New Natures in Tourism: Local Ecotourism and Environmental Activism

by

Randle Joseph Hart
B.A., University of Victoria, 1997

A Thesis Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

in the Department of Sociology and
Contemporary Social and Political Thought

We accept this thesis as conforming
to the required standard

[redacted]
Dr. William K. Carroll, Supervisor (Department of Sociology)

[redacted]
Dr. T. Rennie Warburton, Departmental Member (Department of Sociology)

[redacted]
Dr. Warren Magnusson, Outside Member (Department of Political Science)

[redacted]
Dr. Michael M'Gonigle, External Examiner (Faculty of Law, & Department of Environmental Studies)

Supervisor: Dr. William K. Carroll

Abstract

In this thesis I explore the relationship between ecotourism and environmental activism. I argue that processes of de-differentiation and increased reflexivity have created opportunities for environmental activism in spaces hitherto excluded from conventional notions of socio-political action, namely tourism. In Chapter One I argue that it is the very development of global capitalism, the transition from Fordism to post-Fordism, new modes of consumption, and the advent of a postmodern cultural paradigm that have brought about this de-differentiation and increased reflexivity. In Chapter Two, I argue that for ecotourism this has meant that work, leisure, and activism have become, in some instances, indistinguishable and, consequently, some forms of ecotourism have become a viable method of educating people about various environmental problems and crises. In Chapter Three, I argue that through the organization of tourist gazes, ecotourism has made it possible for people to compare different environments, different ideas of nature, as well as various instances of environmental degradation.

[redacted]

Dr. William K. Carroll, Supervisor (Department of Sociology)

[redacted]

Dr. T. Rennie Warburton, Departmental Member (Department of Sociology)

[redacted]

Dr. Warren Magnusson, Outside Member (Department of Political Science)

[redacted]

Dr. Michael M'Gonigle, External Examiner (Faculty of Law, & Department of Environmental Studies)

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements

I'd like to thank Colin Ranson, Bill Kosloski, and Selena Blais for participating in this research, inviting me into their homes and places of work, and sharing their thoughts on ecotourism, the environment, and the environmental politics of Vancouver Island. Their contributions are immeasurable. Bill Carroll deserves special praise for introducing me to the wonderful world of social movements and social theory, and for providing many opportunities to rethink what I thought I understood about the world. Like Dr. Carroll, Rennie Warburton has provided numerous sociological insights during both my undergraduate and graduate training at the University of Victoria. I have always appreciated his honest feedback and sense of social justice. Warren Magnusson has taught me to ask difficult questions, not only about the assumptions of social theories but about my own assumptions as well. I am very grateful that he agreed to be on my committee. I would also like to thank Michael M'Gonigle for agreeing to sit as the external examiner for my thesis defense.

As both an undergraduate and graduate student in sociology, I have had the pleasure of taking courses from almost all the departmental members, and in the process I have met many fellow students. I have never been disappointed with my experiences in the department and I would like to thank everyone for their encouragement. I would like to specifically acknowledge Zheng Wu who has provided me not only with enjoyable employment, but also with friendship, advice, and support. The administrative staff have always been "in the know" and I would like to thank them for helping me keep on track all these years. I thank Caroline Riedel and Jen Riedel for their friendship, many games of pool, classic movies, and overall good times. Stephen Meunier also deserves thanks for his friendship and (what often became, drunken) discussions. Pinky also needs some mention: she is a good dog (despite some of her odd behaviours) and our walks together always helped clear my mind. Finally, I cannot describe the breadth of Andrea Donovan's intellectual contribution and friendship. She has been integral to my life and I thank her for everything so far.

Introduction

It is often held that tourism will soon be the world's largest industry. There are global flows of people, predominantly from more affluent areas of the world, who visit a variety of places, engage in various forms of tourism, and in the process often spend plenty of money. These global flows are supported by an immense infrastructure which include the travel and hospitality industries, various levels of government, national and transnational corporations, and so on. So, tourism can quite easily be seen to support a global regime of capitalism. However, the social, political, economic, and cultural effects of globalization and the uneven development of capitalism are various and have opened up spaces for a different story.

In this thesis I explore the relationship between ecotourism and environmental activism. In part, this research is a response to some assertions that ecotourism merely supports the global regime of capital accumulation and relies on the commodification of popularized notions of "nature" and "the environment" (Bandy 1996; Mowforth and Munt 1998; Munt 1994a; 1994b). These claims are based, for the most part, on the practices of large, transnational ecotour companies that often conduct their tours in developing regions while basing themselves in more affluent parts of the world. While I agree that this type of ecotourism does support global capitalism, and indeed has many ill environmental, cultural, political, social, and economic effects, ecotourism can be practiced in a variety of ways that these authors do not acknowledge.

A main tenet of my argument is that processes of de-differentiation and increased reflexivity have created opportunities for environmental activism in spaces hitherto excluded from conventional notions of socio-political action, namely tourism. As I show in Chapter One, it is the very development of global capitalism, the transition from Fordism to post-

Fordism, new modes of consumption, and the advent of a postmodern cultural paradigm that have brought about this de-differentiation and increased reflexivity. In Chapter Two, I argue that for ecotourism this has meant that work, leisure, and activism have become, in some instances, indistinguishable and, consequently, some forms of ecotourism have become a viable method of educating people about various environmental problems and crises. Indeed, as I demonstrate in Chapter Three, through the organization of tourist gazes, ecotourism has made it possible for people to compare different environments, different ideas of nature, as well as various instances of environmental degradation. According to Lash and Urry (1994:297), consumptions of "the environment" may have a radical edge:

> the very development of consumerism itself has helped to generate the current critique of environmental degradation and the cultural focus upon nature. Ecology in part presupposes a certain kind of consumerism. This is because one element of consumerism is a heightened reflexivity about the places and environments, the goods and services that are "consumed", literally, through a social encounter, or through visual consumption...As people reflect upon such consumptions they develop not only a duty to consume but also certain rights, rights of the citizen as consumer. Such rights include the belief that people are entitled to certain qualities of the environment, of air, water and scenery, and that these extend into the future and to other populations.

As I hope to show through an examination of ecotourism, the development of consumerism can be seen, in some instances, to have brought about a critique of environmental degradation; and as the touristic consumption of "the environment" or "nature" has increased people may have become more reflexive of the causes and consequences of environmental degradation.

Chapter One is a theoretical discussion. I highlight broad social, political, cultural, and economic changes that have led to the development of ecotourism. I argue that ecotourism is a post-Fordist, post-tourist practice based on a postmodern cultural paradigm that, through

processes of de-differentiation and increased reflexivity,[1] opens up positive spaces in tourism for environmental activism. In this chapter I also discuss Ulrich Beck's theory of reflexive modernization and the world risk society in order to elucidate various forms of individual, communal, and institutional reflexivity and discuss the status of expert versus "lay" and everyday knowledges. I conclude this chapter with a brief introduction to the ideals of ecotourism and highlight some criticisms of ecotourism's environmentalist potential.

In Chapter Two, I continue to explore many of the topics from the previous chapter and introduce the three ecotour operators who participated in this research. Through an ethnographic analysis, I demonstrate how activist ecotourism on Vancouver Island is best viewed as part of the latent, or submerged, network of Vancouver Island's environmental movement. I also show how, through ecotourism, these three operators provide a space to counter dominant and popularized environmental discourses, mobilize support for more "visible" environmental movement organizations, and instill, or in some cases support, self-reflexivity in ecotourists through the development of alternative environmental/ecological knowledges in order to propagate more action-oriented environmental identities in opposition to non-controversial and popularized "green" identities.

In Chapter Three, I argue that activist ecotour operators negotiate between "the local" and "the global" through identifying "local contexts of action". These "local contexts of action" provide more actionable means of addressing environmental problems and crises. Although environmental degradation is understood to have global causes and consequences, it is through localizing environmental problems, or identifying them in specific places, that ecotour operators are better able to take some form of action. These "local contexts of

[1] "Reflexivity" in this context may be taken as individual self-reflection of being and becoming in the world. This concept will be explored in greater detail in the next chapter.

action" become ecotour operators' activist spaces; and it is here that they produce their own concepts of nature and the environment while offering critiques of other conceptions. In this chapter, I incorporate an extended discussion of Henri Lefebvre's theory of the production of space as a framework for understanding the processes whereby ecotour operators produce their activist spaces. I show how these spaces are produced through the organization of various "tourist gazes"; and it is these tourist gazes that highlight the spatial embeddedness and environmental consequences of different ideas of nature.

In this thesis, I offer multiple readings of activist ecotourism. These readings are informed by various contemporary social theoretical formulations, each of which helps to clarify particular aspects of this form of tourism. If activist ecotourism is indeed a result of processes of postmodern de-differentiation, then I think a flexible use of theoretical orientations is beneficial to its analysis. At times, however, my analysis may appear somewhat eclectic. I hope this is a strength rather than a weakness: if work, leisure, and activism become de-differentiated in activist ecotourism, then multiple theoretical frameworks can be utilized in order to better understand the specific ways that different processes become articulated in a single form of tourism. I am not concerned with testing the various theories that I utilize in my analysis; rather, I will be using different approaches in so far as I think they are useful in understanding specific aspects of activist ecotourism. Similarly, the empirical data that I employ is demonstrative of the theoretical issues.

Notes on Methods

There is nothing methodologically innovative about my research for this thesis. It is simply a small, ethnographic study. Atkinson and Hammersley (1998:110-1) suggest that

ethnography can be characterized generally as a social scientific approach that emphasizes the exploration of a specific social phenomenon through an investigation of a small number of cases based on the assumption of their representational qualities; and an interpretive approach that focuses on the beliefs and actions of participants through an analysis of what they say and what they do. Although this is a reductive description of ethnography—and consequently skips over the diversity of ethnographic approaches—I think it adequately captures what I have attempted.[2]

I have identified and interviewed three ecotour operators who are also, to varying degrees, embedded in Vancouver Island's environmental movement. This is not to suggest that all three ecotour operators are directly involved in environmental movement organizations on Vancouver Island. Rather, their involvements with these organizations range from past, current, and developing participation. Their environmental activism also stems from a broader range of activities: through volunteer work for CRD parks; through generating and sharing information about Vancouver Island and its "environment" or ecosystem; and through many other aspects of their everyday lives. I am not concerned about making generalizations about ecotourism and environmental activism based on my discussions with these three people. Rather, I use what these ecotour operators say and do as examples of how ecotourism can be practiced as environmental activism. This is not to claim that all forms of ecotourism, nor all locally-based ecotourism, are forms of environmental activism but merely to show how ecotourism and environmental activism can, and in these cases do, coexist.

On average, my personal interviews with the ecotour operators lasted about two hours each. These interviews took a conversational approach; we talked about each operator's

[2] For concise but detailed accounts of the promises and problems of various types of ethnographic methodologies, see Lofland (1995) and Altheide and Johnson (1998).

specific tours, their views on "the environment", environmental activism, and ecotourism in general. I had a set of questions prepared (see Appendix) and where our conversation lagged I used these questions to steer our discussions toward topics we had yet to cover. I did not want these interviews to follow a simple question-and-answer format. I felt that by simply talking about ecotourism, the conversations would not be too structured by my questions and the ecotour operators would be free to offer their opinions on a range of topics and elaborate as they saw fit. With each person's consent, I audio-taped the conversations. I then made transcriptions for my analysis. None of the ecotour operators wished to participate anonymously. So, in what follows, I have used their real names. I think this research could have been much more dynamic had I been able to organize a focus group wherein these three people could have met and discussed their views with each other. Unfortunately, all three were very busy and this would not have been convenient for them.

Chapter One

Introduction

In this chapter I wish to juxtapose two competing theories of social change, namely the regulation school's approach to political-economy and Ulrich Beck's theorization of reflexive modernization and the risk society, in order to examine various changes in the nature of tourism and provide a context for the development of ecotourism. Where the regulation school looks at the inter-dynamics of the social, political, cultural, and economic in changing social systems, Beck's reflexive modernization focuses on modern risks and increasing institutional and individual reflexivity in the changing relationship between social structures and individual agency. Where the regulation school generally sees economic and secular crises as the underlying source of the transition from Fordism to post-Fordism and from modernity to postmodernity, Beck sees modernity's self-generated risks as the primary source of reflexive modernization.

Although these two approaches posit fundamentally different reasons for historical and contemporary changes, they need not be mutually exclusive. Indeed, I will be utilizing these theories in what I hope will be a usefully compatible manner. To do this, I will try to resist the closure that each theoretical approach brings to its subjects. I am less concerned with treating these theories as necessarily complete but would rather attempt to show how each is useful in highlighting and understanding different aspects of the changing natures of tourism.

In what follows, I will argue that ecotourism is a specific form of post-tourism that marks a particular convergence of a variety of social, political, cultural, and economic processes. These processes are to an increasing degree accelerated, and in some instances caused, by processes of globalization. Following mainly from Lash and Urry (1994), I will also show

how a paradigmatic cultural transition, from modernity to postmodernity, is effected by these processes and, in turn, affects the natures of tourism. The transition to a postmodern cultural paradigm can be seen to have opened up positive spaces of action and being-in-the-world. I will argue that activist ecotourism is one instance of the positive potential of this cultural paradigm. Although Beck's "reflexive modernization" posits a radicalization of modernity rather than a transition to a postmodern paradigm, many of his ideas remain valuable in understanding the positive spaces of postmodernity.

Fordism and Post-Fordism

The post-Fordist debate focuses on the nature of the epoch-making changes of the past thirty years or so. It is a debate about the transition from one dominant phase of capitalist development to a new phase characterized by marked economic, social, political, and cultural departures. This debate is in many ways concerned with the politics of the future: "an underlying theme is the search for a political project which is more democratic, more egalitarian and more humane than neo-liberal Conservatism...the debate represents competing political alternatives" (Amin 1994:5). Post-Fordist theories, however, are not solely concerned with economic, political, and institutional changes; they may also incorporate changes in aesthetics, consumption, culture, and lifestyle (Amin 1994:30-1; Lash 1989). The inclusion of these topics in political-economy helps to blur the analytical distinctions between society, culture, economics, and politics. Indeed, such an inclusion is necessary in order to understand the nature of the contemporary world. The practice of treating society, culture, economics, and politics as relatively discrete categories is losing its analytical utility because the underlying ontological assumptions no longer correspond to contemporary experiences in the post-Fordist and postmodern climate. If the ontology of

modernization under Fordism can be characterized as a *differentiation* of social, political, economic, and cultural forms, then the ontology of postmodernization under post-Fordism can in many ways be characterized as a *de-differentiation* of these forms (Lash 1989).

I will not be concerned here with giving an elaborate delineation of post-Fordist theories, nor will I overtly flesh out either the debates within that literature or the critiques of the post-Fordist orientations to epochal changes[3]—I will, however, provide a necessary adjunct to post-Fordist understandings of the contemporary world by way of a discussion of theories of *reflexive modernization*. I introduce post-Fordism in order to provide a general context that is socially, culturally, politically, and economically sensitive to changes in tourism from the dominant forms of mass tourism under Fordism to the appearance of specialized and flexible forms of tourism under post-Fordism. In what immediately follows, I will provide a general outline of Fordist and post-Fordist characteristics. I will then discuss the importance of Lash's (1989) inclusion of "regimes of signification" to understandings of post-Fordist/postmodern culture.

The conceptual framework and theoretical orientation that underlie the Fordist/post-Fordist perspective are generally associated with the "regulation school's" approach to radical political-economy, also known as regime theory. This approach posits a non-linear theory of capitalist development in opposition to some interpretations of Marxist theory that argue for an objective, linear capitalist logic based upon a simple base-superstructure model (Esser and Hirsch 1994:73). For the most part, the regulation approach is primarily concerned with elucidating and theorizing the processes whereby capitalism is reproduced and modified (Elam 1994:56).

---

[3] For a discussion of these debates see Amin (1994) and Elman (1994).

According to the regulation school, each capitalist period is characterized by both a *mode of accumulation* and a corresponding *method*, or *regime*, of *regulation*. A mode of accumulation is:

> a form of surplus value production and realization, supported by particular types of production and management technology. It includes the type and method of organizing production and labour and the national economic reproduction of labour power and capital. This includes investment and capital devaluation strategies, branch structures...wage conditions, consumer models and class structures, the relations between the capitalist and non-capitalist sectors of work in society and the mode of integration into the international market (Esser and Hirsch 1994:73-4).

The method of regulation describes the social-institutional interconnections between the above elements and includes a multifaceted arrangement of political-economic and social-institutional norms which generate and espouse a sense of equilibrium and stability in the reproduction of the whole capitalist system (Esser and Hirsch 1994:74). Following Gramsci, Esser and Hirsch propose that concrete *hegemonic structures* connect the mode of accumulation and method of regulation and provide some durability to the capitalist system through ideological legitimation (1994:74). Accordingly, each capitalist epoch is characterized by a particular hegemonic structure. Esser and Hirsch admit that after capitalist developmental crises, long-lasting, non-hegemonic structures can appear during transition periods. Indeed, it is during these transitional phases that legitimation crises occur which are closely followed by struggles over competing hegemonic structures (Esser and Hirsch 1994:74).[4]

Where some Marxist political-economic theories focus exclusively on economic crises, the regulation school's approach includes *secular crises* in theorizing capitalist development. These secular crises signify a breakdown in the hegemonic structures that connect the mode

[4] For a discussion of the transitional institutional struggles of post-Fordism see *Peck and Tickell 1994*.

of accumulation and the method of regulation. Secular crises are instantiated when the mode of accumulation and the method of regulation are no longer compatible (Esser and Hirsch 1994:75). This incompatibility occurs because, although the method of regulation can remain relatively stable, an imperative to change is writ into any the capitalist mode of accumulation through the valorization process; the mode of accumulation must always undergo "creative destruction" in order to ensure capitalist growth. This means that the mode of accumulation is not static, but is being continually re-configured and innovated in the pursuit of greater sources of profit. Subsequently, a rift develops between a changing mode of accumulation and the methods whereby it is socially reproduced and justified.

The Fordist mode of accumulation and method of regulation comprised the dominant capitalist system after the Second World War, a system that has been in crisis since the 1970s (Harvey 1990:123; Esser and Hirsch 1994:75; Peck and Tickell 1994:280). This mode of accumulation is generally characterized by rigid and rationalized labour processes—instilled by F.W. Taylor's Principles of Scientific Management—mass production, and mass consumption. The mass production of consumer goods "became the basis of an extensive capitalization of the sphere of reproduction, i.e. the reproduction of the work forces became the integral part of the reproduction of capital on the basis of a generalized consumer model" (Esser and Hirsch 1994:75). The method of regulation under Fordism was generally characterized by Keynesian state interventionism and the expanded bureaucracy of the welfare state (Harvey 1990:123-4; Esser and Hirsch 1994:76). Further, a "centralized corporatism" developed which propagated cooperation between commercial associations, trade unions, parties, and state administration through contractual obligations (Esser and Hirsch 1994:75). The Fordist hegemonic structure espoused full employment, economic

growth and stable profit rates, and an increased standard of living. As Harvey argues, Fordism was also an "international affair" that depended upon the expansion of world trade and international investment (1990:136). Fordism on the international scene, however, was hardly homogeneous; many variants of Fordism developed within national economies (Peck and Tickell 1994:283-9).[5]

There is no consensus on the causes of the crises in Fordism nor is there agreement on how to theorize, characterize, or even name the current capitalist epoch, phase, or transition period. For my purposes, however, the following can be seen as the general characteristics of a post-Fordist capitalist system.[6] The post-Fordist mode of accumulation consists of: increased flexibility in production, capital accumulation, work, and consumption patterns (specialized, niche markets); increasing employment in the service, information, and communication industries; increasing globalization of trade, communication, and corporate power; and an increasing de-emphasis of goods production in exchange for an increasing penchant for the production of "events" and "spectacles" with an almost instantaneous turnover time of capital (Harvey 1990:157).

Because secular crises are indicative of a method of regulation's rigidity in responding to changes in the mode of accumulation, it is difficult to make generalizations about the characteristics of a post-Fordist method of regulation. That said, post-Fordist regulation attempts often take the form of increasing neo-liberalism in state and corporate agendas. As

---

[5] These Fordisms are as follows: classic Fordism (USA); flex-Fordism (West Germany); blocked Fordism (Great Britain); state Fordism (France); Delayed Fordism (Spain, Italy); peripheral Fordism (Mexico, Brazil); racial Fordism (South Africa under apartheid); primitive Fordism (Malaysia, Bangladesh, the Philippines); and hybrid Fordism (Japan).

[6] For the most part, I rely on Harvey's discussion of "flexible accumulation" (1990:147-72). I do however, also attempt to generalize some of the characteristics of Germanic post-Fordism that Esser and Hirsch propose (1994:77-8).

Peck and Tickell argue, however, these neo-liberal "fixes" generally only offer short-term solutions and can be regarded as the "politics of crisis" (1994:296).

