

Ethnic Tourism and Indigenous Cosmopolitans

メタデータ	言語: English 出版者: 公開日: 2017-10-03 キーワード (Ja): キーワード (En): 作成者: Swain, Margaret メールアドレス: 所属:
URL	http://hdl.handle.net/2297/28215

Ethnic Tourism and Indigenous Cosmopolitans

MARGARET SWAIN

Sustained ethnic tourism sites provide an ideal location for investigating potentially oppositional identities in a multicultural, globalized state: ethnic affiliations, the indigenous local versus the cosmopolitan global subject, and minority versus majority citizens. Tensions among these categories melt or realign as rooted cosmopolitans, mobile locals, and majority minorities perform their daily lives producing and consuming tourism commoditization of ethnic identities. My years of ethnographic research among Sani Yi in the Stone Forest, a domestic and international scenic/ethnic tourism site in Yunnan, China, read through current transnational cosmopolitan studies literature, frames my questions about constructs of indigeneity and cosmopolitanism in ethnic identity formation. We can see ethnicity transforming and interacting with many embodied identities—gender, race, class, age, sexuality—hyphenated with these indigenous/cosmopolitan categories of belonging. My aim is to add to debates about how indigeneity and cosmopolitanism are co-produced and their meanings for ethnic identities in our future.

Introduction

Sustained ethnic tourism sites provide an ideal location for investigating potentially oppositional identities in a multicultural, globalized state: ethnic affiliations, the indigenous local versus the cosmopolitan global subject, and minority versus majority citizens. Tensions among these categories melt or realign as rooted cosmopolitans, mobile locals, and majority minorities perform their daily lives producing and consuming tourism commoditization of ethnic identities. My years of ethnographic research among Sani Yi in the Stone Forest, a domestic and international scenic/ethnic tourism site in Yunnan, China, read through current transnational cosmopolitan studies literature, informs my questions about constructs of indigeneity and cosmopolitanism in ethnic identity formation.

If you Google “Yunnan tourism development” you are likely to find the Yunnan Province Department of Commerce’s website (2006), with some clear pronouncements about the economic necessity of selling ethnic diversity as a primary renewable resource in the early twenty-first century. Given that about one third of its population comprises twenty-five officially recognized minorities, divided into many additional subgroups, there is certainly potential for ethnic/scenic tourism development. This has been on-going since the 1980s with state and private tourism ventures selling ethnic minority/indigenous identities in both rural and urban locations, often presenting homogenizing images and marketable experiences while fostering the lure of authentic ethnic diversity. Ethnic minorities themselves in Yunnan range from well off to impoverished, urbanites to rural denizens. Some ethnic minority or indigenous people working in tourism may be empowered through commoditized identity, or the marketing of identity traits as commodities for sale. Results, here as elsewhere globally, are uneven and depend on many factors, as we see from research on individual tourism entrepreneurs among the Sani Yi people in Stone Forest (Shilin), with some comparison with other

sites in Yunnan (Swain forthcoming) and Hainan, China (Xie forthcoming).

An aim of this chapter is to add to debates about how indigeneity and cosmopolitanism can be co-produced in relationship to ethnic identities. We can see ethnicity transforming and interacting with many embodied identities—gender, race, class, age, sexuality—hyphenated with these indigenous/cosmopolitan categories of belonging. I will begin by framing the concepts of indigeneity and cosmopolitanism with reference to ethnic identities in multicultural, globalized states. Examples of identities formation are drawn from the Stone Forest ethnic/indigenous tourism site and elsewhere, followed by an evocation of issues embraced by indigenous cosmopolitans in ethnic tourism including interpolated identities, embodied authenticities, and translocal and transnational mobilities.

Indigeneity, Cosmopolitanism, and Ethnic Identities

Ideas about indigeneity reflect tensions between understandings of cultural fluidity and autochthonous claims to being the original people of a place. One of the strands of thought about cosmopolitanism promotes a consciousness of and engagement with the world outside home community or place through hospitality and travel. In Appiah’s (2006) perspective, cosmopolitanism can be distinguished from competing universalisms by engagement with plurality, or difference. Indigeneity might be contrasted to cosmopolitanism in a series of binaries: local/global; rooted/mobile; timeless/contemporary; tradition/modernity. But it would be a mistake to think of these concepts as oppositional rather than complementary, or deny the possibilities of indigenous cosmopolitans.

Indigeneity and cosmopolitanism both have strong, intertwined strands of legal rights and cultural identities woven through their definitions, which resonate with concepts of ethnicity. While the main focus here is on identities, debates about universal and particular rights cannot be ignored.

Rights discourses are the bases for states' affirmative action programs¹ and "autonomous" governing zones for ethnic minority or indigenous citizens, and peoples' reactions to them. Cosmopolitan rights, such as those hashed out at the United Nations (UN), underlay rationales for universal social justice claims as well as protections of specific multicultural, indigenous identities.

Defining Terms

The United Nations has taken a central role in defining what is an indigenous identity and naming indigeneity in our contemporary world. Efforts to raise awareness and cultivate networks include the UN's Working Group on Indigenous Populations begun in 1982; Indigenous Peoples' Decades (1995–2004, 2005–2015); a Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues founded in 2002; and in 2007, the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples. The Declaration has been adopted by many nations including China for example, but not some of the other nations with larger indigenous populations such as including the United States.

