourist, which exist not within and between bounded territories

but with far more immediate, intimate, and to the tourist, more meaningful spaces. Here the focus is upon experience and the in situ production of spaces that facilitates such experiences for tourists; a point largely accommodated by the babel of globalisation theorists who have challenged ideas of national boundaries. The thesis which proffers notions of boundary dissolution (language and religious boundaries included), the compression of time and space, and the emergence of 'landscapes' fashioned along cultural and ethnic lines (Appadurai, 1990), positions the tourist as part of a larger 'flow' of people, ideas and objects. Things and containers such as 'Spain' or 'France', and even their regions, relinquish their importance in the light of processes and actions, and what become more important for the tourist are not the metanarratives and ideological frameworks of nationhood, nor the notions of cultural resemblance and difference, but rather the outcomes of individual and social encounter, interaction and engagement.

This tension inherent in international tourism is not reducible to some binary opposition between modes of production versus modes of consumption. It is not some battle between historical fact and socio/ anthropological interpretation. Nor is it about the relativism of where anyone happens to be standing. Rather, it is very much a movement along a continuum between two sets of equally valid, albeit discursive practices functioning at and between macro and micro levels. International tourism exists as a suitably vague umbrella term that is locked into the continuities of the modern nation-state and operates through the experiences and practices of the individual tourist. Cultural tourism is, *de facto*, caught up in the movements and flows of the world.

Culture as Resource and the Resourcefulness of Culture

The most distinguishing feature of mature capitalist systems over recent decades has been the re-creation of economies around the symbolic value of culture(s). The political roles of culture as representing and enforcing national ideologies and particular hierarchies of power, together with its social roles as entertainment and as a form of communal intellectual glue, while still present, have been overtaken by its centrality in economic life. Scott (1997) neatly summarises this fundamental shift arguing that: capitalism itself is moving into a phase in which the cultural forms and meanings of its outputs become critical if not dominating elements of productive strategy, and in which the realm of human culture as a whole is increasingly subject to commodification, i.e. supplied through profit-making institutions in decentralized markets. In other words, an ever-widening range of economic activity is concerned with producing and marketing goods and services that are infused in one way or another with broadly aesthetic or semiotic attributes.

Culture, in its widest sense, provides a set of material and symbolic resources that are abundant in supply (arguably infinite), and highly mobile (Rojek & Urry, 1997). The resource of culture is certainly at the basis of international tourism and indeed has facilitated its growth and allowed various societies and sections of societies to participate in the development process. However, in treating culture as a resource we should not neglect aspects of agency, as the value and priority of culture(s) relates not only to its intrinsic worth, but to the ways that it is used (Keating, 2001). This in turn begs questions about ownership of, and access to, culture (Robinson, 2001), and also raises issues with regard to the ways in which culture is 'read' by particular typologies of tourists. So-called 'cultural products', as Therkelsen (2003) points out: 'generate associations and meanings that are influenced by the cultural backgrounds of the potential tourist.' In this sense, tourists do not encounter culture as some value-neutral form or process. Rather, they decode culture(s), in social spaces and times in relation to particular formal and informal knowledge regimes accrued through exposure to formulated tourism packages and through the normative processes of socialisation (Robinson, 2005).

In a European context, conventional conceptions of what we understand to be 'culture' have largely been dictated by our post enlightenment sensibilities regarding the romantic, the beautiful, the educational, and also, by extension, the moral. It is not surprising that what is now heralded as 'cultural tourism' broadly follows the patterns of the 'grand tour' of the 18th and 19th centuries indulged in by the social elite. Motivating factors of education, social betterment and basic human curiosity remain but have been complemented by a range of other factors which have assisted in the on-going development of cultural tourist centres. Importantly, the rise of the low-cost airlines across Europe has played a key role in stimulating tourism within more recently acknowledged cultural centres such as Budapest, Krakow and Ljubljana. Though well established cities of culture such as Paris, Rome, Venice and Athens maintain their primacy from the early days of tourism, cheap flights have created new opportunities for people to experience heritage and the arts, particularly in some smaller places such as Girona, Bratislava and Riga. This apparent democratisation of cultural tourism has also been helped along by highly competitive and increasingly sophisticated marketing campaigns, mainly within urban contexts. The European Cities of Culture campaign, with its strong emphasis on destination branding, has been particularly successful in this way and has acted to endorse the idea that culture is a highly 'moral' product and also, through its ability to attract tourists, is economically beneficial.

