

A very similar version of this paper was published in *Tourism development: growths, myths and inequalities*. P. Burns and M. Novelli (eds.). Wallingford: CAB International. Pages 141-158.

THIS IS NOT THE FINAL VERSION PUBLISHED!!!

10

A contextual approach to the power relation between *tourism and development*¹

ANTONIO-MIGUEL NOGUÉS PEDREGAL
Universitas Miguel Hernández of Elche
Spain

Introduction

Tourism is one of the names of power. The noun *tourism* is the discursive form given to the complex set of symbolic and technical *dispositifs* (devices) that, linking the visible and the expressible (Deleuze, 1986), allows certain groups of people to spend their leisure time away from their quotidian, including what they do at those places and the processes induced. Actually, *tourism* produces meanings and realities, especially in those contexts where its economic potentialities are emphasized as the sole mean for development.

In Carboneras, for example, a small coastal village in the desertified south-easternmost province of Almería (Spain), the hotel *Azata del Sol* with more than 20 floors and 411 rooms and a resort of seven more hotels, a 18-holes golf course and 1.500 condominiums was being built just 28 meters away from the shoreline in the beach of *El Algarrobico* within the limits of the Natural Park of *Cabo de Gata-Nijar*. Yet resorted to the Supreme Court the tardy expropriation, on November 2007 was announced that the entire resort was to be demolished promptly. After environmentalists legal actions and public opinion campaigns in the media pressured politicians, and against the 70.000 villagers allegations

¹ Acknowledgements

A previous version of this chapter appeared as an article in the journal, Tourism and Hospitality: Planning & Development, volume 4, issue 1, pages 75-87.

The earliest draft of this paper was presented to the Interim Symposium of the Research Committee on International Tourism (RC-50) of the International Sociological Association (ISA) held in Mytilini (14th-16th May 2004); and it was most recently presented to the 5th Annual Tourism Symposium of the University of Brighton at Eastbourne (22nd- 23rd June 2006). I am most grateful to the participants at both conferences for their helpful comments, and especially to Prof. Jeremy Boissevain (Univ. Amsterdam) and Prof. Ricardo Sanmartín (Univ. Complutense de Madrid), and the two anonymous referees, whose insightful comments and suggestions made this paper worthy to be published.

collected during the public hearing of the new planning and several protest marches with thousands of local demonstrators in support of the development project, the *Junta de Andalucía* (autonomous government of Andalucía) reassessed the area as “land protected from building” and urged the expropriation. However, in the name of the ‘general interest’ and to ‘ensure the social and economic development of the province’, all the three levels of the Spanish administration system had backed during 20 years this immense tourism project and harvested the political hay. The *Junta de Andalucía* had sold in 1999 the plot to the developers, approved the *Plan de Ordenación de Recursos Naturales* (PORN - Natural Resources Planning) of the Natural Park of *Cabo de Gata-Níjar* in 1994, subsidised the project in 2002 within the Sustainable Development Plan of the Natural Park and had a stake in the venture. The local government had authorised the construction and exempted it from municipal building taxes and duties in the late eighties. And the State Ministry of Environment failed to enforce the 1988 Coasts Law on time.

In a piece titled ‘the demolition of a hotel and of the hopes of a village’ (*Ideal*, Nov. 26th 2007), a local columnist wondered whether after all these years of great expectations any of the environmental impact statements recently revised had included the social and cultural consequences of the end of this tourism *development* project? Whether the hotel was constructed within the limits of the Natural Park according to the PORN as argued by environmentalist groups, it is a political issue. Whether the *Plan Urbanístico Parcial* (Partial Urban Development Planning that permits the edificies) was approved before the *Ley de Costas* (Coasts Law) came into force on January 1st 1988 establishing an area up to 200 metres inland from the coast where some construction restrictions are in place, it is a legal matter. To understand why the villagers demonstrated in much favour of the project and against the governmental order of demolition and the environmentalists arguments is, alternatively, a straight anthropological research subject.

Carboneras is not the sole example of conflicts over land use in tourism environments. Different ethnographic accounts show how competition for the foreshore happens in Indonesia, Norway, the Canary Islands or in some spot of the 24 kms of the Slovenian coast (Boissevain, 1996; Boissevain and Selwyn, 2004). Also, the mediation of leisure activities in the signifying process has already been considered in the production of landscapes (Aitchinson *et al.*, 2000). And the spatial relation between power and tourism has been deeply analysed by those on political economy (Britton, 1982) and those on post-structuralist perspectives (Church & Coles, 2007) to name just the classic and the latest works. In Zahara de los Atunes, a formerly fishing community in the southernmost province of Cádiz (Spain), the Minister of Environment himself spectacularly enforced on January the 10th 2001 the Coasts Law via blowing up with 175 kgs. of dynamite an unfinished seventies hotel. Broadcasted as a governmental achievement in the “recovering of the seashore”, in the same location there are today an impressive tourism resort that includes a golf course, a couple of hotels and *urbanizaciones* (summer private neighbour communities) with some hundreds

of condominiums. No local demonstration against these constructions have been made and only a couple of bloggers and environmentalist groups have raised the usual complaints.

A comparison between the Munxar consortium and the Hilton project in Malta leads Boissevain to conclude that locals' reactions partly depend on the stage of tourism development, for in certain locations "inhabitants [are] resigned to the congestion, and many depended on the tourist industry" (2004:254). Gill shows how the power relations shift as the resort community grows and evolves along several phases of residents' involvement: from a pro-development attitude to a concern on environmental, social and economic sustainability on the spatial pattern of development (2007:132-134). Yet one of the main questions is unsolved. Why is that in some places locals are willing to accept tourism development projects and to defend them against any detriment, and in other locations these projects find the absolute opposition and rejection of the people *at some point* of their implementation. To think that a fracture in the continuity of the production of meaning may explain it, seems quite an appealing working hypothesis to consider. And this chapter works on it.