In common use, the geo-cultural category "indigenous" indicates "native" people differentiated from their "others" in a specific place. As this concept has internationalized, the term "indigeneity" has come into use to indicate a commonality or global identity among indigenous peoples that has been institutionalized in the UN and by collective practices of indigenous peoples. Academic and regulatory definitions of indigenous/indigeneity can be seen to have both criterial and relational bases (Merlan 2009: 303–306). Criterial bases are named conditions to be a kind of people, such as those in the UN Declaration: historical continuity in claims to territory pre-invasion or pre-colonization; a continued self-definition as a distinct people; and a determination to transmit to future generations their ancestral territories and ethnic identity. Relational bases include the imposition of state policies governing those deemed belonging to a different category of people within national boundaries; a "fourth world" (Graburn 1976) of imbalanced power produced through conquest, colonization, and exclusionary treatment within nation states.

Over time, the rise of an international concept of indigeneity has brought greater focus on internal or external colonization as a common factor. An imagined identity community based on flexible definitions of what it means to be indigenous intersects with rights-based social constructs and universal moral claims. This is not to say that all peoples who claim indigenous identity participate in global indigeneity. Indigeneity is an evolving construct that has potential repercussions in global governance and equity based democratic or socialist state regulations.

The rise of indigeneity paralleled a revival of interest in cosmopolitan theory in the 1990s as a way to analyze globalization. Cosmopolitanisms has become a pluralized term in an international literature, indicating the many ways of understanding this construct as identity, a consciousness or worldview, a global process or as a monolithic cultural companion to global capitalism. Nussbaum's (1994) work, focused on liberal and relativist ideologies in patriotism, was followed by collections of essays such as those edited by Robbins and Cheah (1998) and Vertovec and Cohen (2002), that provided many examples of how theorists worldwide

were unpacking this most complex of ideas. Some of the newer directions looked to cosmopolitanisms' multiple articulations with the local (Clifford 1997; Hall 2002; Pollock 2002) and ethical dimensions (Tomlinson 1999; Appiah 2006). It is possible to see three dialectical strands in cosmopolitan theory: moral (universal, multiculturalism), political (citizenship, democracy), and cultural (mobilities, consumption, hybridities, networks) (Delanty 2006). These strands reflect distinct theoretical positions as well as areas of interest in various types of cosmopolitanism.

The early twenty-first century faces a global transformation of modernity, which some scholars have begun to map as the "cosmopolitan condition" (Vertovec and Cohen 2002: 9; Beck and Sznaider 2006). This condition connects human mobilities, information webs, and commodity flows in ways that can be celebrated for challenging various racialized, ethnocentric, sexist, national narratives, but critiqued for associated global rootless hybrid cultural forms, standardized mass commodities, images, and practices (Swain 2009). Within this condition, a kind of cosmopolitan citizenship or identity based on connoisseurship of people, places, and cultures may develop into intellectual and aesthetic orientations toward cultural and geographic difference. Szerzynski and Urry (2006: 114–115) envision cosmopolitan practice to involve some configuration of mobility, consumption, curiosity, risk-taking in encounters with the "other," map-making of one's own society onto different sites, semiotic skill to interpret, and openness to appreciating the other's culture.

Cosmopolitan theory focuses on the relationship between political and cultural dimensions in peoples' identities, their practice, and development of world society norms. Cosmopolitanism references an inclusive global citizen identity with diverse origins, while indigeneity refers to a specific global post-colonial identity of native or aboriginal peoples who claim some self-determination. Political solidarity and engagement in minority rights may also move an indigenous group to function as an ethnic group with symbolic and strategic goals. Emergent ethnic group and nationalist identities can be seen as almost congruent: "new identities based on individuals' perceived commonalities with certain people and on their differences from others, arise as the structure of local communities, kin groups, and languages and their patterns of usage changes with demographic, economic, and cultural change" (Harrell 1995: 5).² We can see that ethnic identity and indigenous identity both have claims to territory, cultural and language practices, and common ancestors, while claims of indigeneity focus also on dispossession and/or submission to colonizing forces. Within the global arena, indigeneity and ethnicity are prime sources of multiculturalism, a concept that is celebrated and debated as a cosmopolitan ideal and as a perceived impediment to global equity and peace.

Ethnic tourism development provides an environment ripe for cosmopolitan analysis and action. The global tourism industry commoditizes exotic difference within the homogenizing forces of transnational capitalism. I have questioned how people combine mobility with cultural exchange in tourism by looking at the cosmopolitan condition as an embodied phenomenon (Swain 2009). This "embodied cosmopolitanism" construct takes a feminist approach to the

tensions between the dualities of universal human rights and cultural diversity.

From the study of ethnic tourism, an understanding of a localized indigenous tourism has evolved that emphasizes both ethnic and ecological resources. It is based on an indigenous group's cultural identity and territory, and is controlled somewhat from within by the group, buffering direct incorporation into national or global markets (Swain 1989b: 85). Although there is no consensus in China that Chinese ethnic minorities may be indigenous, there is a rising consciousness among specific groups. A model of indigenous tourism development fits these groups well, given their histories and partial but real control over their resources.

