Tourism as an Anthropological Subject

by Dennison Nash

The anthropological study of tourism is still in its infancy, but enough work has been done (see, e.g., the compendiums of Cohen 1979a, b; de Kadt 1979; Farrell 1977a; Finney and Watson 1975; Knox and Suggs 1979; Smith 1974, 1978a, b, 1980a) to permit a critical assessment of anthropologists’ thinking about this fascinating subject. Furthermore, the growing interest in what heretofore may have been considered a frivolous or inconsequential problem suggests that it is time not only to evaluate anthropological studies of tourism, but also to propose an orientation for future investigations. This paper represents such an evaluation and proposal.

The Significance of the Study of Tourism

Why, until recently, have anthropologists avoided the subject of tourism? One might speculate, first of all, that they tend to think of themselves as intrepid fieldworkers and so do not want to be identified with tourists in any way. Second, as suggested above, the subject may conjure up a frivolous area of culture (play) that they want to avoid. Third, tourism may be thought of as something modern, a way of life that only recently has acquired anthropological legitimacy. Finally, anthropologists simply may be unaware of the extent of tourism and its consequences, particularly in those societies in which they have tended to carry out their studies.

It does not take long to see that tourism is indeed a legitimate subject for anthropological inquiry. Since it involves travel, it also involves contact between cultures or subcultures, an area of concern to the increasing numbers of anthropologists who pursue investigations of acculturation or development. Additionally, as this paper will demonstrate, tourism is widespread in human society. Indeed, it may be identifiable at all levels of social complexity. For anthropologists, whose charge it is to look into the human situation, such a widespread cultural fact would seem to demand attention. Finally, tourism currently is contributing to the transformation of favorite anthropological territory, the preindustrial world. In fact, in some cases, it is the principal cause of this transformation.

There are certain obvious requirements for approaching a subject in an anthropological way. First, the subject has to be defined and then lines of explanation laid out. As we shall see, an adequate definition of tourism is not easy to develop. Since this definition should derive from the anthropological perspective, it should be cross-culturally, or even universally, applicable. At this stage of our study a definition should be broad rather than narrow. This will prevent us from entering prematurely into some theoretical cul-de-sac and keep our options open. This means that it may be desirable to consider a definition that embraces domestic and international, socialist and capitalist, industrial and preindustrial varieties of tourism, among others. Our definition also ought not to be counter-intuitive; this requirement is difficult to fulfill because there is such a variety of conceptions of tourism in popular and scholarly usage. Finally, unless we can provide persuasive arguments to the contrary, our definition ought to be compatible with existing anthropological theories and methods so that by using it we can make some scientific progress. Only after we have developed a satisfactory definition of tourism can we begin to think of ways that will help us to account for it, its variants, and its consequences.

What Is Tourism?

At the heart of any definition of tourism is the person we conceive to be a tourist. From this point of view, one is inclined to think of tourism in terms of the motives and practices of a

Dennison Nash is Professor of Anthropology and Sociology at the University of Connecticut (Storrs, Conn. 06268, U.S.A.). Born in 1924, he was educated at St. Lawrence University (B.A., 1948), Washington University in St. Louis (M.A., 1950), and the University of Pennsylvania (Ph.D., 1954). He taught at Middlebury College (1953–56) before joining the faculty at Connecticut in 1957. His research interests are in culture and personality, culture and religion, expatriates, the Caribbean, and Europe. Besides his writings on tourism (most of which are referred to in the text), his publications include “The Ethnologist as Stranger: An Essay in the Sociology of Knowledge” (Southwestern Journal of Anthropology 19:149–67); “The Personal Consequences of a Year of Study Abroad” (Journal of Higher Education 47:191–203); A Community in Limbo: An Anthropological Study of an American Community Abroad (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1970); with R. Wintrob, “The Emergence of Self-Consciousness in Ethnography” (Current Anthropology 13:527–42); and the collection Essays in Subjective Culture: An Appreciation of A. I. Hallowell (Ethos 5 [1]).

The present paper was submitted in final form 3/1/80.
type of human being who, according to Boyer (1972:7), first emerged in the Western world in the 18th century in the form of a young English gentleman traveling abroad with his tutor. The manifest purpose of the young man’s “tour” was educational, along with a considerable amount of what we would call sightseeing, but a variety of other activities and practices were involved. MacCannell (1976) has adopted this sightseeing definition of tourism in a theoretical treatise in which the tourist becomes the typical modern man. It is clear, however, that such a definition will not serve our purposes. Sightseeing is only one of a tremendous number of activities that have been called touristic. People who lie on the beach, walk, ski, shop, swim, sleep, race, visit, or pursue a host of other activities have, like the sightseer, been called tourists.

Some people think of the tourist as a kind of traveler. This definition also has its problems, the principal one being that too many specifications have to be added in order to rule out people like the traveling salesman. Thus Cohen (1974), in order to make this definition “work,” argues that tourism involves voluntary, nonrecurrent, novelty-seeking, temporary traveling or sojourning. The possible appeal of this conception to our intuition is negated by its lack of parsimony and also (as it turns out) its lack of direct linkages with anthropological or other theories. Possibly such linkages exist, but Cohen does not suggest any.

A more promising approach to a definition of tourism derives from theories of work and leisure. Tourists might be thought of as people at leisure and tourism as the activities they engage in while in this state. It is obvious that not all people at leisure may be considered tourists, but if only one specification, i.e., traveling, is added we arrive at a definition that satisfies most, if not all, of our requirements. We are not home free, however. As anyone who has tried will tell you, the term leisure is not easy to define.

Dumazedier (1968:250) offers us a conception of leisure that appears to cut through the difficulties. He argues that every society imposes on its members a class of obligations that are “fundamental” or “primary.” In our society these include gainful employment, study, family and community responsibilities, etc. One enters the leisure sphere when one is free of such obligations. In this condition the sense of “oughtness” that is associated with primary obligations disappears and a certain disinterestedness comes to prevail. As I have indicated elsewhere (Nash 1979b), I do not find Dumazedier’s argument that true leisure is unique to modern society very persuasive, but I do consider his conception of leisure as freedom from primary obligations suitable for cross-cultural inquiry. It may be more difficult to distinguish leisure in less differentiated societies, but the fact that it is more bound up with other aspects of a culture does not mean that it does not exist or that it cannot be separated out for purposes of study.

Dumazedier points out that leisure may not be completely pure even in modern society, and he feels compelled to use the term “semi-leisure” where “commercial, utilitarian, or ideological” motives also are involved. We ought not be unduly disturbed, however, by our difficulties in finding “pure” leisure activities. This is to be expected where empirical concepts are concerned. We shall have to accept the fact that in some cases we may be unable to decide whether an activity is a leisure one or not. A similar problem regarding travel may be resolved by taking the arbitrary decision that the leisureed person must move outside his or her home community in order to qualify as a tourist. This is because there seems to be fairly general agreement that a tourist does seek some change from life at home. Of course, the tourist’s travels do not lead to permanent residence in another society; he or she is not an immigrant.

If we accept this notion of the tourist as a person at leisure who also travels, then tourism is the activity (whatever, specifically, it is and however it is motivated) of these persons. One becomes a tourist when one leaves home while free of primary obligations. The activities one engages in then usually are not carried on in isolation. Because the tourist must be transported, lodged, entertained, fed, etc., others (non tourists) may be implicated in his or her activities. The duties of those who serve the tourist also have been referred to as tourism or (in modern society) the tourist industry. In order to avoid confusion we might distinguish between those (not at leisure) who serve in tourism and those who practice it as tourists. Since tourism involves travel, a cross-cultural (or subcultural) encounter is inevitably produced, and it is the social transactions involved in this encounter that provide a key to the anthropological understanding of tourism.

The touristic encounter in its simplest form is a series of transactions between hosts and touristic guests. While in complex societies it can also involve elaborate cross-cultural relationships between people who serve the tourist (for example, between the travel agent and the hotel manager in some foreign place), it is the encounter between hosts and tourists which constitutes the core of a touristic system. In this encounter people approach each other as strangers whose orientations are different not only because they come from different cultural backgrounds, but also because one is at work and the other at leisure. The transactional problems that emerge as a result of this difference in orientation must be dealt with by appropriate institutional arrangements if the relationship is to continue.

Taking a more dynamic perspective, it is possible to envisage a touristic process originating with the generation of tourists in some home society or subsociety, continuing as these tourists travel to other places where they encounter hosts with a different culture, and ending as the give-and-take of this encounter affects the tourists, those who serve them, and the various societies or subsocieties involved. In addition, this touristic process may evolve into a touristic system which itself can be embedded in some broader social context. Those who focus on one aspect of this system will be wise to keep in mind the larger contexts of which it is a part.

Though all aspects of the touristic process are essential for the existence of tourism, that part which concerns the generation of tourists would seem to be most important. This is because without leisure travelers there can be no tourism. A society produces leisure by (1) establishing the level of activity needed to fulfill primary obligations, (2) providing the means to carry out such activity in a more or less efficient manner, and (3) producing the surplus needed to maintain those people who are not performing this activity. It creates travel by producing mobility and the means to accomplish it. Where travel and leisure intersect, tourists and tourism are produced. The quality and quantity of these should depend on the character of the society that produces them.

At the other end of the touristic process is the host society or subsociety, which is dependent on one or more tourist-generating areas for its tourist-visitors. How dependent it is and what power it possesses to shape the touristic process will vary according to a number of factors, including its own particular character and the nature of its relationship with tourist-generating societies. From the host point of view, one is tempted to think of the give-and-take between societies involved in the touristic process as mostly “take” and to evoke images of Russian or Spanish seaside resorts, but enough examples exist of host societies that actively shape their tourism to render this view problematic and to throw the question open to empirical research. The host society will be affected by the tourist-guests it receives and by the apparatus that has been created by its own or outside efforts to serve them, but it also may play a significant role in determining the kind of tourists it receives and the form of tourism they practice. In addition, it may affect the tourist-generating society through tourists and their agents. One small example of this
is provided by those alienated modern workers whose life revolves not around the job, but around the vacation and the weekend away from home.

Out of the touristic transactions between home and host societies there may emerge a touristic system with dynamics of its own. What its characteristics are and whether it will change or not will be dependent not only on developments in the partner societies, but also on suprasocietal happenings. One can think of the two societies as becoming more and more closely linked touristically so that each begins to be thought of as a part of the other, as has been the case with Bordeaux and its touristic satellite, Arcachon (see Cassou-Mounot 1973); or one can conceive of the link as becoming increasingly tenuous and possibly breaking altogether, as was the case when English aristocrats ceased to visit Pau for health and diversion (see Duloum 1963). In a discussion of the ebb and flow of aristocratic tourism in Nice from 1763 to 1936 (Nash 1979a), I have suggested that the fate of a tourist resort is bound up with a variety of forces not all of which may properly be considered part of a touristic system. The rise and fall of resorts, therefore, must be understood by reference not only to the touristic system, but also to outside forces that sustain and shape it.

In summary, I have argued here that the anthropologist can profitably view tourism as resulting from the intersection of the histories of two or more cultures or subcultures. Seen in this way, it becomes a process involving the generation of tourists, their travel, and their subsequent encounter with people in some host society. Such an encounter implies transactions between tourists, their agents, and hosts which affect the people and the cultures involved. This touristic encounter may give rise to a touristic system the evolution of which is subject to a variety of forces not only in the partner cultures or subcultures, but also in the system and beyond.

TOURISM IN HUMAN SOCIETY

Viewed from the point of view of the tourist-generating society, how widespread in human society is tourism? Is it unique to industrial society, as Dumazedier has argued, or can we identify it—or something like it—at other levels of culture? Some researchers (e.g., Duchet 1949, Turner and Ash 1976) see it as extending back in Western history to ancient Greece and Rome, and indeed there is abundant evidence that tourism not only existed in those societies, but had an astonishingly modern character. For example, Seneca (quoted in Balsdon 1969:145) reports that “people set out [from Rome] with no particular objective in view. They wander down the coast. In a purposeless way they go by sea, they go by land, always wishing that they were doing something else. ‘Let us go to Campania.’ ‘No, smart resorts are a bore; rough country is the thing to see. Let us go to Bruttium and see the ranches in Lucania.’” Granted that tourism may be identified in these agricultural societies with cities and states, is there any evidence of it in simpler societies? I believe that there is and that if our definition is relentlessly employed we may discern some form of tourism at all levels of human culture. To satisfy some of our critics we may have to call it “protopotourism,” but it is tourism nevertheless.

Among hunters and gatherers like the Washo (Downs 1972) or the Pitjandjara (Tindale 1972), for example, there are stops in their annual wanderings during which people engage in a great deal of what is obviously leisure activity. One might be pressed to demonstrate that the travel involved, which is part of an annual circulation through a particular region, is in fact touristic travel, but if it is viewed as analogous to the wanderings of European aristocrats from city to country or from resort to resort (see Boyer 1972:136–46) it may be easier to accept these stops (and associated travel) as a form of tourism.

We need not depend on such marginal cases as these, however, to identify tourism among hunters and gatherers. Among the San (Bushmen) there appears to be an abundant amount of leisure at least some of which is spent in visiting other bands. Concerning the !Kung San, Lee (1968:37) says:

A woman gathers on one day enough food to feed her family for three days, and spends the rest of her time resting in camp, doing embroidery, visiting other camps, or entertaining visitors from other camps. . . . Hunters sometimes experience a run of bad luck and stop hunting for a month or longer. During these periods visiting, entertaining, and especially dancing are the primary activities of men.

