

Anthropological interventions in tourism.

Tourism policy and the role of local authorities.

Intervention in policy-making: abstract

Anthropologists have debated their role in relation to development for nearly a century. While an ethical consensus has long been asserted, and sympathy with informants usually stressed, the agency of the anthropologist has remained problematic. From the critique of 'anthropologist as advocate' to a range of participatory action research models, anthropologists have been highly attuned to the relations of power between them, their informants and various kinds of authority (where the latter two are sometimes the same). Anthropologists have also turned their attention to policy and development, and often been involved in projects as participants as well as critical voices. However, what has been sorely lacking has been a coherent theory of governance which offers a realistic prospect of the opportunities for influence. This paper examines the idea of intervention in the context of existing governmental systems and debates on participatory governance. It questions what anthropologists 'do' and what roles they may adopt in policy-making in contemporary contexts.

1. tourism?

The question of anthropological intervention in tourism raises a number of conceptual problems. Put simply, it begs the questions, what is intervention, and, what is tourism? Both 'intervention' and 'tourism' are pseudo-categories, which present us with significant difficulties to progress our debates.

If we apply the term to everything from going on a picnic, to visiting a city gallery, to taking a package tour to a beach resort, to trekking the 'Inca Trail' or backpacking round India, or even to attending tourism conferences ('academic tourism'), then it is difficult to find clear lines of coherence within which to develop useful theoretical insights. It is even more difficult to specify how one might intervene in such a complex and broad range of activities across institutional, national, social and economic boundaries. However, a key criticism of tourism studies, and of anthropologies of tourism, is that they often begin from a position which conceptualises tourism as an external research object, and most particularly in economic terms (see also Abram and Waldren 1997). As Franklin and Crang have argued, *'our understanding of tourism has become fetishized as a thing, a product, a behaviour'* (2001: 6). That is, tourism is treated as,

'a series of discrete, localized events, where destinations, seen as bounded localities, are subject to external forces producing impacts, where tourism is a series of discrete, enumerated occurrences of travel, arrival, activity, purchase, departure, and where the tourist is seen as another grim incarnation of individualized "Rational Man"' (Ibid).

Yet a series of analytical approaches to tourism have reframed it away from the industry-led preoccupation with maximising economic gain, reconceptualising tourism as cultural practice, whether the pursuit of authenticity in the face of Modernity (MacCannell) or as an extension of imperialism (Nash 1989), as a way of seeing (Urry), a form of hybrid culture, or, as Franklin would have it, as a form of ordering. (2004). Franklin's approach contemplates tourism as a historically situated

social development that goes beyond a specific set of economic practices, and he is more interested in questions of how the *desire* to indulge in tourist practices was created and is maintained and pursued. Reconceptualised in this perspective, Franklin defines tourism as a significant rhizomic global phenomenon, often enchanted by the machinic (in relation to travel), multi-layered and diverse. But this sort of approach also suggests that it may be increasingly difficult to distinguish tourism from global Modernity or post-Modernity. If tourism is less a definable set of practices and more a way of living and organising our social relations (in relation to the understanding of social life as exhibition, Mitchell, 1991), then as an abstract concept, it may in fact be irreconcilable with the notion of 'intervention'. If it is a defining concept of our age, then, to echo a famous description of planning (Wildavsky, 1973), if tourism is everything, maybe it is nothing.

2. Intervention?

Intervention, too, is a loaded concept. It is a term used in many fields including medicine, international relations and economics, sometimes adopted as a euphemism for interference, regulation, imperialism or aggression, including war. Intervention implies modification or hindering, but the term requires an object, singular or plural. Is it a category that includes its relatives such as intercession, intermediation or interpretation? What kind of social role does intervention imply, and how does it differ from subversion, protest, engagement or management?