Ethnic and Indigenous Tourism Issues in China

The Chinese state's concept of indigeneity supports the efforts of indigenous groups in other nations, but flatly denies that any such peoples exist within their borders. The logic is that all ethnicities in China suffered and struggled together against the aggression of foreign (European) colonizers. Any complications of this scenario with acknowledgement of the internal colonization of minority groups by the Han majority are unthinkable.³ The truth of the matter in China is that members of some "ethnic minorities" do participate in indigeneity forums, and that tourism activity in many ethnic minority autonomous administrative units fits the model of indigenous tourism. As China grapples with rapid globalization, it is evident that the monolithic "Han" Chinese majority is also expressing its diversity, celebrating regional cultural identities, landscapes, and linguistic distinctions (Gladney 1997), and giving rise to nostalgic recreations for festivals and local tourism. Domestic ethnic tourism has grown exponentially. In Yunnan by the 1980s there were four major ethnic tourism sites—Stone Forest, Dali, Xishuangbanna, and Lijiang—which have been joined by Lugu and Zhongdian (now Shangri-la or Xianggelila) in major state promotion. These new sites in northwest Yunnan are part of The Nature Conservancy's Three Rivers watershed project. A clear indication of their cosmopolitan potential is the 2010 publication of the first Chinese language version of Lonely Planet's "Yunnan" guide for independent travelers.

Ethnic/Indigenous Tourism Development

Based on my understanding of the Sani experience in Stone Forest during the late 1980s, I devised a conceptual model of indigenous/ethnic tourism development (Swain 1989a, 2010). The units of analysis (stakeholders) were limited to the nation-state, the tourism industry, and the ethnic group. A matrix was used to analyze each unit's distinct political economy agendas, the paradoxes they encountered, and proposed resolutions leading to sustainable development. These intersecting agendas raise dilemmas: Is the state's promotion of ethnic cultures problematic, or does it assist ethnic group rights? The industry paradoxically promotes predictable, standardized packaged deals for tourists that often "museumize" ethnic subjects as quaintly non-modern, while the very presence of tourism transforms ethnic communities. The indigenous/ethnic group fights to maintain cultural diversity (pluralism) while also becoming more integrated into national and global culture. My model

proposes that a strong ethnic identity might resolve these tensions. The cultural imperative to "stay ethnic" or indigenous presented a valuable resource for an ethnic group to exert control and claim agency in relationship with government and industry.

Trevor Sofield's case study (1999) of Stone Forest applied the concept of empowerment to this model and argued that the devolution of power from the state to the minority group encourages cooperation in tourism development that promotes sustainable ethnic identity, indigenous rights, economic independence, and cultural diversity.

Philip Feifan Xie (forthcoming) applied another variation of my model to ethnic tourism on Hainan Island, off the south coast of China. He assessed the stakeholders' positions, the paradoxes they encountered, and tensions around issues of authenticity, which Xie concluded were understood relative to various stakeholders' interest.

The Sani and Stone Forest Tourism

The Sani, one of twenty-eight officially state-recognized branches of the Yi minority nationality, settled centuries ago in the limestone karst topography of southeast Yunnan within and around what is now the Stone Forest tourism district. They claimed their native place in a region already subjugated by Chinese imperial forces. Based on their subsequent colonization by Han Chinese and Europeans, one could call the Sani an indigenous people, an identity considered by Sani intellectuals. Sani society has dealt with at least three major waves of globalization that moved into their region over the past century, each with their own translocal civilizing project. French Catholicism was brought to the Sani in 1887 during an era of foreign incursions. In 1949 the beginning of the Communist civilizing project brought a new world vision and global social organization that created a new kind of communal citizen, with often disastrous local results. Post-Mao reforms leading to a free market economy opened China to a new world of global capitalism in the 1980s that translated into tourism development within numerous indigenous ethnic minority homelands.

Stone Forest (formerly Lunan) Yi Nationality Autonomous County identified tourism within long-term development plans in 1987. Han managers with ties to Kunming dominated leadership of Stone Forest's tourism bureau, whereas local Sani usually controlled the county government. Tourism marketing has focused on Stone Forest's impressive limestone landscape and a commoditized form of Sani ethnic identity. The region is branded as "Ashima's home town," based on the Sani lore about the golden girl who turned to stone.

During the 1990s, per capita income and employment in private sector and informal tourism grew rapidly (Shi 2000). Sani and Han have opened guesthouses, hotels, restaurants, and souvenir shops outside the park and were employed in various jobs within the park. Local researcher Shi Junchao (Shi 2000) reports that 2 million tourists (1.9 million being domestic) visited Stone Forest during 1999. Since then tourism growth has levelled somewhat with 2.6 million tourists in 2007; 2.37 million in 2008, a year of may natural disasters; and in 2009, 2.7 million tourists (Zhang, personal communication). In 2004, Stone Forest National Park became a UNESCO geopark site, and in 2007 a World Heritage Site,

designations instantly added to park marketing. Local marketers call the park “world class,” though domestic tourism remains much more important than international tourism.