It is essential to inquire into the social and cultural processes involved in those contexts where tourism is presented and valued as the main paved road to economic progress, if any possible contribution from the humanities and the social sciences is ever to be made to this book's main theme. Thus, I argue for a theoretical scheme to assist both researchers and policy-makers doing their work in tourism environments. From this perspective, the complex set of symbolic and technical *dispositifs* called tourism, should also be dissected as a powerful mediator in the production of meaning and realities. Hence anthropology should revisit culture as the central notion of the discipline. It must distinguish unambiguously between 'valuing' (*poner en valor*) selected cultural features as heritage (*patrimonio*) and 'making culture worthy' (*dar valor*) by stressing the importance and usefulness of ensuring the continuity in the production of sense and meaning for human development. When concerned on the process of implementation rather than on the academic feed-back analysis of tourism impacts (Nogués, 1995; Jenkins, 1999), anthropology shall focus on the absorbability of culture within the dialogical appropriation of tourism *dispositifs* through use (Martín-Barbero, 1987) rather than on the cultural resistances to tourism strategic and ideological mechanisms using dialectics. Besides, this distinction helps to ponder *from where* (whose standpoints?) those measures are being designed and *to where* (to whom?) are those measures addressed. Are specific actions planned *from the inside* or *from the outside*? Else, are these addressed *to the inside* (intended to meet locals' expectations and needs) or, conversely, *to the outside* (satisfying visitors' demands and motivations for travelling)?

In order to acknowledge how can anthropology contribute to the welfare of people facing tourism as a mean for development, the question of why *at some point* of the tourism development process locals (or some local groups) detach themselves

from it, must be answered in the first place. This is the challenge. Then, it might be a good idea to start from the beginning. Probably.

Anthropological sketches on tourism

Anthropology is already an old social science whose object of study is amphibologically referred as *culture*, whose approach is comparative and holistic, and whose aim is to understand social groups in their becoming. Hundreds of definitions of culture have been made since Tylor's (1871), but very few of them have been successfully implemented in tourism studies or development studies. This might be because, currently, most of ethnographies on these themes are problem-oriented and theoretical thinking is hemmed into the politics of definitions. Notable criticism over the lack of theorisation (Franklin and Crang, 2001), the individual efforts of researchers and the peripheral situation of certain groups in tourism research has appeared (Lengkeek and Swain, 2006), and has led some authors to call for a post-disciplinary movement towards the production of knowledge in tourism studies (Coles et al, 2005). This paper positions itself within these trends. Hardly any of the numerous books, articles and reviews on tourism, cultural heritage or sustainable development published each year examine culture as a central notion to the arguments. Therefore, culture appears too often as a polysemous noun whose operational meaning is, in the best case, mutually presumed by the author and the reader or, at worst, cloaked by a post-modern writing style.

If anthropology is to comprehend social life holistically, then, the discipline must retrace itself back to culture and to its dia-logical production/reproduction. Rather than questioning whether there is such a difference between tourism and culture (Rojek and Urry, 1997), what is actually meant by 'cultural tourism' (Richards, 2001), what is to be sustained in tourism development (McCool *et al.*, 2001), whether 'culture' may offer variety and the possibility of tourist product differentiation (Boniface, 1999) or what 'community' it is being referred to when addressing community-based-tourism (Hall and Richards, 2000), to name just a few of the usual debates, anthropology should allow for an important distinction in the way of approaching that complex set of *dispositifs* that have been textually reduced to one term: *tourism*. Tourism has been basically approached as a 'business' or as a 'phenomenon' and, still, the issue about its precise meaning remain unsolved (Burns, 1999: 23-37). Besides on the capital concentration as a characteristic, the general agreement on which are the four elements of the tourism-related system (travel demand, tourism intermediaries, destination characteristics and consequences) to be studied, does not avoid that the lack of precision seriously reduces the potentialities of anthropological analyses and their possibilities of implementation. I suggest that another effective approach would be to see 'tourism as a context' (Nogués, 2003).

Within this conception of tourism as a context, explorers may find interesting to privileged two lines of research among some others. On the one hand, as

Boissevain's edited book ethnographically demonstrated, to understand what is tourism, how intercultural processes work, and how 'development' planning can be carried out, social research should focus on one pole of the host-guest tourist continuum: "in the so-called hosts, the people who both service tourists' needs and are the object of their attention" (1996:1). Though still a traditional view on the anthropological study of tourism, the book sketches the need for a change in perspective towards Gramsci's positions. What happens when tourist destination villagers are tourist themselves elsewhere? Can anthropology study the changes in *destination culture* only as a *reaction* to tourist arrival or, quite the reverse, are those produced through the mutual power relation between visitors and local residents? If tourism is analysed as a vehicle that eases the globalisation process and as an homogenising agent, why is that tourism industry cannot ensure the success of a tourism type in a certain destination that easily? The importance of taking into consideration a dialogical perspective is basic for, at least, two goals. First, to comprehend holistically the social and cultural complexity of human groups dynamic and, second, to answer whether any specific measure is sustainable or not according to local needs and hopes, i.e. their culture. As Timothy posed, anthropology should study those to be empowered so they are able "to initiate (i.e. authorized) their own development goals and programmes" (2007:204).

The second line of research would overcome the sterile debates on definitions and on whether this practice or that measure could be qualified as 'sustainable tourism' or 'cultural tourism'. Since movement is shown while walking, neither 'sustainable tourism' nor 'un-sustainable tourism' (not even tourism!) exist independently of the practices that are to be name as such, academics concerned on tourism development implementation must reject logomachy. In its place researchers should devote their analytical efforts to comprehend those practices that gives meaning (content) to the labels and to the labelling process itself. It is a political issue (an institutional power matter) to decide (to name), for instance, whether the present tourism development practices *are* 'sustainable tourism development' (STD), or which STD policies and measures should be implemented in the inland *comarcas* (administrative ensemble of neighbouring municipalities) in the Costa Blanca (Alicante – Spain). Looking at 'what people say they do and what they actually do' it is most used to understand the value/ideal system of a society. And entering the politics of definitions through the looking-glass of 'how people call what they do and who names it' tracks power down to the level of discourse and locates anthropology far away of the observable and daily practices. However to examine *what do those that say that they do* links the realm of discourse production with the daily practices that produce and reproduce meanings; while unveiling the strength of the most vivid and distinguishing of all the anthropological methods: the participant observation. To scrutinize how lifes evolves and how achieve its meaning is, in my opinion, quite a helpful way to understand why so many tourism development projects fail *at some point* of their implementation process to encompass the local community.