A common approach in tourism theory is exemplified by Carson Jenkins (1999), who argues a familiar normative line in urging academics to engage in commercial practice in order to be taken seriously by practitioners. For Jenkins, academics and their insular world of peer-review is preaching only to the converted, and the practitioners with their project-specific, profit-driven aims, encounter academics only when the latter move into the world of project consultancy. He argues that it is only through implementation that projects have any impact on development, and that academics can influence this only through a '*real-world participatory function which should benefit the project*', where '*the experience gained would also benefit teaching and future research*' (1999:63). In this view, academic knowledge for its own sake is the opposite of practical knowledge, and academic influence is only through tourism development project management. This casts the academic into a peripheral role in commercially-driven (profit-seeking) tourism development, and assumes that their influence can only be in the role of damage-limitation, mitigation or improvement in methodology, ruling out activities such as explicit resistance, counterintervention or protest. While anthropologists do count among the consultants employed by the tourism industry, there will be many whose sympathies and energies lie in quite different domains, and whose intellectual ambitions may be quite outside the current status-quo of consumer-capitalism based development. It leaves us facing the self-defeating question of whether change is best achieved by protesting powerlessly from the outside or whether working one's way up to a powerful position inside an organisation requires such internalisation of organisational codes that protest either begins to seem irrelevant, or leads to internal isolation.

The trouble with interventions like Jenkins's is that they supinely take for granted the premises of the world of commerce and leave the academic vainly scratching at the gate, a bit-part player in somebody else's game, whether that is private commerce

or public policy. There is no challenge, here, to the all-powerful image of the World Bank and its economic definition of tourism as a strategy for economic development, nor of the definition of tourism as an economic process with cultural 'effects' and 'impacts'. Jenkins' vision of commercial and governmental institutions as immutable institutions ignores Philip Abrams' observations that Bentham himself argued that government is a word which gives '*spurious concreteness and reality to that which has a merely abstract and formal existence*' (1977/1988: 58). One would hope that anthropologists now, at least, would recognise that government institutions are, like other forms of organisation, complex, inconsistent, heterogeneous and often consisting of competing divisions working with imperfect knowledge and politicised imperatives. 'Markets', too, are illusory effects of cumulative transactions and transactional practices. When 'market', 'state' and 'tourism' are equally abstract, it becomes impossible to make normative statements about who *should* 'intervene' and how.

Anthropologists, by definition, are not typically the kind of academic who never ventures out of their study. On the contrary, many anthropologists have been directly involved in political struggles in their chosen fields, and the commitment to participation has only deepened through the course of the discipline's history. Hence, we are sensitive about defining our relations in the field in terms of 'informants', acknowledging thereby that while Anthropology has something special to offer beyond everyday knowledge, it is not necessarily a privileging authority. A postcolonial Anthropology faces head-on the power relations of fieldwork whether that work is with people who are oppressed or whether it studies 'up' to the centres of power.

Marianne Gullestad, for example, proposes terms such as 'consultant', 'participant', 'conversation partner' or 'partner', '*terms that would reflect, more accurately the high importance of the contribution of the people we work with*' (2006: 321). Hart and Wolff further suggest that building community-university partnerships offers a way to root their work in a '*sense of place and a commitment to engage with issues of locality*' (2006:121). In promoting university-community partnerships, however, Hart and Wolff do not denigrate what they typify as '*pure, disciplinary, homogenous, expert-led, supply-driven, hierarchical, peer-reviewed and almost exclusively university-based*' research (123), but attempt to find ways to mutualise that knowledge. I cannot endorse their suspicions that theorising may be a displacement activity from the harder work of improving services (125), implying as it does a moral hierarchy of intellectual efforts. Yet the work that goes into differentiating academic discourses from practitioner discourses has the potential both to offer greater insight, and to risk irrelevance. Theoretical developments certainly do emerge into practitioner and popular consciousness, even if we are not clear over the routes they take. Our problem is that we cannot necessarily predict in which direction our theorising might go nor when theoretical speculation may spark the interest of practitioners, journalists or politicians.