The marketing potential of Stone Forest County’s cosmopolitan heritage, made possible by French colonialism, is something being explored by the Stone Forest Tourism Bureau. Much of the background work had been done in the turn of the twenty-first century by a small group of cosmopolitan Sani intellectuals: a French educated Catholic teacher, a government historian; a professor at the Nationalities University in Beijing, and an up-and-coming local politician with a Ph.D. A focus on Sani indigenous culture and French colonial history would target both international tourists, and domestic tourists looking for global sophistication. Museum displays could feature the missionary Vial’s wonderful photographs. This commoditization may not be too far off. In a six language Chinese travel Internet site, the text on Stone Forest Park states that the park was “... officially founded in 1931, but at the turn of the twentieth century, a French missionary named Paul Vial revealed its wonder to the West”⁴

Indigenous Cosmopolitans in Ethnic Tourism

Indigenous cosmopolitans participating in ethnic tourism may or may not have left home to produce an authentic experience. They may be rooted cosmopolitans, or global indigenes. Any marketing of cultural commodities as authentic tourist experience raises basic questions about identity and agency of the producers, particularly in “ethnic” tourism based on selling an indigenous minority group’s culture. A protectionist perspective approves of front stage performances, goods, and sites that purportedly keep tourism out of the backstage areas where indigenous ethnic minority people actually live. An essentialist bemoans the lack of authenticity encountered by the tourist, whereas a critical analysis may raise questions of agency by asking whose heritage is being packaged and by whom. In-between perspectives focus on articulations of commoditization, authentic cultural meaning, agency, and control, seeing both positive and negative aspects of all ethnic tourism development.

Recent research in China illustrates these variations in value and construction of authenticity. Ning Wang’s study (2001) of home-stay tourism shows that tourists and hosts coproduce “interactive authenticity” based on how each produce and consume processes, practices in authentication. Looking at theme parks and ethnic villages, Beth Notar (2006a: 65) argues that tourists embrace mimetics (imitation representing the authentic) not caring if a site is fake or real but, rather, enjoying the “journey to these fantasized places.” Tim Oakes (2006: 172) uses the very Chinese concept “authentic replica” (*zhenshi zaixian*) to explain that authenticity in village theme parks both marks the originality of a place and replicates it, thus capturing “a ‘real’ distant world of modern prosperity and national prestige.” Pál Nyíri (2006: 183) also argues against any Westernized construct of postmodern in such tourism encounters and urges an inherently Chinese concept of the authentic.

Notar argues (2006a: 79) that we “should place authentication within a global process of commoditization,” a process that is cosmopolitan making for both the producers and consumers. In a similar vein, Walsh (2005: 481) comments

that authentic Mosuo identity “is lived and created in this context of representations, negotiations, encounters, and shifting identity.” Even behind the backstage, people continue to perform identity for one another, negotiating their many differences. Evoking James Scott (1992), in contrast to front-stage and public transcripts, these backstage strategies are the hidden transcripts that marginalized people might adopt to express their identity and agency despite the pressures of wider political or economic changes. Paradoxically, the more indigenous people mobilize for cultural survival, the more they may be perceived as inauthentic, but it is a false dichotomy to assume that there must be a choice between authenticity and political participation (Levi and Dean 2003: 3).

Embodied Authenticity

Indigenous ethnic tourism workers embody authenticity through their daily negotiations of numerous identities. Starting in the early 1980s, small groups of Sani Yi women engaged in the tourist trade before large-scale government or entrepreneurial efforts began, by selling handicrafts and changing money in the provincial capital of Kunming. Since then, their numbers have varied from more than one hundred to fewer than ten, depending on seasonal, political, and economic climates. These entrepreneurs migrate from their homes in Stone Forest County, often wear vivid “ethnic uniforms” of indigenous clothing, often over street clothes, to mark their difference. On streets or around Stone Forest Park, women peddlers yell: “Hello! Sani bag?” and other phrases in English, Japanese, or Chinese to greet foreigners. Their easy banter also marks Sani women as confident “others” in Han Chinese society.

These women’s differences among themselves reflect the complexity of contemporary Sani identities: some are young unmarried girls, some grandmothers; some are blood relatives, others are strangers; some cooperate, others compete; some are illiterate, others are high school graduates. Some women live full-time in Kunming City, whereas some travel from rural homes for short periods; some are farmers, others housewives. Some are poor, and some are from salaried households. Some are Roman Catholic, and some are Chinese Communist Party members. Sani women are well-known for conducting economic activities that reflect Sani gender identities. They are the producers, wholesalers, and retailers of the commodities they sell and managers of the money they earn. Sani women’s activities and appearance also marks Stone Forest as Ashima’s place for tourists. Some Sani women embrace their indigeneity and cosmopolitanism as critical identities in their response to global tourism commerce in Stone Forest.

One of my favorite memories of my co-researcher Bi, in what I would call operationalizing her indigenous cosmopolitanism (Swain forthcoming), has to do with her arranging my journey to the Kunming airport in 2002, where she translated freely across multiple cultures. Drawing on networks, technologies, time schedules, and entrepreneurial skills, Bi got six people gathered together, then transported them from the university guesthouse to the airport terminal gate. The details involved Sani friends, fictive and real kin relations, a cell phone, and Bi’s son-in-law’s car. When we arrived at the airport’s departure, Bi in full Sani dress drew

a great deal of attention from the foreign tourists there. We waved goodbye as Bi encouraged her daughter to talk to the tourists in Japanese, who tipped for the privilege and took photos of Bi with her granddaughter. The tourists were pleased to have one more chance to capture the archaic image of a native Sani woman, of Ashima.

Bi's Sani-ness allowed her the visible identity and access to engage as a tourism entrepreneur. Her support network—the sustainability of this livelihood—was also based on a diverse family, her own ingenuity and agency, and the ability to shift identities in different circumstances. This combination of individual agency in response to new forms of capitalism under tourism has expanded the potential for cosmopolitan livelihoods and identities.