Because I partially agree with Hughes that ‘the solution of the environmental crisis of tourism does not rest solely with *scientific management* (emphasis added; quoted in Bramwell, 2004:32), I propose a comprehensive and contextual approach to the destination’s culture. I assume that tourism can definitely play an important role in regions where traditional economic activities are in downturn (Reid, 2003) and that there is an inevitable mass-tourism mode-of-production in the European Mediterranean coasts. Consequently, I suggest to investigate the production of meaning and sense in contexts where tourism occurs or is the desired outcome: privileging pragmatics over semantics. Instead of playing the role tourism development managers and agents, I suggest to focus on how central notions such as sustainability, development, tourism or cultural heritage acquire their meanings through social practices in specific contexts.

In accordance with this, what do I mean by culture? In plain terms, social anthropology is a scientific discipline that studies the diversity of human groups in all the spheres of the social life: their expressive and rational manifestations, the transformation of and their adaptation to territories, the modes of social relations, what is said and what is done. It analyses, in short, the compound of social practices, contexts, realities and facts that *gives sense* to the process of life in society. Culture, thus, is that compound of manifestations, modes, what is said, what is done, circumstances and contexts that *acquires its sense* within a specific group and *gives sense* to the social life (either traditional or fluid identities). Thus I contend that any planned tourism development process can only be felt as one’s own if the process maintains those historic and cultural memories that *give sense* to quotidian-ness and that qualify the territory making it the locals’ property. The standard development processes do not take into account that society is a process and fracture the idea of cultural continuity (Mandly, 2002:208). Consequently, any STD must pay attention to the continuity in the production and reproduction of sense (culture itself) designing measures to preserve the most of it. This paper must be read from this point of view.

Tourism and development

It is widely accepted that current STD programmes are anything but sustainable and that sustainability has become a state-of-mind (Blühdorn, 2002). Daily practices of tourism development --that is, those actually implemented by local agents in tourism destinations-- transform ‘nature’ into ‘environment’ and/or ‘culture’ into ‘cultural heritage’ –*patrimonio*, a metonymy of culture-- and are discursively thought according to the market economy and the economic logic of accumulation, interest and benefit (i.e., du Cros, 2001).

During the World Decade for Cultural Development (1988-1997), UNESCO emphasised the importance of cultural heritage as a mean for economic development. The European Union stressed culture as a development resource for the regions through financial initiatives and programmes such as LEADER,

PRODER or RAPHAEL. Moreover, the World Tourism Organisation called the attention to culture as determinant of the growth of tourism consumption. From then on, 'culture' appears as a keyword that organises politics and the binomial culture-tourism has become a token for STD discourses. Because of this, the UNESCO declarations of World Cultural Heritage are everywhere politically and administratively managed as tourism slogans for increasing tourists arrivals (Harrison and Hitchcock, 2006). In most tourism destinations the policy-making actively transforms social and cultural meanings into resources either through the commercialization of natural landscapes and cultural heritages such as in the revised Tourism Master Plan of 1989 in Malta (Boissevain, 2003:99), or through the management of a modernization discourse in urban planning as shown in the case of El Puerto de Santa María in the south of Spain during the last 15 years (Nogués, forthcoming). Since the early 1990s, the tourism policy of the *Junta de Andalucía* has sought to expand the offerings beyond traditional coastal and summer tourism. This included an ambitious programme to face the challenges of the new millennium within a global free-market economy: the Plan for the Integral Development of Tourism (1993) and the General Plan for Cultural Assets (1997). In this context, the economic transformation of culture into cultural heritage pursues the STD, and the mercantilisation of the Andalusian intangible discursively appeared as the unique reality (Nogués, 2002). This 'metacultural product' (García, 1998) labelled *patrimonio* by the *expert-ness*, or 'culture' by the tourism industry, became a key element for human development in tourism contexts. In several international conferences, the World Tourism Organisation considered the new potentialities of cultural tourism. In April 1999, at the meeting held in Uzbekistan, the question addressed was "*how can Humanity draw upon the vast reservoir of tourist demand as to benefit the heritage?*" In 2001 the WTO published *Cultural Heritage and Tourism Development*, and in February 2006, the meeting in Yogyakarta (Indonesia) dealt with *Cultural tourism and local communities*. As a result of this global move from 'nature/culture' to 'environment/cultural heritage', tourism dynamics seem to have turned centre-periphery models over by stressing the pragmatic side of culture either as a resource or a commodity, or a means for social redistribution of wealth and poverty alleviation, or for territorial equilibrium. What leads us to an interesting paradox in development planning: periphery now owns the *culture*, while the centre keeps administering the *expertise*.

The people colonised by the West were usually defined in terms of the lack of culture as barbarians or savages; and the legitimating of such colonial system were done in terms of the need for civilisation or evangelisation; even for the refinement of a bourgeoisie culture as the rhetoric figures analysed by Said (1993) shows. Simultaneously, along with the democratization process of leisure time and tourism consumption in Western countries (Chadefaud, 1987; Furlough, 1998), the notion of culture smoothly shifted to include almost exclusively what people made, and was ultimately materialised in what could be consumed by visitors (artefacts, performances, food, attractions...) as Adorno and Horkheimer's 'culture industry' illustrates (1944). At that time, 'culture'

distinguished (in Bourdieu's sense) (1979) and discriminated people in terms of its lack or its way of consumption; and later has become one of those keywords that, according to Williams (1976), organise politics within those ideoscapes proposed by Appadurai (1990).