A modern parallel to such touristic or prototouristic activities is the holiday visit of the French city worker to country relatives and friends (see Boyer 1972:48–49).

At the horticultural level of subsistence, visiting also appears to be the principal form of touristic or prototouristic activity. Such visiting may be as simple as the rounds of Piaroa boys, mentioned by Kaplan (1975:41), who “will join almost any group leaving their [communal house] for reasons of work and pleasure,” or as elaborate as the intertribal “spree’s” of the Arawak and Caribs, reported by Drummond (1977:85), during which people dance, drink, fight, and pursue sexual assignations.

In less differentiated societies it is obviously more difficult to distinguish leisure from nonleisure and consequently to identify tourism. Among South American horticulturists, for example, trading involves expeditions by men during which, like commercial travelers of today, they may enjoy themselves in other ways. Speaking of such expeditions among the Ye'cuana, Arvelo-Jiménez (1971:47) says that “trading parties take advantage of the hospitality of all the villages along their route.” To say that these and other horticulturists are not touristic at some point during their trading rounds would be to miss some of the quality of these manifestly economic activities. Similarly, it would seem unjust to ignore the obvious fact that kula trading among the Trobrianders, reported by Malinowski (1961), involves magic, ceremonial, feasting, and other noneconomic aspects of culture. I see no reason to argue, as does Dumazedier (1968:248–49), that because in simpler societies leisure (including tourism) activities are often mixed with more utilitarian pursuits they do not exist. Indeed, if we are going to get at the basis of tourism we must look into societies in which leisure, and consequently tourism, are not easy to distinguish.

On the agricultural level of subsistence, tourism usually is easily recognizable. We have already mentioned two rather complex agricultural societies, ancient Greece and Rome. One might also point to medieval England, described by Jusserand (1930), with its fairs, tournaments, and pilgrimages, all of which had elements of tourism in them, or the Yucatán of the 1930s and ’40s described by Redfield (1941, 1950), where tourism was beginning to make its appearance. Though tourism is more easily identifiable in such societies, new problems are posed for the student of tourism because of its more differentiated character. Differences in touristic behavior according to rank, community size, and gender are among the distinctions that now need to be considered. Though the evidence is fragmentary, some preliminary hypotheses about such distinctions may be offered. I have argued, for example (Nash 1979b:22–23), that in such societies people of higher rank are more likely to engage in long-range, luxurious, protracted forms of tourism, men have greater freedom to travel than women, and city-dwellers (especially those of the upper ranks) are more likely to tour than people from the country. Such hypotheses, admittedly, are not very profound, but they open the door to explanations of touristic variability.
The touristic differentials that emerge in agricultural societies continue in industrial societies, and because of better evidence we are able to consider additional factors such as age, type of dwelling, marital and family status, and level of education, as Boyer (1972:19–34) does for modern France. Intrasciental touristic differences do not necessarily increase in more complex industrial societies. Indeed, as in socialist countries, they may actually decline. In such countries, or in capitalist countries where there has been increasing governmental intervention, there may be a more even allocation of the leisure fruits of increased productivity and more efficient transportation. In France, for example, the institution of laws concerning paid vacations dramatically increased the number of summer tourists and made possible the spread of what has been called “mass” tourism. It probably is fair to say that in industrial society more people are able to travel greater distances than ever before, but we must eschew any simple general evolutionary notions of touristic progress. It is possible that in some hunting-and-gathering societies a larger part of the population spends more time in touristic activities than in any industrial society.

To conclude this discussion of tourism in human societies, we should reiterate that tourism, defined as leisure activity requiring travel, exists at all levels of sociocultural complexity. Its widespread existence would seem to be bound up with the ubiquity of leisure and travel. From an economic point of view, one might account for this in terms of surplus and trade, but that is only one point of view; other factors also should be considered. In any case, forces which tend to generate tourism or prototourism would seem to be present in most, if not all, societies, and there is good reason to doubt that we ever will find a society such as the utopia of Lao-tzu (Lin 1977:141), in which “The neighboring states will be so close that they can see each other, and hear the sounds of roosters and dogs/But the people will grow old and die, without having visited each other.”

THE CAUSES OF TOURISM

From the preceding discussion it ought to be clear that I do not feel that we are, at present, in a position to raise questions about the causes of tourism in general. The problem is that we would have to account for the existence and intersection of leisure and travel. It may eventually be possible to explain not only why each exists, but also why they go hand in hand. At present, however, this task seems to involve too much in the way of speculation. Certainly, little is to be gained by positing some kind of need for alternation between ordinary and non-ordinary states, as does Graburn (1977:17–31). In the first place, it does not seem possible to distinguish such a need, and secondly, even if such a need did exist we would still have to inquire into the conditions that cause people to satisfy it through tourism.

A more promising line of investigation would be a consideration of the causes of touristic variability. Why are people in one society more touristically inclined than those in another? Why does tourism in one society or subculture take the specific form that it does? How are we to account for touristic variability in a society? More or less tentative answers to such questions can be obtained from comparative data for both historic (possibly also prehistoric) and contemporary societies. For example, our review of tourism at different levels of social complexity suggests that social and touristic differentiation often go hand in hand and that social stratification is associated with differences in duration, distance, and ease of touring. In medieval England a noble and his entourage could engage in international travel to attend tournaments because he had the great wealth, extensive leisure, freedom to travel, and access to transport that this required (Jusserand 1930:229). On the other hand, people of the lowest social ranks tended to be confined by poverty and governmental edicts to occasional visits to local fairs (pp. 250–51).

What are the forces that cause people to leave home during their leisure time? A number of writers have focussed on urbanism as a factor. One school tends to refer to the alienation of an urban existence. For example, Cribier (1969:68–75) argues that in modern society people with adequate means flee from the problems of city life whenever they can. But modern urbanites (and suburbanites) also may be stimulated to develop broader interests and a livelier curiosity about the world. Simmel (1971 [1903]) is one of a number who have emphasized the cosmopolitanism that develops in an urban milieu. The “psychological mobility” that is supposed to develop in modern conditions (see Lerner 1958) would also, like urban cosmopolitanism, seem to act as a stimulus to touristic activity. We ought not to get ahead of ourselves, however, and assume that urban-rural differences spawn touristic variability everywhere. Some survey data from the United States suggest that in that country no significant rural-urban touristic differentials exist (Mueller and Gurin 1962:41). Undoubtedly, economic factors, such as income level, and political ones, such as the role of government, must also be considered in accounting for touristic variability in more complex societies.

If we assume that multiple causes are at work in affecting people’s decisions to tour or not to tour and that such decisions in turn affect rates of tourist departures, how are we to determine what factors are operative and how significant they are in a given case? A beginning can be made by questioning tourists (and nontourists) themselves. Boyer (1972:233–37) has referred to survey data for modern France that give people’s reasons for not going on vacation and their feelings about this. One can, of course, suggest that answers to survey questions do not give the real reasons for anything or that people may be blind to the real factors affecting their actions, but the responses of appropriately selected people to carefully designed questions would seem to be essential in order to begin to account for tourism. Using a maximizing perspective, such an inquiry would aim to construct subjective maps and outline the constraints, possible rewards, and costs that play a role in the decision to tour or not to tour, or to go this way or that. It would also involve sensitive questioning and possibly observation by skilled researchers. Steps in this direction already have been taken with American tourists by Myers and Moncreif (1978) and Smith (1979).

The quality or style of the tourism generated by a society or subsociety is an important question. What lure has the Mediterranean had for northern Europeans? Why do people seek out certain areas for health, adventure, “culture,” etc.? Why are certain means of transportation and kinds of accommodations used? What accounts for the rhythms of tourist departures? Why do some tourists choose to travel in groups while others pursue more individualistic ways? Can we explain why for some tourism is a serious, rationalized undertaking (with a Baedeker or Guide Michelin, for example) while for others it is more spontaneous and lighthearted? Is tourism in modern society a quest for “authentic” or “pseudo” experiences (a question which constitutes the essence of a dispute between Boorstin [1964] and MacCannell [1973])? What is the point of people’s tourism?

The obvious place to begin to answer questions like these is with the tourists and the tourist-generating situation from which they come. From this vantage point tourism may be seen to be an expression of some more fundamental social or psychological facts. A variety of theoretical perspectives have been used in attempting to account for the quality of a society’s tourism and other leisure phenomena. Possibly the most stimulating discussion is that of Veblen (1973 [1899]), who, though not dealing specifically with tourism, includes touristic phe-
nomena as one kind of consumption by what he refers to as nonproductive leisure classes. Another materialist, Hobshawn (1975:203–7), suggests that industrial capitalism tends to produce certain kinds of travel for pleasure. MacCannell (1976), viewing tourism from a Durkheimian perspective, sees it as a manifestation of the structure of modern society, Barthes (1972:74–77), in his analysis of the Guide Bleu, and Dufour (1977), in his study of French images of the weekend, see it as a kind of myth. Finally, though no one so far appears to have done so, it might be possible to extend the theory of basic personality type (Kardiner 1939, 1945) and view tourism as an “expressive” or “projective” system.

This plentitude of theoretical possibilities suggests that the tourist-generating situation is fertile ground for anthropological investigations; but it is difficult to find significant research in this area. Anthropologists seem to be much more interested in what goes on at the other end of the touristic process in some host society. Even there, however, the shadow of the tourist-generating metropole extends over its touristic satellites, and it is impossible fully to comprehend what is going on in them without reference to metropolitan developments. This is not the only reason anthropologists ought to be concerned with tourist-generating societies or situations. The study of the production of tourists and tourism in such societies also should pay the same kind of dividends as the study of religion, myth, art, and other “superstructural” phenomena. Thus, besides being indispensable for understanding the touristic process, the study of the tourist-generating situation can provide us with a significant lead into sociocultural reality. So far we have been considering tourism as an expression of, and export from, some tourist-generating society, but it also may be conceived as an import into some host society. According to the transactional view, the introduction of tourism into a host society or subculture is never a unilateral action, but rather involves give-and-take. How did Miami Beach, the Gambia, Cancú (Mexico), San Juan (Puerto Rico), Sochi (U.S.S.R.), or Nice come to embark on courses of touristic development, and why has tourism in each of these places taken the form that it has? Certainly the role of external forces such as entrepreneurs, publicists, and governmental or supragovernmental agencies ought to be considered; but a host society’s traditions of service, hospitality, and accommodation of foreign intrusions also play a role in determining whether tourism will emerge and flourish or not. What are the factors that preadapt a society to tourism or to a specific form of it? Consultants on touristic projects, such as the United Nations experts who assessed the international touristic potential of the Gambia and proposed a specific touristic development project (see Harrell-Bond 1978), seem to have some idea of the basic anthropological maxim that one must understand a sociocultural context in order to comprehend or make predictions about its parts, but they seem not to be interested in pursuing the implications of their investigations for sociocultural functioning and change. Of greater social-scientific import is a study by Young (1977) which suggests that different Caribbean islands select or shape the kind of tourism they eventually get. To date, however, investigations like hers seem to be few and far between. The question of the touristic potential of host societies remains, therefore, wide open for interesting anthropological investigations.

In summary, we must say that little, if any, anthropological concern has been directed towards a search for the causes of tourism considered either as an export from a tourist-generating society or an import into a host society. Since the study of tourism by anthropologists is only beginning, it probably would be fruitless to speculate about the reasons for this, but any investigation of an aspect of sociocultural reality must eventually consider its causes. We need to know why tourism occurs at the rate, time, and place and in the form that it does. The theoretical significance of such an inquiry for our understanding of sociocultural functioning and change would seem to be self-evident.

THE CONSEQUENCES OF TOURISM

According to the transactional view, tourism may be seen to have effects on tourist-generating societies, host societies, and any transcultural social systems in which it is embedded. These effects may be seen to operate not only through the tourists themselves, but also through whatever touristic infrastructure serves them. So far, anthropologists have shown very little interest in exploring the consequences of tourism for tourist-generating societies themselves. If we take the view that tourism is a superstructural or expressive manifestation of some society and that it is capable of acting back upon the more essential aspects of a society that brought it into being, the way would seem to be open for carrying out a variety of theoretically significant research projects. Some indication of the possibilities along this line are provided by Geshchter (1979), who sees modern international tourism as performing economic functions for the “rich tourist-generating superpowers,” by Vogt (1978), who speaks of the educational and therapeutic value of “wandering” for individuals (and, presumably, the societies from which they come), and by Dufour (1977), whose discussion of weekend tourism as a kind of myth is mentioned above. In raising the question of the “liberating” or “alienating” functions of the various myths, Dufour suggests that tourism can have both positive and negative consequences for tourists and their home societies. The gap between the expectations generated in tourists and reality is only one of the possible contradictions that invite analysis by students interested in stability and change in tourist-generating societies. Though it ought to be clear by now that a genuinely anthropological perspective on tourism calls for a broader view, anthropologists’ interests in tourism have so far been rather parochial. These social scientists have, not unexpectedly, tended to reveal a kind of “knee-jerk” response to the “imposition” of tourism on their favorite societies, i.e., those in the preindustrial or Third World. The somewhat prescientific conclusion that most of them have reached is that tourism is “bad” for such societies. Such a conclusion is supported by one of the more careful and sophisticated studies to date, that by the economist Bryden (1973). Focusing on the Commonwealth Caribbean and using a straight cost-benefit type of analysis, he concludes (p. 218) that “a perfectly recognizable ‘economic’ case can be made against touristic development.” He points out that without even referring to “transcendental” or “social” costs one can raise serious questions about the value of tourist development for a preindustrial society. As far as these costs are concerned, numerous references are to be found in the various anthologies on tourism cited above. They include environmental degradation, social disintegration, increasing dependence on touristic metropoles, increasing financial deficits, decreasing quality of life, and increasing social inequality. The liberal-radical tenor of anthropologists’ views is distilled in a quotation from the socialist journal Dollars and Sense (1978:15):

No matter how great the tourist industry looks to the World Bank official from a twentieth floor suite of the Manila Hilton, the view from the bottom is something else again. Luxury tourist accommodations run by TWA don’t promise any more in the way of adequate economic development than do copper mines run by Kennecott or Mustang assembly plants run by Ford.