Case studies of other grassroots tourism entrepreneurs substantiate creative tensions between livelihood and identity strategies. Bai women street peddlers are common in Dali and, like the Sani in Stone Forest, have sold to tourists since the mid-1980s. Adept at reading international and domestic tourists' desires for authenticity, they sell an inventory of tie-dye fabric goods, and "genuine" artifacts. Beth Notar (2006a, 2006b) describes how successful Bai women entrepreneurs have prospered. However, she notes that tourism development has also led to a litany of problems, from new roads that literally divided households, to the uneasiness of people seeking aspirations that cannot be met, to the discontent of local intellectuals grappling with the meanings of stereotypes and indigenous knowledge.

Lijiang, a northern mountain town, locale of the Naxi minority and now a UNESCO World Heritage site, has exploded with domestic and international tourism. Farther north, Lugu lake trades on its allure as home of the "matriarchal horde," the Na or Mosuo for a robust tourist trade. Walsh (2005: 468–469) has described how a Mosuo woman called Soma adroitly performed in the "backstage" of her kitchen for Walsh and some visiting Australian feminists staying in the "front stage" of her guest house. Soma projected a matri-local idyll and introduced other women working there as her sisters. Several days later, one of the sisters approached Walsh, eager to explain that she was really an employee and distant cousin from a village that does not receive tourists. Previously, this woman's family supported Soma's family during hard times, but now they had an unequal business relationship as her service workers in this changing ethnic tourism economy where livelihood strategies can reshape identities.

Further northwest, the Diqing prefecture's local Tibetan government renamed Zhongdian County "Shangri-la" in 2002 (Kolås 2004) to promote tourism development tied to the famous 1933 Western orientalist fantasy novel *Lost Horizon*, by James Hilton. This renaming signalled claim to a cosmopolitan identity for the region, meaningful to domestic and international tourists, as well as local residents. Shangri-la also denotes a favorable image of Tibetan-ness as utopian, in contrast to negative Chinese ideas of Tibetans as feudal and superstitious.

Interpolated Identities

In 2001, I surveyed various tour companies' representations of Yunnan ethnic minorities on the Internet. A second survey in 2007 found little difference in representations but

new players. The images of any indigenous ethnic minority I encountered on these sites were often truncated, flattened, and limited by both the form and the intent of the messages. Advertisements for tours take on the nature of "windshield ethnography"—looking out the window of a tour bus or hearing the rote words of a tour guide presents very little about another culture. Encapsulated in the brief phrases of Internet-speak are interpolated identities of these minority natives. By using the word "interpolated," I intend to indicate partial impressions meant to misconstrue somehow or provide unauthorized interpretations. Subtexts denote that they are pre-modern, natural, and, as in the Sani case signifying part of an exotic limestone landscape, to be looked at and consumed. Or they are tour guides and handicraft peddlers very involved in the business of selling their identity. These media carry mixed messages of cultural diversity and denigration, development, and backwardness. Tourism entrepreneurial sites are meant to seduce, draw in the reader, and stimulate a drive to consume someone else's culture. They are often written from an assimilationist model—to present a predictable "generic exotic" subject distinct from the tourist.

Internet information on Yunnan's ethnic tourism often presents the "fill in the blank" ethnic as a singing and dancing minority, as crafty traders to be bargained with, as folkloric heroes, or as heathens in need of evangelization. Their interpolated identities are parts of a whole system of identification creating "ethnic minority" in contrast to indigeneity. How might these dissonant contradictory images be resolved to negotiate an understanding of what constitutes identities for indigenous ethnic minority people and their beholders over time? A constant in this analysis is my own subjective outsider gaze as well. In the Internet data we are missing the "authentic" ethnic minority voice, which can be represented in part by the ethnography of indigenous intellectuals and other researchers. Cyber materials can be seen as discourses on cultural sameness and differences that emanate from paradigms of authenticity, indigeneity, and cosmopolitanism perspectives. Internet discourse refracts back onto real-life efforts of minority ethnic groups to claim greater agency in tourism development

Translocal/Transnational Mobilities

By definition, touristic landscapes, including many indigenous ethnic minority groups, are places of integral meaning that are seen in various ways by both insiders and outsiders. Equitable tourism development must therefore consider these different viewpoints and avoid overlooking how interaction between hosts and guests contribute to images of authenticity (Cartier 2005). How is ethnic performance located in ideas about authenticity and indigeneity in this cosmopolitan age of the translocal, the transnational, and the global? Traditions, as foundational sources of meaning, provide frameworks for argument and exploration that change as conditions change (Hall 2002: 28). Tourism producers see "tradition" as part of their modern lives, though they actively engage change. Performance of ethnicity and the production of indigeneity are expressed through strategically embracing economic opportunities, when attainable.

As we have seen in Yunnan, international governing bodies are one source of opportunities; for example, UNESCO

World Heritage and geopark agencies that establish global standards for sites in terms of cosmopolitan cultural and environmental ethics. Transnational social movements, international NGOs such as The Nature Conservancy and the Ford Foundation, and local NGOs such as the Center for Biodiversity and Indigenous Knowledge promote a form of multiculturalism. But this multiculturalism complements a cosmopolitan preference for permeable boundaries between cultural units that are open to choice, dialogue, and critique. There are also barriers to inclusive tourism in the indifference of many tourists, government mismanagement, and corporate neglect.