My argument is that theoretical academic research need not necessarily be defined in opposition to practical knowledge, an argument that ought to please anthropologists in particular. This requires me, though, to counteract a central dichotomy in Western society, typified by the differentiation referred to above between an academic intellectual work defined as 'pure', and knowledge handled outside academic described, e.g. by Gibbons et al (1994) as 'applied, problem-centred, transdisciplinary, heterogeneous, hybrid, demand-driven, entrepreneurial,

network-embedded'. Explaining why the first is pure and the second polluted would require a history of Western intellectual thought which I am by no means able to address (particularly not here). Instead, I aim to muddy the water between the intellectual and the practical to recast the notion of intervention.

3. Tourism intervention

Most commonly, the aspect of tourism addressed in discussions on intervention is the economics of its mode of development. Economics becomes a prioritised arena in relation to the transformation of social relations, whether that is in relation to concerns about commodification of rituals or of traditional exchange practices, a concern debated since Greenwood's early criticism of Spanish government intervention in village rituals (1978), the transformation of hospitality, or the construction of national economies which demand particular property relations and the incorporation of local markets into a globalised capitalism. Boissevain, has countered arguments that tourism debases traditional practices, suggesting that tourism has, in fact, been a factor in the revitalisation of rituals, even if this revitalisation includes transformations of different kinds (1992). Deborah Root, however, reframes the debate from one about authenticity (c.f. MacCannell 1992) – which she considers as '*no more than a merchandising device*' (Ibid.: 80), to one of cultural integrity which is complicated because,

'any cultural object or practice can still manifest integrity among the people who respect and treat it as such, even if aspects of the form or practice have been appropriated and inserted into a market economy' (Ibid.).

Root's point is that commodification is part of the pattern of colonial expansion. In this perspective, the commodification of traditional objects and practices is a symptom of a broader economic expansion enacted by investors with the support and encouragement of international organisations. The World Bank is one of these organisations, and it has been through various phases in its policy of using tourism as a means of economic development, seeing tourism as a 'value chain', a means by which growth in gross national product can be generated (Hawkins and Mann, 2007: 250). During the 1960s, the Bank invested heavily in tourism development, funding private sector development to maintain import substitution for foreign exchange earnings, while in the 1970s, investment was targeted to public infrastructure in what it called 'capacity building' (Ibid. 354). During the 1980s, they appear to have recognised the environmental impacts of this rapid expansion, and began to fund remedial projects, but they had also decided that tourism had become so profitable that the private sector could manage on their own, or, in their own words, '*that the markets and the private sector were the most appropriate growth engine and that focused lending would not be necessary*' (Ibid: 355). By the 1990s, the Bank had more or less handed over intervention in tourism development to the UNDP and the World Tourism Organization, and its own projects were supposed to focus on biodiversity conservation and some cultural heritage preservation. The bank continued to support tourism projects, however, notably '*to examine micro-policy reform, to decentralize institutional structures, and to promote public-private partnerships*' (Ibid.: 358).

Recently, the World Bank's Board of Directors has elected to halt funding of tourism development, judging the industry to be,

'unstable and volatile, with destinations at the mercy of trends and fashions for their popularity, dependent upon fluctuating political and economic

conditions worldwide, and impacted by natural/human-made disasters and political instability' (Hawkins and Mann, 2007: 359)

These 'challenging externalities' are not seen to assist the Bank in its supposedly core business of poverty reduction. The only other area where funding has been halted has been in the field of nuclear energy.

Clearly, in terms of tourism development, the World Bank has most certainly intervened in its inimitable way, and it is not altogether clear what influence anthropological work might have had in this process. Whether or how governments should be involved in tourism development in the first place would seem like a question that anthropologists may be able to contemplate. Certainly the arguments put forward by economic determinists ('fatalists' might be a better term) like Jenkins and Henry (1982) that '*In many if not all developing countries, government has to undertake an entrepreneurial role to ensure that "pioneer" activities are initiated*' strikes the reader now as extraordinarily pessimistic, if not naïve, not only about the inevitability and desirability of tourism development and the incapability of developing countries to resist the pressures of international capital, but also about the nature, strength and capabilities of governments themselves. We cannot know whether this article had any effect in itself, but in reinforcing a dominant line, it has the potential to legitimise governmental strategies.