Yet there are cases in which tourism not only has not harmed a preindustrial society, but has actually benefited it. Cohen (1979c:32) began his investigation of the impact of tourism
on some Thai upland villages with the notion that that impact was almost certainly bad, but he had to conclude that “tourism in the hill tribe region . . . is not expected to have a destructive impact . . . in the foreseeable future.” An even more telling conclusion has been reached by Boissevain (1979), who reports that by Malta’s own criteria of development tourism has had a largely beneficial effect. A more balanced view of the positive and negative consequences of tourism for developing countries is to be found in the anthology of de Kadt (1979).

If tourism can have both positive and negative effects on development, the practical-minded question is how to accentuate the positive. Policy recommendations adopted by the seminar convened by the World Bank (de Kadt 1979:339–47) refer to factors such as the size of the tourist establishment, rate of growth, location, and internal versus external inputs and controls. A still more scientific attitude would be to set aside the notions of good and bad and attempt to see tourism as a factor in the maintenance and change not only of developing societies, but also of all host societies. What kind of conceptual framework for looking into this problem might we adopt?

In another work (Nash 1978) I pointed out that tourism might be thought to affect a host society through a tourist sector. This sector, which may be more or less differentiated from the rest of the host society, contains, first of all, tourists who act directly on the hosts. One result of this encounter is the so-called demonstration effect, an example of which is provided by Johnson (1978:64–65) in his discussion of the reaction of the somewhat straitlaced Tungans to tourists’ dress and behavior. As Farrell (1979b) points out, both hosts and tourists have problems with accurately assessing people with whom they must deal but about whom they know very little. The fact that their assessments are inaccurate or possibly unrepresentative does not make the consequences any less real for them.

The tourist sector also includes an array of roles, variously organized, that relate more or less directly to tourism. In the modern era these include hotel managers, lifeguards, cooks, chambermaids, guides, taxi drivers, construction workers, shopkeepers, craftsmen, and the like. The effect of tourism on them and their society, though it depends on tourists, is brought about through the existence and requirements of some tourist-service role. Smaouli (1979:102–7), in his discussion of jobs created by tourism in Tunisia, deals with this kind of effect. Also, by referring to employment that is indirectly related to tourism, he raises the question of primary and secondary effects, as, for example, in the hotel “industry” or the agricultural area. The so-called multiplier effect, which refers to the secondary consequences of tourist input, comes about through the links that the tourist sector has with the rest of the host society. It should be kept in mind, however, that as in the case of the relationship between tourist-generating and host societies, these links are not one-way streets. There is give-and-take between the tourist sector and its social context.

A refreshing alternative to the general tendency to see tourism (acting through a tourist sector) as affecting the host society and not vice versa is provided by Young’s study, mentioned above, which associates the kind of economic and political structure of Caribbean host societies with the form of tourism they develop. Her study also raises the practical question of the amount of control a host society has over its tourist input, an issue that was of particular concern to members of the seminar convened by the World Bank.

Anthropologists have been fairly free in suggesting causal relationships between touristic input and other developments in host societies. The usual method has been to obtain some kind of indication of each and to suggest that any association is an indication of causation. Sometimes this has been impressionistically done, as in Greenwood’s (1977) study of the touristically induced commodification of a Basque community, or statistically phrased, as in Boissevain’s (1978) study of tourism and development in Malta. But as any social scientist surely ought to know, the demonstration of an association need not imply causation. Is it the touristic input that is bringing about specified consequences, or could other kinds of input be involved? The fact that in many developing countries the growth of tourism is occurring hand in hand with industrial development and other modernizing influences should make us extremely wary of proposing lines of causation. As I have said elsewhere (Nash 1978:139), “The experimental method of difference is the methodological tool that ought to be kept in mind in studies of [this] kind. . . .” Barring that, one could choose host societies in which inputs other than tourism are minimal or absent, as in Lewis’s (1972) study of the U.S. Virgin Islands or my (1979a) investigation of aristocratic tourism in Nice. Of course, an adequate methodology must be allied with appropriate theory if scientists are to regard causal statements seriously. And the mere fact that some of our studies of tourism in host situations could include powerful places like Paris, Moscow, or New York should keep us from assuming any unidirectional line of causation.

Finally, we ought to consider the consequences of tourism for social systems that transcend home and host societies or subsocieties. This is perhaps most obvious in the case of domestic tourism, particularly in more politically centralized societies such as Hungary, but sometimes the line separating domestic and international tourism is rather shadowy. To go rather far afield, the San (Bushmen) exhibit a pattern of visiting between bands that fits into a framework of alliances which are apparently affected by such touristic or proto-touristic activity; and it may not be going far beyond the data provided by Silberbauer (1972), Lee (1968, 1972, 1979), and others to suggest that not only the various processes of fission and fusion, but also the coming and going between bands, some of which is at least prototouristic, serve an ecological function for an entire regional system of hunter-gatherers and farming and herding associates. Referring to a more complex culture, Turner and Turner (1978:1–79) suggest various functions that were performed by medieval pilgrimages, a form of migration which was at least partially touristic. According to these researchers, such peregrinations enabled people to transcend localized existences, and this in turn fostered solidarity within a church bent on claiming supralocal or supranational jurisdiction. In our own era it is increasingly evident that there is something “out there” which affects, and is affected by, developments in individual societies. The economies of different countries have become so interdependent that some scholars have begun to use terms like “world economy,” “world capitalist system,” etc. For such an economy or system the operation of a transnational tourist conglomerate such as Pan American Airways, its associated corporations and subsidiaries, would seem to have consequences that ought to be investigated.

It should be clear from the foregoing that any study of the causes or consequences of tourism must take into account larger social contexts in which it is embedded. Which is the significant larger context will, of course, be determined by the nature of the problem that has been set as well as the reality of the touristic situation. Adams (1974:240) makes us more fully aware of this in referring to the study of ancient trade: “Both social change and social continuity require interactive processes, with the significant interactions in some respects confined to single communities, in others to multiple groups in time-ordered social settings, in others to whole regions, in still others to interregional contacts whose historical role was far out of proportion to their limited scale and frequency.”

---

4 Smith (1980) refers to this as a “region,” and her analysis is similar to, but not identical with, mine.
Because of the considerable number of empirical studies of tourism now extant, it may be overstating the case somewhat to claim that the anthropological study of tourism still is in a prescientific stage. But empirical inquiry—even if it is organized by a high-powered research methodology—is not, in itself, sufficient for a scientific study of tourism. Theory also is needed, and it is in this respect that the anthropological study of tourism is most deficient. Though we are not now in a position to overcome this deficiency in one fell swoop, we can, after reviewing the field, make some preliminary theoretical proposals.

It would seem that anthropologists can profitably view tourism as a transaction between tourist-generating and host societies. The partners in touristic transactions may be more or less independent of each other, but in the end the anthropologist must see them as parts of broader social contexts which include the entire touristic process or system. Some variety of exchange theory (see, e.g., Ekeh 1974) ultimately may prove to be the best way of organizing an appropriate overview, but for the moment less ambitious perspectives would seem to be indicated. In the touristic system the natural foci of investigation are the tourist-generating situation, the host situation, and the transactions between the two. Different theoretical approaches now appear to be appropriate for these foci.

At the tourist-generating end of the touristic process, one might begin an investigation with the notion that tourism is some kind of superstructural manifestation of a more fundamental reality. This touristic superstructure, of course, may be conceived as having the capacity of acting back upon the reality that has created it. Additionally, it is possible to conceive of the search for, selection of, and relations with host satellites as attempts to create superstructural manifestations of the tourist-generating society. If Ritchie and Zins (1978) had questioned tourists and other metropolitan people with various (Quebec) host respondents in their exploration of factors determining the attractiveness of a tourist region, they would have been in a position to begin to analyze the manner in which a host society responds to metropolitan tourist values and so to comprehend the process through which such manifestations might be created. Where metropolitan influence in such a process is significant, one might be justified in using, as I have (Nash 1977), the term touristic imperialism, an extreme example of which is the creation of places like Disneyland, which—at least at the outset—have no will of their own.

Though the degree of power that tourists, their agents, and their hosts possess in their transactions with each other may vary, all such transactions have two things in common: First, as both Cohen (1972) and I (1977) have emphasized, they involve a relationship between strangers. The people involved come from different cultures or subcultures. In addition, they are differently occupied. Tourists, being people at leisure, are free of primary obligations, while their hosts, having to serve them, are not. This leisure-service distinction is the other universal in relations between tourists and hosts. All touristic institutions must respond to these essential elements of the tourist-host relationship.

Tourist strangers and their hosts may be seen to interact along a kind of “contact front,” as Aspelin (1978), using Ribeiro’s (1967) scheme for analyzing relations between ethnic groups, has suggested. On a more microsociological level, the views of Goffman (1959, 1967), whose analysis of the precarious nature of social relations in everyday life seems especially applicable to touristic contact, have been used in studies of tourism by Cohen (1979c), Kemper (1979), La-Flamme (1979), and MacCannell (1976), among others. These and other approaches to tourist-host interaction all would
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profit from Simmel’s (1950[1908]:402–7) conception of strangerhood, which is better known to sociologists than to anthropologists. The tourist, who seems to be very close to Simmel’s ideal-typical stranger, is a person who (to the hosts) seems near but actually is far away culturally. As a result, tourist-host interaction contains a curious mixture of intimacy and distance in which the partners tend to deal with each other not only as types, but also as objects. Pi-Sunyer (1977), in Catalonia, and Brewer (1978), in Mexico, have captured some of the quality of such interaction between tourists and their hosts. Of course, the nature of such transactions will vary with factors such as the rate of arrival and numbers of tourists and the overall relationship of the societies involved. If, for example, disparities of power are great, one might expect to find the kind of relationship between settlers and the colonized that Fanon (1968) has analyzed so sensitively and angrily.

Moving to the host end of the touristic process, the student of tourism will concentrate on the more or less differentiated tourist sector, the qualities of which are, in most cases, derived from both metropolitan and host societies or subsocieties. Like a trading sector, tourism is open to the outside, but, as Bryden (1973:92) points out, it is unusual in that “consumers” and “producers” actually confront each other in person. The resulting interaction produces effects on both parties. One such effect is the “demonstration effect,” which may run the gamut from emulation to rejection of partners in touristic transactions. If the result is of this may be a growing dissatisfaction with the old and frustration in one’s attempts to realize the new. Straitlaced North Americans, stimulated by the sensual ways of their Caribbean hosts, may become less content with their life at home. On the other hand, their hosts may take these tourists as a reference group for new consumption patterns that cannot be fully realized. Of course, greater cultural discrepancies are more likely to produce inconsistencies of this kind. Another direct consequence of tourist-host contact is the anxiety inherent in strangerhood. People respond to stranger anxiety in a variety of ways. One response on the tourist side is to clump together against the host “enemy.” For the hosts, Levine (1979:31–32) suggests a variety of responses along a continuum extending from “compulsive friendliness” to “compulsive antagonism.” Which response emerges will depend on, among other things, qualities of strangers and hosts. Whether or not one agrees with the particulars of this scheme, it does seem possible to fit tourists into Levine’s “paradigm for the sociology of the stranger” and to propose a host reaction to tourist-strangers which is a mixture of friendliness and aggression. Tourists must be welcomed, no matter how difficult it is to do.

The presence of tourists also affects the host society indirectly through the services that must exist to deal with these leisure travelers. Tourists need to be fed, housed, transported, and possibly entertained, among other things. The institutionalized ways of carrying out these tasks may be seen to constitute an infrastructure which, once established, acts upon the society that created them. A touristic infrastructure is a tertiary or service industry which, though it may not have the productive possibilities of manufacturing or agriculture, can significantly affect a host economy and society.

The much-disputed multiplier, which assesses the economic consequences of a certain touristic input, is one way of looking at this kind of effect. In its simplest sense, the multiplier indicates the rate of profit to be expected from a specific touristic input, but it can also be used to refer to economic or other effects on different sectors of the host society. For example, in referring to tourist receipts in Antigua in 1963, Bryden (1973:156) points out that most of the receipts accrued to the hotel and distribution sectors and that the agricultural sector benefited not at all. It is possible to think of societies,
however, in which the agricultural sector, having been mobilized to produce for tourist consumption, would benefit more. The image that might be kept in mind in considering the effect of the touristic infrastructure on the host economy and society is of a pond that has been disturbed by a stone dropped into it. In this case, the resulting ripples extend outward through the various economic services related to tourism. The consequences, however, are not confined to the economic, but extend into the remainder of the culture and its environment as well.