Writers such as Lash (1989), Harvey (1990), and Lash and Urry (1994) recognize that although cultural dimensions may be implicit in the regulation school's exploration of political economy, more explicit theorizations of the interaction between culture and political economy are needed. This is especially true as culture is increasingly merged with once differentiated social, political and economic forms. An important contribution to theorizing the interaction between political-economy and culture is Lash's (1989) notion of *regimes of signification*. For Lash, cultural paradigms such as modernism and postmodernism are regimes of signification that produce cultural objects. Each regime of signification is comprised of a specific, material *cultural economy* which includes: "specific relations of production of cultural objects, specific conditions of reception, a particular institutional framework that mediates between production and reception, and a particular way in which cultural objects circulate" (Lash 1989:5). A regime of signification is further comprised of a specific *mode of signification* whereby "cultural objects depend on a particular relationship between signifier, signified, and referent" (Lash 1989:5).

The *cultural economy* of each regime of signification coincides with the dominance of a particular mode of accumulation and method of regulation. This not to argue for a causal base-superstructural arrangement but rather to consider culture as "part and parcel of the economy" (Lash 1989:38).[7] A specific epoch is characterized by the inter-dynamics and cross-influencing of the relationships between its dominant mode of accumulation, method of regulation, and regime of signification. A regime of signification, however, may not be

unified and uncontested. Lash suggests that, under post-Fordism, the dynamics between two opposing postmodernisms (mainstream postmodernism and oppositional postmodernism) make up the dominant regime of signification (Lash 1989:36-38).[8] Through processes of de-differentiation, the post-Fordist mode of accumulation is becoming indistinguishable from its regime of signification (Lash 1989:39). More specifically, on the consumption, or supply, side of post-Fordist modes of accumulation, the use-value of goods is increasingly being conflated with their sign-value. Whereas the use-value of material goods has generally been associated with their material properties and the sign-value associated in their signifying properties, in cultural goods both use- and sign-value are inherent in their signifying properties (Lash 1989:43-4). As the mode of accumulation and regime of signification increasingly overlap, material goods are increasingly becoming cultural goods wherein their use-values are increasingly becoming culturally mediated through their sign-value (Lash 1989:39). In addition, the conflation of the mode of accumulation and the regime of signification under post-Fordism is resulting in the production of more and more "immaterial" cultural goods that are based upon cultural experiences and spectacles, such as many new forms of tourism.[9] As mentioned above, these cultural goods are very attractive from a business standpoint because the turn-over time of capital is, in some cases, almost instantaneous. Further, as postmodern culture encourages sign-value consumption, the limits of consumer demand are somewhat removed: "If goods function primarily as symbols, and

---

[7] Indeed, Lash and Urry (1994:6-7) argue that contemporary *information and communication structures* are becoming so pervasive that they are becoming primary socializing structures in the globalizing world. I will discuss the importance of these structures later.

[8] Rojek (1995) makes a similar argument with regard to two conflicting cultural modernities.

[9] This is not to argue that the production, circulation, and consumption of material goods is decreasing. Rather, the turn-over time of material goods is also increased as their sign- and use-values become conflated because modish consumption patterns necessitate a steadily changing availability of newer and different products (Harvey 1990:285).

individuals use them to establish invidious distinctions between themselves and other individuals, then there are in principle no limits to consumer demand" (Lash 1989:40-1).

With specific regard to each regime of signification's mode of signification, Lash argues that modernism is, for the most part, *discursive*, whereas postmodernism is *figural* (1989:174). The modernist, discursive mode of signification prioritizes words over images, values the form of cultural objects, espouses a rationalist view of culture, is concerned with the cultural significance of "important" texts, and places a clear distinction between the spectator and cultural objects. In contrast, the postmodern, figural mode of signification prioritizes images over words, is concerned with making meanings through the juxtaposition of mundane signifiers, emphasizes play and irrationality in culture, is concerned with how meaning is made, and immerses the spectator in her/his experience of cultural objects through the mediation of desire (Lash 1989:175).

It is through an exploration of the dynamics between the mode of accumulation, method of regulation, and regime of signification, that a theory of social change can understand the cultural-paradigmatic transition from modernity to postmodernity in a way that is coterminous with, but not determined by, the transition from Fordism to post-Fordism. For Lash, these dynamics can be understood as processes of differentiation in modernity and de-differentiation in postmodernity (1989:5). By modern cultural differentiation, Lash means that the cultural and the social appear autonomous and self-legislating,[10] i.e. "high" art is separated from everyday life, politics, economics, etc. Furthermore, cultural practices are themselves seen as unrelated and autonomous, i.e. "high" art is differentiated and separated from "low" art. Postmodern cultural de-differentiation, on the other hand, describes the

[10] By self-legislating, Lash means that each sphere develops its own conventions and valuation processes (1989:9).

processes whereby the cultural, the social, the political, and the economic become viewed as overlapping, interacting, and cross-influential. For example, cultural aesthetics increasingly become both conceptually and materially conflated with political-economic practices.

Although the regulation school's approach, especially in conjunction with Lash's inclusion of regimes of signification, is sensitive to the cultural, social, political, and economic inter-dynamics, this framework misses some important aspects of modernity and modernization, namely risk and reflexivity. Generally, theorists of *reflexive modernization* such as Ulrich Beck (1992; 1994; 1995; 1997) and Anthony Giddens (1984; 1990; 1992; 1994) focus on the changing relationships between structures and agency. Unlike the regulation school, reflexive modernization theory is more concerned with how people negotiate their variegated roles in de-traditionalized—or re-traditionalized—contemporary societies and how these roles are affected by new and changing relationships to dynamic social structures. Common to both theorists' ideas of reflexive modernization are their discussions of the relationship between expert and public knowledges in the mediation of trust and security. Also, each theorist refutes ideas of postmodernization in favour of understanding contemporary structural changes as a radicalization of the assumptions of modernity. Although Giddens' contribution is important, it is beyond the scope of this thesis to compare and contrast Beck's and Giddens' positions.[11] In what follows, then, I will focus solely on Beck's theory of reflexive modernization and the risk society—although some of Giddens' phrasings may creep in now and then.

[11] For illustrative comparisons of Beck and Giddens, see Lash (1993), Beck et al. (1994), Lash and Urry (1994), and Wynne (1996).

Reflexive Modernization: Risks and Reflexivity

Generally, as mentioned above, Beck's approach entails a structural exploration of the processes of modernization as well as a theorization of the changing nature of individual and collective agency. At a structural level, Beck is concerned with theorizing the transition from what he calls the simple modernization of industrial societies to the reflexive modernization of a world risk society. Where simple modernization involves the disembedding of traditional, feudal social forms and the process of traditionalizing industrial social forms, reflexive modernization involves the disembedding of industrial social forms and the processes of traditionalizing alternative modernities as new sources of *security* (1997: 22-3).[12] For Beck, the concerns of industrial society can be characterized as the production and fair distribution of "goods", whereas the concerns of the risk society can be characterized by the production and self-confrontation of "bads". Industrial societies are focused upon the production and distribution of material goods and resources that, within the ideals of linear "progress", are meant to improve people's life-chances and happiness. Risk societies, on the other hand, are primarily concerned with managing the unintended consequences of simple modernization that greatly jeopardize people's very existence.

The transition from simple modernization to reflexive modernization is unintended and objective; it occurs through the "back door of side-effects" that exist whether they are acknowledged as legitimate risks or not (Beck 1992:21; 1997:22). It is when the real threats of these new hazards are confronted that reflexive modernization begins to characterize an epoch. For Beck, reflexivity in this context does not mean increased *self-reflection* but rather the necessary and *automatic self-confrontation* of modernity with itself (Beck 1994:5; 1996:28). This self-confrontation means that the risks of the risk society are no longer the

same as those confronted by industrial society[13] and, subsequently, the security and insurability structures of simple modernization can no longer mediate, or even fathom, new, global hazards. These new forms of risk are the very product of industrial society. So, self-confrontation characterizes the attempt to mediate and control the hazardous effects of simple modernization. The extent to which this process is automatic is reflected in the fact that these new risks have an ontological status regardless of whether they are dealt with or not. The very fact that nuclear annihilation is possible or that human-caused ecological crises are indeed occurring means that there are new forms of risk that societies have never had to manage before: "The entry into risk society occurs at the moment when the hazards which are now decided and consequently produced by society *undermine and/or cancel the established safety systems of the provident state's existing risk calculations*" (Beck 1996:31).

The variety of ways that people confront these new risks marks new relationships and conflicts within the reflexive modernization of the risk society (Beck 1992:46). One important new conflict occurs in the relationship between expert knowledges and public trust.[14] In addition, new relationships between expert (scientific) and "lay" knowledges arise. Beck argues that the new forms of risk are indicative of the failure of instrumental rationality because "the sciences are entirely incapable of reacting adequately to civilizational risks, since they are prominently involved in the origin and growth of those very risks" (Beck 1992:59). This inability to react to new forms of risk stems from the inability of scientific probabilistic calculations (i.e. instrumental rationality) to adequately reflect the scope of the risk itself. For example, calculating the probability of a nuclear accident, and then promoting

---

[12] The influence of Giddens' work is evident here. See Giddens (1994).

[13] In industrial society, risks were often resource based shortages, natural disasters, and economic crises. The new risks of the risk society are unintended challenges and problems brought about and characterized by the limits of rational modernity.

actions based upon this probabilistic calculation, is ludicrous when one considers that the effects of a nuclear accident may be global and, indeed, may result in rendering the planet uninhabitable. With such new forms of risk, the stakes are often too high for probabilistic models of action. In public discourse, the scientific definition of risk based upon probability becomes unacceptable based upon scope.

For Beck, cultural premises of the acceptability of risks are indicative of a new, cultural criticism of science. When the sciences confront their self-generated risks outside of the scope of instrumental rationality, they must overstep the boundaries of their disciplines and ask "how do we want to live?" (Beck 1992:58). By asking a culturally normative question, the sciences admit that the objectivity they espouse can do nothing to solve the ontological insecurity that arises in the face of self-generated risks. Further, such questions indicate "that the cultural premises of acceptability contained in the scientific and technical statements on risks are wrong. The technical risk experts are mistaken in the empirical accuracy of their implicit value premises, specifically in their assumptions of what appears acceptable to the population" (Beck 1992:58). The definitions of risk, then, can become social definitions rather than scientific. In turn, this forces the definitions of risk toward democracy through the acceptance of non-scientific judgments into scientific inquiry through public debate (Beck 1992:58). The instrumental rationality of the more traditional scientific epistemologies remains central to risk calculations but their monopoly on the truth and a passive reception based on public trust is no longer available. Indeed, the failure to promote a sense of ontological security has, in many ways, delegitimated science as a purveyor of the good (and safe) life.

---

[14] Again, compare with Giddens (1994).

Ultimately, Beck argues, this cultural criticism of science must appeal to scientific rationality (Beck 1992:71-2). Within the risk society, many risks are not legitimated and legislated as dangers unless they are scientifically defined by experts. Indeed, some risks, such as the hole in the ozone layer, can only be "seen" with scientific instruments and understood using complex and specialized knowledges. Thus the very knowledge of such risks is almost entirely dependent upon scientific models. Those who wish to challenge scientific judgments in these cases must do so on the basis of scientific evidence. The focus on risk definition, then, becomes the rational basis of alternative, scientific claims. Although normative statements are admitted in such contests over risk definitions, there cannot be a total delegitimization of science. Such a devaluing of science would result in a general "obfuscation of risks" and would be counter-productive because there could be no foundation for judging the scope of risks.[15] Beck asks, and this is his critique of (somewhat caricaturized) postmodern epistemological critiques of science, if anything goes then "where does anyone derive the right to believe only in certain risks?" (Beck 1992:72).

For Beck, science within the processes of reflexive modernization undergoes a process of *reflexive scientization* (Beck 1992:155). This form of science is self-aware and self-confrontational: it is both aware that science itself has caused new global risks that threaten the habitability of the planet and is hyper-sensitive in its avoidance of repeating past errors. Science alone becomes less and less sufficient for defining truth and, indeed, its monopoly on truth construction is broken by challenges to its risk definitions. For Beck, however, reflexive science within the risk society must become more scientific; and this is where Beck's rationalist tendencies are revealed. As Lash (1993) argues, in Beck's view, processes of modernization are learning processes. Although Beck claims that the promises of the

[15] See Wynne (1996) for a critique of this.

project of the Enlightenment are somewhat checked by the errors and failures of science within industrial society (1992:155), it is only a smarter science that will ultimately save everyone from the dangers inherent in the risk society. It is still scientific knowledge that will lead the way to a better life.

The public questioning of science, and more particularly the questioning of scientific risk definitions, is, in part, brought about through *individualization*. Beck argues that as traditional industrial social forms are being replaced through the traditionalization of new social forms, people are beginning to be ostensibly set free from the structuring influence of industrial categories such as class, stratification, family, and gender status (Beck 1992:87). In part, Beck is suggesting that this process occurs only in appearance. These industrial social forms remain strong in their structuring effects but become socially delegitimated as sources of inequality. In addition, within the processes of reflexive modernization, new structured inequalities are produced based on risk positions (risk winners and losers) that become, on the surface, more globally pervasive than the industrial society's categories of inequality and thus overshadow these more traditional concerns. These new risk positions are the sources of new inequalities that, in a sense, compete with the inequalities of industrial society. Rather than being completely free agents of reflexive modernization, what Beck is arguing is that people are increasingly being forced to make choices regarding their own biographies and lifestyles; that they can no longer follow a script written through the traditions of industrial society and based upon the traditional categories of inequality (Beck 1994:13; 1997:95). As people are forced to make such active life-choices, they ostensibly become responsible for the risks inherent in their choices and, ultimately, are forced to blame themselves for any failures (Beck 1992:88-9; 1994:14). Structural positions of inequality

become *individualized social risks* and, in the process, structural inequalities become deprived of social identity (Beck 1992:100).[16]

Where people are actually being set free from the structuring effects of traditional industrial social forms is in their increased individual reflexivity.[17] This reflexivity is not so much self-confrontation as *self-reflection*. People within the risk society are better able to reflect upon the structuring effects of social forms and, indeed, counter-act, mediate, and, in some instances change, some structures through both personal and collective critique and action. People increasingly question the structures and institutions of industrial society and judge for themselves whether their own sensibilities are represented. For Beck, the new risk positions are becoming a dominant focus in this type of reflexivity; it is people's position vis-à-vis global risks that motivates their critiques of social structures and institutions.

Lash (1993, 1994) and Lash and Urry (1994) argue that this form of individual reflexivity describes only a part of people's changing relationships both to social structures and their senses of self in the course of the transition to a period of reflexive modernization. Further, Lash argues that Beck's traditional approach to social theory and sociology misses completely the cultural dimensions involved in modernization processes (Lash 1993:2). Beck's discussion of individual reflexivity can be characterized as a *cognitive reflexivity* (Lash 1993:9; 1994:111; Lash and Urry 1994:37). This form of individual reflexivity generally refers to a self-awareness of one's own ontological and epistemological assumptions and a continual critique and renewal of those assumptions. More specifically,

---

[16] It is important, I think, to emphasize that Beck is *not* arguing that social inequalities are personal failures; rather, he is suggesting that individualization incorporates a "blame the victim" sensibility.

[17] Alternatively, Lash (1994) argues that people are being *forced* to be free as a post-Fordist, reflexive system dominates over the rigidity of the Fordist system. People may be freed from traditional social structures but newly forming information and communication structures increasingly becoming in embedded in structuration processes. See also Lash and Urry 1994.

this form of individual reflexivity reflects how people are increasingly utilizing new knowledges and information and communication systems to manage and organize their personal life-narratives (Lash and Urry 1994:5). Cognitive reflexivity also marks a critical stance to expert systems and knowledge structures; the hegemony of dominant forms of knowledge is, in some instances, undermined by people's increasing realization of epistemological and ontological uncertainty—which is itself a result of the realization and availability of a plethora of knowledge systems. As Lash argues, this cognitive dimension of reflexivity falls directly within the Enlightenment tradition; it involves a "critique by the universal (knowledgeable agency) of the particular (existing social conditions)" (1994:111).

Lash and Lash and Urry argue that Beck misses both the aesthetic and hermeneutic aspects of reflexivity. Aesthetic reflexivity runs along side cognitive reflexivity; people's individual reflexivity involves both cognitive and aesthetic dimensions (Lash 1993:8-9). Aesthetic reflexivity is interpretive rather than cognitive and, generally, involves a critique of universals through the particular (Lash 1994:111). Further, aesthetic reflexivity entails a realization and appreciation of contingency, ambivalence, and uncertainty, whereas cognitive reflexivity is more concerned with order and certitude. Where cognitive reflexivity characterizes self-monitoring mediated through logical conceptualizations and calculations, aesthetic reflexivity is rooted in self-interpretation and is largely mediated through allegories and symbols (Lash and Urry 1994:54). Cognitive reflexivity is a self-reflection on *being-in-the-world*, whereas aesthetic reflexivity is a self-reflection on a perpetual *becoming-in-the-world*. This means that people not only reflect upon their immediate lives (cognitive reflexivity) and their (rational) future goals, but they also actively reflect upon who they wish to be, and how they would like to live and feel in the future (aesthetic reflexivity).

For Lash, both cognitive and aesthetic sources of, and reflections on, the self are somewhat trapped within a "metaphysical universe" of agency versus structure, subject versus object, control versus contingency, and the conceptual versus the mimetic (1994:144). The point, however, is not to deconstruct these oppositions but rather to avoid them altogether through an hermeneutic understanding of the self embedded within a community through shared understandings: "Communal knowledge is…hermeneutic knowledge and…is only possible when the knower is in the same world as and 'dwells among' the things and other human beings whose truth she seeks. Community does not involve chronic problematization of the signifier, but is instead rooted in shared meanings and routine background practices" (Lash 1994:157). In contrast to those who are suspicious of foundationalist claims, this is a project of a *hermeneutics of retrieval* that lays "open the ontological foundations of communal being-in-the-world" (Lash 1994:146). With reflexive modernization, communities (of shared understandings) become reflexive and are as much sources of the self as cognitive and aesthetic reflexivity. Reflexive communities, in opposition to traditional communities, are voluntary associations that often stretch through time and space. The members of such communities consciously reflect on the processes and procedures of community creation and continuation (Lash 1994:163). Although the cognitive, aesthetic, and hermeneutic are all sources of the reflexive self, this does not mean they work in harmony. Rather, these forms of reflexivity can also inaugurate a discordant self (Lash 1994:165).

Lash's introduction of a hermeneutic retrieval of community provides a necessary check against Beck's individualization thesis and its apparently narrow focus on the atomization of the self. For as Lash argues, reflexivity can only truly become critical when one turns from

self-reflection to a reflection on social systems (Lash 1994:140). So, the individual reflexivity that Beck assumes is the source of a critique of the supremacy of scientific and expert knowledges is only one aspect of reflexivity. As information and communication structures become important, or even dominant, structuring entities, both aesthetic and hermeneutic reflexivity also become necessary bases of critiques of institutions and social systems (Lash and Urry 1994). Some people's contemporary mistrust of science and experts is as much a part of their hermeneutic and aesthetic reflexivity as it is their cognitive reflexivity. Indeed, the idea of cognitive reflexivity not only posits an atomistic individual but it also assumes an a-cultural individual. All three forms of reflexivity, on the other hand, are intrinsically culturally informed: these forms of reflexivity all rely on cultural meanings in the processes of self-interpretation. For a reflexive individual to become critical of social institutions a certain amount of cultural mediation is needed, especially when these institutions are themselves increasingly becoming laden with culture.

Beck does not completely ignore community and collectivities in his theorization of the risk society and reflexive modernization. Indeed, he suggests that new forms of sub-political action arise that refigure traditional forms of political and communal action. Groups—and sometimes individuals—hitherto excluded from traditional politics have commanded their own voices and have developed their own political methods of disseminating their messages and rectifying inequalities. In so doing they have reinvented politics. Of sub-politics, Beck writes:

> The concept of "subpolitics" refers to politics outside and beyond the representative institutions of the political system of nation-states. It focuses attention on signs of an (ultimately global) self-organization of politics, which tends to set all areas of society in motion. Subpolitics means "*direct*" politics—that is, *ad hoc* individual participation in political decisions, bypassing the institutions of representative opinion-formation (political parties,

> parliaments) and often even lacking the protection of law. In other words, subpolitics means the shaping of society from below. Economy, science, career, everyday existence, private life, all become caught up in the storm of political debate. But these do not fit into the traditional spectrum of party-political differences. What is characteristic of the subpolitics of world society are precisely *ad hoc "coalitions of opposites"* (of parties, nations, regions, religions, governments, rebels, classes). Crucially, however, subpolitics sets politics free by changing the rules and boundaries of the political so that it becomes more open and susceptible to new linkages—as well as capable of being negotiated and reshaped" (Beck 1996a:18).

For Beck, however, individualization is the necessary condition for sub-politics (Beck 1994:19-23; 1997:94-109). People must be at least ostensibly set free from industrial social structures in order to become sub-political agents and command new political spaces within reflexive modernity because if they were to remain within the confines of the categories espoused by industrial society their political options would be too restrictive. In sub-politics, private self-reflexivity (cognitive and aesthetic) becomes publicly communicated; and the increased availability of a variety of life-choices become the basis for people's entry into (individual and/or collection) sub-political action and reflexive communities. People's cognitive and aesthetic self-reflection enables them to realize that traditional forms of political action alone are insufficient for successfully espousing and addressing their particular concerns. So, in reflexive modernization, politics is reinvented and becomes reflexive.