4. policy-making

The history of anthropological participatory analysis of development cannot be simply summarised here without sacrificing the depth and richness of the analysis on offer, yet if we are to move beyond normative moralising pressures to do more to make our own voices heard by large economic institutions, we must rethink what intervention is and how it might be imagined. We can start this by considering how, in practice, different voices are heard in policy processes through a consideration of the debates about broadening participation in governmental networks.

The element of policy which is often most relevant to tourism is development or land-use policy which, theoretically, aims to regulate the externalities of building projects. Development policy's domain is explicitly about the governance of externalities. What effect will the building of your house have on your neighbour? What effect will the building of a housing estate have on the environment (particular or general) or on the market for existing or future houses? It is the element of planning for future effects, as well as for effects on existing societies which makes development policy into a complex negotiation between competing interests and conflicting world-views.

For many years, planners and political scientists have debated the role of citizens in forming policy about development, not only in so-called 'Developing', but also 'Developed' countries. The term 'developed' is, of course, a misnomer. It refers effectively to countries for whom the discourse and practices of development are wholly normalised, a taken-for-granted enacted way of life, even if contested in the particular.¹

¹ Generally speaking, economic development depends on concrete constructions in time and place, and certain forms of infrastructure which join these together, and it is this arena which is regulated through a web of legislative and practical processes. Trends in development policy do cross over between the overseas development and

In Britain, planning for development is tied into a model of representative democracy which presumes that different, and conflicting individual and collective interests, can be represented by individuals. The idea of representation is so embedded that recent experiments with more participatory models of democracy still rely on the idea that collectives can be represented by spokespersons. A person representing only themselves has no legitimate role in public debate, and this is illustrated vividly in **conflictual situations** as much as in **routine policy processes**. The **former** may be illustrated by a public enquiry into housing demolition in Liverpool, where individual householders objecting to the demolition of their homes are portrayed as self-interested and lacking in appreciation of the larger picture of area regeneration, even when their arguments may concern energy-reduction or community-continuity. The most common way to undermine a non-corporate speaker at such an enquiry is to demand 'who do you represent' or 'how were you elected'. A PhD student arguing the cause of community regeneration over corporate gentrification in principle, can be swiftly dismissed by a barrister as a 'meddling busybody'. On the other hand, corporate investors, working on behalf of shareholders who are, by definition, purely self-interested, carry the legitimacy of being an economic force representing a wider instance of 'the economy'. The national economy, abstract as it is, is a powerful rhetorical force in development contexts.

The **latter** instance of representation, in routine policy processes, can be considered in the light of current reviews of national planning policies. Changes in the planning legislation of England since 1997 have stated a desire to increase community participation in planning, but even aside from the tendency of public servants again to assume that there are communities which can be represented by singular voices, the rhetoric about participation is not supported by rights enshrined in the law. Currently, local authorities must demonstrate that they have a policy on 'community involvement' in relation to planning, where involvement is not clearly defined. Although the demand for a 'Statement on Community Involvement' could be used to experiment with new democratic practices, cash-strapped local authorities seem more inclined to satisfy this demand by making public announcements about policy or by staging one-off public exhibitions about new developments. The key principled debates about participative democracy address the risk of policy processes being derailed by strongly motivated minority interests (example, what if your local community wants to adopt racist plans?), and the problem of how to make decisions when several competing collectives seem to have equally valid proposals. Planning theorists have gone so far as to propose that planners can perform a sort of community therapy between conflicting ethnic groups (Sandercock 2000), where the question of rights dissolves into a desire for consensus. Yet too often, conflict resolution can require more compromise by the oppressed than by oppressors. Finding resolutions to conflict between people with contrasting ethnicities which avoid forms of oppression is not necessarily a problem which representative or participatory democracy have solved.