Current hyper-industrial mobility has brought to the metropolises those formerly uncultivated people, and cultivated people have flown to peripheral and semi-peripheral areas. Touring cultures may have blurred the differences between tourism and culture by de-differentiating the correlation between culture and society as Rojek and Urry (1997) have suggested². Notwithstanding, this 'post-colonial' hybridity –as if colonialism had finished-- has developed into a "neo-colonisation of quality space" rather than into a socio-cultural merging in the Spanish Mediterranean coasts (Gaviria, 1974, 1976; Jurdao and Sánchez, 1990; O'Reilly, 2000; Aledo and Rodríguez, 2002; Mazón and Aledo, 2005; Nogués, 2007; Haug et al. 2007). This presence of outsiders has eased the appearance of a socio-spatial stratification through the mushroom-type urbanizations and secondary residences, the construction of strong community boundaries among foreigners, a revived demonstration effect among Spaniards, and has submerged many tourism development policies under *techno-tropism* – a peripheral way of referring to what Dann cryptically calls 'language of tourism': the prevalence of a paradigm that assumes the modernistic qualities of monologue and social control that pervaded the industrial society, and leaves little or no voice for the demanding visitor or the visited (Lengkeek and Swain, 2006). In other words, *techno-tropism* not only defines local culture –whatever may be today referred to as such—according to the capital and broader geopolitical interests, but understands it and administers it through the instrumental knowledge of the visitors drawing up the boundaries of what is it for and how to preserve it. Current tourism policies conceive culture only in its metonymy (*patrimonio*) and not as the compound that gives sense to social life. In most tourism contexts culture it is not commoditised, but mainly deprived of its transformative power, what makes a regenerative development planning impossible.

The ethnological-friendly approach proposed in these pages is born out of these neo-colonial processes and aims to understand them. Derived from Foucault's notions of knowledge and power, the 'post-colonial' prevailing discourses and the use of Western *expertness* development planning (Powell, 2006; Summer, 2006), this analytical model stresses the study of mediations and the dialogics of cultural receptions (Martín-Barbero, 1987) rejecting to enter into the essentialist commoditization debate.

² Quite on the contrary, in many Andalusian tourism destinations the promotion of cultural heritage is precisely the political instrument promoted to differentiate one destination from another, and to stress local or regional identity.

Culture in tourism contexts

Particularly among classic anthropologists and sociologists who dealt with tourism, the idea of clashing societies or cultures in conflicts is still prevalent (Núñez, 1963; Smith, 1977; and to some extent Robinson, 1999, and Rojek and Urry, 1997). Acculturation theory ontologically conceives cultures mainly in its territorial (spatial) dimension and, consequently, also as mere recipients where tourists land for ‘grazing’³ and tourism industry, poured by capitalist forces to foster and preserve underdevelopment, creates ‘peripheral enclaves’ (Britton, 1982)⁴. This reductive vision of what a culture is, has caused tourism research to be theorised in terms of static models (Meethan, 2003) and has kept tourism researchers focusing on dialectics rather than on dialogics; in so doing, both the anthropological understanding of socio-cultural processes in tourism contexts and the production of knowledge are reduced.

Contrary to dialectics, many ethnographic accounts demonstrate how tourism-receiving societies daily structure their interaction with outsiders and cope with tourism and tourists in many diverse ways (Boissevain, 1996). At this point it is interesting to note that, somehow, the differences in the implementation of tourism development programmes at the central Western countries (i.e. Europe) and those at the periphery, resemble and reflect the interiorizing of the roles of the ‘colonised’ and of the ‘coloniser’. Destinations in Europe show how, for instance, at the Stockfish festival in Norway (Puijk, 1996:219) locals attend the festival as something vivid because “most of them also have holidays and are regularly tourists in other places”. In The Netherlands the construction of a local narrative, closely intertwined with their own experience of being a citizen of Amsterdam, is not the detached narrative of the tourist industry, but one linked to the popular culture of the city (Dahles, 1996:244). Also in Europe, Odermatt (1996) demonstrates that Sardinians in the village of Abbassanta may agree with the commercialization of culture (‘cultural heritage’) as being a question of pride, but many may not accept outsider management of the same heritage. Though this case refers to a prehistoric monument, it might be accepted that an ‘ethnologically-friendly’ approach to tourism development must pass through the management, not only of the resources, of course, but also principally of the meanings. Furthermore, to talk of the production of meanings is to talk about power and politics.

³ Zygmunt Bauman updates Boorstin’s classical view and coined the term ‘tourist syndrome’ as being characterised by ‘looseness of attachment’ with the place visited, the ‘grazing behaviour’ of the consumption of ‘pure relationships’, and the ‘frailty of relationships’ into wherever they go (Franklin, 2003).

⁴ Very explicit in those cases sponsored by the World Bank, the International Monetary Fund, the World Trade Organization and the various multinational funds and financial instruments for development.

The dialogics of tourism space

The scheme helps to understand socio-cultural processes in tourism contexts. It analyses the dialogic relations that exist between, on the one hand, the macro-social conditions imposed (a) by the physical presence of the tourism industry in form of lodgements (hotels, apartments, urbanizations), restaurants, leisure enterprises or transport companies, (b) by the symbolic presence of the *dispositifs* of ideological dominance that condition the desirable, and (c) the instruments of institutional power (governments, city councils, mass-media, entrepreneur associations, etc.) that condition the feasible, and, on the other hand, the possibilities generated from the microsocial as shown in what is said and what is done by the people. *Tourism space* is the outcome of the relationship between these macro-social structures, theorised as constrictive, and the microsocial practices, considered as capable. This reminds us of Chadeffaud's (1987) for whom tourism space represents in time and space the projection of the ideals and myths of global society, and converts goods into tourist products and territories. Therefore, it appears a referential frame, furnished by those images and values that *give sense* to everyday life, through which social practices are understood.

Understanding this dialogical model requires partially overcoming the centrality of the equation 'culture equals territory' (derived from the acculturative perspective and the *hic et nunc* functionalist axiom), and distinguishing the spatial --locative-- dimension (the "tourism environment") of a society from that of the expressive dimension of culture (Bakhtin, 1965). Consequently, social theorists ought to differentiate (therefore, name) both dimensions methodologically, to arrange the data (actions, practices) observed and collected during the fieldwork, and to analyse them in their proper context. Only by doing this will social science be able to provide perspectives distinct to those derived from the *expert's* administration of the desirable.

FIGURE1 ABOUT HERE

Caption: Theoretical model of the 'conversion of place through tourism space'.