Although new political affinities, sensibilities, and associations arise based on emergent individual life-choices, even the long-fought politics based on class, stratification, race, ethnicity, gender, sexual orientation, environmental concerns etc. open up into new spheres of action. Sub-politics is not restricted to individualized risk positions; rather, all social movements, whether they are long established or newly formed, may incorporate new political strategies and create new political spaces. Hermeneutic reflexivity is as important as

cognitive and aesthetic reflexivity in these social movements because shared understandings and reflexive communal associations form and are maintained within these sub-political spaces.

Following Lash, Wynne (1996) argues that Beck's view of these new sub-political arrangements is overly realist and rationalist and that in order to adequately theorize and understand global risks, expert versus "lay" knowledges, and sub-political processes, social constructivist and hermeneutic dimensions of culture need to be incorporated. Risks, then, need not always be defined and legitimated by and through science. Cultural understandings inevitably mediate scientific and "lay" definitions of risks and risk solutions. Wynne writes that Beck's perspective on the risk society "implicitly treat[s] the non-expert world as epistemologically vacuous" with "little cognitive access to nature or society" (1996:61). What Wynne is calling "lay" knowledges are alternative, culturally based epistemological perspectives on nature, society, and the relationships between the two. Indeed, in Wynne's formulation, science is only one among many cultural epistemologies—although it remains in a dominant position within risk societies and maintains a certain amount of public trust (Wynne 1996:75). Sub-political associations are not necessarily competing scientific experts, although this can certainly be the case, but also reflexive communities that provide alternative cultural ways of knowing and framing risks and that give alternative answers the question, "how do we want to live?".

Changing Leisure

There is no shortage of theories about the changing nature of leisure during the course of the twentieth century (Rojek 1994; 1995). Fundamental to these leisure theories is a distinction between work and non-work (Britton 1991; Urry 1990; 1994; 1995). But if the

contemporary "condition" is marked by processes of de-differentiation, then this opposition would appear to be a (false) dichotomy that no longer holds the analytical utility it may once have. It is more useful, I think, to explore the relationships between work and leisure and to show how these two activities can overlap. Leisure does seem to posit its opposite (work) but there has always been more than a conceptual relationship between the two. Most people's leisure activities, for example, involve immense amounts of work by others: hotel and restaurant staff, travel agents, television studios, tour guides, transportation personnel, and so on (Urry 1990:2-4; Urry 1994:132). Obviously, to turn this around, some people's work lives are made possible by other people's leisure lives. Leisure is embedded in a web of social, political, economic and cultural practices and cannot be understood without also exploring its relationships to work.

Although the relationships between work and leisure are important, maintaining the dichotomy between the two tends to ignore an increasingly important part of many people's lives, namely social-political activism. If, as many people have noted, the late twentieth century has seen a tremendous increase in people's participation in new social movements and "sub-political" action, then it may be important to understand how people negotiate their activist endeavors in conjunction with their work and leisure lives. Time spent in activist endeavors cannot be simply allotted to either work-time or free-time, nor can activist spaces be simply equated with either work-spaces or leisure-space. As I will discuss later, there may be activist-times and activist spaces but these cannot be simply differentiated from work and leisure times and spaces.

What is leisure if it does not simply reflect people's use of free-time and free-space in opposition to their work-time and work-space? Rojek's (1995) approach to decentring

leisure is useful in answering such a question. As just mentioned, leisure is often treated as a discrete unit of study that can be operationalized apart from work and other social practices. Leisure is then defined as an avenue whereby people express and pursue their freedom, choices, life-satisfaction, and self-improvement (Rojek 1995:1; Craik 1997:18-19). These aspects of leisure, however, are culturally mediated, vary through time and across space, and tend to be abstract and elusive: "like the concept of utopia, leisure seems to be one place on the map of the human world where we are constantly trying to land, but which perpetually evades our reach" (Rojek 1995:1). Rather than treat leisure as a thing-in-itself, it may be more theoretically fruitful to explore the contexts that give it a particular form in a particular time and place (Rojek 1995:2).

In the next two sections, I will argue that work, leisure, and activism have become de-differentiated in late twentieth century tourism and that increased institutional, individual and communal reflexivity has played an important part in this. To do this I will first briefly discuss the changing nature of tourism from its Fordist to its post-Fordist forms. I will then explore what I take to be an illustrative case of post-Fordist tourism, namely ecotourism, that characterizes a particular form of de-differentiation and reflexivity.

Modern Mass Tourism and Postmodern Post-Tourism

The transitions from Fordism to post-Fordism and from modernity to postmodernity are witnessed in the changes from mass tourism to post-tourism. Prior to the late nineteenth century, travel had been generally associated with either work and business (e.g. trade) or with religious pilgrimage (Sharpley 1994:33-4). For the most part, it was only in the Grand Tour that travel was associated with leisure; and this form of leisure travel was reserved for wealthy aristocrats (Sharpley 1994:40-2; Craik 1997:118-20). The rise of mass tourism saw

the transformation of travel as a leisure activity (Urry 1990:5). During the late nineteenth and early twentieth century, the work-week was becoming standardized and, thus, leisure times were becoming more pre-set and orderly (Urry 1990:20; Sharpley 1994:44). This increase in predictable leisure time along with better access to transportation, especially increased access to rail travel, led to the development of mass tourism (Urry 1990:20-1).

Generally, mass tourism is characterized by the large scale production of tourism sites and infrastructures for mass consumption by a seemingly homogenous group of consumers (Urry 1990:87; Shaw and Williams 1994:174-96; Mowforth and Munt 1998:85-95). For the most part, mass tourists had little choice in how the holiday was put together and arranged. The organization of mass tourism is generally accredited to Thomas Cook's efforts during the nineteenth and early twentieth century to orchestrate low risk, pre-packaged holidays (Swinglehurst 1982; Lash and Urry 1994:261-269; Sharpley 1994:49-51). Cook's tours targeted people with both disposable income and leisure time—British middle- and upper-classes—and facilitated travel mostly within England and Europe. Like mass tourism in general, these were highly standardized and rationalized holidays that attempted to alleviate people's travel insecurities by coordinating all transportation, accommodation, financial exchange, and sight-seeing activities in advance.

There are general characteristics of the dominant modern cultural paradigm in the culture of mass tourism. Most obvious is the Fordist, rigid ordering and standardization of holiday production and consumption, reflecting modern, instrumentally rational attempts to control the world through predictability and calculation (Rojek 1995:38-9; Ritzer and Liska 1997:96-8). Work and leisure are also clearly differentiated as separate social practices (Urry 1990:2-3). In part, this differentiation is maintained through the reification of tourism and tourism

sites. The social organization of work (e.g. travel agents, transportation personnel, hotel staff) is obscured because tourists do not generally want to be reminded of work when they are on a holiday (Britton 1991). For the most part, tourism services become part of the tourist site and experience itself (Crang 1997; Urry 1990:66-73; Urry 1995:131). Mass tourism sites, then, are regarded as sources of authentic experiences of "other" cultures and/or environments rather than sites constructed for, or organized around, tourism.[18] This reification of tourism is made even easier through the modern regime of signification that does not generally problematize reality. As Culler (1981) and Frow (1991) argue, all forms of tourism are culturally mediated and an important part of being a tourist is semiotic interpretation. In mass tourism, tourism signs are regarded as authentic markers of a culture and/or environment—the relationship between a signifier and its signified is not problematized—and, thus, the mass tourism experience is regarded as authentic rather than constructed or staged. As Urry (1990) argues, this search for authenticity is often accomplished through the search for symbols; mass tourists look for authenticity indicators to gaze upon. For example, a peasant in a field becomes an authentic symbol of rural life. The mass tourist searching for authentic experiences within a mass tourism site is not generally reflexive and thus relies on the traditional assumptions about being-in-the-world. The modern cultural paradigm organizes the experience of mass tourism; mass tourists, in general, are not playful interpreters of the world.

The above discussion focuses on the dominant modern cultural paradigm. However, this cultural paradigm cannot really be regarded as uncontested and homogenous. There is another side to modernity that also needs to be recognized. Indeed, as Rojek (1995) argues

[18] For discussions of mass tourism as a quest for authentic experiences see MacCannell (1976), Krippendorf (1984), Shaw and Williams (1994), and Sharpley (1994).

(following Berman), there are two conflicting modernities. The above discussion represents the hegemonic structure that embraces order, control, rationality, and differentiation. The second modern cultural paradigm recognizes the disorderly, fluctuating, and irrational aspects of modern life that resist the assumption of the first modernity. These two modernities contradict each other in the processes of cultural change—indeed, processes of postmodern de-differentiation have their beginnings in this second modernity (Rojek 1995:101-2).

In tourism, this second modernity is instantiated in forms of tourism that are carnivalesque, hedonistic, and disorderly (Rojek 1995:79-103; Jokinen and Veijola 1997:28-32; Rojek and Urry 1997:3-4). As opposed to the mass tourist of the dominant modern cultural paradigm, the pedestrian *flaneur* is the metaphoric character of this second modernity. The solitary flaneur constantly seeks sensual impressions of modern life, especially cultural experiences forbidden by the dominant cultural paradigm, but remains a spectator unwilling to participate while reveling in flux, inauthenticity, and movement. The flaneur is a person of leisure who "makes a virtue of idleness and values the senses above reason" (Rojek 1995:91). The flaneur disavows labour; work becomes an obstacle to leisure.[19] In many ways, but not exclusively, it is the culture of this second modernity that becomes accentuated in the postmodern cultural paradigm; and, in part, it is the flaneur that becomes emblematic of the post-tourist (Urry 1990:139; Rojek 1995:90-1).

As discussed above, the postmodern cultural paradigm is characteristic of a new regime of signification; and a transition to a new mode of signification, cultural economy, and interpretive positions is closely associated with the transition from Fordism to post-Fordism.

---

[19] The flaneur is exclusively male and women become part of the spectacle of his idle viewing (Rojek 1995:91). For a critique of using the flaneur as emblematic of this second modernity see Urry (1990) and Wolff (1990).

De-differentiation of the political, social, cultural and economic becomes more pronounced with these transitions, and information and communication structures become increasingly pervasive socializing mechanisms. Forms of individual, community, and institutional reflexivity also develop in and further propagate these transitions. Generally, as Harvey (1990) and Lash and Urry (1994) argue, albeit in different ways, globalization processes have been some of the primary mechanisms driving both the transition from rigid, Fordist systems to more flexible, post-Fordist systems and the transition from modernity to a postmodern cultural paradigm.

For Harvey, this paradigmatic shift from modernity to postmodernity can be understood as a cultural reaction to the globalization of capital that produces a bout of time-space compression wherein the world, for some people, has become a smaller place—or at least easier to get around in and to exchange information and capital in—and wherein space has been annihilated through time. The globalization of capitalism itself is indicative of a necessary "spatial fix" wherein capital must extend beyond national borders in order to solve overaccumulation crises. The shift to a postmodern cultural paradigm, according to Harvey, is a direct result of the globalizing flows of commodities and capital and the acceleration of the turn-over time of investment (1990:284-5). Global flows and accelerated turn-over times mean that consumption choices are increased and consumer demands, tastes, and desires change rapidly. An increased imperative to decrease turn-over time also leads to an increase in the production of spectacles and experiences rather than the production of physical goods. Furthermore, consumption and commodities are increasingly carriers of social values and meanings and are becoming inculcated in personal identity formation and subject positions (Harvey 1990:299-300). Harvey suggests that in both production and consumption the

decrease in turn-over time and the increased conflation of commodities and money with cultural and social valuations and meanings, have resulted in a dominant culture wherein instantaneity, ephemerality, volatility and disposability are characteristic (1990:285-7).

Lash and Urry (1994) propose that pessimistic accounts of postmodernity, like Harvey's, are a result of an overly structural exploration of the relationship between globalization and postmodernity. Instead of proposing that postmodernism leads to increased meaninglessness, abstraction, disassociation, and the destruction of the subject, the authors argue that globalization and the shift to post-Fordism and a postmodern cultural paradigm can open up positive spaces wherein new meanings of work and leisure can develop, the idea of community can be reconstituted, subjectivity can be re-assessed, and space and everyday life can become more heterogeneous (Lash and Urry 1994:3-4). These new opportunities are a result of increased reflexivity and the new structuring effects of global information and communication (I&C) structures. These I&C structures are the physical and symbolic infrastructures through which cultural objects and signs flow and are exchanged. Post-Fordism becomes a logical result of Fordist consumption. For Fordism to be successful, mass consumption had to be stimulated; and so the structuring effects of traditional social structures, which espoused a certain amount of restraint in people's consumption patterns, had to at least partially subside to allow for new consumption sensibilities. This weakening of traditional social structures opens up spaces for reflexivity and increases the structuring, or traditionalizing, effects of I&C structures. People begin reflecting upon the cultural meanings of the popular commodities flowing through I&C structures and interpret them and themselves in novel ways. Indeed, the popularization of the cultural meanings of commodities (reflexive objects), in conjunction with increasingly diverse interpretations,

results in niche market opportunities and, consequently, the development of more flexible and responsive production systems (Lash and Urry 1994:132-4). The increase in reflexivity and the structuring effects of I&C structures has also resulted in a shift to a postmodern cultural paradigm. As previously discussed, this paradigm is characterized by a new regime of signification. The cultural objects flowing through global I&C structures (the cultural economy) have novel modes of signification; and these cultural objects are interpreted in diverse and novels ways by reflexive subjects.

The concept of "post-tourism" marks a distinction between the organization and experiences of modern, Fordist mass tourism and postmodern, post-Fordist forms of tourism. Through processes of de-differentiation, tourism practices become conflated with other activities and, consequently, tourism is no longer organized nor experienced as a discrete phenomenon (Rojek 1994:134; Urry 1990:84; 1995:150). Indeed, as Urry (1990; 1992a; 1992b) argues, the universalization of the tourist gaze means that in many ways people are tourists most of the time.

Lash and Urry (1994:274) outline some of the correspondences between post-Fordism and post-tourism. With post-Fordism, specialized markets, based upon a plurality of consumer lifestyles, form in opposition to the mass market of the Fordist epoch. As a result of this market segmentation, tourism becomes diversified in order to meet the exigencies of these new and forming lifestyles. This segmentation also results in niche-marketing practices; specific forms of post-tourism become marketed to people characterizing specific lifestyles. Thus, within post-Fordism, production is more consumer-oriented as consumers' wants need to be satisfied. In post-tourism this is expressed as a consumer rejection of forms of mass tourist, packaged holidays in favor of specialized tours. Consumers' desires also change

more rapidly within this mode of production/consumption than within Fordism. Post-tourists are less likely to repeatedly visit the same destinations as they search out new experiences in order to accumulate a plethora of cultural signs.[20] Consumers also become more informed and, as a result, are more active in their consumption choices. In forms of post-tourism, this consumer involvement translates into a marked need to gather more information about their possible destinations as well as an increased reflexivity in their travel activities; post-tourists are more aware of the processes involved in their tourism consumption and are also more cognizant of the outcomes of their choices. This active quest for information places post-tourists into global flows of information that, in turn, expose them to a greater variety of destination opportunities. With the increase in consumer choice, the turnover time of post-Fordist products decreases as fashions and fads rapidly change. As a result, tourist sites and forms of post-tourism become short-lived as new sites and forms become available. Finally, there is an aestheticization of consumption in post-Fordism as opposed to the functional, utilitarian consumption of the Fordist era. This is expressed as a de-differentiation of tourism; leisure, culture, education and even work become conflated within the post-tourist experience (see also Rojek 1994; 1995; Munt 1994a; 1994b).

The postmodern cultural paradigm, processes of de-differentiation, and reflexivity all inform the cultures of post-tourism. There are many post-tourism cultures because of the variety of conflations of tourism with other practices and because of the variety of post-tourist subject positions. So, it is difficult to generalize about the characteristics of "post-tourism" or the "post-tourist". That said, I will outline some ways that post-tourism differs from mass tourism. Generally, post-tourists are more aware of the social organization of

[20] According to Bourdieu, this search for cultural signs signifies the new middle class's accumulation of cultural capital. This cultural capital is utilized by the new middle class to differentiate themselves from other

more rapidly within this mode of production/consumption than within Fordism. Post-tourists are less likely to repeatedly visit the same destinations as they search out new experiences in order to accumulate a plethora of cultural signs.[20] Consumers also become more informed and, as a result, are more active in their consumption choices. In forms of post-tourism, this consumer involvement translates into a marked need to gather more information about their possible destinations as well as an increased reflexivity in their travel activities; post-tourists are more aware of the processes involved in their tourism consumption and are also more cognizant of the outcomes of their choices. This active quest for information places post-tourists into global flows of information that, in turn, expose them to a greater variety of destination opportunities. With the increase in consumer choice, the turnover time of post-Fordist products decreases as fashions and fads rapidly change. As a result, tourist sites and forms of post-tourism become short-lived as new sites and forms become available. Finally, there is an aestheticization of consumption in post-Fordism as opposed to the functional, utilitarian consumption of the Fordist era. This is expressed as a de-differentiation of tourism; leisure, culture, education and even work become conflated within the post-tourist experience (see also Rojek 1994; 1995; Munt 1994a; 1994b).

The postmodern cultural paradigm, processes of de-differentiation, and reflexivity all inform the cultures of post-tourism. There are many post-tourism cultures because of the variety of conflations of tourism with other practices and because of the variety of post-tourist subject positions. So, it is difficult to generalize about the characteristics of "post-tourism" or the "post-tourist". That said, I will outline some ways that post-tourism differs from mass tourism. Generally, post-tourists are more aware of the social organization of

[20] According to Bourdieu, this search for cultural signs signifies the new middle class's accumulation of cultural capital. This cultural capital is utilized by the new middle class to differentiate themselves from other

tourism and the work involved in the production of a tourism site (Rojek 1994:133-4). Indeed, part of being a post-tourist involves a playful search for the social organization of the site itself. Where mass tourism often involved the search for symbols of authenticity, post-tourism involves more allegorical and figural relationships between the tourism site and its constituent signs. In some forms of post-tourism, the inauthenticity and fabrication of the site itself is celebrated (Ritzer and Liska 1997; Rojek 1995; Urry 1990). Disneyland and Las Vegas are often taken as paradigmatic.[21] The organization of these types of post-tourism sites is often conducive to post-tourist interpretation; these sites tend to foreground and aggrandize their architectural and planning achievements.

Some forms of post-tourism, however, such as ecotourism and some forms of heritage and culture tourism, are indicative of a search for the real and the authentic. This quest for authenticity can be seen as a reaction to both the uncritical (un-reflexive) assumption of authenticity in mass tourism and the celebration of the inauthentic in some forms of post-tourism (Munt 1994b; Urry 1990). The difference with the mass tourist's quest for authenticity is the post-tourist's reflexivity and semiotic skills (Urry 1995:145-7). The post-tourist search for the authentic involves interpretations that are informed by the postmodern cultural paradigm rather than the modern. Whereas reality isn't generally problematized in mass tourism, in post-tourism the post-tourist recognizes that her/his experiences of reality can be easily manipulated. This realization necessitates a hyper-vigilance in uncovering a sense of authenticity through increased reflexivity and semiotic prowess. However, as Urry (1990) argues, part of being a post-tourist is being able to choose between what specific type

---

social classes (Mowforth and Munt 1998:129; Munt 1994b:108-9).

[21] Following Ritzer's McDonaldization thesis, Ritzer and Liska (1997) argue that Disneyland is not postmodern but rather modern: it signifies the success of modern, Fordist standardization and rationalization. In short, Disneyland marks the success of McDisneyization.

of tourism to practice at a particular time and place; a post-tourist does not have to commit to consistently being a particular type of post-tourist in search of a particular authentic experience.

Some forms of post-tourism can also be characterized by an increased professionalization and intellectualization (Munt 1994b:110-14). By professionalization, Munt means that, on the tourism production side, there is an increase in tourism organizations that set general codes for conduct for tourism companies and there is an increased certification and licensing of tour guides. On the consumption side, post-tourists themselves professionalize tourism. Tourists themselves set-up organizations and travel clubs. These organizations set conditions for membership, such as the maintenance of travel resumes or CVs, and set their own tourist codes of conduct. By intellectualization, Munt means that both tourism production and consumption are conflated with education and teaching. People with advanced degrees in history, art history, anthropology, and even the physical sciences, for instance, are increasingly finding employment as specialty (expert) guides (Munt 1994b). Education and tourism are also conflated in educative and research tours where the tour itself follows a syllabus and/or a research plan. Travel is further intellectualized through tourists' independent research. Post-tourists increasingly gather information about a site prior to, during, and after their travels. Both intellectualization and professionalization are indicative of de-differentiation processes, reflexivity, and the self-organization of communities.

To sum up, the transition from mass tourism to post-tourism follows broader transitions from Fordism to post-Fordism and from the modern cultural paradigm to the postmodern. These broader transitions have instigated greater reflexivity, a new interpretive (and hegemonic?) mode of signification, and new socializing, or traditionalizing, structures (e.g.