In this vein, the concept of cultural tourism seems to be taking hold everywhere. Former heavily industrial centres have moved from being economies of production to economies

of symbolic cultural consumption, and industrial heritage sites would seem to substitute all too easily for sites of manufacturing. The number of festivals and cultural events has increased exponentially over recent years and there has also been substantive growth in the number of museums and cultural attractions as destinations have sought to compete for the growing markets of culture-hungry tourists. But the on-going ferment and frenzy to create new displays of cultural capital and to attract the 'cultural tourist' that is the well educated, largely White, high-spending, middle-class tourist raises a number of longstanding issues relating to how we use culture to make sense of, and gain meaning from, a rapidly changing world.

An important point of perspective to bear in mind is that while cultural tourism is certainly a growing segment of international tourism, the vast majority of tourists could be said to be culture-proof (Craik, 1997) in that they are not seeking the exotic, culture or heritage, but relaxation, warm weather and various forms of hedonistic activity. Beach holidays remain as popular as ever with tour operators continually seeking to develop virgin stretches of coastline, while theme parks (50 years after the opening of Disneyland), as a destination and a model of tourism development, are flourishing. This is not to say that the individuals that go to make up so-called 'mass' tourism are somehow devoid of any interest in culture(s). But it does remind us that tourism reflects a certain degree of polarisation between the persistence of culture as somehow elevated and special in society, and the culture of the ordinary and the everyday.

Culture, as the social critic Raymond Williams pointed out, is one of the most problematic words to define, but despite elaborations and attempts by anthropologists over the years to widen our understanding of the term culture away from elitist notions, it would seem that, in the context of tourism we are, in the main, reproducing the idea of 'high' culture from the 18th and 19th centuries. Nor is this restricted to European tourism. We have exported our aesthetic preferences and conceptions of culture to other places. In the Middle East, for instance, rich as it is with centuries of history and cultural diversity, we haven't inscribed our predilections for romantic ruins that we can recognise onto national tourist strategies. A country like Jordan, for example, is locked into the promotion of its Greco-Roman sites and the Nabatean city of Petra, as 'must-see' places. However, such sites are hardly representative of the culture(s) of the Jordanian/Arab peoples, shaped as they have been by Ottoman culture and complex historical relations with the West. At one level this is playing to the market. At another level it is obscuring the very essence of local and national identity.

We should not be surprised at our own preferences for culture as expressed in the iconic and the spectacular. As tourists we have but little time in any one location and instinctively we gravitate to what is heralded as being the

exceptional, rather than the norm, and what we recognise through our own aesthetic frames. It is also not surprising that a destination eager to capitalise on the economic rewards of tourism should prioritise its cultural high points. The question, however, is one of extent. For in privileging some aspects of culture to tourists, we exclude others and close off tourism as a development option for some destinations and communities.

Discussion, Summary and Conclusion

Cultural heritage was first addressed in international law in 1907 as an independent term, but was not brought into the tourism industry arena until 1967. In that year, UNCTAD agreed on the commercialization aspect of cultural heritage and the UNESCO released the report on Cultural Factors in Tourism. CHT is a special tourism product with reference to traditions, festivals, industries and places with strong diversity and territoriality, including irreplaceable historic elements along with cultural and natural resources, such as built structure and surroundings, cultural landscapes, ruins and archaeological sites, historical communities and sites, museums, performing arts and other similar aspects (NTHP, 2005). Keitumetse (2009) believes that CHT is mainly constituted with the components of cultural heritage (monuments, archaeological sites, museums and others) and cultural experiences (festivals, communities and so on). So it is not difficult to understand that CHT has been gradually regarded as one of the most effective ways to stimulate national patriotism for domestic tourists and enhance the understanding for overseas tourists (Lu, 2006).