Anthropologists have considered the effects of tourism on host societies almost entirely in the developing world. One is not surprised to find, therefore, that if theory appears at all in the anthropological literature, it often is shaped by the problems of modernization, development, or underdevelopment. In such cases tourism is lumped together with all other kinds of industrial input into preindustrial societies. This may be explained by the fact that the nature of tourism has only recently begun to be explored by sociologists and anthropologists. Most research, as Boissevain (1978:39) has noted, has been a "spin-off dividend of analyses constructed and executed to elicit information on other topics." Which theory is appropriate for dealing with tourism in developing situations will depend in part on the question raised. Using one example, the U.S. Virgin Islands, as analyzed by Lewis (1972), one can envisage a variety of theoretical treatments.

Though the U.S. Virgins do not have a pure tourist economy, (North American) tourism appears to be the main source of income in these highly dependent islands. As a result, according to Lewis (1972:127), "economic life and activity revolve increasing-ly around the art of getting the most out of the tourist dollar." All groups in this society—even the revolutionaries—are in favor of tourism, though they may differ as to the direction it should take. A functionalist would find it instructive to trace the manner in which tourism extends into all areas of this society—even the churches. A Marxist might be struck by the manner in which the profits from tourism accrue disproportionately to a comparatively small business elite that seems to have its finger in every tourist-related piece of the pie. An evolutionist interested in modernization might be impressed with the general line of touristic development, which seems to lead towards what Lewis refers to as the "anti-civilization" of Las Vegas or the Condado Beach section of San Juan. The increasing power of mainland interests in the local economy, the skewing of that economy according to their wishes, and the increasing share of the tourist dollar being taken by these interests might attract the dependency theorist.

From this one example, it seems obvious that a variety of theoretical approaches can be used for analyzing tourism in developing societies. But in order to do full justice to the subject, one must fully understand tourism and the way it operates. In addition, one ought to keep in mind the fact that a theory which is appropriate for a problem in a developing situation may be useless when considering, for example, tourism in host situations such as Moscow or a band of San. Finally, different aspects of the touristic process appear to call for different theoretical approaches. It may be that this is an overly eclectic stance to take at this point in our research, but there always is a danger of premature theoretical closure in an uncharted area. Similarly, there is a danger of simply accumulating empirical studies that are not theoretically informed. As Cohen (1979c: 32) points out in his reflections on tourism as a sociological subject, we should plan to cut "a middle way between a presumptuous attempt to create a monolithic (generalizing) 'theory of tourism' and the piece-meal, ad hoc investigation of discrete empirical problems." Finally, we should keep in mind our peculiar anthropological perspective on the world, a perspective (as I hope this paper has demonstrated) which can dramatically illuminate tourism as it does so many other subjects.

Comments

by Anne V. Akeroyd
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This article should bring the potentialities of tourism as a field of study to the attention of anthropologists who are not familiar with papers in more specialised journals. It is surprising, however, that Nash does not develop one specific anthropological interpretation of the touristic encounter. He dismisses as unhelpful Graburn's (1977) article; but we do not have to accept the idea of a need for an alternation between ordinary and non-ordinary states to recognise the more valuable aspect of identifying tourist travel as a rite de passage. The tourist is in a liminal period, in a state of existence which is out of space (often literally "abroad"), out of the normal, everyday social-structural and cultural environment and beyond its social and moral constraints, frequently between two states of work (not simply at leisure), and out of (structural) time. Wagner (1977), for example, fruitfully adopts this viewpoint, not only to analyse the experiences of Swedish tourists in the Gambia and the ways in which they interact with and are treated by their hosts, especially young people, but also to account for the (often unhappy) experiences of young males who follow their Swedish "friends" to Europe. Nash notes that "tourists . . . are free of primary obligations, while their hosts, having to serve them, are not," but he does not consider a corollary of this, that the seasonal and diurnal rhythms of work and timing of activities may be markedly affected. Tourists live life upside down, starting and ending a day late, and, if it is to be successful, a resort must in some degree conform to this pattern (see, e.g., Sutton 1967, Wagner 1977, Pi-Sunyer 1973). If hosts wish to avoid intrusion upon or trivialisation of their activities and cultural events, they must arrange matters so that these take place out of "tourist time," early in the day (e.g., holding funerals at 6 a.m. [Smith and Turner 1973:60, citing Knebel 1960:106]) or out of season (Brownrigg and Greig 1976). A different aspect (which the author of a book on expatriates [Nash 1970] might have discussed) is the analogy with migration. The stranger-tourist takes his cultural baggage with him but expects the host community to meet his requirements; whereas, in the case of (say) Turkish labour migrants in Europe, it is the migrant who is primarily expected to adapt and to conform. The tourist-generating society, on the other hand, is in a position analogous to that of a labour-exporting country in that tourists, like labour migrants, may return with new interests, tastes, and ideas. If tourism is viewed as a subclass of migration, then studies of migrant assimilation and acculturation (e.g., Graves and Graves 1974, Price 1969) will be relevant.

I think it unhelpful to use a definition of tourist which covers the Western tourist in Fiji staying among strangers, who is involved in temporary, nonreciprocal relationships, and a San woman visiting kin and affines, who will in her turn be expected to reciprocate their hospitality. Tourists and their "hosts" are associated in artificial, asymmetrical, and unidirectional relationships, often only through brief encounters. In many of the communities frequented by tourists from the developed world the concept of a holiday in the touristic sense, let alone the experience of one, or even of "going abroad," is at best confined to a small elite. The image of the social and cultural home world of the tourist-generating society received by the hosts may therefore well be distorted or false, and one-dimensional. Such a broad definition, too, limits the value of studying the tourist as stranger—though wives and affines may indeed be classed as such and received "strangerly," i.e., hospitably, as by the Tallensi (Fortes 1975:230). It certainly obfuscates the nature of modern mass tourism and discounts the impact of a tourist encounter which demands the provision of special structures.
spaces, sights, services, and entertainments and which thereby generates new roles, occupations, activities, sites, etc., in the host society.

For the record, the following studies are also of interest: Schwimmer (1979), Forster (1964), Nufiez (1963), Armstrong (1977), Miller (1974).

by John J. Bodine
Department of Anthropology, American University, Washington, D.C. 20016, U.S.A. 16 in 81

Nash has commendably called attention to an important area of contemporary anthropological research—tourism—but in his article many more questions are raised than answered. While we are badly in need of good theory in tourism studies, I feel that we do not yet have enough sound empirical studies to abandon those efforts as Nash contends. Many of the questions he poses could be explored in just such studies.

I have some problem with Nash’s definition of a tourist. Perhaps we do need such a broad definition if we are to investigate tourism cross-culturally, but then I have difficulty with the statement “Since tourism involves travel, a cross-cultural (or subcultural) encounter is inevitably produced.” If, on a leisurely Saturday evening, I travel across Washington, D.C., to Chinatown and enter a restaurant which is most definitely outside my cultural milieu, am I a tourist? If the Ladies’ Garden Club of York, Pa., hires a bus and goes to New York to spend the day having lunch, shopping, and perhaps taking in a matinee, are its members tourists? Can the contemporary Plains Indians who spend their weekends and other periods of summer leisure following the “powwow circuit,” immersing themselves in an aspect of Pan-Indianism which is part of their culture today, be considered tourists? I have some difficulty accepting any of the above as truly tourists, yet they all fit the definition. I think this may point up how far we still have to go in our research on tourism.

Nash states several times that anthropologists have only recently begun to look at tourism. I do not know what he means by “recently.” The first organized attempt by anthropologists to look at tourism was a symposium of the Central States Anthropological Society held in Milwaukee in 1964. As far as I know, only one of its papers (Nufiez 1963) was ever published, although my later symposium effort on tourism at Taos was highlighted in the AES Proceedings (Bodine 1968).

I suspect that there is a considerable amount of potentially helpful information lurking in the anthropological literature generated before the more focused research on tourism began a few years ago.

The evidence for the antiquity of tourism, particularly in Greece and Rome, goes well beyond the statement of Seneca quoted by Nash, as he knows. Herodotus’ Histories show that he had travelled throughout all of Greece, to Egypt as far south as Elephantine (modern Aswan), along the east coast of the Mediterranean to Gaza and Tyre, to the Euphrates Valley and Babylon, to Scythia and the Black Sea region, and, finally, to Thrace in southern Italy, where he died. The Description of Greece by Pausanias of Lydia (ca. a.d. 150) is truly a guidebook of great accuracy. I was particularly struck by the entry on travel in the Oxford Classical Dictionary (Badian 1970:1000), which discusses the situation at the height of the Roman Empire: “A regular tourist industry on quite a modern scale seems to have developed in times of peace and prosperity. Inns, mules, and carriages, under legal regulation, were available in all civilized places: means of conveyance could be hired in one city and left at the gate of the next.”

1 I am indebted to Valerie French, a historian here at American University, for calling my attention to this.

by Erik Cohen
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Nash’s essay is a welcome introduction to the study of tourism as a legitimate professional topic for the wider anthropological community. While I agree with much of his exposition, I feel that his approach is too broad and too general; hence he fails (a) to distinguish tourism from other types of noninstrumental travel and (b) to distinguish important systematic variations within the area of tourism proper.

a) The problem of demarcation. “Tourism” belongs to that class of concepts, like “city” or “religion,” with which everybody is familiar but which are very hard to define. Basically, there are two definitional strategies: a comprehensive definition, which can be cross-culturally applied, thus capturing the commonalities of apparently diverse phenomena, and an exclusive definition which highlights the distinguishing traits of the phenomenon in one culture and then compares it with related phenomena in other cultures. Nash chooses the former strategy and I the latter (Cohen 1974). Both strategies are, in principle, legitimate, but the decision depends on one’s theoretical position: Nash obviously considers the cross-cultural similarities crucial and points them out through his “relentlessly employed” comprehensive definition; I am impressed by the differences and prefer to reserve “tourism” for the peculiar variety of noninstrumental travel predominant in the modern world, using other concepts, such as “pilgrimage,” to capture the peculiarities of the various kinds of such travel in other cultures.

Since Nash finds my approach lacking in “direct linkage . . . with theory,” I shall briefly state its rationale: Modern man has developed a generalized interest in his environment (Cohen 1972:165) in contrast to the more restricted one of nonmodern cultures; his travel is not bounded by particularistic ties to people (e.g., his family or friends, as in “visits”) or places (e.g., shrines, as in pilgrimages). Tourism is therefore, institutionally speaking, wide open; it is voluntary (vs. the obligatory or semiobligatoriness of visits or pilgrimages), noncurrent, tends toward faraway places, and is legitimately oriented to mere novelty and change (vs. the “higher purpose” of, e.g., pilgrims or tourists [Lowenthal 1962]). These qualities, in turn, aggravate the problems of strangeness and impersonality in the tourist’s situation and lead to the emergence of touristic institutions of “commercialized hospitality” such as travel agencies, tour companies, and hotels and, eventually, a “tourist industry.” Nash is aware of the differences and introduces the term “prototourism” to designate the various forms of noninstitutional travel in nonmodern cultures. Instead of lumping all of them together, I prefer to introduce separate concepts for these precursors, as I did for marginal touristic phenomena on the fuzzy boundaries of modern tourism (Cohen 1974:535–55). This approach enables us to clarify the important differences, as well as similarities (e.g., those between tourism and pilgrimage [Cohen 1981]), and may eventually lead to a comprehensive theory of travel as a universal social phenomenon.

b) The problem of internal variation. While Nash emphasizes the variety of touristic phenomena, he does little to systematize them. Thus he discusses extensively the various causes of tourism but except for characterizing touristic phenomena as “superstructural” does little to clarify the forces which move modern man to become a tourist. This, however, is a central question for an understanding of the cultural significance of modern tourism. While some authors, such as MacCannell (1973), assume a single motive—the quest for authenticity in an alienated world—I argue (Cohen 1979d) that a broad spectrum of “modes of desired touristic experiences” can be distinguished, depending on modern man’s basic attitude to his own culture.
and society. These modes are probably closely related to styles of travelling and particularly to the tourist's propensity to expose himself to strangeness or, contrariwise, to retreat into the "environmental bubble" provided by the tourist establishment. This propensity, in turn, is a useful criterion for the definition of different types of tourists (Cohen 1972) and may, in turn, serve as a point of departure for the comparative study of tourist-host relationships, touristic institutions, and the impact of tourism. The establishment of these and similar typologies (e.g., Smith 1977b: 8-10) is necessary in order to steer a middle way between the mere awareness of the multifariousness of touristic phenomena to which Nash draws our attention and the contrary tendency to speak of "the tourist" as a single type or even, as MacCannell (1973) would have it, as the prototype of modern man.

by Graham Dann
Department of Sociology, University of the West Indies, Barbados. 18th & 81

Nash's paper is as significant as it is controversial. In a nutshell, he argues that the study of tourism by anthropologists is important because it offers scope for the study of (a) the process of acculturation, (b) a worldwide phenomenon, (c) intercultural encounters, and (d) linkages with the preindustrial world. Nash, however, as often is the case, they focus on developing at the expense of generating societies, are characterized by a weakness of theory and corresponding methodology, and display an unwillingness to confront the phenomenon they are investigating.