I&C structures) that are increasingly culture-laden. The characteristics of specific post-tourism forms are the result of the particular temporal and spatial convergence of these larger social, cultural, political, and economic changes. How a specific post-tourism form arises depends upon the intersection of a variety of other processes. Post-tourism, then, cannot be understood apart from these processes.

So far, this chapter has highlighted and discussed the various processes involved in the development of post-tourism, all of which provides some context for the development of ecotourism. There is a variety of forms of ecotourism that each mark specific intersections of broader social, political, cultural, and economy processes. In the next section, I will discuss an ideal-typical form of ecotourism that embodies a particular de-differentiation of work, leisure, and activism. More specifically, I will introduce an activist centered ecotourism. I am largely concerned with exploring small-scale, "local" ecotours rather than large ecotour businesses or transnational ecotour companies—local, small-scale ecotours will have different relationships to global circuits of capital accumulation than larger ecotour businesses and transnational ecotour companies. In chapter two I will examine in depth the relationship between ecotourism and environmental activism and in chapter three I will explore ecotourism and the production of natures and environments. So, in this next section, I will limit my discussion to a general introduction to an ideal-typical activist ecotourism.

Ecotourism

There are many different forms of ecotourism and various cultures of ecotourism because social, political, economy, and cultural relations converge differently at particular times and places. As Mowforth and Munt (1998) show, ecotourism can be a part of mass tourism, post-tourism, colonialism, racism, ethnocentrism, sustainable development, the environmental

movement, or global capitalism. Whatever definition of ecotourism one adopts it is necessarily tied to one's social position and purposes (Mowforth and Munt 1998:123). Social power plays a key role in deciding the nature and practices of ecotourism. Some transnational ecotour companies, for example, may adopt a specific definition of ecotourism in order to market their product to post-tourists who are somewhat concerned with environmental preservation and conservation. Mowforth and Munt's (1998) and McLaren's (1998) research indicates that these transnational companies are often less concerned with environmental degradation and environmentally-conscious tourism than they are with the accumulation of capital. Indeed, these companies often cause environmental damage by endorsing the construction of resort hotels, over-extending the population capacity of local ecosystems (e.g. the damage caused by too many tourists on hiking trails), and utilizing high-pollution travel (such as air travel) as a means of transporting their clients (Mowforth and Munt 1998). In addition to damaging the natural environment, some transnational ecotour companies also degrade: cultural environments through the colonization and appropriation of local cultures (e.g. commodifying local culture); economic environments by excluding locals from the control and benefits of tourist activities; and built environments by changing communities to meet the desires and standards of their ecotour clients. For these types of transnational ecotour companies, the "sustainability" of ecotourism is equated with the sustainability of the global economic market and the accumulation of capital rather than the sustainability of the natural and local-cultural environments (Mowforth and Munt 1998:37; McLaren 1998:109). In short, these types of tour organizations are sometimes ecotours in name, not in practice.

Although there is no formal definition of ecotourism, the environmental, cultural, and economic exploitation by some transnational ecotour companies do not correspond to what can be considered an activist ecotourism's core characteristics.[22] Indeed, the ideals of activist ecotourism are in direct conflict with these exploitative practices. A main tenet of this form of ecotourism is the promotion of an environmental ethic (Whelan 1991:15-6; Wood 1991:201; Hvenegaard 1994:25; McLaren 1998:111-2). Generally, this ethic is comprised of respect for local cultures, economies, and ecosystems. Further, activist ecotourism is meant to be an educational experience rather than a romanticized or mundane consumption of "Other" cultures and environments (Hvenegaard 1994:25; McLaren 1998:111-2). Ideal ecotourists are supposed to be reflexive; they are supposed to reflect upon their experiences and interactions within an environment.

According to McLaren (1998:120-1) ecotourism should also incorporate an activist element. Ecotourists and ecotour operators ought to be actively aware and reflexive of their social *and* environmental impacts. This reflexivity involves informed decision making and research. Ecotourists should be cognizant both of the environmental practices of their ecotourism providers and of their own behaviour as they travel to and explore their destinations. This awareness involves gaining knowledge of their own as well as an ecotour company's actual environmental, economic, and cultural effects on local communities (McLaren 1998:120-1). Further, a necessary part of ecotourists' consumer choices should involve avoiding transnational tour companies in favor of locally owned and operated ecotours that may be more likely to promote environmental awareness along with cultural respect. As I will show in later chapters, ecotourism also incorporates more aesthetic and

[22] I am sure that *some* locally owned ecotours have similar economic agendas and ill environmental effects.

hermeneutic forms of reflexivity. These types of reflexivity are crucial in understanding the ecotourism as a form of environmental activism.

In order for ecotour operators to conduct effective activist ecotours—and here I mean encouraging environmental awareness and progressive change— they must also situate themselves and their organizations within the environmental movement (McLaren 1998:121). Indeed, many local and global environmental organizations endorse local ecotourism and ecotour businesses as an effective means of increasing global environmental awareness *and* inter-cultural respect (Boo 1990; McLaren 1998; Mowforth and Munt 1998). There are also transnational ecotour organizations that provide both ecotour operators and ecotourists with information and guidance in establishing and consuming truly "environmentally friendly" ecotourism (McLaren 1998:171-3; Mowforth and Munt 1998:195-6).

As with other social movements, networking, sharing information, and education are important aspects of organizational success and longevity (McLaren 1998:113). Global information and communication systems are integral to ecotourism because they enable (global) ecotourists to gather the information necessary for informed decisions concerning their travel destinations. For ecotour operators, these communication systems underlie important network linkages between local ecotours and global ecotour organizations or other social movement organizations.

Munt argues that because new forms of tourism are embedded within globalized capitalist relations, the oppositional politics of ecotourism can be somewhat precarious. Regardless of whether we conceptualize ecotourism as part of the environmental movement, ecotourism must deal with the problems of fetishization and aestheticization (Munt1994a:56). Fetishization in tourism involves the obfuscation of social and labour relations, through

ecotour operators. Places are not commodified by ecotourism so much as they are reconceptualized as activist spaces/places. The fetishization and aestheticization with which Munt is concerned reflect a more passive form of tourism. As noted above, post-tourism is characterized by a more active, interpretive involvement and reflexivity with regard to both tour providers' and tourists' activities.

Munt is correct in his observation that ecotourism, whether local or global, both directly and indirectly supports the accumulation of capital. If ecotourism is to be seen as a form of oppositional politics, then the contradiction between ecotour operators' critical action (or claims of critical action) and their implication in capitalist accumulation must be acknowledged. Some ecotour companies, for example, espouse an ideology of sustainable development. This ideology tends to justify the accumulation of capital by attempting to show how it is compatible with an environmental ethic. A sustainable development ideology attempts to demonstrate that capitalism does not necessarily involve environmental degradation (Bandy1996:551). As mentioned above, in the case of transnational ecotour corporations, sustainability in this context means the sustainability of capital accumulation.

Local ecotour practices have a different relationship to the global regime of capital. The problem is identifying how local ecotourism can be a form of environmental activism despite its position within the global capitalist economy. If capitalism is a totalizing system of social relations, there is no "outside" position from which to oppose it. Every activist, however critical of capitalist practices, remains embedded within this dominant economic form—it is very difficult to think of an example of a social activity wherein capitalist relations are not, in some way, involved. In the case of local forms of ecotourism, especially activist ecotourism, it may be important to acknowledge how people negotiate the apparent contradiction of

making a living within the capitalist system through activism. If some forms of reflexive consumption have an oppositional quality, or a radical edge, then there may be no contradiction. Instead of simply making a living through a commodification of nature or the environment, and thus supporting a global regime of capital, local activist ecotour operators may attempt to instill a new sense of nature through its commodification. This commodification of nature and the environment may not simply involve trying to make some money in as much as it may be rooted in attempts to instill an environmental activist sensibility in ecotourists. If this is the case, the sign-value and use-value of nature and the environment as ecotourism commodities may be more important than their exchange-values. The use-value of nature and the environment would be their utility in promoting an environmental ethic; and their sign-value would be indicative of new cultural significations that promote ecologically sensitive ideas of nature and the environment. Of course, local, activist ecotour operators hope to make a living through tourism, but this may not be their primary aim. In fact, working as ecotour operators may provide them more time to act as environmental activists; and this activism may be their primary goal.

Conclusion

This chapter is meant as an acclimatizing discussion. I introduced a variety of ideal-typical processes and transitions that generally come together to make a form of activist ecotourism possible. The transitions from Fordism to post-Fordism and from modernity to postmodernity have brought about, or perhaps just intensified, processes of de-differentiation and have increased reflexivity. From my perspective, the regulation school and Beck's reflexive modernization are best viewed as attempts to characterize these transitions. Obviously, each posits fundamentally different arguments for the causes but in their

descriptions of the results of these transitions, I think these two theoretical orientations work well together.

In the next two chapters I want to show how ecotourism is practiced as a form of environmental activism. In chapter two, I will flesh out the de-differentiation of work, leisure, and activism in activist ecotourism and argue that this form of ecotourism involves forms of reflexivity that are negotiated in "local contexts of action". I will also argue that activist ecotourism makes up part of the submerged network of the environmental movement. In the third chapter, I will expand upon the idea of "local contexts of action" and describe how activist ecotours operators produce ideas of nature and the environment.

Chapter Two

Introduction

In the previous chapter, I argued that activist ecotourism is a post-Fordist, post-tourist practice that has been given form by a particular convergence of political, economic, social, and cultural processes. Further, I argued that in the case of activist ecotourism, a paradigmatic shift in the dominant regime of signification from modernity to postmodernity has resulted in a de-differentiation of work, leisure, and activism. From the perspective of reflexive modernization, I attempted to elucidate various forms of individual, communal, and institutional reflexivity and I discussed the status of expert knowledge in the context of the risk society. In the present chapter, I will continue to explore these topics through an examination of data collected during extended interviews with three ecotour operators. More specifically, I will explore the relationship between the environmental movement and activist ecotourism and argue that activist ecotourism is best viewed as part of the latent or submerged network of the environmental movement rather than as part of more visible environmental movement organizations (EMOs). I will show how ecotour operators attempt to instill, or support, self-reflexivity in ecotourists, mobilize support for the more visible EMOs and environmental-activist endeavors, and provide alternative ecological knowledges that counter dominant Western cultural ecological discourses.

Environmental Discourses

Part of the success of the environmental movement has been that people have generally become more aware of the issues of environmental degradation and dangers. To a large degree this increase in public environmental awareness is due to the diffusion of ecological,

or environmental, discourses into various cultural sensibilities (Sandilands 1997; Hajer 1995; 1996; Eder 1996a; 1996b; Harvey 1996; Myers and Macnaghten 1998; Beck 1995; 1996; Eden 1993). Indeed, the growing popularity of various forms of ecotourism can be seen as an indicator of many people's growing interest in the environment. Although, there is no unified ecological or environmental discourse—there are many competing discourses—most agree on one thing, namely that there is an environmental crisis (Hajer 1995:12). The environmental movement in general has been successful in its attempts to inform and persuade people that the environment has been negatively affected by human interventions. But as the environment has become popularized, it has in many ways become de-politicized. As Sandilands argues, when environmental concerns can be expressed through everyday acts like recycling and are increasingly defined through technological and scientific expert discourses, a sustained and thorough public *and* political environmentalism becomes more difficult: "where 'the environment' is defined by experts, and where personal responses to that predefined environment remain solidly located in the private realm, individuals gain few opportunities to come together and to see their environmental concerns as producing/reflecting a commonality" (1997:86). As discourses on environmental crises and concerns enter popular discourse and as environmental activities are increasingly defined through dominant institutional practices, then, the more radical critiques by the environmental movement become somewhat diluted.

The very success of the environmental movement in placing the environment into public discourse has meant that the movement itself is no longer the primary source of environmental discourses and symbolic resources. In many ways, the environmental movement, or at least its discourses, has been institutionalized:

> The institutionalization of environmentalism transgresses the symbolic space created by environmental movements in a double sense: it extends into the public space as it is no longer restricted to its role as a constituency of a movement, and it creates a symbolic universe which can no longer be controlled and claimed as movement property. Environmentalism leaves its generating context and becomes part of modern society, thereby exposing itself to the dynamics of modern discourses which also make environmentalism the object of rationalization and disenchantment (Eder 1996b: 208-9).

Environmental discourses thus get fused with other political discourses and become incorporated with a number of different perspectives and agendas. Consequently, some environmental discourses have become more dominant and more popular than others.

Eder (1996a; 1996b) proposes that an ecological masterframe (ideology) has developed that provides people with the symbolic resources to make consistent empirical, aesthetic, and moral judgements about environmental problems and solutions; and the popularization of this masterframe has instilled a non-controversial, collective ecological identity. For Eder, this masterframe is *ecology*; and an ecological discourse can "be seen as the most productive cultural form for generating and mobilising ideological consensus and dissensus in modern societies" (1996b:204-5). The generation and mobilization of ideological consensus is achieved through three cognitive (sub)frames: 1) the ecological-empirical frame which relies largely on the scientific model to objectify the environment and assumes the environment's ontological (realist) status as well as the reality of its degradation; 2) the ecological-moral frame which espouses a responsibility between people and the rest of the (organic and inorganic) natural world; and 3) the ecological-aesthetic frame which provides symbolic resources that organize people's more expressive and romantic relationships to nature (Eder 1996a:171). The success of the institutionalization of the environmental movement hinges on the symbolic packaging of these frames and the acceptance of this packaging in public

discourse over alternative symbolic packages. The symbolic packages of environmentalist groups, then, must compete with this developing ideology within the "marketplace of public discourse" (Eder 1996a:181).[23] So, it is the success of the environmental movement in instilling environmental awareness in public discourse that is now making it difficult for various environmental discourses to be identified. Indeed, within public discourses these environmentalist symbolic packages can even become misidentified as ecological discourses (Eder 1996a:183).

For Eder, there is currently a non-controversial environmental identity frame that has made it easy for people to identify themselves as "environmentally friendly" subjects (Eder 1996a: 1996b). Following Beck and Giddens, Eder argues that this "green" identity frame reflects processes of de-traditionalization and individualization. The availability of a "green" identity frame is a new, non-traditional subject position that can be voluntarily accepted and rejected. However, where this identity frame may once have helped organize people's involvements in voluntary environmental communities, such as EMOs, as these green identity frames have become more pervasive in public discourse, and framed within the symbolic package of ecology, they have become less controversial. It may once have been considered radical to claim to be an environmentalist but it has now become commonplace and accepted because ecological discourse is so incorporated into public discourse.

Modern political institutions also become re-legitimated through this framing process (Eder 1996a:183; 1996b:209-12). Whereas environmental groups often criticize dominant institutions and practices for their role in environmental degradation, and thus create a legitimation crisis, the ecological masterframe provides an ethical justification for these

[23] Eder argues that the symbolic packaging of ecology reflects the successful adoption of the political-ecological symbolic package as well as the convergence of some aspects of conservationism's and deep ecology's

institutions. For example, where science can be critiqued, and de-legitimated, for its role in environmental degradation (see Chapter One), it can be reasserted as an ethically legitimate endeavor toward the solution of environmental problems: "ecology provides an ethical frame for the use of scientific expertise and the communication of scientific certainties in a situation where certainties are rare and expertise fallible" (Eder 1996a:186). In this "greening" of science, scientific goals and aims may become more accessible to the public but scientific methods remain unaccountable to public criticisms (Eder 1996b:212). Scientific methodological assumptions are not challenged.

Hajer's discussion of *ecological modernization* (1995; 1996) sheds some more light on how environmental discourses have become popularized and used to legitimate modern institutions but does this "against the background of a Becksian theory of reflexive modernization" (Hajer 1995:39). Like Eder, Hajer suggests that contemporary environmental politics are centered on the generation of environmental meanings and discourses rather than merely on identifying environmental problems. Environmental politics becomes "a struggle for discursive hegemony in which actors try to secure support for their definition of reality" (Hajer 1995:59). Rather than view environmental politics as a struggle between states and environmental movements, Hajer conceptualizes this form of politics as processes of creating discourse-coalitions that espouse particular "story-lines" that provide actors with a consistent way of framing a diversity of environmental problems (Hajer 1995:56). Hajer suggests that a discourse of *ecological modernization* has been successful in producing a dominant story-line that organizes how dominant institutions have taken up environmental issues.

---

symbolic packages (Eder 1996a:191).

A discourse of *ecological modernization* was developed during the 1980s in response to radical environmental critiques of modern institutions and has become dominant since the 1992 Earth Summit in Rio de Janeiro. This discourse provides the resources to address the diversity of environmental issues and the role of institutions in environmental degradation but does not question the assumptions of modernity. This ideology "recognizes the structural character of the environmental problematique but nonetheless assumes that existing political, economic, and social institutions can internalize the care for the environment" (Hajer 1995:25). Indeed, the discourse of ecological modernization turns the environmental critique of modern institutions upside-down: "what first appeared a threat to the system now becomes a vehicle for its very innovation" (Hajer 1995:32). Ecological modernization, as both a response to the environmental critique and as an attempt to contain the radical environment movement, is a reflexive response to modernity's self-produced risks (Hajer 1995:39). It acknowledges modern institutions' roles in environmental degradation and attempts to provide regulatory and anticipatory mechanisms whereby these institutions can become more responsive to environmental concerns. Ecological modernization provides more systematic anticipatory and regulatory ways of dealing with environmental crises rather than leaving them to *ad hoc* bureaucratic solutions. Through ecological modernization, institutions, such as science, become more responsive to environmental critiques and concerns and treat these responses as part of an institutional learning process.

Both Eder's idea of an ecological masterframe and Hajer's discussion of ecological modernization highlight how dominant environmental discourses have normalized concerns about environmental degradation. The popularization of a dominant environmental discourse, whether an ecological masterframe or a discourse of ecological modernization, has

meant that alternative environmental/ecological discourses must now compete with dominant environmental notions for legitimacy in public discourse. There is a myriad of ways in which EMOs engage in innovative discursive contestations in this field. Writers such as Beck (1995; 1996) and Yearly (1991; 1996) suggest that EMOs can only be successful if they can provide scientific evidence that counters dominant scientific claims. Others (Burningham and O'Brien 1994; Eden 1993; Hinchliffe 1996; Jamison 1996; Macnaghten and Urry 1998; Myers and Macnaghten 1998; Szerszynski 1996; Wynne 1996) critique this position and suggest that everyday, experiential environmental knowledges (i.e. non-expert knowledges) are also imperative not only for understanding contemporary environmental problems and providing solutions but also for critiquing overly scientistic approaches to environmental concerns.

As I discussed in Chapter One, when science confronts its self-generated risks, it must do so with normative assumptions; it must ask "how do we want to live?". This question can be answered in a variety of ways and from many perspectives. Some writers have suggested that people generally formulate their environmental concerns within the contexts of their everyday lives (Burningham and O'Brien 1994; Myers and Macnaghten 1998; Wynne 1996). The environment that people are *most* concerned about protecting is generally framed in what Burningham and O'Brien call "local contexts of action". People are certainly aware of more trans-local or global environmental issues but are more concerned with how the crises and concerns in their immediate environments impact upon their lives. Burningham and O'Brien argue that these local concerns are more action oriented than global concerns: "The difference between these 'local' and 'global' concepts is simply this: global concepts are decontextualized, abstract statements of aims, goals and values…localising concepts, on the

other hand, place specific aims and goals as central elements of action and policy..." (919). The ideas of environment that develop in these local contexts of action, then, are usually different from expert and scientific definitions. Although people will use, and even generate, scientific knowledge when addressing their parochial concerns, they will also rely upon a variety of non-expert and non-scientific resources to define and legitimate what are perceived to be local environmental risks (Burningham and O'Brien 1994:914-5). The environments produced in people's local contexts of action as well as their understandings of environmental risks tend to reflect local interests and concerns, whereas scientific and expert definitions very often abstract from local social conditions and issues.

Locally-based EMOs may also define the environment in their own local contexts of action and incorporate a mixture of scientific and non-expert knowledges in order to counter dominant environmental discourses and insert their own definitions into public discourse.[24] Eyerman and Jamison's (1991) notion of social movements as processes of "cognitive praxis" is useful here:

> we view social movements as processes in formation. We study them as forms of activity by which individuals create new kinds of social identities. All social life can be seen as a combination of action and construction, forms of practical activity that are informed by some underlying project. Most often implicitly and even unconsciously, social action is conditioned by the actors' own 'frames of reference' in constant interaction with the social environment or context. Action is neither predetermined nor completely self-willed; its meaning is derived from the context in which it is carried out and the understanding that actors bring to it and/or derive from it. By using the term cognitive praxis, we want to emphasize the creative role of consciousness and cognition in all human action, individual and collective (2-3).

[24] This is not say that these local EMOs ignore the global dimensions to their local grievances. As Magnusson and Walker (1988:61) point out, critical social movements often originate in local action but the context for this action is necessarily embedded in larger global processes. These social movements discover and articulate how global processes inform everyday life in particular places. Critical social movements develop site specific means of addressing more abstract and general processes; they instantiate the phrase "think globally, act locally".