Figure 1 charts the model: imagine a dynamic graph progressing from left to right. Imagine that visitors land in a place where there is already an existing society. Imagine now that the place shrinks as tourists gradually consumes "quality space" by means of services and accommodations facilities for visitors. Then, in the spatial dimension appear (1) a 'tourist territory' where to locate these premises on a map, and (2) a 'place', that indicates where insiders dwell. But tourism also consumes local culture; therefore, in that Bakhtinian expressive dimension of culture it might be distinguishes (1) a 'tourist setting' from where tourists are seduced to find their motivation to travel, and (2) a 'place' through which locals express themselves as a meaningful group (i.e. community). The resulting 'negotiated ground' in both spatial and expressive dimensions suggests the

dialogics and the diachronics of the model. The corollary of the conversion -- neither simple transformation nor occupation-- of the place through the mediation of tourism space occurs when the 'place' is perceived, experienced, interpreted and understood through the perceptual and expressive world of the visitors; when, progressively, tradition vanishes as cultural amalgamation and is managed for residents in the same way as it is for visitors; when, in the end, the 'place' converts through 'tourism space' and the profitable meanings of the tourism industry appear as the hegemonic discourse in the most diverse cultural, social, and economic daily activities and locations (Nogués, 2006).

To approach the study of cultural processes within tourism contexts from this model is different to what Selwyn calls the study of the *transformation processes*. He is interested in the way that the 'raw materials' of tourism (particularly land, labour, raw materials themselves and the body) are transformed within the processes which are either or both politico-economic and ideological in character (Lengkeek and Swain, 2006). This is similar to what Duim expresses with his analysis of *tourismscapes*: the complex processes of association and ordering people and things (Duim, 2005). The conversion model would explain even those cases where "a state characterised by an axiological confusion between what belongs to culture and what pertains to tourism" as Balinese authorities themselves call *kebudayaan parawisata* (tourist culture) (Picard, 1995:57).

I argue that the generation of *tourism space* cannot be analysed as a mechanical reflect of any infrastructural or discursive determination, nor as a dialectical synthesis of the inner contradictions of the tourism system, but should be analysed as a dialogical process. As said at the beginning, the working hypothesis states that tourism space is neither a product directed against the native population of a certain destination defined as peripheral by the neo-colonial ideology of capitalism; nor the resistance soil of imagined communities that reacts against the invasion of their homeland and *their* culture; nor the space created by Frankfurtian-like contrivances that alienate hyper-industrialised societies through leisure time management. To understand the transformative capabilities (hence, regenerative) of the dialogical processes of meaning that gives content to tourism space, anthropologists must attend to the reception. This is, to deeply comprehend the cultural dynamics in tourism contexts, academics concerned on the implementation of tourism projects as a social development mean cannot analyse only the tourism process as coming from the *outside* (be tourist agents, neo-colonial capital, hotel chains, or cultural tourism experts) and thought of it only as something *towards the outside* (be tourists or incomes). Much on the contrary, anthropologists must look at how the residents of the destinations *make sense* of their own processes in society --'popular culture', and, additionally, how they themselves appropriate of (absorb) those *dispositifs* that construct the masses (be either tourism, mobile phones, internet...) through its use and avoid the dissolution of that popular culture implied in the very same construction of the masses (Martín-Barbero, 1987).

Some ethnographic examples

Let me illustrate the argument with a picture (see Figure 2). The photograph was taken deep inside the *Axarquía*, an Andalusian *comarca* in the *hinterland* of the *Costa del Sol* that deepens its most precious historical memory in the times of the Castilian conquest of *Al-andalus* at the end of the XV Century and the subsequent uprisings of the XVI. The board is an invitation, truly full of historical discontinuities, to enjoy the relaxing atmosphere under a carved panelled ceiling at a *mudéjar* inn along with the exotic savour of the typical *mozárabe* cuisine, as well as of the globalised taste of international cooking. This billboard, however, offers the possibility of getting closer to the cultural processes in the tourism environment of the *Axarquía*, at least, from two perspectives. It can be underlined the historical confusion between the Christian-Visigoth culture of the *mozárabes* under the Cordoba Caliphate rule during the IX Century, and the *mudéjar* culture of those Muslims that lived in the Christian kingdoms of Spain until 1502 when the law baptised them as *moriscos* (Christianised Muslims). This mixture of times and cultures may result too offensive for critics who conceive of tourism only as an external phenomenon that commoditizes culture, fractures the complex world of meanings, uproots historical memory, de-structures social groups and, eventually, unifies every culture under the umbrella of ‘international cuisine’ as a metaphor of a global and de-localised world.

FIGURE 2 ABOUT HERE

Caption: Historical mixture (*mestizaje*) in tourism contexts. Costa del Sol, 2001

On the other hand, the billboard also allows to focus on the dialogics of the cultural processes in tourism contexts, as it demonstrates the appropriation of the historic-cultural sense using it as a tourist catchword. This cultural tourism venture (if anyone dares to name it in such way) claim for the friendliness and hospitality that, in the mythical past, supposedly characterised the ancient hostelries that lodged travellers, muleteers and wayfarers. To understand the message of this board fully, anthropologists must look at it through the meanings produced by tourism space.

Against the de-personalisation of the overcrowded *customer* service that distinguishes the majority of the hotels-restaurants in the *Costa de Sol*, the *posada-mesón* at Archez offers (starting with the redundancy of the title: inn-hostelry) a distinguishing and personalised service to each of the *hosts*. Following Garcia Calvo’s distinction of the two worlds of significance, the invitation clearly refers to the world of the linguistic production: the world *on which* we talk. Yet, the content of the billboard itself performs an astonishing capacity of appropriation of the key traits of the tourism industry (hence its focus *towards the outside*) but starting with the historical essence of the *comarca* (designed *from the inside*). Such a sign comprises the absolute strength and richness of the *mestizaje*

(mixture), and is evidence for the role played by the negotiation of meanings in the production and reproduction of culture in tourism contexts.