Whether anthropologists should be particularly equipped to perform such tasks is not at all clear, although the crux of this problem has often been masked by the context of cultural difference, about which anthropology has a great deal to say.

domestic planning policy, even though they appear to be segregated both politically and academically.

Tourism development offers an archetypal case, as it refers not merely to the tendency of tourists to appear in particular places, but to the generation of particular types of accommodation, transport infrastructure, currency exchange and other concrete and political constructions, as well as the resulting effects of cultural encounter. Tourism development is merely a particular case of the general commitment to physical development intrinsic to Western states, but one which may highlight the injustices of capital expansion.

Trevor Sofield describes attempts by the government of the Solomon Islands to introduce and to regulate tourism development in the late 1980s through a comprehensive tourism development policy, together with a ten year implementation plan and a foreign aid programme used to fund developments (1993). However, he notes that,

‘the government’s tourism policy, its tourism development plan, and the aid scheme were all formulated in isolation from a consideration of the impact on them of existing legislation and accompanying regulations’ (Ibid.: 730)

Those laws consisted in particular of the Lands and Titles Act, the Town and Country Planning Act, and the National Building Code, legal structures based on imported colonial systems, which, he suggests, ‘for the most part find no echo in traditional resources, skills, and systems’ (Ibid.). In the Solomon Islands, Sofield argues that three spatial systems emerged during the process of colonisation as a British protectorate from the late 19th century: one for the specialised functions of the colonial government (administration, commerce, transport and communication), a pre-existing space of local people with communities, village settlements, land and sea resources and a traditional market system, and a third system of the Christian missions focused on churches and the schools and hospitals that were attached to them (731-2).

Tourism policies developed in the 1980s proposed that indigenous tourism be supported by counselling relating to feasibility, financing, marketing and training, and encouraged tourism focused on natural and cultural/historic features, festivals and special events (Ibid. 733). Given that cultural events are ‘owned’ by indigenous groups, this seems to support their participation in the tourism market, and indeed some groups have made traditional shell money to market as a tourist attraction. Policies also propose governmental mediation of indigenous land rights in relation to tourism development. But for indigenous people to develop tourism themselves, they must negotiate the Land and Titles Act of 1984, which divides land into alienated land, government land, and customary land. Around 80% of land is held in customary ownership, held on the basis of ancestral settlements and claims, which can be registered as alienated land by the claiming of title and payment of compensation to customary owners. Customary land can be developed, but as it is not recognised by any lending institution in the Solomon Islands as collateral (as it cannot be bought or sold), it may be impossible to raise collateral for development (735). Further, the Town and Country Planning Act defines areas where development can be permitted according to zoning techniques, and where indigenous communities are outside areas designated for tourism, they are faced with a barrier to participation in tourism development (736). Finally, the National Building Code requiring standards of building to withstand earthquakes is complex and requires architectural or engineering training to interpret and implement (737). As Sofield notes,

'The net result of the various Acts is to move the establishment of a village guest-house or resort constructed on customary land, built out of traditional materials available locally, and utilizing traditional building skills outside approved or legal practice.' (737).

Sofield goes on to show how villagers in north Malaita opened their village to tourists by setting aside two huts and allowing limited numbers of visitors, '(no more than six at a time and for only 3 weeks out of every month)' (739) to participate in every-day village activities. The venture completely bypassed all regulatory mechanisms, benefiting from the well-recognised boundary limitation on planning enforcement – that is, breaches of planning law at the periphery of an authority's territory are less likely to be noticed than those in the centre. A village product such as this does not comply with the building code, with fire regulations, with sanitation regulations, health regulations or Safety Inspectorate requirements, and 'the project would not be eligible for a Solomon Islands bank loan' (740). Meeting such requirements would be sufficiently expensive to push control of development into the hands of lending institutions or a foreign joint partner, and the need to service the loans would require a much larger scale of tourism.