By cognitive praxis, Eyerman and Jamison mean to capture the processes whereby social movements generate knowledge and collective identities in their local, practical contexts. Cognitive praxis involves the development of new knowledges as well as the reinterpretation of old knowledges; and these knowledges are as much expressive as they are cognitive (1991:48-9). It is these new and reinterpreted knowledges that provide the basis for a social movement's practical activities and construction and maintenance of collective identities.

For a movement to be successful, it must develop and disseminate a consistent "knowledge interest" that informs its cognitive praxis (Eyerman and Jamison 1991:66; see also Eyerman and Jamison 1989 and Jamison 1996). Generally, there are three dimensions to this: the cosmological, the technological, and the organizational. For example, Eyerman and Jamison argue that the environmental movement in general presents an ecological cosmology, or world-view, that incorporates the social into a systems ecological perspective—it acknowledges that people's social lives are a part of the world ecosystem. Technologically, the environmental movement espouses small-scale, locally-based, and environmentally friendly criteria and principles of development. Organizationally, the environmental movement provides "a more democratic mode of producing and disseminating knowledge" (Jamison 1996:239-40). When these three dimensions are consistently articulated into an unified knowledge interest, the environmental movement can indeed be seen as a social movement and resist being incorporation into conventional politics (Eyerman and Jamison 1991:67-8).

Social movements also provide spaces "in which the established routines of everyday life are broken, creating opportunities for new social identities and roles to be tried on and tested out" (Eyerman and Jamison 1991:118). In terms of the environmental movement, it is within

these spaces that environmentalist identities can be constructed in opposition to the non-controversial green identities discussed above. New knowledges, and/or reinterpreted knowledges, are used in conjunction with the practical activities of the movement organization to construct and maintain a collective movement identity.[25]

The spaces that social movements create defy conventional political analysis, for these social movements, as processes of cognitive praxis, create their own definitions of politics and legitimate political space:

> To think of social movements in terms of inclusion is to think in terms of a static world of fixed contexts, in which ready-formed agents struggle to be recognized as legitimate political actors. Our process oriented cognitive approach speaks rather of social movements in terms of opening new public spaces in which newly forming groups challenge structured definitions and institutionalized routines of political behavior. The first challenge social movements make is to the established social definitions of what politics entails. In the course of their development, they are often drawn into accepted channels and forced to redefine their conflict and their issues in conventional terms. For as we have argued, social movements are transitory, impermanent processes which serve to re-collect the political projects of the past into contemporary settings. Redefining situations, opening up new conceptual spaces, and framing new issues in political terms—this is politics in its primary form and is the core around which the cognitive praxis of social movements revolves (149-50).

This view is similar to Beck's idea of subpolitics.[26] As I discussed in the previous chapter, subpolitical actions that reinvent political venues are characteristic of the politics of the risk society. These new forms of political activity arise, in part, from increased individualization: people's self-responsible, (cognitive and aesthetic) reflexive negotiations of their life-narratives may lead some to participate in subpolitical communities as they realize and articulate grievances with a variety of social organizations and practices. These communities

---

[25] This form of identity construction and organizational structure is reminiscent of the reflexive, hermeneutic communities discussed in the previous chapter.

[26] Magnusson (1996; 1997) provides a similar view but theorizes the idea of a social movements' self-producing hyper-space.

are very often, but certainly not exclusively, (hermeneutically reflexive) social movement organizations (SMOs).

It is the maintenance of these activist spaces, and the ongoing creation and affirmation of self- and collective identity within these spaces, that ensure that a social movement is not co-opted by a dominant discourse. So, although dominant environmental discourses may make it difficult for EMOs to survive in the spaces of public discourse, the maintenance of environmental-activist spaces ensures that oppositional discourses and identities are continually being produced and maintained. As I will show in the next section, activist ecotourism produces and maintains these activist spaces.

Submerged Networks and Activist Ecotourism

Ecotourism can be seen as the instantiation in tourism of the popularization of the environment (Bandy 1996; Munt 1994a; 1994b). In this view, ecotourism is merely a cultural phenomenon that capitalizes on the success of the environmental movement. The diffusion of environmental discourses into public discourse has made it easy for "the environment" to become a tourism commodity and the availability of non-controversial green identities has made it relatively easy to become a "green" consumer or "green" tourist (Munt 1994b). Indeed, Munt argues, following Bourdieu, that the consumption of ecotourism is a means whereby the new middle class accumulates cultural capital in which they can differentiate themselves from other social classes (1994b: 108-9). Although there certainly are some ecotour practices that commodify the environment and some ecotourists who are solely interested in a prestige-based consumption of the environment, this characterization does not fit well with more activist oriented ecotours. Indeed, the de-differentiation of work,

leisure, and activism and the development of new forms of post-tourism practices open up spaces wherein ecotourism can reflect and espouse an environmental activist sensibility.

Although activist ecotours are part of the environmental movement and produce and provide activist spaces, they are not environment movement organizations. They may better be understood as part of the submerged, or latent, network of the environmental movement. Alberto Melucci argues that new social movements are best viewed as both latent, or submerged, networks of meanings that are embedded in the practices of everyday life which act as "cultural laboratories" *and* more visible organizational efforts that respond to specific issues:

> They require individual investments in experimentation and practice of new cultural models, forms of relationships and alternative perceptions and meanings of the world. The various groups comprising these networks mobilize only periodically in response to specific issues. The submerged networks function as a system of exchanges, in which individuals and information circulate. Memberships are multiple and involvement is limited and temporary; personal involvement is a condition for participation. The latent movement areas create new cultural codes and enable individuals to put them into practice. When small groups emerge in order to visibly confront the political authorities on specific issues, they indicate to the rest of society the existence of a systemic problem and the possibility of meaningful alternatives (Melucci 1989:60).

That these movements are both latent and visible reflects the mutability of their organizational forms and participation enrollments and marks the extent of the pervasion of activist cultural significations in the mesh of people's everyday lives. The recognition that social movements are submerged in networks of everyday life is an acknowledgement that activist-oriented activities are not solely practiced *within* social movement organizations. Rather, various everyday practices in the fields of work and leisure are also incorporated within these latent networks of interpersonal communication and information exchange. Melucci proposes that the reflexive organization of these movements hyperextend

conventional notions and uses of time and space; and this caters to more flexible forms of reflexive personal identity.

Because social movements are both latent and visible they allow for varying levels of intensity of involvement. That people may identify as activists in many parts of their everyday lives, rather than just in relation to their activities in SMOs, allows for more flexible notions of how people make use of their time: this type of movement organization meets "the needs of individuals who no longer distinguish between work time and leisure time" (Melucci 1994:123). Spatially, submerged networks may overlap with work and leisure spaces: people can identify as activists throughout their everyday work and leisure activities. In this way, participants in social movements are "nomads of the present" who construct their own temporary times and spaces throughout their variegated lives.

There are many EMOs on Vancouver Island that provide information and volunteer opportunities to enhance people's understanding and involvement in environmental campaigns. Perhaps the most predominant are the Victoria chapter of the Sierra Club, which has about 450 local members (the Sierra Club of British Columbia memberships totals about 1200); and the Western Canadian Wilderness Committee, which has about 25,000 members.[27] There also are many organizations that focus exclusively on specific areas of Vancouver Island, such as Friends of Clayoquot Sound, which formed in 1979 and organized the largest civil disobedience action in Canadian history between July and October of 1993. In addition to the over 800 people who were arrested, thousands of people worldwide

[27] Membership information was obtained "online" from Victoria Green Pages: www.greenpages.victoria.bc.ca.

supported the Clayoquot Sound Campaign.[28] Indeed, this campaign brought global recognition to Vancouver Island's local environmental politics.

In very different ways, each of the activities of the three ecotour operators I interviewed can be seen as embedded within the submerged network of the environmental movement on Vancouver Island. It is within this network that these ecotour operators produce and provide activist spaces. Within these activist spaces, these ecotour operators disseminate environmental/ecological discourses that compete with the more commonplace, dominant discourses. These counter-discourses circulate not only between ecotour operators/guides and ecotourists but also between EMOs and ecotour operators/guides. These discourses are often deployed in local contexts of action but these local contexts are also globally influenced. As part of a latent network, activist ecotourism is a "cultural laboratory" wherein ecotourists can attempt to learn more about environmental issues while also gaining the discursive resources needed to develop or maintain a reflexive "green" identity.

Colin Ranson, *Nature Calls Eco-Tours Ltd.*

Nature Calls was established in 1996 by Colin Ranson and his business partner.[29] They provide interpretive ecotours within a number of Vancouver Island park areas. Like most ecotour companies on the Island, Nature Calls offers single and multi-day tours (e.g., the Carmanah Valley, East Sooke Park, and the Juan de Fuca Marine Trail) as well as custom and group tours. Groups tours are kept to a maximum of about nine people in order to increase the intimacy of the tours and to limit over-burdening the trails.

---

[28] More information about Friends of Clayoquot Sound can be found at their official website: www.island.net/~focs.

[29] Because Colin Ranson's business partner did not participate in our interview, she/he will remain anonymous.

For Colin of *Nature Calls*, ecotourism is not strictly a form of environmental activism but rather a chance to provide an experience wherein tourists can make connections between their everyday lives and the environment. Ecotourism provides him with a chance to practice what he calls "eco-psychology":

> Ecotourism to us, this is...this is our definition of it...it is sort of sneaky. You practice sort of eco-psychology—which is also known as "deep ecology". Arne Naess, he, he uh...originated it—on unsuspecting people. They think they're going to get a nature tour, you know educating them about nature, but the secret to us is to form that link between the person and nature. So they respect it more and form very much a spiritual connection more than an intellectual connection, a feeling connection, a spiritual connection. An inter-connectedness between nature and themselves, their own lives. So, we have this policy that we don't use Latin names...we try to make everything very personal to them. So, on the way to the hike we interview the person. We ask them what they do. You know, not a formal interview but sort of informal. Just ask them questions about their beliefs...You know, what they do in life, where they come from...that type of thing...their family life. Everything else. You just talk and they talk. They just volunteer it; they don't know that they're volunteering it. And then we adjust the hike and our talk to the people. This is why we keep our groups very small. We don't like...well, six is the maximum that you can actually have to do an ecotour. If you get more than six then you can not make it as personal as we'd like. So, we have a maximum of about ten clients per guide—that's our absolute maximum—we prefer less than six.

Through ecotourism, Colin hopes to generate both an aesthetic and a cognitive reflexivity in ecotourists. He provides, and to some extent orchestrates, an *experience* that he hopes will allow people to re-assess their place in "the environment". This endeavor is less about initiating people into the environmental movement through the development of a collective identity (hermeneutic reflexivity) than about changing peoples' personal concepts of their being- and becoming-in-the-world. Rather than convincing people of the need for environmental protection and conservation through argumentation and evidence, he prefers to show people how they are intricately connected to "the environment". From this, Colin hopes that people will make the necessary connections between their everyday lives and the

ecosystem. Following deep ecology, Colin hopes to instill the *feeling* that environmental degradation *is* human degradation.

Colin attempts to encourage ecotourists' reflexivity by demonstrating through storytelling and education how people are part of nature. Once he has discovered his ecotourists' interests and biographies, he tailors the tour to meet their interests. From here he attempts to make connections between the ecotourists and the location of the tour. For example, when he conducted an ecotour for a group of dentists he showed them a banana slug and discussed how its mucus is used to make banana cream, an anesthetic dentists often use. From there, he explained how the Nuu-chah-nulth of the area use the banana slugs not only for its anesthetic properties but also in some of their cultural practices. Colin hopes that by making these connections people will not only better understand their interconnections with the environment but will also change how they interact within it. In this case the banana slug becomes symbolic of these interconnections; and Colin's stories "build the spiritual and the emotional connection with the banana slug". The banana slug represents the connection between the dentists' everyday lives and the environment.

As efforts to help ecotourists realize their interconnections within the environment, Colin's stories are allegorical—the real meaning is beyond the literal meaning. Colin is not providing a nature tour in which one is simply educated about *things* in nature. Rather, the information he provides is a means for aiding people in making spiritual interconnections:

> Ecotourism…can be practiced almost anywhere. It can be practiced with adventure tourism, it can be practiced with ethno-tourism. Then there is nature tourism and nature tourism is when you go to be educated about nature. Well, we are sort of nature tourism with the ecotourism slant, where you practice eco-psychology and make that spiritual connection.

Colin's practice of eco-psychology also involves a disruption of people's everyday lives:

> It doesn't matter who you are talking to; you can always build that spiritual connection somehow. You tell them the medical connection and if that doesn't work you tell them a romantic connection and if that doesn't work you try something else. By the time you've spent five hours with these people, out in the wilderness, you know, they're out of their comfort zone. A lot of these people are city people or people from, mostly foreigners we have, and this is not their comfort zone. Especially up on the Juan de Fuca Trail. If you run into a bear or see bear scat, or yesterday on the east Sooke we found a part of a deer, the hind leg of a deer and part of its spine. It was obviously caught by a cougar. You know, that brings it home. There's that element of danger now. That puts them even more out of their comfort zone and they then listen even closer on what you have to say, you know. So, we don't go out and try to make converts or anything. We give them information, and we give them information in a way that they make their own connection. So, you know, it's fun and you can see it, you can see it happening through the tour. It's really, really great you know.

Colin believes that a spiritual connection with the environment can be made by taking people from the security of their everyday lives and placing them in an uncertain situation. The contingency of this experience helps ecotourists reassess their lives and self-identities. The predictability and comfort of their everyday lives become contrasted with their experiences on the ecotour. Colin's role is to provide a new sense of security through his allegorical stories. By stripping away this unreflexive sense of security, Colin is better able to allow ecotourists to develop a more intuitive relationship with their surroundings. This intuitive understanding is at the core of deep ecological thought; it is a self-realization of ecological inter-connectedness through a process of identifying the environment within one's self (Naess 1989; Fox 1995). When one has self-identified as part of the environment fear and insecurity disappear; nature becomes part of everyday life. For deep ecologists, this signals a realization of the Eco-Self.

This identification and realization of the Eco-Self incorporates the personal, the ontological, and the cosmological (Fox 1995:249-268). Personal identification is a process of realization of commonality with other entities through direct involvement and experience.

Ontological identification "refers to experiences of commonality with all that is that are brought about through deep-seated realization of the fact *that* things are" (Fox 1995:250). Ontological identification refers to feelings that things exist in the world—things are not merely appearances—and that one's body and self are part of that world. Cosmological identification refers to a realization that all entities belong to the same unfolding reality; it involves the realization that things are inter-dependent. By practicing eco-psychology in his ecotours, Colin hopes to provide ecotourists with the discursive and experiential resource to realize a sense of Eco-Self.

Colin's ecotours provide people with the chance to realize and experience spiritual interconnections and develop a sense of personal reflexivity, namely the development of an Eco-Self. Cognitively, this reflexivity informs people of how they are situated within an inter-connected world (being-in-the-world). Aesthetically, this reflexivity allows people to change how they interpret themselves through their interactions within the ecosystem. Ideally, newly developed spiritual connections give ecotourists a chance to reassess their self-concepts with a "deeper" sense of environmental awareness (becoming-in-the-world) than that of more commonplace and non-controversial "green" identities.

Although the idea of the Eco-Self is rooted in deep ecology, it is not necessarily hermeneutically reflexive in Colin's case. Although there is a deep ecology community that provides the opportunity for hermeneutic reflexivity, Colin does not appear concerned about indoctrinating ecotourists into it. Colin's idea of eco-psychology is informed by deep ecology but he is not trying to promote deep ecology during his ecotours. Rather, he is more concerned with helping people make connections between the environment and themselves.

Rather than rely on the shared understandings of deep ecology, Colin fosters more personal and esoteric understandings.

Colin is part of an informal network that exchanges environmental information. More specifically, they exchange information concerning Vancouver Island:

> me and my partner, my business partner and I, we volunteer at CRD Parks, we're members of interpretation Canada, we volunteer at B.C. Parks and each time we volunteer somewhere they give you a little training session. So, there's also all the local naturalists, it's a, it's a big community. And we share knowledge every time we find something. For instance, I did a walk for CRD Parks on May first and on the computer right here I'm sending off all the research I found...And now I share this knowledge with the interpreters at CRD Parks and it will get around...It's a big community... I belong to the Paleontology Society...Victoria Natural History Society and they have all these talks and everything. It just blossoms. I've taken some extension courses from Uvic, ethnobotony and geology...that type of thing.

Much of the information Colin collects is used during his tours to construct a deep ecological discourse; and, ideally, this provides ecotourists with the discursive and experiential resources to reassess their identities. In this way, Colin's ecotours provide an alternative to the dominant environmental/ecological discourses. He also provides a space wherein ecotourists can reassess their identities apart form their everyday experiences. Colin takes ecotourists out of dominant environmental spaces of everyday life—where activities like recycling are safe forms of environmental awareness and instill non-controversial "green" identities—into places where a "deeper" environmental awareness and self-identification can develop.

Bill Kosloski, *GoGreen Eco-Adventures*

GoGreen Eco-Adventures was established in 1996 by Bill Kosloski and a business partner. They offer a variety of guided ecotours which also include multi-sport activities (e.g. kayaking and cycling tours). Currently, they provide eight multi-day tour packages that

range from hiking tours of Clayoquot Sound to Kayak tours of Denman Island and Hornby Island. Custom tours also are available. GoGreen is based in the town of Cumberland, but the tours extend to almost all parts of Vancouver Island. Bill also is a charter member of the Vancouver Island Outdoor Adventure Network and is currently organizing a co-operative organization among Vancouver Island ecotour operators. Ideally, this organization will give these operators a unified voice for lobbying the provincial government and approaching the forestry industry with their concerns. Through this organization, Bill also wishes to actively participate in the creation of ecotour standards; he feels that the provincial government will soon be attempting to regulate the ecotour industry, and he feels that it is important for ecotour operators to be prepared for, and actively involved in, this process.

Bill's ecotours, *GoGreen Eco-Adventures,* are somewhat different from Colin's. Rather than trying to help people make a spiritual connection with "the environment", Bill tries to inform ecotourists of some of the environmental issues on Vancouver Island while also teaching them low-impact camping and providing outdoor experiences. This involves taking a holistic approach to environmental education:

> I try to look at it as a more holistic approach. Just looking at the entire ecosystem and...trying to see how it kinda fits into everything else. I mean of course there's the basic plants and trees and things that people want to know, just the basic names, but at the same time I try not to overload people. Like the one Clayoquot hike that we do is a great eye opening tour because when you start the tour, you start it in a clear cut and a lot of the streams have just been destroyed there. So, its real easy to see the apparent damage of logging. And when you hike onto the trail you actually hike into a watershed that hasn't been logged and...it really doesn't take much explaining to really show what's going on...And just talking about the different economies and alternatives it's dependent on the group too, it varies...But then with our marine tours, I'll do a whole inter-tidal thing and go through all the different creatures there and just showing the great diversity, especially out in Tofino when you walk into those inter-tidal areas there's such a wide range of diversity, animals and things, there's a ...it's quite a visual thing again...And we're trying to create our company and provide people with news letters and

> updates on events and...environmental issues on Vancouver Island and things like that.

Bill's ecotours provide a space for people to experience and think about nature while also giving them a chance to witness first hand some areas that have been negatively impacted by logging. Although Bill does talk about various environmental issues on Vancouver Island, his ecotours are not necessarily environmental "lectures". Rather, like Colin, Bill believes that people will appreciate nature and the environment more once they have an extended outdoor experience:

> the programs aren't just about environmentalism or that, it's also about experiencing the outdoors. And so, it's just a rounded experience that we're trying to provide and...we hope that with the education that we're providing for people that people will start thinking about issues. Anybody who's spent any time, I believe, in the forest or the outdoors really starts to have an appreciation for it and you can just, if you're not even talking about it, people are just walking through old growth trees and stuff, they can really start to have an appreciation for what's around them. And they start thinking about the issues more and opening up their eyes more, more than anything. And...we don't really provide a lecture while we're out there. It's more about highlighting some important things.

The environmental topics and issues brought up during the tours are often initiated by the ecotourists themselves after they have witnessed a logged area:

> there's always the issue of logging and why it's going on. Just the different view points behind that.... it's because they [the ecotourists] get quite emotional about it when they see it, especially when we're driving. When you do the tour of Tofino and you're driving by Kennedy Lake and stuff, I mean, it's quite visible...We had a German group last year and they were quite upset when we went through there and they say that...We almost had to go on the other side and say "well, things are changing with the forest practices code and the different logging techniques"...and things like that because people can get quite upset when they see things like that...But we do talk a lot about the different politics and things like that. Concerning the different issues, especially at night even when we're sitting around the campfire. That'll be a lot of what we talk about.

Bill believes that it is through direct experience that ecotourists come to reflect upon and better understand endangered areas on Vancouver Island. The format of his ecotours provide ecotourists with the opportunity to compare different areas and discuss their ideas and observations. Bill also plans to continue informing his clients of the environmental issues on Vancouver Island by sending out a newsletter and emails, and by continually updating his web-site. In this way, he not only maintains contact with his clients, and produces repeat customers, but he also creates an information network around a common environmental discourse that his clients can utilize in opposition to dominant and commonplace environmental discourses.