In order to remedy the situation, Nash tries to carve out a niche for anthropologists by proposing a definition of tourism in which travel and leisure intersect. In so doing, however, he appears to sidestep a number of theoretical difficulties. In the first place, travel as (active) tourism seems to discount the more passive and popular pursuits of vacationing and visiting. Secondly, the definition permits no distinction between types of travel. Presumably for Nash students, tourists, and hippies would all be tourists; all travel for leisure of sorts. Yet Cohen makes the point that without differentiation of the tourist role such distinctions become blurred. In this sense the definition is too broad for analytical purposes. At the same time it may be overly restrictive. If tourism is considered only with reference to leisure, those who travel for other purposes (e.g., pilgrims for religious motives) are automatically excluded. The paradox is possibly due to Nash's reluctance to examine typologies and their underpinning tourist motivation. Such a line of inquiry he rules out on the grounds of theoretical prematurity and lack of scholarly precedent. Yet a perusal of the literature reveals that writers such as Buck, Cohen, Crompton, De Sola Pool, Gray, MacCannell, Rivers, and Sutton agree that a study of tourism without tourist motivation is largely a sterile exercise. Nash of course would recognize that most of these authors are not anthropologists and that their presence might weaken his case for the anthropological study of tourism. Indeed, where he dwells on the paucity of theoretical insights provided by his own discipline he cites a number of sociologists offering a richer source of material. Unfortunately, he does not include their most recent work on the phenomenological approach to touristic experiences. Had he done so he would have discovered that their variation is directly related to tourist motivation. Upon further reflection he would appreciate the differential nuances of meaning associated with cause, purpose, motive, reason, verbal justification, satisfaction, intention, and disposition, all of which arguably should be taken into account before a definition of tourism is contemplated.

Instead Nash suggests that a viable approach to an under-

by Nelson H. H. Graburn
Department of Anthropology, University of California, Berkeley, Calif. 94720, U.S.A. 17th & 81

For a decade or so anthropologists have bemoaned the infancy of the anthropology of tourism, but this publication is a measure of the fact that it has "arrived," at least in our leading international journal. Nash has done well to cover in an eclectic fashion the basic problem areas in the anthropology of tourism, with attention to the most important recent literature and with considerable erudition. He has brought out many of the problems, both theoretical and applied, which will doubtless be the subjects of the increasing number of research projects that anthropologists are undertaking in this field. Particularly important are (1) the prototypes or analogues of tourism in preindustrial societies, (2) the causes of touristic variability, (3) tourism as a "superstructural" phenomenon to be studied in tourist-generating societies, and (4) the disaggregation of the impact of tourism from the impacts of other changes in developing societies. As one particularly interested in the impact of tourism on expressive features of culture (Graburn 1976) I might wish to add a consideration of the impact of tourism on ethnicity (cf. Gamper n.d.).

Nash spends an inordinate number of pages discussing problems of definition but ends up with the simple idea that tourism is "leisure activity requiring travel." This is very close to Smith's (1977b: 2) definition and to the theoretical heart of my own (Graburn 1977: 18-19), a position that he regards as useless. I asserted in a somewhat structuralist fashion that tourism is best understood as a necessary socio-psychological contrast, comparable to "holidays vs. work," between the tourist mode and that of "staying at home." Thus variability in tourist behavior would be best understood not "etically" as "what the tourist does," as Nash implies, but as the alternative state that stems from and ultimately relates to the home cultural and psychological environment. Surprisingly, Nash himself later makes the similar statement "tourism may be seen to be an expression of some more fundamental social or psychological facts." He then goes on to state, correctly, that tourism is analogous to other superstructural expressive phenomena, such as religion, myth, and art (to which I and others [Gamper n.d.] would add play).

Perhaps his best section is on the consequences of tourism. He points out, as few others have, that we must pay more attention to the consequences for the metropolitan, tourist-generating societies—another case in which anthropologists need to "study
up." He also takes the minority but more balanced view that tourism may have positive as well as negative impacts, even in less developed areas. It is in this latter area that anthropologists, if they are to be taken seriously as advisors and consultants rather than as petulant nay-sayers, must provide analytical tools and case studies which will elucidate the factors whereby tourism can maximize its positive consequences and alleviate its many deleterious affects. As I have pointed out in my teaching and in print (Graburn and Hetzer 1979; Graburn 1980:63-65), in actual case studies the impacts of tourism must be measured both against the possibility of other investments and developments and against the consequences of no development.

by DYMPHNA HERMANS
Albert Cuyypstraat 114, Amsterdam, The Netherlands. 9 III 81

Nash's article aims to explain the relevance of anthropology to the study of tourism. What the reader gets, however, is yet another account of why tourism should be studied by anthropologists, what it is, its consequences, and why people tour. Instead of the promised critical assessment of anthropologists' thinking about tourism, this is a plea for the study of tourism as a system with a dynamic of its own. From this point of view the basic question of the causes of tourism naturally arises. Nash feels, however, that we are not yet in a position to raise questions about causes. We can look, he says, at the causes of variability in the rates, times, places, and forms of tourism.

It seems to me that here lies the main problem of the relation between anthropology and tourism. It is not enough to say that tourism is a system with a dynamic of its own. One should argue —however speculatively—that tourism is part of a general social process. If that could be done, no doubt anthropologists' interests would extend beyond the effects of tourism on "their" village. It's precisely because no one has yet been speculative about the causes of tourism that anthropologists have been rather "parochial." Nash does show how widespread tourism is—that it exists at all levels of sociocultural complexity. This could be a valuable contribution to an argument about the causes of tourism, but in the absence of the latter it seems without much point.

Nash's plea is halfhearted—plea for a theory of tourism obscures the alternative possibility and its problems. It is not yet at all certain that tourism is a social process with a dynamic of its own and thus that a theory of tourism should exist. Is it surprising, then, that anthropologists haven't shown much concern with the causes of tourism and the generation of tourists? That their interests have been directed towards the other end, the encounter of hosts and guests and the effects of tourism on host populations? It is difficult to see why they should be "blamed" for that. Had Nash given us a critical assessment of anthropologists' thinking on tourism, he might have touched upon the basic problem, which is why anthropologists working on tourism produce so few studies that make use of or contribute to debates in anthropology. It is insufficient to say that this is because the anthropology of tourism is still in its infancy or that most research has been a "spin-off dividend of analyses constructed and executed to elicit information on other topics" (Boissevain 1978:39)—however true this may be. It is, in my view, the ambivalence of anthropologists of tourism—wanting to study tourism both in itself and as a subject of anthropological enquiry—that is the main cause of their piecemeal, ad hoc investigation of discrete empirical problems (Cohen 1979:32). Some very good articles on the effects of tourism can be found in Bailey's Debate and Compromise (1973): they treat matters like the relevance of technical and social innovation to the belief and value system of a community, and they suggest, for example, the ways acceptance of change may be related to the degree of stratification. It is good anthropology and it is about tourism, yet I have never seen any anthropologist of tourism referring to it.

by JAFAR JAFARI
Department of Habitational Resources, University of Wisconsin-Stout, Menomonie, Wis. 54751, U.S.A. 18 III 81

Nash's article makes several contributions. It introduces tourism as an anthropological concern, discusses how some theories of anthropology lend themselves to the study of tourism, and suggests how an anthropological focus on tourism contributes to general anthropological perspectives and interpretations.

The study of tourism in the context of anthropology is no longer a notion; it is a fact. An extensive tourism social science bibliography for the period of 1970-78 included a large number of tourism papers by anthropologists (Jafari 1979). An examination of the back issues of Annals of Tourism Research, a refereed journal representing academic perspectives on tourism, would also indicate that many of its feature articles are written by anthropologists. This journal even devoted one of its special issues to "Tourism and Development: Anthropological Perspectives" (Smith 1980). Nash's article demonstrates this growing attention by anthropologists to the study of tourism, yet it correctly notes that "the anthropological study of tourism is still in a prescientific stage.

Tourism is not a total stranger to departments of anthropology in the United States or abroad. Other colleges and universities will soon join the University of California at Berkeley Department of Anthropology, among other forerunners, in offering undergraduate and graduate courses in the anthropology of tourism as well as allowing students to write undergraduate and graduate theses on tourism. Other institutions will undoubtedly follow the California State University at Chico Department of Anthropology in offering a minor in tourism. Graburn (1980:64) succinctly states why tourism deserves this anthropological reception:

The study of tourism is an entirely suitable, albeit neglected, topic for anthropologists. In many parts of our complex, interconnected world, tourism is the major cause of inter-ethnic, cross-cultural interaction. The study of the nature of tourist motivations and behavior reveals much about the underlying value systems of the modern world. If we are to study the nature of solidarity, identity, and differentiation in modern society, we cannot neglect tourism, which is one of the major forces shaping modern societies and bringing (and changing) meaning in the lives of the people of today's world.

Therefore, it may not be far-fetched to suggest that an innovative department of anthropology might someday even offer a graduate degree in the anthropology of tourism. Nash's article, among other recent writings cited in his paper and this comment, presents the kind of framework and seminal theoretical thinking that fosters an optimistic view of the future of this area of study.

The anthropology of tourism could be further advanced if it were introduced within or in association with an established anthropological concern, the anthropology of play; the commonalities of play and tourism have not previously been explored. There is no consensus on the definition of play. Norbeck (quoted in Schwartzman 1980:52) has described play as "voluntary pleasurable behavior that is separated in time from other activities and that has a quality of make-believe...is conditioned by learned attitudes and values...[and] is molded by culture, consciously and unconsciously." Depending on which definition or concept of play is used, the focus of study changes. This has resulted in fragmentary and discordant study of play in its full range.

That aspect of play which deals with the activities of children requires no explanation, for many disciplines have recognized
the significance of learning through play. Interestingly, home economics studies children's play from the early months to about age 12, but does not pursue the issue beyond adolescence—as if when children become adults they stopped playing (anthropologists, more than any other group, realize that initiation into adulthood or entry into any stage of life is a cultural arbitration). (Or perhaps it is at this precise age that the "responsibility" of home economics ends.) That aspect of play which deals with the activities of adults (however "adult" is culturally defined) does, however, call for some explanation. Adults' play ranges from the ritualistic events of Naven (Bateson) and the kula (Malinowski) to attending bullfights and sports events, participating in Mardi Gras, visiting nearby people and places, and traveling to faraway destinations in this age of jumbo-jet tourism. Because the play aspects of adult life are not considered "play" cross-culturally, they have not yet been dealt with coherently. Moreover, depending on the disciplinary context, various terms are employed for various manifestations of adult leisure activities: ritual, play, leisure, recreation, sports, games, travel and tourism, to name but a few.

Sociology, for example, does not study play; it studies leisure. Courses in the sociology of leisure or sport are common, and the International Sociological Association has research committees on the sociology of leisure and the sociology of sports. In recent years, however, some sociologists have shown interest in other forms of leisure, such as the sociology of tourism (see Cohen 1979). The Association of American Geographers also has a specialty group for recreation and tourism. Geographers have actively participated in tourism research for more than two decades (see Carlson 1980, Mitchell 1979), and courses in the geography of recreation and tourism are not uncommon. Other academic concerns take a broader view of leisure, recreation, sports, or games as their disciplinary contexts. A large number of colleges and universities offer degrees, ranging from undergraduate to doctorate levels, in leisure and recreation (with a passing interest in tourism). This vast and growing field is also represented by associations such as the National Recreation and Park Association and some scholarly journals. Furthermore, there are specialized programs which respond to specific delivery aspects of leisure-time activities. Hotel management, for example, addresses some of the needs of travelers away from home. The study of travel and tourism in itself, initially a branch of hotel management, has now grown to full undergraduate and graduate degree status both here and abroad. This newer field of study has its own associations, such as the Travel and Tourism Research Association, as well as a few research-oriented journals. 

Thus there are various discordant concerns, foci, programs, and disciplines which deal with selected aspects of play. These specializations have provided researchers with a sharper focus on the various manifestations of play, but specialization has its limitations. An attempt should be made to bring the various concerns together in a single discipline. This calls for a framework which can accommodate multidisciplinary efforts and foster both specific focus and a holistic perspective.

Anthropology can offer this breadth of viewpoint. It can study play with an eye to its relationship to other aspects and institutions of culture. Unique to each culture, play represents a color-changing thread of continuity in human life and an amplifier of cultural expressions. With its cultural relativism and emic and etic approaches to the study of each culture, anthropology offers the possibility of a more comprehensive cross-cultural interpretation of play in its full range. Actually, anthropologists have always acknowledged play in relation both to animals and to Homo sapiens. Their deep-seated interest in this topic is apparent in many volumes of published work (Lancy and Tindall 1977; Saltler 1978; Schwartzman 1980, Stevens 1977). Anthropologists have studied play at and away from home, in complex and simple societies, and among Western and non-Western peoples. In recent years, interest in the anthropology of play has given rise to an association with play as its central theme: the Association for the Anthropological Study of Play. It addresses play in all its manifestations, but unfortunately there is no mention of tourism.