It would be a mistake, though, to assume that such legislative structures are unproblematic even where there are few echoes of traditional resources, skills or systems, or that these are necessarily absent in modern Western contexts. On the contrary, many of the difficulties of tourism development are common to development per se. Wherever such a system of property and land-use planning prevail, poor people and/or anti-capitalists face the same dilemmas. Tourism is just as often a domestic development issue as a confrontation between cultural differences, whether or not international capital is involved.

Where, in these scenarios, can we imagine the anthropologist? When residents' interests are considered negligible, and representation is formally channelled through elected politicians, the role of advocate carries little legitimacy. Speaking truth to power, on the other hand, requires that powers are identifiable, and that they are listening or can be made to listen. Although our immediate instincts may urge us to try to speak out on behalf of the oppressed, this may relegate us to a form of oppression ourselves. Speaking against even particular forms of development easily allows us to be labelled economically naïve and lose legitimacy among developers, yet the alternative - keeping quiet about exploitation – renders us equally powerless. What privileges academics, though, among the few privileges remaining, is the position of relative authority afforded to our work when it is needed by others than ourselves, be that campaigners, journalists or students. This is not to say that anthropologists are not able to fill these other roles themselves at times, but that the production of authoritative texts can be an invaluable resource which reaches beyond the bounds of individual action.

Conclusions. Anthropological intervention in tourism

I would argue that Jenkins is wrong to imagine that academic debate does not reach into development contexts. Although tourism practitioners may not read the academic press, this is more than one route by which academic debates move into the field. While anthropologists are often very aware of their own use of ideas and theories from other disciplines, it is perhaps less obvious to us when our own ideas travel out to others. There are well known examples of concepts travelling both in and out of Anthropology. Keith Hart's work on informal economies is recognised as a key development in economic theory, one which can now be heard tripping off the

tongue of television news reporters. But the very concept of Culture in its current form emerged from anthropological and ethnological debate. Georges Henri Rivières championed the reinvention of the museum to revalidate everyday experience as valuable cultural material, and Geertz's discussions of culture have been adopted in many disciplines. Tourism as cultural encounter was described in the anthropological press, and was taken up by campaign groups and activists. Although tourism as a research field is dominated by industry-led tourism-management questions, overlap between academic and industrial discourse is clearly apparent. Although they may not read academic publications, tourism and development practitioners are undoubtedly influenced by the discourses and debates which circulate within it, and not least by occasionally critical attention in more serious public media about tourism and its consequences. The Tourism Anthropologists at London Metropolitan University, for example, have cultivated good relations with journalists and industry to help bring their research findings into broader public domains.

On the other hand, direct involvement in policy making by academics is also a problematic issue, especially in Britain today. My own colleagues in the planning profession lament the unwillingness of the British government to acknowledge any real academic debate, or often even research outputs unless they accord to existing political trajectories, and also report how competing government departments commission rival research. A government department only recently declared that it would not accept any policy paper longer than 12 sides of A4 (pers. comm.). The Treasury, it is stated by those who have produced research for it, commissions research only to support policy directions already confirmed, not to open debate on alternatives. Academics who criticise these policy choices, whether internally in Treasury consultations or externally through policy review and academic debate, are most likely to be excluded from further policy-influence (pers. comm.). Government departments have their own social histories and peculiar mutations of collective memory (or lack of memory), and tend to build practices of trust built with particular academics, rather than broad engagements with research fields.

Calling for anthropological intervention also assumes a common moral or ethical stance towards engagement, which may or may not reflect a meaningful commonality among anthropologists. Members of the ASA are expected to abide by its ethical code which specifies the avoidance of harm, for example. Yet not all anthropologists are members of the ASA, and the title 'anthropologist' is not a protected professional appellation. Anthropology is a broad discipline, and its literature may appeal – or not - across the political spectrum, implying quite different understandings of legitimacy of intervention in different circumstances. We know of anthropologists who support covert activity by the CIA and who apparently also carry out such activities (see Houtman 2007), and we are aware of people adopting anthropology and ethnography to support racist regimes (see Lang 2005). We also know of debates in which anthropologists apparently decrying racism themselves reinforce race-based thinking (see Gullestad 2006b). Why, then, should we imagine that all anthropologists share a political stance in relation to their public role, and why, further, in relation to tourism? Anthropology is not a corporation with an agreed public image, but a discipline of study with associated adherents. We are constantly in the process of reproducing Anthropology yet always aware that our definitions are not universally shared.