Although Bill notes that most of his clients come to his tours with an interest in the environment, this interest does not necessarily reflect local issues. Rather, their concept of the environment may be abstract and unspecific or more accurately reflect the environmental issues of either their places of origin or the issues of other places where they have had an ecotour. As Burningham and O'Brien (1994) argue, people tend to be more action oriented when their concepts of an environment are informed through direct experiences. Through ecotourism, Bill provides ecotourists with the opportunity to explore some of the specific environmental issues on Vancouver Island. He provides a space and the discursive resources whereby these tourists can develop a better appreciation for the local, Vancouver Island environment and become informed of the local environmental issues and politics. By sending out newsletters and emails and by updating his web-site, Bill makes it possible for his clients to understand local Vancouver Island issues at a distance.

Beyond his own clientele, Bill's educative program connects with EMOs and informs environmental activists from elsewhere of the environmental politics on Vancouver Island:

> We have been working with...we're trying to develop a relationship with...it's an organization based in Alberta called the Land Stewardship Society of Canada and what they try to promote is a sustainable use of land and resources and with us, they've approached us, and they want to develop retreats for different kinds of organizations, non-governmental organizations, in which they can come on our tours maybe while they're doing a meeting or something like that...and we'd highlight different areas of Vancouver Island and things like that. They're also talking about filling up our tours with people who are working at places like Greenpeace or the Sierra Club and offering them a discounted rate just to fit into tours that are already going out.

According to this plan, Bill's ecotours will enable environmental activists from afar to witness Vancouver Island environments and to learn more about local issues, and in the process will extend Bill's ecotours into a larger environmental network.

Bill's approach to environmental education stems from his experiences in the environmental movement and his conservation/preservation activities. He saw ecotourism as a way to continue exploring and teaching environmental issues while also making an environmentally sensitive living:

> I guess it started with my background in environmental work. That's how I became tuned onto various issues, especially on Vancouver Island...plus trying to create a business for myself as well in that field. Essentially with that background...I was looking at becoming a biologist and how I could contribute to the environment and I had an opportunity when I started thinking about ecotourism I thought more along the lines of education. I thought how that would really maybe promote my ideas better plus create a job for myself too. And that's essentially how I got started. My background is...I did some work in the valley here in around environmental issues and water quality issues. I also have a background in fisheries. I've worked on the west coast with Clayoquot Biosphere Project. So, that kinda initiated it for me. Actually, when I was working with the Clayoquot Biosphere Project I was working on the Clayoquot river main-stem, mapping out that river and doing an inventory of all the fish species so that if they did go there and log it we'd know what was there previous to logging. The Western Wilderness Committee actually cut a trail in there. It's called the Clayoquot Witness Trail and it follows the main-stem of this river and I guess that's initially where I got the idea from because I thought, you know, this is such a great, great place to bring people and I guess that kinda sparked it for me. I thought, "If I could get people to pay money to see this..." and then there's also a research station there as well and, you know, my idea was eventually to try to link-up with this research

> station to...increase awareness and things like that. It just kinda spread out from there.

In the future, Bill plans to integrate his interest in biology with ecotourism and provide ecotourists with an opportunity to participate in generating scientific environmental knowledge:

> My vision is to obtain my degree in marine biology...but what I'd like to do is something that Earth Watch does. They fund their research by having people pay to be on a tour but while they're on a tour they actually participate in research. It kinda gets back to the idea I was talking about earlier with the Clayoquot Biosphere Project. They have a research station...Maybe I can fund my own research by having people come on tours; they pay, they also help, but the proceeds also help to fund the research as well. I've sorta started doing it right now. I'm linked up with a whale watching tour...it's actually a whale research tour...The next step beyond is that you have to involve people in research to really understand. I think within the scientific community right now a lot of research being funded is purely for economic needs not for...ecological needs. There's kinda a shift that I've noticed within the scientific community...With all these huge multi-national corporations, they want to...they're investing in research but only for profit...especially the biotechnology industry right now. It's totally insane.

Bill's plans to incorporate environmental research with his ecotours obviously reflects the intellectualization of tourism (see Chapter One). His idea of science, however, is indicative of a more reflexive scientific endeavor. Bill wants to be able to provide a scientifically based environmental discourse that competes with dominant scientific discourses which are, in part, generated by multi-national corporations. In the context of the risk society, Bill hopes to produce scientifically based risk-definitions.

These definitions would be produced in Bill's "local context of action" and would also incorporate non-scientific claims. For Bill, the normative aspects of defining risks (see Chapter One) are derived from his localized sense of the environment:

> I like to look at things from a community and an individual perspective as opposed to a global one. I mean when you try to wrap your mind around a global concept or an issue it becomes too large and you just, instead of

> trying to understand it you just block it out. I mean then you start thinking of what's happening in Third World Countries in terms of the environment and things like that and it's just a really hard concept to grasp. For me it is and I think for most people it is but if you just think of what you do on a day-to-day basis, I mean if you drive your car, do you catch a bus, do you ride your bike, do you know what I mean? When you start making those changes, in how you live day-to-day and changing your values and trying to change what your culture dictates to you then it'll go a long way in how you relate to your community and so on. Just working up from the local to the global level. Essentially, you know, think globally but act locally.

Rather than define abstract global risks, Bill is concerned with how his local community is impacted. This is not to say that Bill disregards global environmental issues; he recognizes that global processes are apparent in these local contexts. However, Bill's sense of environmental agency arises from, and revolves around, his experiences within his community: "Take a small town like Cumberland, you have to think about how we're going to develop the forests around here and put in sub-developments or is the population going to grow or...and it's just a small little place of three thousand people but there's all those issues to deal with". As an activism rooted in his community and acting within a self-defined "local context of action", Bill's environmentalism entails a hermeneutic reflexivity. As discussed in the previous chapter, hermeneutic reflexivity is an understanding of the self as embedded in a community of shared understandings. Bill's community of shared understandings is Vancouver Island's environmental movement rather than strictly the town of Cumberland. Although Bill's contexts of action are often *located* within Cumberland, and the surrounding areas, it is his understanding of environmental issues that *inform* his actions. Through ecotourism, Bill is attempting to promote these shared environmental understandings. Further, through the inclusion of research into his tours, Bill is hoping to include ecotourists in the production of these shared understandings.

In summary, as part of the latent network of Vancouver Island's environmental movement, Bill helps to maintain an alternative environmental discourse and provides people with the opportunity to experience the Vancouver Island environment. Unlike Colin's ecotours, Bill provides ecotourists with the opportunity to learn about the specific environmental issues on Vancouver Island. He provides both discursive resources and outdoor experiences that, he hopes, will spark an interest in Vancouver Island's environmental movement. Further, he hopes to be able to generate scientific environmental knowledges in order to provide alternative discourses to dominant environmental notions.

Selena Blais, *Canadian Wilderness Ecotours*

Canadian Wilderness Ecotours was established by Selena Blais and two business partners in 1999. Her partners conduct ecotours on the Sunshine Coast, while Selena is in charge of organizing the Vancouver Island tours. Currently, she offers four tours: two to threatened wilderness areas and two to newly protected areas. Like Colin's and Bill's tours, Selena also provides custom and group tours.

Selena's ecotours, *Canadian Wilderness Ecotours*, are ostensibly the most environmentally activist of the three. She works full time at the Western Canadian Wilderness Committee (WC^2) and her ecotours are a related side project. Her involvement with ecotourism stems directly from her work as an environmental activist:

> it started out when I worked at the Vancouver office. I was managing our retail store there in Gastown, a huge tourism destination, and, ya, people were seeing our posters and our newspapers and wanted to get out to these places. I would have loved to drop everything and take them then and there but I was stuck in a city, stuck in a store, and just getting myself out there became a priority…mostly to the threatened areas that the Wilderness Committee was working on. I would focus on getting to those places almost every weekend. So, ya, just the demand from tourists, from Gastown first of all, and then from our members wondering what we were doing to get people

> out to see these areas before they were gone. I found that once we did take people in trail building or just hiking, they became really passionate about that wilderness area and got really active in the campaign to protect it. So, I found that that was a major factor both for myself, having that feeling of coming back into the city and being able to focus my energies on that specific area that I just spent the week-end in because it really brings it home when you see the logging trucks coming out with the trees and see them punching roads into pristine wilderness areas and so, both my passion and the demand from tourists and our members of the WC.

For Selena, ecotourism presents an opportunity for her to generate and mobilize people's interests in environmental conservation and preservation. Like Colin and Bill, she believes that people will appreciate the environment and nature when they have had a meaningful outdoor experience. Unlike Colin's and Bill's, Selena's ecotours cater to Vancouver Island residents. Her main focus is educating local people about local environmental issues by giving them a chance to experience these areas first hand. Rather than take people to provincial and national parks, which is mainly where Colin and Bill conduct their tours, Selena takes people to newly preserved areas and endangered areas where the WC[2] is active:

> my focus with this company, Canadian Wilderness Ecotours, isn't really to cater to tourists, sure if they want to come along I will take them, definitely. But I really want to focus…my whole marketing way is going towards the locals in Victoria and Vancouver Island, and my partners as well, we want people to get out and see their own backyards and write letters to their local politicians and get active because a lot of people haven't been to their own backyard and they don't realize the things that are happing because you don't see things from the highway, most likely. And a lot of people are aware but that doesn't mean that they've been out to see those places for a variety of reasons…I definitely consider myself an activist and conservationist…My trips, I have four trips, and two of them are to threatened wilderness areas and two of them are to recently protected areas. So, I want people to see the threatened areas and I also want them to be thankful for what we've, conservation groups, not only the WC but lots of conservation groups have been working so hard for in the past. But, ya, that's my main thing is to get people active in a campaign. Even if I take them to a recently protected area, there are still issues in those areas that need to be dealt with as well…So talking to the locals, tourists are good to, they can go back to their country and spread the word, but I would really, really like to focus on people on Vancouver Island for my tours…Even if it's that they only do one thing, one

> letter, that's something and it all helps. I know that there's going to be people who don't do anything and people who do one thing and there's going to be people that do as much as a they possibly can after they've been to this place…
>
> I want Mom and Dad to bring their kids…If they want to bring their two year old and not have it cost them a lot of money. I think that's what's holding back a lot of locals. Ya sure they'd like to go out on an ecotour and learn something about the Carmanah or learn something about the Juan de Fuca marine trail but two hundred bucks per day per person, that's eight hundred dollars for my family to go to the West Coast of Vancouver Island, forget it. Locals wouldn't even think about picking up those brochures because they know they cost too much. So, that's another thing with my trips: they're dirt cheap.

Ideally, the environmental appreciation that Selena hopes to instill in local residents will help encourage them to be more aware of the environmental issues on Vancouver Island and mobilize them to join environmental campaigns:

> I think a good ecotourist would be someone who learns something about the natural history of the area, learns something about low-impact camping, learns something about the campaigns, the issues that are relative to the areas, of a variety of things. And, like I said, I won't necessarily be catering to tourists but the locals. They…the biggest thing that I hope will come of this is their taking action and learning about all these things, a combination of things…but I just think that a good ecotourist is someone who comes out of an area with a positive or negative feeling, depending on the way it impacts them. Positive in so far as this area is protected, thank god that this area is here forever, or a positive feeling knowing that this area is completely threatened and I'm going to go back to the city and do something or I'm going to tell a friend and they are going to come with me next time and I'm going to network among my friends and family to write letters or come out and see the place. There's so many things, there's probably fifty things that make a good ecotourist and I guess that's just… Basically, what I want people to feel the most is empowerment. That they can actually do something. A lot of people feel that they can't do anything about saving a huge wilderness area but really they can. So, we really want to set that empowerment into them. To show them that there are other people out there feeling this way and this is what they're doing and this is what you can do to help as well…I think that's the best thing that could come from an ecotourist is the action that follows.

Selena is attempting to re-define people's sense of the environment through ecotourism. Rather than merely appreciate an outdoor experience, she hopes that local ecotourists will

learn to consider newly preserved areas and threatened areas as part of their own "backyards". By doing this, the environment becomes contextualized locally. The spaces for environmental action become localized and personalized rather than being merely popularized and abstract areas. By providing locals with the opportunity to witness the contentious sites in environmental politics, Selena hopes to bring these areas into people's contexts of action; she hopes that once local ecotourists have witnessed endangered or newly preserved areas they will feel connected to those areas and realize that their own actions can indeed contribute to Vancouver Island's environmental movement. In short, Selena's ecotours are meant to expand local residents' "contexts of action" by re-defining their sense of the environment to include Vancouver Island's wilderness areas.[30]

Selena's ecotours also help to incorporate Vancouver Island residents into the information and communication networks of the Vancouver Island environmental movement:

> a lot of people aren't doing anything about it [environmental degradation of Vancouver Island] because they feel helpless or they don't feel like they can do anything...They might have been activists five years ago when Clayoquot Sound was heavy-duty because everyone else was doing it. Or because they knew about the issues then and now Clayoquot Sound is relatively quiet. Everyone thinks that Clayoquot sound is resolved, that there's no problems in Clayoquot. Not true. They just haven't read the WC publications lately on the way Clayoquot Sound is going. I just think there are a lot of people really wanting to just do something. I have a list of hundred fifty volunteers that I don't even have time to call and they don't call me and say "What can I do for you this week". For the most part, people are sitting around and waiting for something to come to them...So, this is just my way. I realize that I'm just one person and that I can only do so much. And this is my effort by totally engulfing myself and educating myself and getting them out to these places. Because for me it just helps so much. It makes me come back to the city and work harder.

Through her experiences of working for WC^2, Selena has realized that local residents do not have an information and communication infrastructure that can continually inform and

[30] I will be discussing this type of "production" of the environment further in the next chapter.

mobilize them; and without this structure local residents appear to have become somewhat passive in their environmental concerns. For her, ecotourism provides a means whereby local residents can learn about environmental issues on Vancouver Island and learn how to become more environmentally active. It is her hope that after taking one, or more, of her ecotours, people will gain skills that will enable them to take their friends into the wilderness, pass-on information, and encourage others to become more environmentally active on Vancouver Island.

With her focus on local residents, Selena's ecotours can be understood as a hermeneutically reflexive endeavor. Selena provides the discursive resources and communication infrastructure necessary to include local residents in Vancouver Island's environmental movement. Through her ecotours, she is seeking to expand local residents' contexts of action to include both endangered and newly preserved wilderness areas. Local residents' understandings of their local environments, then, become part of the shared understandings of the local environmental movement. Through economical and local ecotourism, local residents are given a chance to experience sites of environmental contestation and are given discursive resources from which they can draw to develop more active "green" identities.

Conclusion

In this chapter, I have argued that as part of the latent network of Vancouver Island's environmental movement, ecotour operators use ecotourism as a mean to counter dominant and popularized environmental discourses. These dominant discourses have normalized a "green" identity and have made it desirable to be a "green" consumer. Further, these popularized environmental discourses often excuse many institutional practices that cause

environmental degradation. Indeed, these discourses promote institutionally based environmental solutions and serve to close off more radical environmental movement organizations' solutions.

The ecotour operators in this research all attempt to produce self-reflexivity in their clients by instilling a sense of environmental appreciation that is not grounded in dominant environment thought and practices. For Colin, this appreciation would involve a change in self-identity through identification with the environment and the development of an Eco-Self. This sense of self is more personal than collective. For Bill and Selena, environmental appreciation would lead to more active participation in Vancouver Island's environmental movement and the development of a more hermeneutic reflexivity which would nurture a more *collective* "green" identity. All three believe that through direct experiences in nature people will become more appreciative of the environment. They believe that environmental appreciation develops not only through cognitive and rational persuasion but also through direct experience and aesthetic judgement.

Chapter Three

Introduction

In the previous chapter, I discussed the possibility that popularized, and relatively non-controversial, environmental/ecological discourses may restrict the scope of people's environmental/ecological actions and excuse many institutional causes of environmental degradation. I also argued that as part of the latent network of the environmental movement, activist-oriented ecotour operators attempt to disseminate alternative environmental/ecological discourses in order to help construct more action-oriented environmental/ecological identities in ecotourists. I suggested that these alternative discourses originate in each ecotour operator's "local context of action". In the present chapter I will expand upon and substantiate this claim.

However, operating in a "local context of action" alone is not sufficient for the construction and dissemination of alternative environmental/ecological discourses nor for the practice of activist ecotourism. Particular productions and conceptions of space, nature, and the environment both form and are informed by alternative environmental/ecological discourses. Each ecotour operator has particular conceptions of nature and the environment which influence their practices within their "local contexts of action".

In Chapter One, I argued that Munt's (1994a) claim that ecotourism necessarily fetishizes tourism destinations may not adequately capture the processes of an activist ecotourism. Recall that Munt argues that ecotour operators must commodify and sell a particular conception of place in order to attract ecotourists. He claims that this commodification necessarily obfuscates the social and labour processes that create ecotour sites. With activist-oriented ecotourism there may not be a fetishization of place; rather, this form of ecotourism

may call attention to dominant productions and conceptions of places, natures and environments, while simultaneously constructing alternative, action-based productions and concepts. This would be more in line with the semiotics of post-tourism practices which either problematize reality and the construction of tourism sites or take the problematization of reality as a starting point for a hyper-vigilant, but reflexive, search for an "authentic" reality. Where the "authenticity" of a tourism site may be assumed in modern, mass tourism practices, post-tourism practices may not take this reality for granted but rather continually reflect upon the construction of reality. Indeed, as I will argue below, activist ecotourism takes the search for the various constructions of nature and the environment as a starting point for the development of an environmental sensitivity in ecotourists.

It is through the organization of "tourist gazes" that activist ecotour operators avoid the fetishization of tourist sites. Within the postmodern cultural paradigm, these gazes are reflexive; they call attention to the social organization of the site as well as invite the ecotourist to reflect upon her/his own assumptions about nature and the environment. The promotion of this reflexivity creates the opportunity for ecotour operators to attempt to instill an activist sensibility in their clients. In part, this is achieved through highlighting the material results of different valuations of nature and the environment and by attempting to promote and encourage less environmentally damaging ideas.

In this chapter, I follow Lefebvre's theory of the production of space, which highlights the dialectical relationships between people's spatial practices, representations of space, and spaces of representation. I discuss how each ecotour operator in this research defines "local contexts of action" in which their spatial practices are embedded. These spatial practices (the ecotours) are informed by particular spaces of representation (their ideas of nature) which

oppose dominant representations of space (predominant ideas of nature as a resource). I argue that activist ecotour operators localize their ideas of nature and the environment in order to promote actionable environmental sensibilities. I then discuss each operator's constructions of nature and show how these constructions influence their organization of tourist gazes. It is through the organization of these gazes that ecotour operators call attention to how different ideas and valuations of nature affect the natural landscape.

The Production of Space and "Local Contexts of Action"

Activist ecotour operators' identification of "local contexts of action" involves the determination of the processes whereby specific places are simultaneously produced by, and embedded in, local and extra-local relations. From this identification, these ecotour operators create their ecotour sites; and through their ecotours, these sites become areas of contestation. The actual orderings and understandings of space, nature, and the environment become the main focus of these contested sites, and through ecotourism, activist operators produce alternative spaces, natures, and environments.

As a conceptual tool, Lefebvre proposes a triadic framework for understanding the production of space which involves three dialectical moments (Lefebvre 1991b:38-9). The first moment is *spatial practices*. These are people's actual movements, interactions, and experiences within physical space. The second moment is *representations of space*. This involves how space is conceptualized *and* planned in practice. Representations of space are the spaces of scientists, social engineers, and urban planners etc. This is the dominant space of capitalism and is characterized by technocratic/instrumental rationality. Where representations of space become hegemonic and incorporated into the mundane they can dominate people's spatial practices. The third moment is *spaces of representation* (or

representational spaces). These are spaces invested with symbolic meanings in everyday life. These spaces include such notions as utopias, romantic and imaginary landscapes, emotive memories of places and so on. Spaces of representation reflect people's everyday, creative interplay with their immediate, physical surroundings. For Lefebvre, this is *always* the site of resistance to the dominant representations of space which are meant to incorporate and control the use of space. People's spatial practices, then, are characterized by the tension between the dominant representations of space and people's particular spaces of representation. Spatial practices are a result of the variety of ways that spaces are presented to, and constructed around, people and how these people actually perceive, conceive, and live within these spaces.

With the historical development and domination of the capitalist mode of production, Lefebvre posits a movement from *absolute* to *abstract space* (Lefebvre 1991b). Generally, absolute space is space that is directly lived and is not addressed in the intellect but in the body (Lefebvre 1991b:235). By this Lefebvre means that space and subsistence are materially tied; it is through the direct appropriation of nature (e.g. producing food and shelter) that subsistence can be met. Absolute space is based on agro-pastoral, nomadic and semi-nomad relations to nature and is located nowhere (234): "it has no place because it embodies *all* places, and has a strictly symbolic existence" (236). Within Lefebvre's general, triadic framework there is, more or less, a direct correspondence between people's spatial practices and their spaces of representation when absolute space is the dominant conception and experience. Absolute space is conceived as a matter of fact, and is not problematized, instrumentalized, commodified nor planned.