At the same time, a small group of anthropologists does focus on tourism, albeit without apparent association with those in anthropology of play. A few anthropological tourism writings, dealing with limited aspects of tourism, first appeared in the early 1960s. Since then, interest in the study of tourism has grown rapidly, and it now benefits from a wider network of anthropological thinking (see Smith 1977, 1978a, b, 1980). Even some recent annual conferences of the American Anthropological Association and the Society for Applied Anthropology have featured tourism symposia. But, unfortunately, even in this single field, anthropologists interested in the study of play and those interested in tourism do not communicate with each other. Examination of the bibliographies of their publications indicate that they carry on their research essentially independently, apparently not realizing that both groups study the same continuum of activities.

As a culture/time-bound manifestation of human energy, play takes place mostly in one's home or community. The culture which gives it its forms of expression is often the culture which sees it in action. One often participates in his own culturally bound play or leisure activities, with his own friends, in his own community. The play, players, audience (when appropriate), and playground (setting) are all familiar. In the case of tourism, in contrast, often play, players, audience, and playground are not familiar, but, like home-bound play and leisure activities, tourism also often takes its form from its culture. Special temporal and spatial zones of tourism distinguish it from other forms of play at home. It is at this juncture that Nash's article makes a significant contribution. Further study of tourism and its intrinsic relationships with play is needed.

In summary, considering play as a culturally stylized but conceptually coherent multidimensional entity should not only provide the framework for a more holistic study of play, but also introduce the unfamiliar subject of tourism to anthropologists in a familiar context. Anthropology also stands to benefit from the pursuit of this integrated study of play and the theoretical thread that binds its components together.

by Robert V. Kemper

Department of Anthropology, Southern Methodist University,
Dallas, Tex. 75275, U.S.A. 1 III 81

In this overview of tourism as an anthropological subject, Nash wishes to show that the study of tourism "can provide us with a significant lead into sociocultural reality" and that "our peculiar anthropological perspective... can... illuminate tourism as it does so many other subjects." He begins by offering a definition of tourism derived from an individualist viewpoint but soon moves on to a broader structuralist approach. Specifically, he argues that "the tourist is a person at leisure who also travels" and that "tourism is the activity... of these persons." Then he shifts his attention to the "transactions between hosts and touristic guests" and goes on to argue that tourism results "from the intersection of the histories of two or more cultures or subcultures." Ultimately, he concludes that "tourism is a superstructural or expressive manifestation of some society."

Although Nash gives considerable attention to the emergence of "tourist sectors" in 20th-century "tourist-generating" and "host" societies and speaks of the importance of the linkages of these sectors with the "broader social contexts" through "demonstration effects" and "multiplier effects," his analysis fails to deal with the subtle reality of many touristic situations. For instance, does a waiter in a Manhattan restaurant distin-
guish between tourists and other classes of customers? Does the Hilton Hotel (anywhere in the world) differentiate between business travelers and tourists? Indeed, as anthropologists we are likely to mix business with leisure during our field trips or conventions in such subtle ways that Nash would be hard-presssed to identify etically or emically what constitutes our role in the touristic system. To be fair to him, the lack of conceptual clarity in anthropological and social scientific analyses of tourism is widespread; in this regard, his “evaluation” of the literature reflects its limitations.

Nash makes a number of important points. He rightly urges that we stress the “touristic process” rather than treat tourism as a static phenomenon. He raises an intriguing point regarding the likelihood that some forms of tourism have existed in all types of societies from hunter-gatherer to industrial capitalist. He shows the importance of seeing tourism in terms of “a relationship among strangers” (although some tourists travel so often to particular resorts that they and the staff become friends). He suggests that tourism be understood in terms of “transactions” and that some form of exchange theory or culture-contact theory might serve as the basis for touristic analyses. He flirts with the applicability of functionalist, Marxist, evolutionist, and even dependency-theorist approaches to the study of tourism.

In sum, Nash illuminates a number of the fundamental problems involved in the anthropological approach to touristic phenomena, but he seems content to serve as the torchbearer of those few anthropologists already committed to touristic studies. Although he promotes “a critical assessment of anthropologists’ thinking about this fascinating subject” and “an orientation for future investigation,” he merely hints at the special contributions anthropologists can make to the analysis of tourism and the distinctive benefits for our discipline’s theory and methodology if tourism were to become as important an anthropological subject as, say, kinship has been for the past 100 years.

by ALAN G. LAFLAMME

Department of Sociology and Anthropology, State University of New York College at Fredonia, Fredonia, N.Y. 14063, U.S.A.

Tourism is a major worldwide phenomenon. According to Sutton (1967), it is quite likely to become the world’s largest business by the end of the 20th century. Scores of millions of people are involved, directly or indirectly, with tourism. In contrast to such frequently discussed anthropological topics as the fur trade and missionary activity, are relatively minor socio-cultural forces. For anthropologists to ignore or play down the significance of tourism is, as Nash points out, unjustified.

Through the years, anthropology has broadened its perspective. Because of both a changing world and a changing disciplinary world view, peasant studies supplemented the study of “primitive” cultures. More recently, analysis of “modern” cultures has been given greater emphasis. Of necessity, the same has been true with regard to intercultural contact. Studies of supposedly pristine cultures have long since been overshadowed by those dealing with contact and acculturation. Today, studies of tourism are merely continuing this trend.

Beyond justifying an anthropological concern with tourism, Nash’s survey article makes several valuable observations. For example, in his brief discussion of the existence of tourism within the “primitive” world, Nash corrects the mistaken and often cited notion of Dumazedier (1968) that tourism only comes into being with the evolution of high levels of socio-cultural complexity. His point that anthropological studies have tended to overemphasize the consequences of tourism at the expense of analysis of its causes is well taken. Most importantly, perhaps, Nash has underscored what we all have known but have seldom heeded: that studies of tourism must develop a more sophisticated and coherent theoretical framework.

The role of the entrepreneur (broadly defined) in tourism, mentioned in passing by Nash, needs to be dealt with in much greater detail by anthropologists. Such individuals and organizations are usually much less accessible for social-science scrutiny than taxi drivers and waitresses, but they are of greater importance if we are to understand the origins, growth, and nature of tourist attractions.

That members of host societies are at work while tourists are at leisure is not entirely true. Granted, most interactions are of this sort, but many representatives of host societies interact with tourists in the context of mutual leisure. Conversations, noneconomically motivated sexual encounters, and common participation in (or watching of) sporting events are cases that come immediately to mind.

As an observer of tourism in several parts of the Caribbean region, I suggest that the stereotypes of the “sensuous” locals and “straitlaced” North American tourists are just as often reversed. Many fundamentalist Christian (and other) Caribbean residents object rather strongly to the “sensuous” dress and manners of tourists.

Minor criticisms aside, I believe that Nash has done us a service by increasing the awareness of many colleagues of the significance of tourism as an anthropological topic.

by FRANK MANNING

Department of Anthropology, University of Western Ontario, London, Ont., Canada N6A 3C2. 18 III 81

This article addresses major gaps in the anthropology of tourism but leaves many of them unfilled. Specifically, it fails to deliver adequately on its two major promises—to evaluate anthropological studies of tourism and to propose an orientation for further investigation.

Nash deals almost exclusively with tourists and tourist-generating societies, despite his stated realization that most of the anthropological work has been done among recipient or host populations. His implied rationale for this emphasis is that the anthropology of tourism has been “parochial” and colored by an antitourist reaction of the “knee-jerk” variety. This charge is partially true, but there is also a sizable corpus of carefully researched and dispassionately analyzed studies, some of which (i.e., the contributions to de Kadt 1979) are mentioned but not examined. I appreciate MacCannell’s (1976) contention that tourism is a metaphor of modern life and therefore an appropriate perspective on contemporary “leisure,” but I object to the generalization of this insight into an anthropology of tourism, which merely brings us back to the solipsism characteristic of anthropology before it went into the field. On more practical grounds, I find it difficult to conceive of an anthropology of tourism which is not strongly concerned with what the tourist presence does, and what it means, to host societies, particularly those whose economic fortunes are heavily dependent on it and whose social formations bear the stamp of its influence.

A related deficiency is the lack of attention to critical analyses produced from within tourist-oriented societies, especially those of the Third and Fourth Worlds. Like the work of anthropologists, much of this is a knee-jerk reaction, but there is insight and often refreshing good humor as well. In the Caribbean, where the impact of tourism has been more dramatic and extensive than elsewhere in the undeveloped world, tourism has engaged the reflexive attention of social researchers, church leaders, literary figures, calypsonians, even the general public. The following poem, which appeared in the letters-to-the-editor section of Barbados’s daily newspaper (Barbados Advocate,
August 8, 1973), comments on the island's famed "beach boys" or male prostitutes:

**ODE TO 'BEACH PROPOSITIONERS'**
They seek them here
They seek them there
These lads they seek them everywhere
They offer lots of merriment
These cheeky lads
From "Rent-A-Gent"
They seek them here
They seek them there
These girls they seek them everywhere
To try a new experiment
With cheeky lads
From "Rent-A-Gent"
Why, suddenly I ask myself
These worries from on high
When, after all, with no demand
There would be no supply
But heads are getting much too big,
And though some boys this suits
Their brazen tactics clearly show
They're only prostitutes
And though I do regret to have
To sound belligerent
I'm saying "Cool it brother man!"
To guys from "Rent-A-Gent."

**SCORPIO**

Exemplifying cultural reflection at a popular level, this type of artefact illuminates the significance of tourism to those whose societies and lives it shapes.

Finally, the promised framework for further research seems to me far too general. Nash contends that tourism is a "superstructure" of modernity, similar to art and religion, but what does that mean? Are theories of art and religion useful in the study of tourism? What are the critical problem areas? What, specifically, can tourism reveal about the societies that generate it? We are also told that the "touristic" encounter is an important social transaction, affecting the personalities and cultures of both visitor and host, but there is no framework for moving beyond this rather obvious point either in terms of elaborating theory or clarifying issues.

These problems notwithstanding, the article can be valued as a first step at synthesizing anthropological work on an important subject. My criticism stems from the limitations of the synthesis and from the absence of both forceful conclusions and a bold, substantive agenda for further research.

by Raymond Noronha
604 N. Pegram St., Alexandria, Va. 22304, U.S.A. 11 III 81

Nash's article is an important step towards making tourism respectable as a subject of academic enquiry—a continuing effort pioneered by Forster (1964), Cohen (1972, 1973, 1974, 1979), and Smith (1977a). However, his approach, reflecting, possibly, the infancy of the subject, is both Procrustean and ambivalent. Why should, for example, a definition of tourism be "compatible with" or require "direct linkages with" anthropological or other theories? Surely, it is fact that should suggest theory, and it is the method of collecting facts that should really be under scrutiny. As a result, Nash repeatedly proposes theoretical frameworks only to reject them, for he recognizes that "there is always a danger of premature theoretical closure in an uncharted area."

The dichotomy Nash draws between "work" (a "primary" activity) and "leisure" (a "secondary" activity of which tourism forms part) unduly narrows the scope of the subject at this stage. It is a view that appears to have been generated by reference to the Western world and a few tribes. If one were to agree with Nash, the "compulsory tourism" of doctoral candi-

dates in anthropology collecting data in a "strange" land would not be subsumed under the rubric of tourism; nor would a socially compulsory pilgrimage, say, by a group of Hindus carrying a deceased ancestor's remains for immersion in a river distant from their homes. These are examples of primary obligations that have little to do with theories of work and leisure and must be considered touristic activities. Further, if taking a vacation is increasingly a social expectation or demand, why should tourism not become a primary obligation?

An analysis of tourism should also recognize that tourism can exist without any "encounter" between tourists (from one subculture) and hosts (from the same, or another, subculture). It would be tourism if a family chartered a plane for a vacation on an island which it owned and on which it had no contact at all with "locals." In fact, one manifestation of "modern" tourism (I hesitate to use the word "mass," since it connotes, theoretically, more elements than mere numbers) is that tourists often only meet other tourists (quite often from the same subculture) and have peripheral contact, if any, with "strangers" from other subcultures.

It is true that an analysis of tourism requires an understanding of tourists (and tourist-generating countries), their hosts, the encounter between tourist and host, and the infrastructure (transport, salesmen, agents, guides). Anthropologists, as Nash rightly points out, have been guilty of an overconcentration on the "supply side" (the impact of tourism on developing countries). But, as I have pointed out (Noronha 1979), the type of tourism, the type of tourist, the nature and depth of the encounter, the facilities available, and the roles and expectations of tourist and host are significantly influenced by the stage of tourism development—by the degree to which tourism is "institutionalized." To equate, for instance, the encounter between tourist and host in the early stage of tourism development with that when tourism has been institutionalized—compare the tourist in Bali in the 1950s and today—would be erroneous and counterproductive. The use of an independent variable such as the "degree of institutionalization" of tourism could provide an understanding of the evolution of tourism, the changing roles of tourist and host, the rise of transnational companies, and the impact of tourism. It could lead to the development of sound theory. On the other hand, preselected theories (such as Marxism or metropolitan dominance) may not fit the particular case and could irreparably bias data collection.

by Oriol Pi-Sunyer
Department of Anthropology, University of Massachusetts, Amherst, Mass. 01003, U.S.A. 11 III 81

Nash's praiseworthy article does much to synthesize the state of the art in tourism research. The information is current and much of it provocative; as a result, the specialist will thank him for new leads and insights, while the general community of anthropologists will be better apprised of the potentials of this area and some of the problems it faces.