Cultural tourism has a variety of definitions that echo the understanding of culture embodied in the above descriptions. For instance, the 1976 Charter on Cultural Tourism, defined Cultural Tourism as a form of tourism concerned with a country or region's culture, especially its arts. This form of tourism includes historic sites, cultural facilities (museums, theaters), architecture – including houses of writers and artists, outdoor festivals, rural landscapes and monuments (ICOMOS 1999). For the UNWTO, it is the movement of persons for essentially cultural motivations, which they suggest includes study tours, performing arts, cultural tours, travel to festivals, visits to historic sites and monuments and folklore and pilgrimages (WTO, 1985). This approach to heritage is typically enshrined in the activities of most international, national, and local tourism agencies involved in tourism development, and their policies and practices.

Thus, even with the most sensitive approach, the challenge for communities involved in cultural or cultural heritage tourism, in general, is to preserve the character of the community and its cultural resources, to offer an authentic experience, and to respect the social and cultural way of life of the host community. Individual communities will

identify the cultural resources that they feel make their locale special and unique (Jamieson 1994). Nonetheless, this does not completely resolve the dilemma in that tourists are encouraged to focus on past practices, all modern societies are under tremendous pressures to change from the growing integration of the international economy, communications, and cultures, including especially tourism.

Wallerstein (2000) writes of multiple temporalities, universalisms and particularisms in the context of cultural development in the 21st century. Although total relativism is not a necessarily desirable condition (universalisms relating to fundamental human rights might need to be prioritised, for example), this affords enormous scope for tolerance, political change and innovation. Though this can lead to a superficial democratisation of culture (Wallerstein, 2000), and problematises how we define who are 'we' and who are the 'others', it nevertheless forces our attention to the rapidity and restlessness of change and shifting power relations.

Relativism and pluralism go a long way in characterising culture(s) as a set of resources and it is thus not surprising that cultural tourism constantly seems to generate interconnected and apparently intractable moments of contestation in the way we represent and receive culture as both tourists and hosts. How, for example, how can we privilege women's or Black history without doing the same for men or Whites? How can we balance the iconic signification of culture with the intimate? How do we celebrate cultural difference and diversity in ways that retain meaning for tourists and visited communities? Both relativism and essentialism still create major challenges in the context of truth and reconciliation, especially when interpreting or representing one's past in the present. Alexander et al. (2004) note how cultural traumas (e.g. the Holocaust) leave indelible marks on their groups' consciousness, memories and identity, which can be both solidifying or disruptive, but rarely unanimous. People come to terms with their past in different ways, but the development of a (cultural) tourism industry also necessitates the acceptance of responsibility in terms of interpretation and representation of events. The 20th century is widely regarded as one of the most violent and tragic in modern history, thus there is much to come to terms with and to (re)present.

Culture is a serious process and a serious state, and this research brings out the ways in which the ephemeral tourist experience touches upon the deepest and most persistent of struggles. At the same time, postmodern societies are equally meant to be 'playful' in their approach to tourism (Rojek, 1993). As a leisure industry, tourism is based on a sense of escape from the existential burden of history and contemporary reconciliation. Human coping strategies also include the freedom and hedonistic expression afforded by tourism. The 21st century, and its concomitant globalisation born of new media, technology and regenerative creative

industries, lends itself easily to a proliferation of exciting touristic developments. For example, Junemo (2004) describes how a growing destination like Dubai is the epitome of playfulness, a place where globalisation is not a threat, but has been embraced wholeheartedly both in urban and tourism planning. Sheller and Urry (2004) refer to the playfulness of places, which are always on the move, consisting of different mobilisations of memories, emotions, performances, bodies, etc. There are multiple contested meanings of place as described earlier with regard to interpretations of history, but these can also be used in creative ways to transform and regenerate, or even to create new destinations. The literature in the area refers to the ways in which culture as heritage, and culture as contemporary creativity are being used simultaneously (not always without conflict) in the redevelopment or repositioning of destinations. Some of the more playful and creative aspects of cultural tourism development arguably need to take their place alongside the more sombre reminders of our dissonant pasts.