During my fieldwork in the Axarquía, I collected several other examples of this appropriation of the production of new meanings through use. Probably one of the most remarkable one was that hand-written road indicator pointing to the *Ruta del Socavón* (route of the roadway full of holes in the road surface) next to the official one that indicates the airport. In a tourist territory such as Andalucía or the Costa del Sol, completely traversed by hundreds of tiny and detailed tourist routes (route of the sun and the avocado, route of the olive oil and the hills (see Figure 3), route of Washington Irving, route of the southern Pyrenees, route of the *almorávides* and *almohades*...) this sign acts as an ironic complaint-sheet. It points at both the authorities who do not pave the road and to the heart of tourism's unique concerns: the tourists and their facilities. On another occasion, a goatherd I meet by the road clearly differentiated between the metric system and the *fanegas* (6.400m²) depending on whether he was referring to how many plots could he get out of an hectare (the world *about which* we talk), or he was just telling me some happenings and family stories (the world *from which* we talk).

FIGURE 3 ABOUT HERE.

Caption: Fracturing continuity: a territorial dilemma at a cross-road... where to Granada or where to Málaga, 2001.

Analysis of and control over the mediation role of this tourism space is, for these reasons, one of the few ways to stop the fracture (or discontinuity) in the production of sense, and to give the production and reproduction of culture its own position. "There is—as Odermatt concludes—another kind of economics to be taken into account in the analysis of tourism development" (1996:98).

Redifining tourism development: 'from the inside to the inside' by 'making culture worthy'

Applying the dimensions and spheres of the analytical model, several ethnographic examples reveal that in order to make an appropriate social development planning in tourism environments the measures should take into account *from where* the actions over culture are designed and thought, and *to where* these actions are to be addressed to. There are examples of this dialogical redefinition of meanings both in tourists producing societies located at the core, and in 'touristified' societies in the periphery. For instance, the authorities of Abassanta (Sardinia) acknowledged the feasibility of 'from the inside to the inside development practices' when preparing a photographic exhibition to recover the prehistoric monument in order to "re-discovered Losa" not only for tourist but also for the residents themselves (Odermatt, 1996:102). In the contrived *techno-comarca* of Bonaigua (in the *hinterland* of the Costa Blanca in Alicante), the

villages celebrated a traditional gastronomy festival in non-tourist season both for visitors and residents (Nogués, 2006), thus making the local culture worthy. In Amsterdam a group of seniors faced the de-contextualisation offered by the guided tours along the channels, and recalled their own experiences to share them with the visitors through the inner spirit of *Mokum* (Amsterdam) (Dahles, 1996). Conclusively, in Bali the local authorities uphold the *balisering* (balinization of Bali) with the intention of recovering the spirit of the island for the Balinese people (Picard, 1995).

Everyone would agree that the road indicators (see Figure 3) of those mythical ‘route of the sun and the avocados’, or ‘route of the olive oil and the hills’ are proposed *from the outside-to the outside*: that is, projected by tourism agents with no connections to the place, and thinking only on ‘grazing’ visitors. On the contrary, the case of the *posada-mesón* shown in the photograph was arranged *from the inside-to the outside*: this is, prepared by someone emotionally and culturally tied up to the place and its history but bearing in mind the visitors’ expectations. Regardless of this important difference, in both cases, the tourist representation of accurate features (there were *mudéjares* in the XVI Century, and there are olive oil and avocados in the Axarquía today) for tourists do not present them as the result of concrete historical practices, but simply as buzzwords to attract visitors. This de-contextualisation of culture directly affects residents’ relation to their own historical roots, fracturing the production of a common cultural memory, and making impossible a regenerative social development.

The standard sustainable tourism developments planning barely consider insiders’ ideas for two reasons. One, tourism is addressed to bring investments and investors (by definition located in the outside). Two, because insiders, due to the conversion of place through tourism space process, have partly accepted the hegemonic of tourism as the main developer (sometimes the unique agent of development) and have shaped local practices according to it. Alternatively, as Kanbur puts it: “it is extremely difficult for outsiders to induce policy reform in a country from the outside, for the outside tail to wag the internal political economy dog” (1998:4). Indeed, in most Andalusian *comarcas* tourism space directly influences the way culture itself is produced and reproduced by local agents, to such an extent that tourism investments are seen almost as the unique “panacea for a stagnating agrarian economy and as a deterrent to high unemployment rates” (Crain, 1996:44). This extended situation forces social scientists to overlook sustainability and to think of new development tourism strategies posed in terms of the continuity in the production of sense and meaning.

Quite the reverse to these developments towards the outside, the ‘ethnologically-friendly approach’ is generated *from within*. The main aim is not to overcome ancient dichotomies such as ‘modernity’ versus ‘tradition’ or ‘centre’ versus ‘periphery’ (prevailing in dialectical approaches), but to pore over the production of culture as a meaningful set of signs (therefore, contextualised), and the reproduction of tradition as a meaningful set of shared memories. The challenge is

to encourage a community without breaking the sense of cultural continuity that daily shapes it, taking into consideration the dialogics implied in tourism contexts.

Conclusions

Since the late 1980s, many different agents have reified culture *from the outside*: social scientists writing on cultural heritage, the *expertness* of countless advisors and consultants, and various international institutions (UNESCO, the European Union, and the World Tourism Organisation). In the same way that nature was transformed into environment, so has culture become a metacultural product: cultural heritage (*patrimonio*) to be valued, a metonymy of ‘culture’ thought of as a tourism resource for the ‘sustainable’ development of many regions in the world. However, this idea of ‘sustainability’ is addressed *for the outside* and does not consider either the fracture provoked in the continuity in the production of meanings or the social and cultural consequences of such measures.

The analytical model presented here uses an anthropological perspective and brings the notion of culture back to the social science debate on development. It does not intend to decide whether tourism is good or bad, given that this is not a question to solve ethnographically. On the contrary, the model pays special attention to the continuity in the production of meaning within the capitalist mode-of-production in many tourist destinations. It distinguishes between ‘valuing cultural heritage’ and ‘making culture worthy’. This ethnologically-friendly approach to tourism development implies the full recognition of the mutual obligations implicit in the dialogic relationship between residents (host/insider) and visitors (guest/outsider) ruled by the laws of the market and commerce framed by capitalism, as well as the role played by culture as a meaningful set of practices that *gives sense* to quotidian-ness.