He correctly notes that in this relatively new field theory has tended to lag behind ethnographic description. I would agree with him that there are problems of scale that must be dealt with, since tourism research can, and does, cover the gamut from world systems to dyadic interaction. Given this spread, Nash positions touristic research in the context of middle-range theory, and he is modest enough to offer the opinion that there are some causative factors underlying tourism that still elude us.

Part of the problem, I feel, is that tourism studies as currently understood represent such a wide parish that it is hard to move much beyond description and some very general abstractions drawn from comparable situations. It is perhaps unrealistic to bring into the same analytical orbit such disparate phenomena
as modern mass tourism, the elite grand tour of former times, pilgrimage activities, and what might be termed the hunter-collector walkabout.

Tourism, I suggest, is such a modern phenomenon that general comparisons with travel and leisure may obscure the issue rather than clarify it. This is not to doubt the satisfactions of travel, shared alike by tourist and Bushman, or to question certain touristic features of the Way of Santiago. Similarly, the roles of stranger, host, and guest are inherent to all levels of human organization, although whether tourists genuinely partake of the attributes of guests is debatable. Granted, however, that there is common ground—important common ground—between tourism and many other movements and conditions of concern to the social scientist, the differences, quantitative and qualitative, are enormous: tourism as we know it can only flourish as a particular commodity in a specialized market system. Expressed differently, travel, like conflict, is primordial, but just as it takes specific infrastructural changes to transform conflict into war, it requires the commercialization of leisure to change travel into tourism.

The particular value of an anthropology of tourism is that it allows us to examine at the local level macropolitical and macroeconomic changes that are in the process of altering not only our own society, but virtually all others. This transformation includes the emergence of a new economic order in which the most developed societies (or regions) derive a growing share of their income from high-technology goods and sophisticated services, while the post-industrializing (and long-term underdeveloped) societies (of long-industrialized societies) compete in what are now thought of as "traditional" industries and services—including mass tourism.

This new international (and intranational) division of labor entails more than a shuffling of jobs. It is bringing tremendous changes in kinship structures, migration, and sex-role allocations, both in the developed world and in less developed countries. Tourism is a particularly powerful agent of change whose impact and consequences can be studied in the kinds of contexts in which anthropologists generally feel most comfortable: communities, small groups, families.

I am not espousing the "premature theoretical closure" of Nash's final paragraph, but rather presenting the case that tourism, a product of industrial societies in search of the natural and the simple, is both a metaphor of our times and a means of understanding them. Nash has raised important matters and given his readers a superior résumé of the subject; I hope all have benefited as much as I.

by VALENE L. SMITH

Department of Anthropology, California State University, Chico, Calif. 95929, U.S.A. 25 III 81

Nash is to be commended for a succinct summary of the "state of the art" in tourism studies. For emphasis, I reiterate his appropriate statement of the need for theoretical frameworks in which to assess and explain the ad hoc empirical studies published to date. In these case studies, theory has so far emerged primarily to describe a local problem or situation. More rigorous and better insight would obtain if the methodology were reversed and tourism data were used to test established anthropological theory. A study in cultural continuity by Smith (1981) is a significant case in point.

In general, we need to broaden our inquiry; tourism should be studied as one aspect of the human use of time and resources. The phenomenon of tourism occurs only when three elements— temporary leisure + disposable income + travel ethic—simultaneously occur. It is the sanctioning of travel within a culture that converts the use of time and resources into spatial or geographical social mobility. If travel is not deemed culturally appropriate, then time and resources may be channelled elsewhere, e.g., into upward mobility for status and honors, as among Indians of the Northwest Coast in their acquisition of the means to potlatch.

In the broadest context, what options are available to a given society for the use of free time and spare resources? When, and for what segment of the population, is tourism an approved activity? By applying this overview, we may more readily understand tourism, not as an isolated occurrence or separate entity, but as a variable in the human behavioral spectrum. Simultaneously, we are better able to isolate the culture-based motivations that permit and encourage travel and even the kind of tourism (historical, ethnic, or pilgrimage) in which individuals participate. For example, Hermans (1981) details the lives of a Costa Brava farm couple, tacitly Catholic, who became relatively wealthy during the several decades they operated a pension for foreigners. However, despite their long exposure to and evident interest in the activities of their sight-seeing guests, when this husband and wife finally took their own first trip it was to a single destination—Lourdes—and not for health-related reasons.

The study of tourism can add a significant dimension to an understanding of the human use of noncompulsory time, whether it be to journey, to play games, or perhaps to sit in the sun by a stream (at home or abroad) and watch dead leaves drift by.

by RICHARD W. STOFFLE

Division of Behavioral Science, University of Wisconsin-Parkside, Kenosha, Wis. 53141, U.S.A. 26 III 81

Nash has provided a thorough and timely state-of-the-art synthesis regarding the anthropological analysis of tourism. Still, some points may be served by further elaboration, and there are additional points that might be considered.

Nash correctly emphasizes the need for a model of tourism to include (1) the degree of fit with pre-touring culture and (2) the relative balance of control by hosts and guests over the process of establishing tourism. These are exemplified by the case of the Kaibab Paiutes of northern Arizona, who have established an on-reservation tourism facility. Common assumptions about the conservatism of Indian culture and knowledge of how the Bureau of Indian Affairs stimulates reservation-based tourism might reasonably lead one to expect problems of cultural imperialism and conflict. Such is not the case here, however, because the Kaibab Paiutes (1) are culturally preadapted to tourism and (2) have maintained control over various "spheres of autonomy" during the developmental process as defined in Wallman's (1977:11-13) model and recommended by the Vicos case (Dobyms, Doughty, and Lasswell 1971). In addition, the program has involved all segments of the tribal community, the BIA, external scientists, and local tourists (Stoffle, Evans, and Last 1979).

The pre-1840 "prototouristic" patterns of Southern Paiutes closely fit Nash's description of other peoples with a horticultural/intensive-gathering economy. Although Paiute families would have traveled for hundreds of miles to attend a ceremony, to harvest food, to share strategic information, or even to visit (see Laird 1976, Stoffle and Bunte 1980), a "fundamental obligation" was always either a manifest or a latent function of the trip. Each visit involved recreational activities, such as gambling and touring the local countryside on nature walks, and these constitute important cultural preadaptations to current Euroamerican patterns of touring. Las Vegas gambling casinos located on Paiute land are viewed by one Las Vegas Paiute elder as acceptable and to be expected because that location was "sacred for gambling" (Stoffle and Evans 1979). A strong environmental interest and desire to know about local Indian people on the part of Arizona-Strip tourists fit with elder Kaibab
Paiutes' traditional pattern of learning about the ecology of local food plants when visiting and their current desire to teach tourists the "truth" about Paiute life. Sensitivity to such common values as exist across the cultural boundary between Native American hosts and Euroamerican guests has permitted development of educational hiking trails emphasizing ethnocentric, cultural-technical value systems. These interpretive centers (now a virtual museum) are dominated by Paiute elders. "

Weber agrees that tourism absorbs culture, especially when it becomes "a cultural-technical value system." These Paiute centers have taught visitors about Paiute life and values. This tourism facility has remained under the control of the tribal council and community elders.

The Kaibab Paiute case suggests two anthropological models not discussed by Nash. The recent efforts of Kaibab Paiutes to attract tourists, provide on-reservation employment, and change tourist attitudes towards Paiute people can be viewed as an adaptive strategy (cf. Bennett 1969) utilized by a people engaged in ongoing interethnic competition for resources (cf. Hoetink 1975:9). These two models have been used to reconstruct early Paiute-Euroamerican relations (Stoffle and Evans 1976) and seem best to explain current tourism activity.

Other scientific disciplines have long traditions of studying tourism that have produced numerous models containing cultural variables. Economists have asked tourists to translate into economic terms their cultural evaluations of tourist environments' features (Randall, Ives, and Eastman 1974, Brookshire, Ives, and Schulze 1976) and their willingness to tour or not tour at different times (Bishop and Heberlein 1979, Cesario 1976). Others have recorded culturally based developmental cycles of touring behavior (Jackson 1980, Jackson and Norton 1980), and one study (Lucas 1964) has caused cultural variables to dominate in the management of a major international park. Anthropologists interested in studying tourism must first control the literature of other disciplines or be faced with reinventing the wheel.

by J. M. THURET

Centre des Hautes Etudes Touristiques, 18, rue de l’Opéra, 13100 Aix-en-Provence, France. 10 nr 81

This article examines the anthropological issues of tourism in a relatively new light because Nash, not content with a superficial knowledge of the phenomenon, raises questions about the very theory of tourism as well. I would like to review two points that have not been clearly enough emphasized and that continue to bias any discussion of the subject.

Tourism seems to be viewed as something quite different from other types of acculturation that accompany industrialization, the presence of military bases, etc.—something that affects values intuitively perceived, whether by the ordinary tourist or by the peasant from Africa, Arkansas, or the Alps, as transcending the intended socioeconomic objectives. One must therefore ask oneself what the development of sociology is worth if it agrees to take part in a cost/benefit analysis incorporating (how?) the social and the cultural. This attitude, illustrated by de Kadt’s reflections (and significantly put into practice by the World Bank), corresponds to an ethical view identified by Max Weber as characteristic of Protestantism—which suggests its limitations when one proposes to analyze the Third World. In fact this view is accepted not only by economists and sociologists, but also by tourists, since all three groups are Americans or Northern Europeans. To give subjective legitimacy to practices that would be condemned if viewed objectively, this ethic freely invents economic or cultural-technical excuses to suit its purposes (e.g., the development or modernization that tourism brings with it, as well as capitalism—or socialism). If Western sociology wants to retain its credibility, it must seek to dissociate itself from this eminently subjective development.

In my opinion, analyses that present a homogeneous and harmonious picture of the host society should be challenged. Any impression of unity stems from the existence of a norm for the behavior of members of the group, and this presupposes the existence of a majority that holds power (economic, religious, political, police) and defines the norm and one or more minorities that await the opportunity to oppose it. The media often offer an opportunity by spreading information about different standards and weakening social control. Tourism represents another opportunity. Incidentally, among these minorities the intellectual class merits a mention: sometimes it collaborates with the class in power and sometimes it claims leadership of the opposition, but it always does so in terms of the language and code of the sociologist to which it is accustomed, having been trained in the same universities. The sociologist tends to pay too much attention to this type of interlocutor and in so doing forgets that the discussion of tourism has become a way of approaching the powers that be. He should not use the rejection or approbation shown him as raw material. Every society contains its own contradictions, and it is appropriate that the rhetoric behind this supposedly raw material be revealed and that that aspect of the rhetoric which serves only to support the dialectic of the appropriation of power be laid bare.

by KAREN ANN WATSON-GEERO

Graduate School of Education, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass. 02138, U.S.A. 4 nr 81

Nash’s paper is a useful attempt to integrate selected studies of tourism and to introduce some order into the fledgling anthropological study of tourism.

Defining tourism is a thorny problem. Nash’s definition of the tourist as one who “leaves home while free of primary obligations” omits businessmen, government officials, conventionees, and even university professors who travel for professional reasons but spend part of their travel time at leisure. The tourist is one who is “touring,” as Nash points out in his historical sketch: in other words, a traveler, someone who arrives at a place that is not his/her home, stays there briefly, and leaves again (presumably, to return home). The transiency of the tourist seems to me as important a factor as leisure. Tourism is a very complex activity; in many countries, tourist destination facilities are used by locals or nearby residents as well as by tourists.

People have always traveled, yes; but I'm not convinced that the kind of travel, entertainment, and socializing in what Nash calls the less differentiated societies is appropriately labeled tourism, as he argues. The defining features of tourism seem to me to be (1) the large-scale, temporary movement of people (as individuals or in groups) to another place (the tourist destination) and (2) the performance of services by people wholly at work for people essentially (or part of the time) at leisure. Mutual celebrations, as in the !Kung and kula examples Nash offers (which may have evolved to sustain important social or economic relationships and networks), do not have the same social functions or meanings as tourism and may not have the same sociocultural impact on the host society.

An anthropological perspective is definitely needed in tourism study, but the perspectives Nash lists seem standard, and I'm not sure that they are enough. Tourism needs to be studied by interdisciplinary teams—e.g., one cannot ignore the role of transnational corporations. The anthropological perspectives Nash develops seem more reflective of traditional studies of small-scale societies than of the international realities of modern tourism.

Although Nash eschews the emphasis on Third World and developing-nation tourist destinations, the truth is that for many of these sites a crisis of survival is under way. There is a great need for systematic, long-term studies of tourism impact on host cultures, studies with practical importance. We need anthropologists to provide them.
Whilst in agreement with Nash that the study of tourism is a fascinating subject still in its infancy and acknowledging the service he provides by drawing attention to research already done in this area, I do not find his paper the proposal for future investigations that he wishes it to be. My objections are mainly definitional and procedural.