Capitalism brings with it the development the abstraction of space. This involves a contradictory double movement of homogenization and fragmentation both of which are the result of the *commodification* of space. The processes involved in the production of abstract space are similar to the processes that Marx elucidated in the abstraction of labour (Lefebvre 1991b:307). I think, it is useful to discuss the general processes involved in the abstraction of labour, which is a lived abstraction, because these processes also operate to make the spaces of the capitalist mode of production a lived abstraction.

As abstract labour, labour-power can be bought and sold on the "free" market (Marx 1976:271). Labour-power is qualitatively de-differentiated and, thus, exchangeable. Marx writes: "What is the precondition of a merely quantitative difference between things? The fact that their quality is the same" (Marx 1977:362). So, within the capitalist mode of production, the particular qualities of a labour form—qualities that cannot be quantified or numerically compared to other labour forms—are abstracted. Labour-power is *made* quantifiable through this abstraction. As labour-power becomes socially imbued with exchange-value, it becomes abstract and quantifiable. From the worker's position in the capitalist class society, labour-power appears to have exchange-value; from the capitalist's position this labour-power has use-value. It is this exchange-value of abstract labour that is a necessary condition for capitalism.

Concrete labour, on the other hand, is the specific work done by laborers to create a particular commodity with use-value. Use-value is transferred to the commodity through concrete labour (Marx 1976:137). As opposed to abstract labour, concrete labour consists of qualitatively different activities. So, it cannot be quantified and exchanged. The particular

quality of concrete labour is not as important from the capitalist's point-of-view because value is derived from abstract labour.

The quantitative obfuscation of qualitative properties through abstraction holds for all commodities, not just the peculiar commodity "labour-power". So, in order for commodities to be exchanged and have value, they must be quantifiable; their qualitative differences must be abstracted. Without this abstraction, commodities remain solely use-values that cannot be quantitatively compared. According to Lefebvre, the homogenization of space follows from this process of quantification. However, various people continually oppose this spatial logic in their everyday spatial practices; homogenization is the *goal* of the production of abstract space *not necessarily* the result (1991b:287-8). Homogenous space is an appearance that hides multiform spaces; and it is this appearance that can make space a lived abstraction.[31]

The second, contradictory movement in the production of abstract space is fragmentation. In the process of making it exchangeable, and thus producing the appearance of homogeneity, space becomes fragmented. Not only does space get parceled out as units for exchange, but it also becomes differentiated as each parcel of space has different exchange-values based upon varying social-spatial significances (Lefebvre 1979:289-90). These differences become hierarchically arranged according to their exchange-values. As opposed to the lived abstraction of homogenous space, fragmented space is localized and concrete (Lefebvre 1991b:341-2); It is within each zone, or fragment, of space that people actualize, or live, their spatial practices. Of course, the exchange-value of each zone has an impact upon how people's spatial practices are organized and conducted.

---

[31] These same processes are also alienating (Lefebvre 1991a:52-83). This alienation reflects a modern, decorporealization of space: the movement from "the space of the body" to the "body-in-space" (Gregory 1994:382-3).

For Lefebvre, this double movement of homogeneity and fragmentation ultimately results in an *explosion* of spaces (Lefebvre 1979:290-1). Space is represented through a capitalist apparatus of power that attempts to plan spatial practices by planning the organization and representation of space. The ideal of urban planning—the concrete mechanism through which abstract space is enforced (1976:15)—is the planning of people's quotidian spatial practices. The ideal of controlling spatial practices, however, is perpetually stymied, especially in the city, as people always make creative uses of space in the course of their everyday lives. These spaces are imbued with shared, creative meanings and shared, emotive experiences. In each zone, or fragment, of space people inevitably develop particular, or local, spaces of representation that resist the dominant representations of space. Indeed, in some instances, the dominant representations of space can be appropriated to the needs of the community.[32]

For Lefebvre, one goal of theory is to define people's rights "by determining the conditions of their entry into practice" (1976:35). He discusses two inter-related rights: the "right to the city"—which is "the right not to be thrown out of society and civilization into some space which has been produced solely for the purpose of discrimination" (35) and the "right to be different"—which is "the right not to be classified forcibly into categories which have been determined by the necessarily homogenizing powers" (35). For Lefebvre, the entry of these rights into practice is inherently spatial. That people often make creative use of dominant spaces in their everyday spatial practices, that people develop spaces of representation in opposition to dominant representations of space, is indicative of their right to the city. People's actual uses of space, their appropriations of space, reflect their right to

[32] This is not to discount the harsh reality of domination; both domination and resistance are interactive and simultaneous. For example, people's in segregated space may appropriate some aspects of the dominant space,

dwell in accordance to their needs (i.e. according the particular use-value of space). As these needs vary between people's spaces the right to the city includes the right to be different.

So, for Lefebvre, the city is necessarily a site of struggle. City planners rationally organize city spaces according to their exchange-values whereas city dwellers often utilize space according to their use-values. Consequently, the city can be either a *product*, by which Lefebvre means planned, rationalized, and exchangeable spaces, or the city can be an *oeuvre*, by which he means a collected work (of art) established over time through people's everyday spatial practices and appropriations (Lefebvre 1991b; 1996). The city as *oeuvre* reflects both the right to the city and the right to be different; the *oeuvre* is an ensemble of rights and differences (Kofman and Lebas 1996:20). So, an important point of conflict within city spaces is between the city as product (exchange-value) and the city as oeuvre (use-value).

Ultimately, for Lefebvre, conflict in and over space is a conflict between local, everyday spatial practices based upon the use-value of space and the extra-local representations of space which organize and conceptualize space according to its exchange-value. This conflict is played out in people's everyday, spatial practices. More specifically, this central spatial conflict takes place in the city and in relation to urbanism. For Lefebvre, the realization of the "right to the city" and the "right to be different" would be the actualization of the primacy of use-value over exchange value (quality over quantity), and would result in the realization of equitable, *differential* space (Lefebvre 1979:292-3).

Although Lefebvre provides a history of the production of space, and acknowledges that the "natural environment" is always present and operating in the background (1991b:30-1), his primary aim is to understand the contemporary production and contradictions of capitalist, abstract space. For Lefebvre, abstract space obscures the "natural environment"

---

and thus resist total domination, but not ultimately escape segregation.

and, consequently, concepts of nature and the environment are not necessary in order to reach an understanding of the capitalist spatial contradictions. This is not to say that "environmental crises" are unimportant. Lefebvre recognizes that human spatial practices can harm the "natural environment" and, subsequently, may bring about the destruction of humans and other life-forms altogether (1976a:32). The central problem for him, however, is not "the environment", "nature", or "environmental crises" but the production of capitalist space itself (Lefebvre 1976b:18; 1991b:326; 1996:157-8).[33]

For Lefebvre, it is, in part, through *mimesis* that nature and the environment are incorporated into the abstract spaces of capitalism. As Lefebvre states:

> With its components and variants, mimesis makes it possible to establish an abstract "spatiality" as a coherent system that is partly artificial and partly real. Nature is imitated, for example, but only *seemingly* reproduced: what are produced are the *signs* of nature or of the natural realm...In this way nature is effectively replaced by powerful and destructive abstractions without any production of "second nature", without an appropriation of nature; nature is left, as it were, in a no-man's-land (1991b:376).

Nature is neither second nature nor first nature;[34] it cannot be built or entirely planned nor can it be appropriated according to people's needs. Instead, the *signs* of nature obfuscate its socio-spatial organization. For Lefebvre, this reification is easily achieved through the primacy of vision in modernity (1991b:75-6, 312, 376). The signs of nature are taken as signs of authenticity; nature, within abstract space, is seen to exist wherever the signs of

---

[33] In his review essay, Molotch optimistically, and, I think incorrectly, suggests that The Production of Space provides a *rationale* for environmental activism; that Lefebvre's comments on nature and the environment are *warnings* about an impending destruction; and that praxis involves saving the earth's well as enhancing people's lives (1993:891).

[34] For Lefebvre, "first nature" consists of the physical world that exists independently of human beings. People are necessarily part of this first nature. However, they predominantly live within, and with conceptions of, a "second nature". This second nature consists of human interventions in first nature (e.g. buildings) that are simultaneously physical *and* conceptual. Second nature does not only consist of the material reality of buildings; it also consists of the variety of ways people conceive of their physical surroundings in the course of their everyday, socio-spatial lives.

nature are seen. For Lefebvre, this is a "metonymic maneuver" (1991b:326): parts of nature (e.g. trees in a park) are taken as the whole of nature. Because this produces an illusion, nature cannot be truly appropriated according to people's needs. This "abstract nature" obscures the identification of people's needs by replacing them with ideas concerning new needs and, consequently, new (pseudo) rights.

One such new right is the "right to nature" (Lefebvre 1996:157-8). Lefebvre suggests that this right within late capitalism is a reaction to people's alienation within the city and enters into social practice through leisure. People retreat to the countryside and parks to escape the "noise, fatigue, the concentrationary universe of cities" (Lefebvre 1996:157-8). Leisure practices feed into the commodification (homogenization-fragmentation), and subsequently a further abstraction, of nature. More importantly, Lefebvre considers this a pseudo right that contradicts the right to the city by detouring people's oppositional spatial practices: for Lefebvre, the search for, and belief in, an authentic, contemporaneous relationship to nature obscures the *real* sites of resistance to abstract spaces. So long as people attempt to find authenticity and freedom in nature, the grip of urban representations of space tightens through increasingly reified representations of space. Because nature becomes lost to view in the process of spatial abstraction, it cannot be directly appropriated according to people's needs. So, for Lefebvre the city is the most appropriate site of opposition, or resistance, to the abstract spaces of capitalism. People's everyday lives are not conducted in relation to nature at all; rather, it is in the city and the processes of urbanization that people conduct their lives and appropriate space according to their needs. Consequently, "nature", "the environment", and "environmental crises" are not major concerns to Lefebvre. Indeed,

Lefebvre conflates these concerns with the problems of the production (and reproduction) of abstract space.

Lefebvre's theory of the production of space is useful for exploring and describing the spatial practices of activist ecotourist operators; and the discussion that follows will draw from Lefebvre. That said, I think Lefebvre is wrong in suggesting that urban spaces are the most appropriate spaces of resistance to capitalist, abstract space and that an understanding of nature and the environment is unnecessary. As I will show later, in their local contexts of action activist ecotour operators often make creative uses of ideas of nature and the environment that do not fit dominant, capitalist conceptions. Indeed, their spatial practices may dynamically oppose capitalist productions of space and conceptions of nature and the environment.

That people do indeed utilize varying concepts of nature and the environment—both in and outside of city spaces as opposed to simply adopting dominant notions—highlights a problem with Lefebvre's theory. Lefebvre assumes that people's various appropriations of urban spaces during the courses of their everyday lives are sustainable. Without a clear notion of how ideas of environment and nature are incorporated into representations of space, spaces of representation, and spatial practices, Lefebvre cannot explain how a city, either as an *oeuvre* or a planned system, can benefit its producers or even maintain their health and lives. To turn this around, without ideas of natures and environments, Lefebvre cannot explain how some people's city lives are unhealthy and hazardous. This is not say that nature simply exists in city spaces and accounts for good and ill health; rather, this is to suggest that ideas of nature and environment are often important for making valuations about

people's quality of life and the ecological sustainability of their lifeworlds and spatial practices.

This is not to suggest that capitalism does not produce dominant ideas of nature or the environment that people can unproblematically accept as part of their everyday assumptions. As Smith (1984) argues, part of the success of the uneven development of global capitalism is its dominant conceptualization of nature. Some forms of ecotourism can exist quite comfortably within the dominant, capitalist organization of abstract space and conceptions of nature. Indeed, the spatial practices of the transnational and corporate ecotour organizations that I discussed in Chapter One operate within the dominant representation of space. As I noted in that chapter, these companies are more concerned with the accumulation of capital than with the preservation and protection of the environment or nature. It is these ecotour organizations that can be seen to commodify and fetishize places in order to make a profit (Munt 1994a; Bandy 1996). Ecotour sites are sought-out for their exchange values and it is the particular environmental and/or natural qualities of these sites that become marketed—and thus contributing to spatial fragmentation through a hierarchical ordering of different spatial properties. The identification of these ecotour sites and their subsequent commodification is largely dependent upon the popularization of the environment and nature and their incorporation into consumption (e.g. green consumerism). With regard to this type of ecotourism, Bandy argues that:

> Sustainable development discourse in general, and ecotourism more specifically, appears to be a means by which global capital can, at once, appear to accommodate growing environmental crises, while reformulating public discourse on sustainability to maintain legitimacy for development as usual. As profit outweighs protection, the sustainability of nature is rewritten as the sustainability of capital; the protection of nature is inverted to be the protection of profits; and the morality of democratic multigenerational planning is transmogrified into the pursuit of competitive advantage in the free market

of nature. (551-2)

This form of ecotourism utilizes the infrastructures, flows, spatial orderings of global capitalism, and capitalist ideas of nature and the environment as they are meant to be used. This is capitalism as usual: particular experiences and spectacles of nature and the environment are being popularized, commodified and sold for profit.[35]

There is no doubt, then, that ecotourism can accommodate and propagate global capitalism and that its spatial practices can be aligned with the spatial ordering of global capital. But activist ecotourism can challenge dominant representations of space, organize various spaces of representation through local practices, and, in some cases, offer a critique of global capitalism and its spatial structures. For the most part, Bandy (1996), Munt (1994a), and Mowforth and Munt (1998) do not recognize this potential.

That ecotour activists *can* construct alternative conceptualizations is not to suggest that the construction of space through capitalist relations does not pose a formidable hindrance; capitalist hegemony constantly attempts to impose its conception of space and politics in opposition to counter-hegemonic socio-spatial constructions. The production of space is constantly negotiated and contested within the global capitalist context. Indeed, Magnusson (1996) argues that capitalism often reshapes political spaces of resistance to fit its own model of politics. When this co-optation of activist space occurs, a "virtual politics" is established wherein people can image that they are able to change the world when in reality their efforts have been effectively stymied. In such cases, politics becomes a "a series of meaningless shows" (Magnusson 1996:92). This may be seen in Lefebvre's assertion that people's "right to nature" is misleading and, in fact, operates to maintain abstract space. If the nature that

[35] For a discussion of the capitalistic nature of general tourism production and consumption, see Britton (1991).

some people are trying to protect and save is really just a sign of nature rather than an "authentic nature", then capitalist abstract space has indeed thwarted this effort from the beginning. But not all ideas of nature or the environment are merely planned signs or metonyms. As I will argue below, the active construction of ideas of nature and the environment in the course of environmental activism and ecotourism provides spaces that dominant ideas cannot easily co-opt.

As Magnusson suggests, social movements may successfully avoid a capitalist co-optation of their political spaces by operating within the "hyper-space" of the "global city" and etching out their own political spaces within the globalizing world (1996:294-6). On this interpretation, local politics are seen as a particular type of global politics; and social movements are then able to circumvent capitalist and statist spaces by conceptualizing localities within global, socio-spatial relations. In this "hyper-space", social activists recognize a plurality of political spheres of action, and parochial politics is replaced with a form of global politics. Thinking globally but acting locally becomes an organizing theme of these social movements.

Magnusson (1996, 1997, and *forthcoming*) addresses a major problem with Lefebvre's theorization. Lefebvre's "right to the city" and his related idea that the city is the most appropriate space of resistance to abstract, capitalist space rely on a dualism between the urban and the rural. In this respect, Lefebvre tends to reify cities and rural areas (or the country) as localities and ignores both the common and the uneven global processes that create them. Magnusson's idea of the "global city" collapses this dualism by conceiving of urbanization as a ensemble of processes that transcend the city and the country as locales. What becomes important is the myriad of global processes that link places and give them

shape. Once the city and the rural, which are both viewed as part of the "global city" and produced through processes of urbanization, are understood in this way, Lefebvre's view of urban politics can be expanded to include all areas of the globe (i.e. both urban and rural areas)—albeit each locale, or place, is differently affected by these processes of urbanization and uneven development. Because cities cannot be viewed apart from the global processes that give them shape, Lefebvre's "right to the city" need not be restricted to city spaces. Indeed, because processes of urbanization are global, all people's spatial practices and forms of resistance need to be acknowledged. This includes those living in, and/or protecting, rural areas, the country, the forests, and so on.

Harvey (1996) discusses the problems of moving local environmental politics to a global space. Following Raymond Williams, he argues that the "militant particularisms" found in specific localities are difficult to translate to a more general and abstract scale. For Harvey, the contemporary politics of place construction—especially economically motivated space construction—create a crisis in peoples' feelings of authenticity of place. A sense of authenticity is undermined by political-economic processes of space-time compression and the increasing penetration of technological rationality and market values into everyday social life. In reaction to these phenomena, contemporary environmental organizations epitomize the search for authentic senses of communities and relationships to nature (Harvey 1996:302). However, Harvey argues that these environmental organizations become somewhat trapped by their senses of place; they are bound to their local, "militant particularisms" and cannot command the universals necessary for challenging the uneven development of global capitalism (Harvey 1996:398-400). Local, "militant particularisms" occasionally acquire global ambitions but their sense of place often remains fractured and

regional. So, local movement organizations are easily dominated by capital: these movements do not develop a critical awareness of global capitalism that allows them to avoid co-optation (Harvey 1996:324). The problem, then, is that these local resistances, however broad in scope, do not "find a way to cross that problematic divide between action that is deeply embedded in *place*, in local experience, power conditions and social relations to a much more general movement" (Harvey 1996:399). For Harvey, these local movements must shift from local feelings of solidarity organized around *place* to a level of abstraction capable of stretching across *space* in order to adequately oppose the processes of global capitalism (Harvey 1996:398).

Harvey, however, fails to recognize that place-based political action is often simultaneously global political action. Indeed, this failure seems odd as he claims to be viewing the world *dialectically*—to be focusing on processes rather than merely on *things* (Harvey 1996:47-68). By treating locales, or places, as things and global capitalism as an ensemble of processes, Harvey overlooks (or ignores) some important processes that contribute to the creation of places. These processes include global capitalism but they also include various conflicts and cooperations that are unique to particular places.

In criticizing Harvey, Massey proposes a more "progressive sense of place" that is sensitive to power relations and differential experiences of space-time compression. For Massey, places necessarily involve various internal conflicts and tensions as well as various forms of cooperation. There is never a unified sense of place nor is there a homogenous sense of space-time compression within places. These various senses of place and space-time within a locale result from power relations and the subsequent social inequalities (Massey 1993:60-2). This "power-geometry" of space-time compression is a continuum and

a process: within a place some people will have access to global transportation, communication, and information, while others have a more restricted access to, or a restricted sense of, the world beyond their place (Massey 1993:61).

This plurality of space-time experiences within places creates differential social constructions of place that, in turn, blur the distinction between the global and the local. Massey argues:

> The uniqueness of a place, or a locality...is constructed out of particular interactions and mutual articulations of social relations, social processes, experiences and understandings, in a situation of co-presence, but where a large proportion of those relations, experiences and understandings are actually constructed on a far larger scale than what we happen to define for that moment as the place itself...Instead, then, of thinking of places as areas with boundaries around, they can be imagined as articulated moments in networks of social relations and understandings. And this in turn allows a sense of place which is extra-verted, which includes a consciousness of its links with the wider world, which integrates in a positive way the global and the local (Massey 1993:66).

Places do not have homogeneous identities; rather, a plurality of identities is constructed *within* places (Massey 1993:67). Further, there are real differences *between* places and these differences are a product of specific histories and the distinct mixture of both wider and local relations (Massey 1993:68). In short, a place is the product of the plurality of its social constructions that are all situated within a particular empirical-historical context and mediated by a power-geometry. In addition, from various sources of information, people construct senses of places external to their own.

I think Harvey is quite correct to argue that place-based political action that does not also acknowledge the global processes that influence various points of grievance can become too parochial and fail to address root problems. However, he does not acknowledge that many place-based social movement organizations do indeed contain their own senses of these global processes and incorporate these into their immediate fields of action. As I noted in the

previous chapter, Burningham and O'Brien's (1994) idea of "local contexts of action" is based on their argument that local concepts are often action oriented whereas global concepts are often too abstract to motivate action. Within the context of this chapter, it is the localizing of global processes, or, alternatively, globalizing localities, that help people "act locally and think globally". In the process, activist ecotour operators produce activist spaces and re-conceptualize nature and the environment. Burningham and O'Brien argue that localized accounts of the environment are not simply about creating territorial ideas, rather these accounts situate the environment in relation to a scheme that gives value to a particular concept of the environment over other conceptualizations (1994:914). In localizing their ideas of the environment, each ecotour operator in my research can be seen to have attached particular values to the environment in order to establish their particular activist ecotour goals.