Mobility and playfulness are clearly still predominantly influenced by power and capital, but as Turner and Rojek (2001) note, there has been a democratisation of mobility, in which travel has become almost a citizenship right. It is worth noting too, that communities are as fluid and mobile as their cultures. Many cultural theorists write of 'deterritorialisation' and groups occupying 'the borderlands' (i.e. those who do not fit into established master discourses of nation, race, ethnicity, etc). A sense of place is now as much a psychological concept as a physical or geographical one, especially for diasporic cultures. Place, like identity, is also constantly being negotiated. As stated by Meethan (2001), cultures and societies are not passive recipients of tourism, they are also sites of contestation and resistance. Postcolonial discourse often emphasises the 'loss' of cultures (usually referring to indigenous cultures), but questions should be asked about for whom it is a loss? There is a Western tendency to fossilise cultures as heritage and to prioritise the built environment. There is something of a postimperial obsession with physical symbols or legacies that represent the past (e.g. buildings, statues, memorials). Even where these are now displaced and dissonant (for example, in former communist countries), they may be preserved and placed in tourist 'statue parks' (e.g. in Hungary). By contrast, Fisher (2004) notes how indigenous peoples in neocolonial societies tend to describe their heritage more in terms of intangible, precolonial traditions or 'essence' of place.

Since we constantly deal in multiplicity and 'the conditions of possibility do not necessarily come in large blocks' (Law, 2000), knowledge is never homogeneous and uncontested. Rather, they are connected parts in shaping the concepts, questions and terrain of tourism research. Just as tourism may not be embraced in its entirety in one narrative, statistic or discourse analysis, so tourism research is not accounted

for or told in one consistent way, from one position, with one voice. In fact, Tribe's (2010) analysis of tourism's tribes, territories and networks "presents a macro picture of the field of tourism driven by dynamic networks". As a fractionally coherent network created by and producing multiple actors, tourism research is dependent upon the mobility of its participants and on their ability to shift between different roles that are inconsistent with one another and that do not add up (Law, 1997).

For instance, many of us who teach on tourism management programmes transcend the seeming divide between business and social science research in our everyday teaching practices as well as our relationships, networks and our writings.

All three narratives describe the intricate link between the personal and knowledge construction, describing and exposing the entanglements between commonly separated entities. Positioning and personal relationships clearly emerge as an unarticulated and unrecognised factor in shaping the constitution of tourism research. These ongoing silences are major omissions in our understanding of tourism knowledge production as 'all of what I am affects the problems I see and the power dynamics we experience as researchers. It must be said that these are selected narratives pertaining to the co-construction of knowledge and there are countless others which would bear scrutiny, including the dialogues between and amongst journal editors, reviewers, grant referees, research supervisors, authors, students and research participants.

It is in such contexts that we have to position cultural tourism as creatively evolving and evolving creatively. In doing so, what we refer to as cultural tourism is becoming far more inclusive, breaking away from some of the more established notions of culture as loci of symbolic power and elitist expressions of apparent 'good taste', and moving toward more inclusive, democratic and experiential interpretations. There are perhaps two key reasons for this movement, or, more aptly, drifting. The first relates to the nature of the tourist experience itself. Destinations, their peoples and cultures are experienced by the tourist and not just gazed upon. Observing tourists reveals that they actually spend considerably less time than we think in formalised cultural settings such as galleries, museums and historic buildings. Rather more time is spent in restaurants, cafes, bars, shops, the airport and the hotel. Indeed, tourists spend large amounts of time 'walking around' and 'people watching', and in the process observing and encountering aspects of the host's culture in the form of everyday practices and behaviours. Far from being culture proof, it is particularly these aspects of ordinary life that tourists absorb and on their return home constitute their narratives of memory of experience. From the point of view of the host community and indeed the host tourist authorities, this aspect of culture is easily overlooked as not being of any significance and hence devoid of political currency. It is

informal, ad hoc, impossible to manage and control and yet it is of critical importance in shaping the tourist experience. But it is easy to forget that what is considered to be ordinary in one cultural setting is exotic to another. As a normative part of the touristic process people encounter the cultures of others, through shopping, eating and drinking etc., but this in itself can become an out-of-the-ordinary experience. In Britain, for example, the still-popular activities of going to a pub or of eating fish and chips are transformed into special activities for many overseas tourists. Ordinary as they may be, these are authentic activities in themselves and can be said to be close to the heart of British culture, however they seldom appear on the cover of promotional brochures.