The various ‘sustainable’ approaches basically asserts for the local control over management and decision-making –what the neo-colonial discourse calls empowerment-- but seldom consider either the anthropological nature of the resources employed (‘cultural heritage’ as a simple metonymy of culture) or the social objective of the ‘product’ generated by social practices, which are the kernel of the model proposed. For this truly reason, it is important for human and social sciences to delimit the different spheres and dimensions playing and negotiating within a tourism environment (thus, creating it) and to recognise the fundamental mediation role of tourism space too,. Given that this approach intends to surmount the gap between the production of meaning and the management of this very same meaning, anthropology ought to pay close attention to those who are the final beneficiaries of such ‘product’ both in the instrumental and the expressive spheres of culture. Thus, the scheme distinguishes between the spatial and the expressive dimensions of culture (place, tourist territory, tourist setting, negotiated ground and tourism space) and explains how in many destinations the ‘place’ is perceived, experienced, interpreted and understood through the perceptual and expressive world of the visitors. I contend that the

anthropological analysis of the ‘conversion of the place through the meaningful mediation of tourism space’ helps to understand better the social and cultural processes in tourism environments. Consequently, it allows new types of actions and measures for the social development of tourist destinations that are thought *from the inside* and are addressed *to the inside* to be designed. In sum, the model vindicates the transformative power of culture, i.e. a regenerative social development, versus the neutral *techno-tropism* hegemonic in most tourism environments.

References

- Aledo, A. and M.J. Rodríguez (2002) “Movimientos migratorios contemporáneos. Los otros inmigrantes: cifras y problemas de los inmigrantes europeos en los municipios turísticos residenciales del Levante español”, in *IV Jornadas de Antropología de la UCAM*, Universidad Católica San Antonio, Murcia.
- Aitchison, C., N.E. Macleod and S.J. Shaw (2000) *Leisure and tourism landscapes*. Routledge, London.
- Appadurai, A. (1990) “Disjuncture and Difference in the Global Cultural Economy”, *Theory, Culture & Society*, 7, 295-310.
- Bakhtin, M. (1965) *La cultura popular en la Edad Media y el Renacimiento. El contexto de Françoise Rabelais*. Alianza Editorial, Madrid.
- Blühdorn, I. (2002) “Unsustainability as a frame-of-mind and how we disguise it: the silent counter-revolution and the politics of simulation”. *The Trumpeter*, 181, 59-69.
- Boissevain, J. (1996) “Introduction”, in *ibid.*, (ed.), *Coping with Tourists: European Reactions to Mass Tourism*, Berghahn Books, Oxford.
- Boissevain, J. (2003) “Confronting the Tourist Industry in Malta”, in Muršič, R. and Weber, I. (eds.), *Mediterranean Ethnological Summer School (Vol.5)*, Department of Ethnology and Cultural Anthropology, University of Ljubljana, Ljubljana.
- Boissevain, J. (2004) “Hotels, Tuna Pens and Civil Society: Contesting the Foreshore in Malta”, in J. Boissevain and T. Selwyn (eds.) *Contesting the Foreshore: Tourism, Society, and Politics on the Foreshore*. Amsterdam: University of Amsterdam Press. Pp. 233-260.
- Boniface, P. (1999) “Tourism and Cultures: Consensus in the Making?”, in M. Robinson and P. Boniface (eds.), *Tourism and Cultural Conflicts*. CABI Publishing, Wallingford.
- Bourdieu, P. [1979] *La distinción: Criterios y bases sociales del gusto*. Taurus, Madrid, 1999.
- Bramwell, B., ed. (2004) *Coastal Mass Tourism. Diversification and Sustainable Development in Southern Europe*. Channel View Publications, Clevedon.
- Britton, S.G. (1982) “The Political Economy of Tourism in the Third World”, *Annals of Tourism Research*, 9, 331-358.

Burns, P.M. (1999) *An introduction to tourism & anthropology*. Routledge, London

Chadefaud, M. (1987) *Aux origines du tourisme dans les pays de l'Adour. Du mythe à l'espace: un essai de géographie historique*. Département de géographie et d'aménagement de l'Université de Pau et des Pays de l'Adour, et Centre de recherche sur l'impact socio-spatial de l'aménagement (U.A. 911 – C.N.R.S), Pau.

Crain, M. (1996) "Contested Territories: the Politics of Touristic Development at the Shrine of El Rocío in Southwestern Andalusia", in Boissevain, J. (ed.), *Coping with Tourists: European Reactions to Mass Tourism*, Berghahn Books, Oxford.

Coles, T., D.T. Duval and C.M. Hall (2005) "Sobre el turismo y la movilidad en tiempos de movimiento y conjetura posdisciplinar". *Política y sociedad*, 42(1), 85-99.

Dahles, N. (1996) "The Social Construction of Mokum: Tourism and the Quest for Local Identity in Amsterdam", in Boissevain, J. (ed.), *Coping with Tourists: European Reactions to Mass Tourism*, Berghahn Books, Oxford.

Deleuze, G. (1986) *Foucault*. Ediciones Paidós Ibérica, Barcelona.

Duim, V.R. van der (2005) *Tourismscapes, an Actor-Network Perspective on Sustainable Tourism Development*. Wageningen University, Wageningen.

du Cros, H. (2001) "A New Model to Assist in Planning for Sustainable Cultural Heritage Tourism". *The International Journal of Tourism Research*, 3: 165-170.

Franklin, A. and Crang, M. (2001) "The trouble with tourism and travel theory" *Tourist Studies*, 1(1), 5-22.

Franklin, A. (2003) "The Tourist Syndrome: an Interview with Zygmunt Bauman", *Tourist Studies*, 3 (2), 205-217.

Furlough, E. (1998) "Making Mass Vacations: Tourism and Consumer Culture in France". *Comparative Studies in Society and History*, 40, 247-286.

García García, J.L. (1998) "De la cultura como patrimonio al patrimonio cultural", *Política y Sociedad*, 27, 9-20.

Gaviria, M. (1974) *España a go-gó. Turismo charter y neocolonialismo del espacio*. Turner, Ediciones Madrid.

Gaviria, M. (1976) *El turismo de invierno y el asentamiento de extranjeros en la provincia de Alicante*. Instituto de Estudios Alicantinos, Diputación de Alicante.