Yet even in discussing Anthropologists in relation to Government departments, we risk returning to an imagined world of powerful actors and institutions with whom academics have supposedly little contact, and over whom little influence. If we follow Franklin's demand and employ a more rhizomic critical approach to institutions, we may be able to acknowledge the contingent qualities of power, and the illusory nature of institutionalised objects². That is to say that an analysis which sees state institutions or commercial organisations as unified entities leaves us always out in the cold. Using a nuanced analysis of such institutions as illusory impressions maintained by constant relational work may open up different perspectives on possibilities for action. At this point, we may also need to abandon the metaphor of intervention with its implication of modifying existing trajectories, and adopt a more open question of action in contingent worlds, the creation of new rhizomic nodes, or gathering of otherwise dispersed forces.

There are other ways in which we can imagine intervention that may not be so direct. Intervention is a term adopted by artists to describe a particular form of commentary, an intervention which provokes a re-thinking of the everyday, or a reconceptualising of mainstream assumptions or perceptions. Sometimes, too, architects are described as making interventions in the landscape or the built environment, and these rather different versions of intervention offer us a useful alternative route to imagining the interventions possible for anthropologists. Madconald's recent article on tourist guides at Nuremberg demonstrates the extent to which guides are involved in a form of mediation by communication, encouraging preferred readings of tourist sites, using performative techniques to draw visitors' perceptions beyond the visible surfaces of the sites they perceive, to the social, cultural and historical realities beyond (2006). The guides, thus, intervene between the visitors and the site, modifying their perceptions and attempting to hinder the development of pro-nazi sentiment.

Intervention in tourism may not only mean diverting economic processes or attempting to change the wording of public policy. Even if those remain the desired outcomes, the means to achieve them may be more closely related to anthropologists' core realm of expertise. If an Anthropologist is an expert, then it is an expertise tied to participant observation, distanciation, analysis and representation. The academic training of anthropologists is directed towards making representations, whether that is in texts, images, filmed, audio or other media, just as much as it is in making oral representations. David Mosse's reflections on a ten-year-long development project offer a sharply contrasting understanding of development to that shared by many of the development actors. That his book provoked aggressive reactions from the development department sponsoring the project, even after so many years of collaboration, itself helps us to understand the significance of the analysis that he offers. It is quite possible that this could change development project management more than his participation on the project, and possible that it may not. Yet its impact on a broader readership in development issues is as valuable as any direct action. In contrast, Michael Welsch's 5-minute YouTube clip on the mutability of online text and human-machine relations has probably been read by more people than any other anthropological text, with over 2 million viewings at the time of writing (Wesch 2007a, b, Wesch *et. al.* 2007). Short, critical and incisive reflections on the world about us, which build on our capacity for

² Latour (1993) notes that 'power is the illusion people get when they are obeyed'

subversive and creative thought, offer great potential for changing dominant practices and hegemonic concepts.

My conclusion, then, is that anthropological intervention in tourism can take many forms, and that we must be wary of calls for academics always to make the imaginary journey across into policy or commerce, and wary of the anti-intellectualism and false dichotomies of thought and knowledge that this implies. There is value in engaging with immediate questions of justice and oppression, but there is value also in reflective thought which influences our peers. We never know which may have the most effect in the longer term.