A second reason for the trend towards less elitist cultural forms relates to the realities of generational replacement and increasing distance away from so-called 'high-brow' culture. Each generation produces its own cultures, the potential of which has still not been fully recognised by the tourism sector. On the one hand this does create problems as various established cultural forms and traditions becoming threatened with extinction. On the other hand, new cultural forms are created. Again, it is sometimes all too easy to dismiss these as being outside of 'culture'. In the context of European history and culture, the notion of fast food would seem to have little in the way of cultural value and any distinctive pull for tourists. However, in the USA, a nation with a relatively short documented history, the birthplace of Kentucky Fried Chicken in Corbin, Kentucky, boasts a museum and an authentically reconstructed cafe, and many tourists. Their cultural experiences revolve around what they can relate to and what they feel connected with, albeit in a different environment. This does not make them unappreciative of the other cultural products, but it does illustrate the point that cultures do change in relation to the market.

Recognising and promoting the culture of the ordinary and the everyday is not to deny the importance of the 'high' arts, heritage and classical performances. Rather, it is to recognise the realities of cultural change and different forms of creativity, and the importance of the overall experience in tourism. But what does all of this mean for the future development of cultural tourism and the communities and economies it purports to serve?

For the increasing number of tourists roaming the surface of the planet it creates an ever-expanding number of experiences and possibilities. All tourism is 'cultural' in this sense. As tourists, and as people, in a globalising world we are increasingly in contact with 'other' cultures, able to experience the uniqueness of each and the commonalities of all. Cultural tourism in this way can be a powerful mechanism to understanding other places, peoples and pasts, not through selective, high-profile cultural sites and activities that may not necessarily be representative of the societies they operate

in, but through a more democratic and ubiquitous approach to cultures. In these terms even mass tourism has important and forgotten cultural elements. Our first encounter with another culture is most likely to be with the menu, the waiter and the food in a restaurant near a resort.

It is 'popular', everyday culture that increasingly infuses domestic and international tourism patterns. Television soap operas now hold more influence on travel patterns than classical opera. Tourists are more likely to visit a destination with literary connections because they have seen a film than because they have read the book. Football, and sport generally, has the power to define new tourist opportunities. Different shopping and dining experiences are arguably more central to the overall cultural experience than museum visits. Now, all of this may not be a popular perspective with the guardians of 'high' culture, but for the tourism authorities of those destinations off the main tourist routes and in many cases these overlap with the very places which need economic and cultural development. The everydayness of culture, in both material and symbolic ways, provides an important set of resources. At one level the cultural landscape has transformed considerably since the early days of tourism and travel. The canvas of culture has broadened, become more accessible and more creative. On another level, the basics of culture have remained in place and its important dimensions relate to the changes it constantly undergoes and the fact that it is lived, experienced, shared and exchanged.

This research does not claim to offer any definitive solutions to the issues that it raises. However, it does seek to locate the phenomenon that is cultural tourism as part of a wider set of contexts that are historically embedded but are changing constantly. This is the case for both the development of tourism 'products' as expressions of culture, and in the way that culture is consumed by the tourist. Moreover, it invites the reader to read cultural tourism as a political process, or at least a set of economic transactions that have political impacts. The research reveals an ongoing process of negotiation between different social groupings relating to access to various configurations of places.