Conclusions

Beck (2002: 18) cogently notes that “the defining characteristic of a cosmopolitan perspective is the ‘dialogic imagination’ [to] ... compare, reflect, criticize, understand, combine contradictory certainties.” Indigenous cosmopolitans engage their “others” from particular imagined locations of belonging. When such locations are circumscribed by participation in ethnic tourism, they utilize these locations to “... reflect on, contest, express, and perform multiple social meanings and representations of Nativeness” (Scarangella 2010: 175). Being attached to one’s native place is no longer a criteria for indigeneity or an exclusion for being cosmopolitan. In the production of multiple identities while participating in ethnic tourism commoditization, an indigenous person may be at home or away in a transnational, translocal, or cyber space.

My aim in this chapter is to add to debates about how indigeneity and cosmopolitanism are co-produced and their meanings for ethnic identities in our future. Drawing from examples of indigenous ethnic tourism in Yunnan, China, we can see ethnicity transforming and interacting with many embodied identities—gender, race, class, age, sexuality—hyphenated with these indigenous/cosmopolitan categories of belonging. We also observe the state’s many roles in defining what is or is not ethnic, or indigenous, in contrast to self-identification of indigenous cosmopolitans.

Notes

1. Including educational opportunities, local infrastructure, and development schemes such as an ethnic tourism venue.
2. Without tipping into the enormous literature on ethnicity and ethnic identity, my touchstone for what constitutes ethnicity in the straightforward “purported common descent and purported cultural commonality” (Harrell 1995: 4).
3. In April 2010, the Asia Indigenous Peoples Caucus of the UN Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues sent a letter to the Forum Chair, protesting the detaining of an indigenous Chinese Forum delegate in Beijing by the state. They note that China voted for the Declaration and is thus, “obliged to abide by its international commitments and cannot continue to deny the existence of indigenous peoples in China, regardless if they are referred to as ethnic minorities.” The cancelling of the ICAES meeting is another case in point—just because indigeneity does not officially apply to China does not mean that state is not vigilant against incur-

sions by more rambunctious “ethnic minorities” like Tibetans or Uighurs.

4. www.chinatoday.com.cn/English/e2007/e200706/p28.htm (accessed 11 November 2007).

References Cited

- Appiah, Kwame.** 2006. “The Case for Contamination: No to Purity; No to Tribalism; No to Cultural Protectionism; Toward a New Cosmopolitanism.” *New York Times Magazine*, 1 January: 31–38, 52.
- Beck, Ulrich.** 2002. “The Cosmopolitan Society and Its Enemies.” *Theory, Culture, and Society* 19(1–2): 17–44.
- Beck, Ulrich, and Natan Sznaider.** 2006. “Unpacking Cosmopolitanism for the Social Sciences: A Research Agenda.” *British Journal of Sociology* 57(1): 1–23.
- Cartier, Carolyn.** 2005. “Introduction: Touristed Landscapes and Seductions of Place.” Pp. 1–19 in *Seductions of Place: Geographical Perspectives on Globalization and Touristed Landscapes*, eds. Carolyn Cartier and Alan Lew. London: Routledge.
- Cheah, Pheng, and Bruce Robbins, eds.** 1998. *Cosmopolitics: Thinking and Feeling Beyond the Nation*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Clifford, James.** 1997. *Routes: Travel and Translation in the Late 20th Century*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Delanty, Gerard.** 2006. “The Cosmopolitan Imagination: Critical Cosmopolitanism and Social Theory.” *The British Journal of Sociology* 57(1): 25–47.
- Gladney, Dru.** “The Question of Minority Identity and Indigeneity in Post-Colonial China.” *Cultural Survival Quarterly* 21(3).
- Graburn, Nelson, ed.** 1976. *Ethnic and Tourist Arts: Cultural Expressions from the Fourth World*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Hall, Stuart.** 2002. “Political Belongings in a World of Multiple Identities.” Pp. 25–31 in *Conceiving Cosmopolitanism: Theory, Context and Practice*, eds. Steven Vertovec and Robin Cohen. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Harrell, Stevan.** 1995. “Introduction In Negotiating Ethnicities in China and Taiwan.” Pp. 1–10 in *Institute of East Asian Studies (China Research Monograph 46)*, ed. Melissa Brown. Berkeley: University of California.
- Kolås, Åshild.** 2004. “Tourism and the Making of Place in Shangri-la.” *Tourism Geographies* 6(4): 262–278.
- Levi, Jerome, and Bartholomew Dean.** 2003. “Introduction.” Pp. 2–30 in *At the Risk of Being Heard: Identity, Indigenous Rights and Postcolonial States*, eds. Bartholomew Dean and Jerome Levi. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Merlan, Francesca.** 2009. “Indigeneity: Global and Local.” *Current Anthropology* 50(3): 303–333.
- Notar, Beth.** 2006a. “Authenticity, Anxiety, and Counterfeit Confidence.” *Modern China* 32(1): 64–98.
- . 2006b. *Displacing Desire: Travel and Popular Culture in China*. Honolulu: University of Hawai’i Press.
- Nussbaum, Martha.** 1994. “Patriotism and Cosmopolitanism.” *Boston Review* 19(5).
- Nyíri, Pál.** 2006. *Scenic Spots: Chinese Tourism, the State, and Cultural Authority*. Seattle: University of Washington Press.
- Oakes, Tim.** 2006. “The Village as Theme Park: Mimesis