Nash argues that only after a suitable definition of tourism has been provided can an adequate line of explanation be laid out. To this end he finds Dumazedier's notion of "leisure as freedom from primary obligations" a useful concept, but he does not address the question of who defines such obligations, the observer or the observed. Are such obligations necessarily the same in all societies? Surely this is a question for empirical research, for it can be argued that such obligations are clearly cultural products and not universal givens. Similarly, he goes on to suggest that cross-cultural tourist-host encounters result in transactions that provide a "key to the anthropological understanding of tourism." However, no attempt is made to establish whether or not such transactions are unique to tourism and therefore help us understand tourism rather than some wider phenomenon of which it is merely one example. Perhaps the hosts see little difference between dealing with tourists and dealing with other types of stranger such as immigrants, missionaries, travelling salesmen, Peace Corps workers, UN experts, trades union delegations, and sports teams. Again, only empirical investigation can reveal whether the tourist-host encounter is perceived as different to any other.

Thus I feel that the search for a universally valid definition of tourism inhibits rather than facilitates research; it distracts attention from the real issues. Definitions are needed only when there is likely to be real uncertainty or confusion over meaning. In any case, it is the tourist himself who should surely be the arbitrator of such disputes. He knows if he is or isn't a tourist, and it is his criteria for knowing, not Nash's, which ought to be of interest to the investigator. Fascinating research questions such as the tourist's criteria for deciding who is a tourist, what tourists do, and how transactions conducted by them as tourists differ from similar transactions when they are not tourists, and so on, cannot be asked if definitions are established prior to fieldwork.

One reason for Nash's search for the broadest possible definition is to enable him to "identify" tourism in hunting-and-gathering and other types of society. Unfortunately this approach would seem to distort more than illuminate the ethnographic record. In what way does referring to distant family visitors, trading expeditions, travelling entertainers, pilgrims, and the like to tourists provide us with insights we did not previously possess? Nash's technique at this point is somewhat reminiscent of that of the 19th-century evolutionists who cheerfully ripped institutions out of their social and historical context in order to provide examples of "types" and "stages" previously identified in their armchair speculations. Does it matter whether tourism is a universal phenomenon or not?

Nash suggests that "the transactional view" is a profitable approach to the study of tourism, but he does not tell us whose transactional view he is referring to—his own, other anthropologists', or those of the tourists and hosts. His later suggestion that "different aspects of the tourist process appear to call for different theoretical approaches" would seem to imply that all these transactional views are equally meritorious. Indeed, an "eclectic stance" is positively advocated. Presumably he intends this to mean keeping a healthy open mind in a newly emerging field and utilizing the best parts of hitherto existing approaches. My riposte is that eclecticism of this sort inevitably produces ontological and epistemological confusion and pre-

vents the rigorous gathering and analysis of data within the framework of a coherent research strategy.

Nash concludes by stating that we should keep in mind "our peculiar anthropological perspective on the world ... which can dramatically illuminate tourism." I could not agree more, but unfortunately he omits to tell us what this peculiar perspective is. In what way, for example, would an anthropology of tourism differ from a sociology of tourism, a psychology of tourism, an economics of tourism, or a politics of tourism? In fact I suspect that Nash cannot answer this question, for his eclecticism allows him to embrace all these viewpoints as and when it suits him.

As I have implied, my own answer is that any anthropological approach to tourism must be based on a thoroughly empirical research strategy which seeks hermeneutic understanding in terms of the knowledge possessed by the participants themselves—their definitions, goals, strategies, decisions, and the perceived consequences of their actions (intended or otherwise). Furthermore, this same methodology applies regardless of level—whether we are looking at policy making at government level, transactions of multinational tourist companies, disrupted natives, or the tourist himself. Nash hints at such an approach when he suggests that a "beginning can be made by questioning tourists." However, he hedges this radical idea with cautions such as "answers to survey questions do not give the real reasons for anything" and that "people may be blind to the real factors affecting their actions." Why such stultifying caution? Of course people can deliberately mislead others in answering a questionnaire, but surely the whole point of long-term participant observation is to provide the context within which the validity of such responses can be reasonably ascertained by reference to other unsolicited remarks, observed actions, consistency over periods of time, situational variations, etc. To suggest that people may be blind to the real reasons for their actions insults the intelligence of both hosts and guests and other agents in the touristic encounter. If a person is unaware of something, how can that factor possibly influence his conscious decision to act in a particular way? Does Nash know the "real reasons" he wrote his paper, for example, or doesn't he?

Reply

by Dennison Nash

Storrs, Conn., U.S.A. 6 v 81

Following the rich and varied response to my paper, for which I am grateful, I would like to extend our thoughts on tourism as an anthropological subject.

Though the commentators generally affirm the purpose of the paper, they are not in agreement about how well that purpose has been realized. Hermans's rather wholehearted criticism refers to my "halfhearted" and "ambivalent" approach, and Manning points to the "absence of both forceful conclusions and a bold, substantive agenda." I would prefer to use the term "cautious" to characterize my approach, and, now that the comments are in, to believe that my caution was justified. As can be seen from them, there are many disagreements in the infant field of tourism studies. I had hoped to make a small start towards reducing the confusion by proposing a general orientation that anthropologists, being anthropologists, could accept. It seemed to me that before getting on with the serious business of integrating the study of tourism with bodies of anthropological or other theory it was necessary to define the anthropological stance and the shape of the subject as seen from that stance. Considerable disagreement remains, however, not only about
the nature of the subject, but also about the stance that anthropologists should take in viewing it.

After having grasped something of the character of tourism as viewed from what I considered to be the anthropological perspective, I thought that it would begin to be possible to ascertain what theories or theories would be most appropriate for ordering our data. I suggested certain theoretical orientations for looking at different aspects of what I have called the touristic process. Theories, however, have to be tried on with care. Nothing of significance can be accomplished without an understanding of the aspect of sociocultural reality we have chosen to study. An immediate application of anthropological theory to the study of tourism would, I feel, be as misguided as the "piecemeal, ad-hoc investigation of empirical problems" that Hermans complains of. Considering our many disagreements, the correct way is, rather, to move forward cautiously with much give-and-take between theories and empirical inquiries. As we move along in our study we shall acquire a better understanding of the nature of touristic phenomena, how far afield we have to go in considering them, and what kinds of theories are most applicable. As I indicated, I feel that we cannot be parochial in our pursuit and that, as Stoffle points out, we can benefit from the theories and methods of other disciplines. Indeed, as I mentioned in n. 1, there already appears to be a convergence among some of the social sciences in the study of tourism.

A number of commentators have had problems with my definition of tourism, one I felt was well established and in widespread use. They reveal a variety of definitional views, some apparently emotionally and uncritically held. Some have had difficulties with my cross-cultural application of this definition. I, too, have had my problems here, especially in regard to preindustrial societies. In that realm one is more frequently struck by the confined nature of what Cohen refers to as "non-instrumental travel." The more I looked at such travel, however (see esp. Nash 1979b), the more I became convinced that the differences between premodern and modern societies were not of kind, but only of degree. I had hoped that the examples I gave would attest to this. There is a strong inclination in some of the respondents (e.g., Akeroyd, Cohen, Pi-Sunyer) to follow Dumazedier (though not always for the same reasons) in viewing tourism as a uniquely modern phenomenon. Though such an orientation is legitimate, it does not spring from the kind of pancultural awareness that anthropologists are supposed to acquire. Our notions of "primitives" have had to be reshaped over and over again in the light of empirical data. Similarly, in my investigations I have found that there is something that approaches, or is, tourism (by whatever definition we choose to use) in primitive societies.

It looks now as if there were two main definitional camps in regard to tourism. One camp, in which I am located, tends to see tourism primarily as a variety of leisure. I have defined leisure as freedom from primary obligations, which (Wilson should note) can only be determined from a society's own point of view. Thus a pilgrimage may or may not be a leisure activity (and hence tourism) depending on the importance of religion to the people of a society. Medieval pilgrimages, therefore, do not qualify as tourism except in their obviously nonreligious aspects. Further, traveling salesmen do not qualify as tourists except in their roles as Merrymakers, pursuers of women, etc. The second definitional camp, which has its most eloquent spokesman in Cohen, sees tourism primarily as a variety of travel. In reality, as Smith points out, tourism requires leisure and travel (plus certain means), but people seem not to be evenhanded in this matter. While both positions are legitimate, I think that viewing tourism primarily as a variety of leisure is more likely to be theoretically productive in the near future. Cohen speaks of the possibility of developing a "comprehensive theory of travel," but the corpus of travel theories available to us appears not to be very rich. On the other hand, by considering tourism as a special kind of leisure phenomenon, noninstrumental phenomenon, or the like it seems to be possible to tie our touristic inquiries into a number of significant anthropological theories through the general notion of "superstructure," a term which Manning should understand to refer to a range of phenomena which have in common a dependence on some more fundamental substructural or infrastructural reality. I would be willing to wager that when Wilson gets through questioning all those tourists to obtain a definition of tourism he will find that his definition will tend to favor one or the other of the views just indicated.

Bodine, Hermans, Kemper, LaFlamme, Noronha, Watson-Gegeo, and Wilson raise the question of boundaries that Cohen deals with so thoughtfully in his comment and elsewhere (see especially Cohen 1974). There always will be such a problem where empirical concepts are concerned, but I had thought that readers would be aware that I was using ideal-typical constructs in my analysis and, accordingly, would not get bogged down in impure or borderline cases. Even so, I did take a number of more or less arbitrary decisions about the boundaries of terms like tourist, tourist-host transaction, touristic sector, etc., and I do feel that, considering the ideal-typical method employed, that discussion was adequate.

Enough of definitional matters; they tend to bore unless one is a partisan of one or the other view. What is tourism a manifestation of? As I pointed out, I do not think that we are in a position now to get at the cause of tourism, much less to see it as a manifestation of some need or attitude. Though my views on Graburn's position have been modified by his comment, I still feel that he is proposing (see Graburn 1977) that tourism is one manifestation of some kind of need for alternation. Jafari also sees it as a manifestation of a need or impulse (to play). While these views may prove valuable as heuristic devices, I do not believe that at this juncture we should commit tourism to some presumably universal need or impulse. The range of potential touristic phenomena, whether subjectively or objectively viewed, is so great that it would be impossible to demonstrate such a universal link. Taking one very difficult example, are we to consider Cotton Mather, a presumed tourist traveling to, and taking the waters at, Stafford Springs, Connecticut, at play? Possibly this visit and those of other proper Bostonians were manifestations of a psychological need for alternation, but how can we know? Certainly much is to be gained by looking at examples of tourism from the perspectives chosen by Graburn and Jafari, but a too enthusiastic endorsement of one or both of these positions might short-circuit much necessary empirical work in exploring the motivations and outlook of tourists. Those respondents (Cohen, Dann, Wilson) who raise questions about my position in this regard are quite right to insist that we must get at the dispositions of tourists, I take that for granted. Here our investigations will be guided by the definitional strategy we have employed. Obviously Cohen is farther along in identifying touristic dispositions and fitting them into his strategy than I am. His approach now appears to have a coherence that I was not able to pick up earlier.

Manning, Thurot, and Watson-Gegeo point out the importance of considering the impact of tourism on host (particularly Third World) societies and viewing tourism through host eyes. The interest of anthropologists in the point of view and welfare of such societies is, of course, well established and will continue (ideally with more and more research by Third World scholars). However, this interest may have been responsible for a kind of anthropological ethnocentrism which has prevented us from realizing the full potential of tourism study. It may be that a number of commentators' problems with my definition of tourism spring from this myopic point of view. I hope that I have been critical enough of this anthropological myopia, but I don't see how anyone who has read the paper carefully can claim, as
Watson-Gedge does, that the host society aspect of the touristic process and the role of transcultural tourism or other organizations have been slighted. I have benefited enormously from reading these comments, and I cannot conceive that others will not benefit also. Tourism is an exciting field for anthropological study which, as Bodine implied, should have gotten off the ground earlier. Now it seems to be well launched, as is indicated by the rather impressive bibliography which we, here, have managed to develop (see also Jafari 1979 and Noronha 1975, 1979). The fact that there are a number of lively disagreements among us would seem to attest to our enthusiasm for the subject as well as the variety of legitimate ways in which it can be approached. Undoubtedly our differences will diminish as we and others continue our research and debates.

It does not now look as if a theory of tourism ever will emerge in anthropology or the social sciences. The tendency already exists to see tourism as a variety of some broader phenomenon (e.g., leisure, travel). What we eventually will have will be similar to what we now have in the anthropological study of religion, that is, the application of existing theories to some aspect of sociocultural reality that we take to be religious. There never will be an anthropological or other theory of tourism, but there will be a much more sophisticated integration of theory and empirical work on the subject than we have now.

Ideally, such a development will be accompanied by an equally sophisticated awareness of the systems and people our research serves. Thurnot has done well to remind us that we do not live in a vacuum and that our investigative efforts reflect certain sociocultural interests, the most obvious of which are those of the people who commission our studies and/or stand to benefit from them. But there are interests that operate in more subtle ways. They may give rise to perspectives that can be adopted uncritically by the researcher. Thurnot would rule out the use of certain perspectives that reflect the interests of establishments in the modern and modernizing world. I, on the other hand, feel that considering the tremendous variety of touristic phenomena and the preliminary state of our art we should keep an open mind about possible perspectives. Obviously we must consider the real nature of the situations we have chosen to investigate and the problems we have set; but effective choices can be made only by those researchers who have undertaken to free themselves from taken-for-granted views of the world. This problem of self-awareness, however, is not unique to the study of tourism.
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