References

- Abram, Simone 2006. *Materializing Identities Bricks coming out of the ground in Materializing Sheffield*. HRI Online:
<http://www.hrionline.ac.uk/matshef/abram/MSabram.htm>
- Abram, Simone and Jacqueline Waldren 1997. 'Introduction'. In S Abram, J Waldren and D Macleod (Eds) *Tourists and Tourism: Identifying with People and Places*. Berg: Oxford: 1-12.
- Abrams, Philip 1988(1977). Notes on the Difficulty of Studying the State. *Journal of Historical Sociology* 1(1): 58-89.
- Boissevain Jeremy (Ed.) 1992. *Revitalizing European Rituals*. London: Routledge.
- Franklin, Adrian 2004. 'Tourism as an ordering: Towards a new ontology of tourism'. *Tourist Studies* 4(3): 277-301
- Franklin, Adrian and Mike A Crang 2001. 'The trouble with tourism and travel theory?' *Tourist Studies*. 1(1): 5-22.
- Gibbons, M., Limoges, C., Nowotony, H., Schwarzman, S., Scott, P. & Trow, M. 1994. *The New Production of Knowledge: The Dynamics of Science and Research in Contemporary Societies*. London, Sage.
- Gullestad, Marianne 2006a. *Plausible Prejudice* Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.
- Gullestad, Marianne 2006b. 'Anthropologists Debating 'Culture' and 'Race' in *Plausible Prejudice* Oslo: Universitetsforlaget. Pp.221-247
- Hart, Angie and David Wolff 2006. 'Developing Local 'Communities of Practice' through Local Community-University Partnerships'. *Planning, Practice & Research*, 21(1): 121-138.
- Houtman, Gustaaf (Ed.) 2007. *Partisan Anthropology*. *Anthropology Today* 23(3).
- Hawkins, Donald E. and Shaun Mann 2007. 'The World Bank's Role in Tourism Development'. *Annals of Tourism Research* 34(2): 348-363.
- Jenkins, Carson L 1999. 'Tourism academics and tourism practitioners: Bridging the

Great Divide'. In Pearce and Butler *Contemporary issues in tourism development*. Routledge: 52-64.

Jenkins, Carson L and B M Henry 1982 'Government Involvement in Tourism in Developing Countries'. *Annals of Tourism Research*. 9: 499-521.

Lang, Andrea M. 2005 'Picking up the Relay Baton: translating traditions in apartheid and democratic South Africa. *Focal* 46: 36-53

Latour, Bruno 1993. *We have never been modern*. New York, Harvester Wheatsheaf.

MacCannell, Dean 1992. *Empty Meeting Grounds: The Tourist Papers*'. London: Routledge.

Mosse, David 2006. Anti-social anthropology? Objectivity, objection, and the ethnography of public policy and professional communities. *JRAI (N.S.)* 12, 935-956.

Mosse, David 2005. *Cultivating development : an ethnography of aid policy and practice*. London : Pluto Press, 2005.

Sharon Macdonald 2006. 'Mediating heritage: Tour guides at the former Nazi Party Rally Grounds, Nuremberg' *Tourist Studies* vol6(2) 119–138.

Mitchell, Tim 1991. *Colonising Egypt*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Murdoch, Jonathan, and Simone Abram 2002. *Rationalities of Planning*. Aldershot, Ashgate.

Root, Deborah 1996. *Cannibal Culture: Art, Appropriation, and the Commodification of Difference*. Oxford: Westview Press.

Sandercock, Leonie 2000. 'When Strangers Become Neighbours: Managing Cities of Difference'. *Planning Theory & Practice* 1(1): 13-30.

Sofield, Trevor H. B. 1993. 'Indigenous Tourism Development' *Annals of Tourism Research* 20: 729-750.

Wesch, Michael 2007a. The Machine is Us(ing) Us'
<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=6gmP4nk0EOE> 5/4/07

Wesch, Michael 2007b. 'The YouTube Project'
http://mediatedcultures.net/ksudigg/?page_id=85 5/4/07

Wesch, Michael et. al. 2007. 'Introducing our YouTube project'
http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=tYcS_VpoWJk&mode=related&search= 5/4/07

Wildavsky, Aaron 1973. 'If Planning is everything, Maybe it is Nothing'. *Policy Sciences* 4 (2): 127-153.