- and Authenticity in Chinese Tourism.” Pp. 166–192 in *Translocal China: Linkages, Identities and the Reimagining of Space*, eds. Tim Oakes and Louisa Schein. New York: Routledge.
- Pollock, Sheldon.** 2002. “Cosmopolitanism and Vernacular in History.” Pp. 15–53 in *Cosmopolitanism*, eds. Carol Breckenridge et al. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Scarangella, Linda.** 2010. “Indigeneity in Tourism: Transnational Spaces, Pan-Indian Identity and Cosmopolitanism.” Pp. 163–188 in *Indigenous Cosmopolitans: Transnational and Transcultural Indigeneity in the Twenty-First Century*, ed. Maximilian C. Forte. New York: Peter Lang.
- Shi, Junchao.** 2000. “Ashima: Yongheng de Meili yu Xiaoying-Shilin Xian da Luyou Xiandai de Wenhua Gainian” [Ashima: Effects of Eternal Charm-Modern Notions in Shilin County Tourism]. Pp. 231–244 in *Shilin Yizu* [Shilin Yi People], eds. He Yaohua and Ang Zhiling. Kunming: Yunnan Jiaoyu Chubanshe.
- Sofield, Trevor.** 1999. The Yi Nationality of Shilin Stone Forest, Yunnan Province, China: A Case Study in Indigenous Tourism. http://www.sustainability.murdoch.edu.au/casestudies/Case_Studies_Asia/tour_yi/tour_yi.htm.
- Swain, Margaret.** 1989a. “Developing Ethnic Tourism in Yunnan, China: Shilin Sani.” *Tourism Recreation Research* 14(1): 33–40.
- . 1989b. “Gender Roles in Indigenous Tourism: Kuna Mola, Kuna Yala, and Cultural Survival.” Pp. 83–104 in *Hosts and Guests, Second Edition*, ed. Valene L. Smith. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- . 2005. “Desiring Ashima: Sexing landscape in China’s Stone Forest.” Pp. 245–259 in *Seductions of Place: Geographical Perspectives on Globalization and Touristed Landscapes*, eds. Carolyn Cartier and Alan Lew. London: Routledge.
- . 2009. “The Cosmopolitan Hope of Tourism.” *Tourism Geographies* 11(4): 505–525.
- . In press. “Commoditizing Ethnicity for Tourism Development in Yunnan.” Pp. 173–192 in *Moving Mountains: Ethnicity and Livelihood in Highland China, Vietnam, and Laos*, eds. Jean Michaud and Tim Forsyth. Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press.
- Szerzynski, Bronislaw, and John Urry.** 2006. “Visuality, Mobility and the Cosmopolitan: Inhabiting the World from Afar.” *British Journal of Sociology* 57(1): 113–131.
- Tomlinson, John.** (1999) *Globalization and Culture*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Vertovec, Steven, and Robin Cohen.** 2002. “Introduction: Conceiving Cosmopolitanism.” Pp. 1–24 in *Conceiving Cosmopolitanism*, eds. Steven Vertovec and Robin Cohen. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Walsh, Eileen.** 2005. “From Nü Guo to Nü’er Guo: Negotiating desire in the land of the Mosuo.” *Modern China* 31(4): 448–486.
- Wang, Ning.** 2001. “On Interactive Authenticity in Tourism: An Illustration from Hospitality Tourism.” Paper presented at *The International Academy for the Study of Tourism*, Macau, 20 July.
- Xie, Philip Feifan.** In press. *Authenticating Cultural Tourism: Folk Villages in Hainan*. PhD Diss., University of Waterloo.
- Yunnan Province Department of Commerce.** 2006. “Tourism Industry in Yunnan.” http://eng.bofcom.gov/bofcom_en/5190407366637518848/20061114/83923.html.
- Zhang, Xiaoping.** 2010. Personal Communication.

エスニック・ツーリズムとコスモポリタンな土着の人々

マーガレット・スウェイン

エスニック・ツーリズムの観光地は、多文化的でグローバル化した国家における潜在的に対立するアイデンティティ——民族間の政治的な関係性、土着のローカルな住民とグローバルに活動するコスモポリタンな人々の二項対立、市民のなかのマイノリティとマジョリティという二項対立——を研究するのに格好の機会を与えてくれる。地域に根づいたコスモポリタンや移動するローカルの人々、そして多数派のマイノリティたちなど、これらのカテゴリーの間にある緊張関係は、彼らが日常的にエスニック・アイデンティティにもとづいて観光向けに作られた商品を生産し消費する時に、溶け合って再編成される。筆者は、国内外で有名な景観と民族文化をもつ、中国雲南省の観光地である石林に住む、イ=サニ族の民族誌的な調査を長年行ってきた。この調査を近年のトランスナショナルなコスモポリタンについての研究成果を通して分析することで、エスニック・アイデンティティが形成される際の、土着性とコスモポリタニズムの構築に関わる問題について、多くの有益な情報もたらされるだろう。

21世紀の初期にあつて、雲南省は民族の多様性を更新可能な資源として推し進めている。人口の3分の1が、公認少数民族のうちの25民族にあたる（それにさらに下位民族集団が加わる）雲南省には、エスニック/シーニック（風景の）・ツーリズムの発展の余地が多くある。この発展は、観光に関わる官民双方が、真正な民族の多様性という魅力を助長しながらも、少数民族/土着の人々のアイデンティティを農村と都市の両方で（しばしば均一化されたイメージと売り込みやすい経験を提示することで）売り物にするというかたちで、1980年代から進んでいる。雲南省の少数民族は、富裕層から貧困層まで、また農村居住者から都市住民までと多岐に渡る。そして、観光産業で働く少数民族や土着住民のなかには、アイデンティティの商品化、すなわちアイデンティティの特徴を商品として売り込むことによって社会的な力を付ける者もいる。だが、石林のイ=サニ族の観光企業家について、雲南省や海南島のその他の観光地との比較を行うと、その結果は一樣ではなく、多くの要因が関係していることがわかる。