- Gill, A.M. (2007) "The politics of bed units. Growth control in the resort of Whistler, British Columbia", in A. Church and T. Coles (eds.), *Tourism, power and space*. Routledge, London and New York.
- Harrison, D. and M. Hitchcock, eds. (2006) *The politics of World Heritage: negotiating tourism and conservation*. Channel View Publications, Clevedon.
- Hall, D. and G. Richards, eds. (2000) *Tourism and sustainable community development*. Routledge, London and New York.
- Haug, B., Dann, G.M.S. and Mehmetoglu, M. (2007) "Little Norway in Spain. From Tourism to Migration", *Annals of Tourism Research*, 34 (1), 202-222.
- Horkheimer, M. and Th. W. Adorno [1944] *Dialéctica del iluminismo*. Editorial sur, Buenos Aires, 1971
- Jenkins, C.L. (1999) "Tourism academics and tourism practitioners: bridging the great divide", in D.P. Pearce and R.W. Butler *Contemporary issues in tourism development*. Routledge, London.
- Jurdao Arrones, F. and Sánchez Elena, M. (1990) *España, asilo de Europa*. Planeta, Barcelona.
- Kanbur, R. (1998) "Aid, Conditionality, and Debt in Africa". *Africa Notes*. Cornell University.
- Lengkeek, J. and Swain, M. eds. (2006) *Proceedings of the Symposium on Theoretical Innovations in Tourism Studies*, Wageningen 9-10 June 2005.
- McCool, S. F., R.N. Moisey and N.P. Nickerson (2001) "What Should Tourism Sustain? The Disconnet with Industry Perceptions of Useful Indicators", *Journal of Travel Research*, 40, 124-131.
- Mandly, A. (2002) "Aportación a la Comisión de Cultura y Patrimonio", in *Informe de la Aportaciones de Expertos/as a las Comisiones de Trabajo del Plan de Actuaciones Estratégicas para la Provincia de Málaga (MADECA 10)*, Excma. Diputación de Málaga, Málaga.
- Martín-Barbero, J. [1987] *De los medios a las mediaciones. Comunicación, cultura y hegemonía*. Editorial Gustavo Gili, 5ª ed., Barcelona, 1998.
- Meethan, K. (2003) "Mobile cultures? Hybridity, Tourism and Cultural Change". *Tourism and Cultural Change*, 1 (1), 11-28

- Mazón, T. and A. Aledo (2005) *Turismo residencial y cambio social. Nuevas perspectivas teóricas y empíricas*. Universidad de Alicante, Alicante.
- Nogués Pedregal, A.M. (1995) “Antropología y turismo rural”. *Gazeta de Antropología*, 11: 66-70.
- Nogués Pedregal, A.M. (2002) “Culture, Transactions and Profitable Meanings”, in Kockel, U. (ed.) *Culture and Economy. Contemporary Perspectives*, Ashgate, Willingdorf.
- Nogués Pedregal, A.M. (2003) “La cultura en contextos turísticos”, in *ibid* (coord) *Cultura y turismo*. Signatura ediciones, Sevilla.
- Nogués Pedregal, A.M. (2006) “Ruralismo y tecnotropismo: turismo y desarrollo en la Bonaigua”, *Pasos: revista de turismo y patrimonio cultural*, 4 (1), 53-68.
- Nogués Pedregal, A.M. (2007) “Quizás una cuestión de topología social: Moebius, la interculturalidad y los residentes europeos en Alicante”. *Revista Valenciana d’Etnologia*, 2, 33-58.
- Nogués Pedregal, A.M. (forthcoming) “Urbanismo y poder político local en entornos turísticos. La mediación del espacio turístico en la producción de significados”. *Gazeta de Antropología*.
- Núñez, Th. A. (1963) “Tourism, tradition and acculturation: weekendismo in a Mexican village”. *Ethnology*, 2 (3), 347-352
- Odermatt, P. (1996) “A Case of Neglect? The Politics of (Re)presentation: a Sardinian Case”, in Boissevain, J. (ed.), *Coping with Tourists: European Reactions to Mass Tourism*, Berghahn Books, Oxford.
- O’Reilly, K. (2000) *The British on the Costa del Sol: Transnational Identities and Local Communities*, Routledge, London.
- Picard, M. (1995) “Cultural Tourism in Bali”, in Lanfant, M-F., Allcock, J. B. and Brunner, E.M. (eds.), *International Tourism: Identity and Change*, Sage Publications, London.
- Powell, M. (2006) “Which knowledge? Whose reality? An overview of knowledge use in the development sector. *Development in Practice*, 16(6), 516-532.
- Puijk, R. (1996) “Dealing with Fish and Tourists: a Case Study from Northern Norway”, in Boissevain, J. (ed.), *Coping with Tourists: European Reactions to Mass Tourism*, Berghahn Books, Oxford.

- Reid, D. G. (2003) *Tourism, Globalization and Development. Responsible Tourism Planning*. Pluto Press, London.
- Richards, G., ed. (2001) *Cultural Attractions and European Tourism*. CABI Publishing, Wallingford.
- Robinson, M. (1999) "Cultural Conflicts in Tourism: Inevitability and Inequality", in M. Robinson and P. Boniface (eds.) *Tourism and Cultural Conflicts*, CABI Publishing, Wallingford.
- Rojek, C. and J. Urry, eds (1997) *Touring cultures. Transformations of Travel and Theory*. Routledge, London-New York.
- Said, E. [1993] *Cultura e imperialismo*. Anagrama, Barcelona, 1996.
- Smith, V. (ed) (1977) *Hosts and guests: the anthropology of tourism*. 1st ed. University of Pennsylvania Press, Philadelphia.
- Summer, A. (2006) "What is Development Studies". *Development in Practice*, 16(6), 664-650.
- Tylor, E.B. (1871) *Primitive culture: researchs into the development of mythology, philosophy, religion, language, art and custom*. J. Murray, London.
- Timothy, D.J. (2007) "Empowerment and stakeholder participation", in A. Church and T. Coles (eds.), *Tourism, power and space*. Routledge, London and New York.
- Williams, R. (1976) *Keywords*. Fontana, London.
- World Tourism Organization (2001) *Cultural Heritage and Tourism Development*. UNWTO Publications, Madrid.