REFERENCES

- Alexander, J. C., Eyerman, R., Giesen, B., Smelser, N. J. & Sztopmka, P. (2004). *Cultural trauma and collective identity*. Berkley: University of California Press.
- Appadurai, A. (1990). Disjuncture and difference in the global cultural economy. *Public Culture* 2(2), 1/24.
- Ateljevic, I., Harris, C., Wilson, E., & Collins, L. (2005). Getting entangled: Reflexivity and the 'critical turn' in tourism studies. *Tourism Recreation Research*, 30(2), 9-21.
- Ateljevic, I., Morgan, N., & Pritchard, A. (2007a). *The critical turn in tourism studies: Innovative research methodologies*. Harlow: Elsevier.
- Ateljevic, I., Morgan, N., & Pritchard, A. (2007b). Editors' introduction: *Promoting an academy of hope in tourism enquiry*. In I. N. Ateljevic, N. Morgan, & A. Pritchard (Eds.), *The critical turn in tourism studies: Innovative research methodologies* (pp. 1-8). Harlow: Elsevier.
- Botterill, T. D. (2003). An autoethnographic narrative on tourism research epistemologies. *Leisure and Society*, 26(1), 97-110.
- Braden, S., & Mayo, M. (1999). Culture, community development and representation. *Community Development Journal*, 34(3), 191-204.
- Bramwell, B. (2006). *Actors, networks and tourism policies*. In D. Buhalis & C. Costa (Eds.), *Tourism management dynamics: Trends, management and tools* (pp. 155-163). Oxford: Elsevier Butterworth Heinemann.
- Butcher, J. (2001). *Cultural baggage and cultural tourism*. In J. Butcher (ed.) *Innovations in Cultural Tourism*. Proceedings to the 5th ATLAS International Conference (pp. 11-17). Tilburg: ATLAS.
- Cole, S. (1997). *Cultural heritage tourism: The villagers' perspective. A case study from Ngada, Flores*. In W. Nuryanti (ed.) *Tourism and Heritage Management* (pp. 468-481). Yogyakarta: Gadjah Mada University Press.
- Craik, J. (1997). *The culture of tourism*. In C. Rojek and J. Urry (eds) *Touring Cultures / Transformations of Travel and Theory* (pp. 113-137). London: Routledge.
- Denning, M. (2004). *Culture in the Age of Three Worlds*. London: Verso.
- Frykman, J. (2002). Place for something else. Analysing a cultural imaginary. *Ethnologia Europaea. Journal of European Ethnology*, 32(2), 47-68.
- Hollinshead, K. (2007). *The 'world-making' drive of tourism: A broadening of Meethan's analysis of culture and place production*. Keynote presented at the Second International Critical Tourism Studies Conference, Split, June 20-23.
- Huxham, C. (1993). Pursuing collaborative advantage. *Journal of the Operational Research Society*, 44(6), 599-611.
- Jafari, J. (2005). Bridging out, nesting afield: Powering a new platform. *Journal of Tourism Studies*, 16(2), 1-5.
- Jamal, T. B., & Everett, J. (2007). Rationalisation in the natural and acemic lifeworld: Critical tourism research or hermeneutic charity?. In I. Ateljevic, N. Tucker (eds) *Tourism and postcolonialism: Contested discourses, identities and representations* (pp. 126/139). London: Routledge.

- McKercher, B., & du Cros, H. (2002). *Cultural tourism: The partnership between tourism and cultural heritage management*. New York: The Haworth Press.
- Meethan, K. (2001). *Tourism in global society: Place, culture, consumption*. London: Palgrave.
- Richards, G. (ed.) (1996). *Cultural tourism in Europe*. Wallingford: CABI.
- Richards, G. (ed.) (2001). *Cultural attractions and European tourism*. Wallingford: CABI.
- Robinson, M., & Boniface, P. (eds) (1999). *Tourism and Cultural Conflicts*. Wallingford: CABI.
- Rojek, C. (1993). *Ways of escape: Modern transformations in leisure and travel*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Smith, M. K. (2003). *Issues in Cultural Tourism Studies*. London: Routledge.
- Tribe, J. (1997). The indisciplin of tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 24(3), 638-657.
- Turner, B. S., & Rojek, C. (2001). *Society and Culture: Principles of Scarcity and Solidarity*. London: Sage.
- Urry, J. (1995). *Consuming places*. London: Routledge.
- Walters, M. (1995). *Globalisation*. London: Routledge.
- Wood, R. (1984). Ethnic tourism, the state and cultural change in Southeast Asia. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 11, 353-374.
- Wood, R. (1993). *Tourism, culture and the sociology of development*. In M. Hitchcock, V.T. King and M.J.G. Parnwell (eds) *Tourism in South East Asia* (pp. 48/70). London: Routledge.