本稿は、土着性とコスモポリタニズムが、エスニック・アイデンティティとの関連のなかで、どのように共に生み出されているのかということについて論じることを目的としている。以下の議論では、様々なアイデンティティ——ジェンダー、人種、階級、年齢、セクシュアリティ——の相互作用によって、土着性/コスモポリタニズムというカテゴリー自体が変容することが述べられる。筆者はまず、多文化的でグローバル化した国家におけるエスニック・アイデンティティの問題を参照しながら、土着性とコスモポリタニズムの概念をまとめることから始める。土着性とコスモポリタニズムのどちらの概念も、法的権利と文化的アイデンティティの議論と定義が関係している。そしてどちらも、エスニシティの概念に影響を与える。本稿

での議論の中心はアイデンティティについてのものだが、普遍的で個別な権利についての議論も無視されるべきではない。権利についての言説は、国家のアフーマティブ・アクションの計画と、少数民族や土着の市民による「自治」区域を基礎づけている。国連で長時間をかけて議論された世界主義的な権利は、特定の多文化主義的な土着の人々のアイデンティティの保護はもちろんのこと、普遍的な社会的正義に関わる論理的根拠となっている。

続いて、石林やその他の地域における民族的／土着的な観光地の例を引き合いに出しながら、改変されたアイデンティティ (interpolated identities)、具体化された真正性、トランスローカル／トランスナショナルな移動を含む、エスニック・ツーリズムのなかの土着的なコスモポリタンが提起する諸問題を考察する。少数民族が住む地域を含む観光地は、内部者と外部者の双方によって多様なやり方で想像されるような多層的な意味を持つ場である。地元の人々に利益をもたらす公正な観光産業の発展のためには、これらの異なる観点が考慮に入れられなければならない。そしてその多様な観点によって、ホストとゲストの相互行為がいかに市場にふさわしい真正なイメージを作り出すかについて理解することが可能になるだろう。トランスローカル、トランスナショナル、グローバル化しているコスモポリタンの時代では、エスニック・ツーリズムが提起する事柄は、次第に真性性と土着性についての概念と関わってくるようになるだろう。このとき、意味の源泉としての伝統は、状況の変化に応じて変わっていく議論と研究のために枠組みを提供する。ツーリズムの生産者は、文化的な「伝統」を自らの生活の一部と考える一方でモダニティとも積極的にかかわっている。エスニシティを演じることと土着性を生み出すことは、経済的な機会を有効活用するための戦略ともなりうるのである。

雲南省の例に見られるように、国際的な政治組織は地元住民に機会を提供することもある。たとえば、ユネスコの世界遺産やジオパークは、世界主義的な文化・環境倫理的観点での世界基準を確立している。また、トランスナショナルな社会運動や、「ネイチャー・コンサーヴァンシー (Nature Conservancy)」や「フォード財団」のような国際的なNGO、「生物多様性センター (Center for Biodiversity)」や「土着的知識 (Indigenous Knowledge)」のようなローカルなNGOは、選択や対話、批評に開かれた多文化主義の形式を促進するだろう。その反対に、現地住民の利益になりうるツーリズムを妨害しているのは、大半の観光客の無関心、政府のずさんな管理、利己的な決定、互いの言い分に耳を貸さないことなどである。

人間が生まれた所に住み続けるということは、必ずしも土着性を生み出す要件ではないし、コスモポリタンではないということにもならない。エスニック・ツーリズムの商品化に参入しながら複合的なアイデンティティが生み出されていく過程で、ある土着住民は自らが生まれた土地にとどまっているかもしれないし、トランスナショナル、トランスローカル、あるいはインターネットでつながれたサイバー空間にいるかもしれない。私たちはまた、何がエスニック (もしくは土着的) で何がそうでないかということを経験が定義する過程について、土着のコスモポリタンがセルフ・アイデンティティを形成していく過程とは対照的なものとして観察しうるのである。

プロフィール

マーガレット・スウェイン氏 (博士、ワシントン大学) は、女性資源研究センターのセンター長と、カリフォルニア大学デイヴィス校の女性・ジェンダー研究の准教授を兼任している。博士論文のためにパナマのクナ族の調査をもとに書かれた初めての論文が、V. スミスが編集した先駆的な論集 *Hosts and Guests, the Anthropology of Tourism* (1976年) に収録されている。民族誌的な関心を中国南西部の土着の人々にまで広げたスウェイン氏には、*Gender/Tourism/Fun(?)* (編著、2002年) と *Explorers and Scientists in China's Borderlands, 1880-1950* (編著、印刷中) のなかに論文が収録されており、その他にも論文 “The Cosmopolitan Hope of Tourism” (2009年) や “Tourism Geographies and Commoditized Ethnicity for Tourism Development in Yunnan” (*Moving Mountains: Highland Livelihoods and Ethnicity in China, Vietnam, and Laos* (Forsyth Michaud編 (2010年) に所収) がある。スウェイン氏は現在、(Wu Bihu氏と共に) ISA国際観光研究連携事業の座長を務めており、またDean MacCannell氏と共に「隙間(ニッチ)観光」というオンライン講座の開設を準備している。