Colin Ranson, *Nature Calls Eco-Tours Ltd.*

Recall that Colin's perspective on nature and the environment stems from deep ecology; and in deep ecology the environment is a global network of interconnections. In this view, humans are both physically and spiritually part of the environment. For Colin, environmental degradation is human degradation; the environment needs to be valued as one values one's self because one is valuing one's self when valuing the environment. It is difficult to motivate action around such a view of the environment because if it is everywhere the environment remains too abstract. Some specific environments are in more need of protection and conservation than others. Through the identification of these endangered environments, a localized context of environmental action can be discerned.

When asked to describe, or define, things like ecology and the environment, Colin gave abstract answers:

> let's define ecosystem. An ecosystem is...well. Ecology is the study of ecosystems. And an ecosystem is the relationship between the living and the dead primarily. So you can study that almost anywhere. What more can you get?
>
> The environment? The environment is just the environment. It is just one of those things. It has flexible boundaries. We can say that our environment is just this little office here or we can say our environment is the galaxy...what does make up the environment? Everything makes up the environment. It's not necessarily natural. Or you can say it's all natural. It depends at how you come at it...You know, every person defines it themselves. So, you can be technical and say it's everything or you can be more subjective and say it's the natural environment. I think most people when they're talking about the environment, they're talking about the natural environment.

These are somewhat abstract ideas and, although there may be some abstract, deep ecological values associated with these ideas of ecology and the environment, they do not have any explicit action-oriented values attached to them. Indeed, Colin maintains that definitions of the environment depend upon how one "comes at it". For Colin the environment may be, at a certain level of abstraction, inseparable from humankind (deep ecology) but its concrete and practical identification depends on more local conceptualizations. For example, when asked about environmental degradation on Vancouver Island (a specific locale), Colin's discourse becomes very concrete:

> The main problem with the degradation of the forest is clear-cut logging. There's no doubt about it You can see it all the while The main reason why we don't have any salmon is clear-cut logging. Things like Jordan River used to be a major, major sockeye salmon run. Well, they put the mining in there, they put a forestry camp in there, they dammed up the lake and put the reservoir up there. They thought salmon were unlimited just as they thought trees were unlimited. We take a lot of clients around and they say, "you don't have any forestry problems around here, look at these trees". They don't realize that a lot of those aren't marketable yet. And they also haven't been beyond the horizon. You know, you go back...if you take a ride up to the Carmanah Valley and go off the beaten track you see the damage that's

> been done there...and there's absolutely no doubt that they've been raping the province. The government, the NDP government, it's supposed to be for the small man, it is supposed to be for the working man...and yet it's basically being run by the unions...Who's unionized? Not small business. The one that's unionized is things like the forestry union. So, the government now has vested interest in maintaining the forest industry...
>
> we try not to talk so much about the government we just talk about policies. A lot of people ask us about the clear cut and we usually start the Juan de Fuca at Parkinson Creek which is an old clear cut that's been re-forested. But we do point out that they didn't replant any Maravelous Fir in there even though the Maravelous Fir was part of the original mix of trees. The forestry people don't like that because it is full of pitch and it gums-up all their machines and everything and it's not really a commercial tree...

Colin identifies specific processes and practices that contribute to environmental degradation in specific places.[36] The environment becomes something different from how he abstractly defined it. Now, the environment is Vancouver Island's forests; and this is a contested terrain. Government policies, government allegiances, and forestry practices all become culpable in environmental degradation. As some research on social movements suggests, part of the nature of articulating grievances and plans of action is identifying culpable agents (Hunt et al. 1994). Colin clearly does this and, as a result, the environment becomes more concrete and localized. Whereas the global, deep ecological idea of the environment remains somewhat abstract, Colin's "local context of action" makes environmental action possible.

As I discussed in the previous chapter, one goal of Colin's ecotours is to provoke a spiritual connection between ecotourists and nature. But, to some extent, Colin also wishes to educate ecotourists about environmental degradation:

> we show people different areas of the woods. On the Juan de Fuca there's an area that's been clear-cut, the next area is virgin forest, then you go into an area that's been selectively logged about forty or fifty years ago and you show them the various logging practices. And you talk about the benefits of each one of them and the cons as well.

These two purposes (spiritual connection and education about environmental degradation) work in concert. Indeed, once Colin as helped someone realize that she/he is intricately connected to a global environment—one goal of deep ecology—it becomes much easier to globalize the local environmental degradation on Vancouver Island. Once an ecotourist realizes a spiritual environmental inter-connection, the idea that logging practices on Vancouver Island affects her/him in some way becomes much more believable both emotionally and conceptually. In Colin's ecotours, then, locally based action leads to global valuations.

Bill Kosloski, *GoGreen Eco-Adventures*

As I discussed in Chapter Two, Bill's ecotours are educative: as part of his tours, he attempts to teach ecotourists about the environmental politics of Vancouver Island. In that chapter, I briefly described Bill's "local context of action" as his community and this community is constituted of both the town of Cumberland (place) and Vancouver Island's environmental movement (hermeneutic community). Although Bill certainly has an understanding of global environmental issues, his actions are purposively localized:

> I like to look at things from a community and an individual perspective as opposed to a global one. I mean when you try to wrap your mind around a global concept or an issue it becomes too large and you just, instead of trying to understand it, you just block it out. I mean then you start thinking of what's happening in Third World Countries in terms of the environment and things like that its just a really hard concept to grasp. For me it is. And I think for most people it is. But if you just think of what you do on a day-to-day basis, I mean if you drive your car, do you catch a bus, do you ride your bike, do you know what I mean? When you start making those changes in how you live day-to-day and changing your values and trying to change what your culture dictates to you then it'll go a long way in how you relate to your community and so on. Just working up from the local to the global level. Essentially, you know, think globally but act locally. You know living in North America, we only make up what five percent of the population but we consume eighty percent of the

[36] Colin stated, as did Bill and Selena, that he his not anti-logging but rather merely questions some logging practices such as clear cut logging.

> resources. So, it's pretty hard to tell a Third World country not to do this or not to do that when we are probably the worst environmental degraders on the planet.[37]

Obviously, Bill believes that local environmental action will have global effects and his comments on the differences in environmental degradation between First World and Third World countries reflect his understanding of differences in environmental culpability at an international level. However, although Bill can value the global environment and global environmental problems, they admittedly remain too abstract for him to take action. Indeed, he suggests that the immensity of global environmental problems simply cause one to block them out and, consequently, not take any action.

Interestingly, Bill similarly defines "community" and "the environment:"

> Essentially the environment, or ecosystem, the environment is essentially, you know, what is contained within it and then how what's in it interacts. So, the environment is how we interact, what things we do, flush down the toilet or cut in trees. And also, how different organisms interact with each other within the environment.
>
> [The community is] just how we interact with each other and with just the environment around us essentially in terms of community...Take a small town like Cumberland, you have to think about how we're going to develop the forests around here and put in sub-developments or is the population going to grow. And it's just a small little place of three thousand people but there's all those issues to deal with.

For Bill, his community is his environment and through localizing his context of action, Bill is better able to come to terms with environmental issues and develop his own methods of addressing local environmental problems. Indeed, at this local level, Bill finds many environmental issues that he feels he can directly act upon. Obviously, his ecotour business is one means whereby he does this. By teaching ecotourists about the environmental politics of his community, Bill is able to educate people about his specific locale and demonstrate how global environmental issues are indeed localized. For example, international ecotourists can learn how global timber practices and economics impact upon a single location:

---

[37] A portion of this statement was quoted earlier. See p. 69 above.

> the one Clayoquot hike that we do is a great eye opening tour because when you start the tour, you start it in a clear cut and a lot of the streams have just been destroyed there. So, its real easy to see the apparent damage of logging. And when you hike onto the trail you actually hike into a watershed that hasn't been logged and it really doesn't take much explaining to really show what's going on. And just talking about the different economies and alternatives.

This is just one example of how global environmental issues can become localized through Bill's tours; but what I want to highlight is that although Bill has a concept of global environmental issues, his ability to act upon environmental problems stems from his "local context of action". It is his community values that predominantly motivate him to act.

Selena Blais, *Canadian Wilderness Ecotours*

As I mentioned in the previous chapter, Selena's ecotours cater mainly to Vancouver Island residents. Although, she will take non-local "tourists" on her ecotours, her main goal is to motivate locals to participate more in Vancouver Island's environmental movement by showing them both the logging practices operating in "their own backyards" as well as the results of the successful campaigns of a variety of preservation and conservation organizations. Like Colin and Bill, Selena recognizes the global influences on Vancouver Island's environment, especially logging and the international trade of wood products. When asked what she took to be the main causes of environmental degradation on Vancouver Island, Selena suggested:

> Logging first of all. [And] the main problem with the logging is the mechanization, the industrialization, the clearcut logging and the old growth logging. Obviously, the clearcut and old growth logging are my two main reasons why I'm so angry. It's also the governments and the huge multinational corporations.
>
> Clear-cutting is not the way to go. I mean I'm not anti-forestry, the WC isn't even anti-forestry, it's part of our economy, it's crashing but its not because of conservation groups, it's because of mechanization, it's because of the huge multi-national corporations that don't give a shit about the loggers who are out in the woods. And I'm not afraid to tell people that. A couple of our areas aren't just

> threatened by logging, it's development, housing going up right beside East Sooke Park, it's, Vancouver Island especially has big, big, development problem and so I'd really like to address that [in my tours].

As with Colin and Bill, Selena recognizes agents and practices that are responsible for environmental degradation. Mechanization and multinational companies are obviously global phenomena and Selena recognizes that the forestry problems on Vancouver Island is a global issue. However, because she takes Vancouver Island as her "local context of action", Selena's goals are firmly located there. Rather than trying to tackle environmental problems at some abstract, global arena, the areas she hopes to protect and conserve are all located in areas wherein she can actively campaign.

Selena also has an abstract, placeless definition of the environment that, although it is difficult to motivate action around, is useful in globalizing localities.

> The bugs, the plants, the animals, the trees...every single, tiny thing makes up the environment. I think people, the animals, the plants, the fungi, the things that fall off the trees, the nurse logs that provide life for other trees, the water, everything, everything that's out there. Cities, cities are fine to. They have to house people otherwise we'd be spread out over the whole entire natural landscape and I wouldn't like to see that happen. As much as I don't like cities, I can survive in one for a long time...So, I guess it's just every single thing.

The idea that things are interconnected and interdependent, as in Colin's perspective, helps to demonstrate that environmental degradation in specific locales have both global causes and consequences. But knowing and feeling that everything is interconnected and interdependent is not generally sufficient to motivate conservation and preservation endeavors. "Local contexts of action" need to be identified and, within these contexts, the environment needs to be valued according to more place-based goals. Ideas of the environment need to be scaled down to the specific locale wherein particular environmental problems or crises occur in order for more concrete goals to be identified and acted upon. Through ecotourism Selena is

attempting to identify these goals for local residents and expand their contexts of action to include endangered and newly conserved wilderness areas. Selena's own goals are multi-fold. As an environmental activist working for WC^2, she hopes to preserve and conserve a variety of wilderness areas on Vancouver Island. As an ecotour operator, she hopes to generate support for the WC^2's campaigns as well as provide a means whereby local residents can witness, first hand, Vancouver Island's endangered wilderness and, subsequently, expand their own ideas of what they can do to protect these specific areas.

Interestingly, Selena became active in the environmental movement when she made a connection between her marketing job and environmental degradation:

> Well, basically, I moved out to B.C, about…six years ago. I came out and started working in an advertising agency, because that's where my educate was, and my first client they put me on was Scott Paper. So, I sat in my office thinking "how am I going to…", you know, I was super keen on it. I didn't know all of the issues. I was thinking, "ya, I can think of a new name for this 3-ply bathroom tissue. I can sell this product, no problem". And then we went on this little cruise to Bowen Island and as we were cruising by West Vancouver, we can see this big patch where the housing was going to go in and everyone on the boat was joking how this was our client, Scott Paper's clear-cut to make the new 3-ply and I was like "what!, no way!" I was freaked out…That was the first time it hit me. I was like, "oh my god, I'm totally contributing to this just by coming up with a name that was going to sell millions of rolls of toilet paper".

So, it was through witnessing the clearcut that Selena was able to make the connection between her job and environmental degradation and this connection motivated her to become active in the environmental movement. Her motivating factor was not some abstract idea of an interconnected global environment but, rather, the material reality of clearcut logging in West Vancouver and her realization of her role in that process. Through her ecotours, Selena appears to be trying to provide an opportunity for others to make this type of connection, albeit in their own particular ways.

All three ecotour operators in this research have both abstract and concrete ideas of the environment. Although their abstract notions of the environment have value for them—they feel a certain responsibility for everything interconnected within the global environment—it is their concrete ideas of their local environments that allow them to take action against environmental degradation. By developing "local contexts of action" each ecotour operator is able to scale down abstract, global ideas of the environment and localize global environmental problems. In the process, these ecotour operators identify concrete means of addressing, and educating others about, these problems. These ecotour operators' practices are not simply parochial "militant particularisms" as Harvey argues of local environmental movement organizations. Rather, because these locales are places of conjunction where various global and local processes come together in unique ways, activist ecotourism opens up the possibility of "acting locally but thinking globally".

Productions of Nature and the Environment

Within their "local contexts of action" activist ecotour operators produce particular spaces of representation in opposition to dominant representations of space; and it is through their spatial practices that their ecotour sites become activist spaces. In part, this is made possible through post-tourism wherein tourists have an increased penchant for learning about and discovering new places. As I outlined in Chapter One, post-tourists are generally more reflexive than mass tourists, and are more inclined to search for the social organization of a tourist site. Activist ecotour operators cater to this search and use it as means to promote environmental awareness.

Both the theory of a postmodern cultural paradigm and the theory of reflexive modernization involve the idea that understandings of reality become increasingly contested as people and collectivities reflect upon their unique being and becoming in the world. Such contestation is evident in activist ecotourism. Activist ecotour operators view the world in particular ways that often conflict with dominant understandings. More specifically, activist ecotour operators understand and value nature and the environment in ways that oppose dominant cultural significations and valuations.

As a form of post-tourism, this type of ecotourism incorporates its perspective on reality as a primary organizational tool. Activist ecotour operators self-consciously organize their tours to promote their understandings of nature and the environment while also critiquing what they take to be destructive perspectives. This endeavor involves foregrounding the multiple perspectives on nature and the environment and demonstrating the impact these perspectives have on the material world, especially the natural landscape.

In his exploration of the cultural constructions of "nature", William Cronon suggests that the very idea that nature is a cultural product flies in the face of what many people take nature to be, namely something *not created by humans* (Cronon 1996:34). For Cronon, the idea that nature is separate from human valuations and cultural significances follows from what he calls nature constructed as "naive reality".[38] In this view, nature is simply what exists factually and unproblematically; nature is transparent and need not be disputed. When nature is understood in this naïve way it is often associated with a moral imperative. This means that what is understood as natural is taken to be what is morally correct. But when nature and morality become fused, when morality becomes essentialized, nature itself

[38] On the various ways that ideas of nature have been constructed see Williams (1972), Oelschlaeger (1991), Evernden (1992), Adams (1996), Arnold (1996), and Eder (1996a).

becomes an ideal. Nature becomes a referent for some abstract, perfect order. This view, Cronon argues, is evident in the Judeo-Christian tradition which has historically understood nature as Edenic. Nature is the perfect world *before* the sins of human intervention. This view of nature is taken up in various discourses of the environmental movement which often take ideas of "pristine wilderness" as an archetype for inherent good and human interventions in nature as an archetype of inherent evil. Edenic nature need not be viewed solely in this way; rather, the idea of Eden can also bring about self-conscious, cultural constructions of Edenic natures. This is evident, for example, in various constructions of city parks where natural things such as trees are planted and ponds created in order to construct a natural, Edenic space. For Cronon, this is "nature as artifice" and may be described as "a key defining quality of the modern landscape" because so many modern landscapes are arranged according to the Edenic trope (1996:40). In this view, nature and landscape are organized according to the particular ideals and purposes of planners, architects and real estate developers. At a more extreme level, Cronon suggests, nature becomes wholly planned as a virtual reality. Nature is almost absolutely constructed through computer simulations and fantastic imagery. Further, nature and "nature as virtual reality" are becoming more and more fused so that one cannot always be sure what parts of nature have been physically constructed and what parts are simply arranged signs of nature. Yet another cultural idea of nature, is "nature as a demonic other, nature as avenging angel, nature as the return of the repressed" (Cronon 1996:48). Nature is something that is never fully within the scope of human control. It is a constant reminder that external forces consistently foil human plans and grand schemes. This is the destructive nature of earthquakes, floods, hurricanes, volcanoes etc. This view of nature is the other side to the Edenic view: "the one represents

our vision of paradise: the good that is utterly compelling that we feel no hesitation in claiming nature as our authority for embracing it. The other is our vision of hell: the place where those who transgress against nature will finally endure the pain and retribution they so justly deserve" (Cronon 1996:50).

Nature can also be viewed as a commodity that can be bought and sold in the marketplace. Few conceptions of nature have had such disastrous ecological effects as this view. Indeed, the predominance of understanding nature as a commodity has resulted in pervasive assumptions that humans have an inherent right to nature and, subsequently, should use it in ways that conform to the logic of the marketplace and capitalism in general.[39] To view "nature as a commodity" is to view nature as a resource. It is this view of nature, as a resource tied to the market, that many environmental groups wish to oppose, for it is this anthropocentric view that they feel is going to bring on the avenging angel of nature. Ultimately, then, for Cronon nature is a contested terrain:

> On the one hand, people in Western cultures use the word "nature" to describe a universal reality, thereby implying that it is and must be common to all people. On the other hand, they also pour into that world all their most personal and culturally specific values: the essence of who they think they are, how and where they should live, what they believe to be good and beautiful, why people should act in certain ways. All these things are described as *natural*, even though everything we know about human history and culture flies in the face of that description. The result is a human world in which these many human visions of nature are always jostling against each other, each claiming to be universal and each soon making the unhappy discovery that even its nearest neighbors refuse to acknowledge that claim. (Cronon 1996:51).

In Contested Natures (1998), Macnaghten and Urry argue that nature is neither simply real nor simply socially constructed; rather, different ideas of nature stem from people's embedded social practices:

---

[39] On capitalist constructions of nature, see Smith (1984) and Harvey (1996).

> It is specific social practices, especially of people's dwellings, which produce, reproduce and transform different natures and different values. It is through such practices that people respond, cognitively, aesthetically and hermeneutically, to what have been constructed as signs and characteristics of nature. (Macnaghten and Urry 1998: 2).

These embedded social practices are discursively ordered, embodied, spaced, timed, and "involve models of human activity, risk, agency and trust" (Macnaghten and Urry 1998:2). Consequently, responses to and interactions with nature are often very ambivalent, highly diverse, and embedded in people's daily activities. Over time, different ideas of natures have been constructed through people's different social practices.

Since the 1960s, and with the tremendous growth of the environmental movement, nature as become increasingly viewed as "the environment" (Macnaghten and Urry 1998:32-74) and it has been predominantly environmental movement organizations that have done the "cultural work" necessary for popularizing the environment as an issue in public discourse. By "cultural work", the authors mean that a variety of environmental organizations have transformed how people think about, and interact within, nature, or the environment. Due largely to the environmental movement, the cultural significances of the environment have been transformed and nature is now valued differently and more diversely. As a result of these new valuations, once dominant views of nature and the environment—such as realist scientistic views and the capitalist nature-as-resource view—are now being steadily contested.[40]

It is through the senses, through notions of time and through notions of space that nature becomes embodied and embedded in people's everyday lives. That people produce nature

---

[40] These new expressions and valuations of nature and the environment that stem from people's social practices also need to be understood in their broader social, cultural, political, and economic contexts. I discussed these contexts in Chapter One under the rubrics of reflexive modernization and the risk society, the cultural consequences of globalization, de-differentiation, individualization and detraditionalization.

through their senses is not to suggest that nature is "out there" waiting to be sensed. The cultural significance of particular senses have varied over time and, consequently so have the ways that people have sensed nature (Macnaghten and Urry 1998:108). Through the different ways of seeing, hearing, smelling, and feeling nature gets embodied in particular ways. These different ways of sensing are historically influenced: the different significances of the senses over time play an important role in how the senses are used to produce nature. For example, the smell of the medieval city was profuse and repugnant and so in contradistinction to the city, nature became constructed around ideas of fresh air and sweet smells (Macnaghten and Urry 1998:128-9). With the rise of modernity and scientific epistemological endeavors came the predominance of sight and seeing. As a result, vision became, and may remain, the primary sense for producing and sensing nature (Macnaghten and Urry 1998:110-2).[41] This, in turn, led to a spectacularization of nature which revolved around various visual discourses that cued particular signs of nature for visual consumption. One example would be the aesthetic experience of the sublime in nature which rearticulated the terrifying forces of nature—nature as the "avenging angel"—into a simultaneously delightful and fearful experience (Macnaghten and Urry 1998:114).

The primacy of vision, however, has, in some ways, now led to a hegemony of vision wherein the other senses, if not completely de-valued, have become subservient to sight.[42] Instrumental and scientific rationalities have ordered nature around culturally produced visual cues and, subsequently, the other senses have, in a sense, become lost to view. This is evident in the processes of both landscaping and mapping nature:

---

[41] In many ways, as I will show later, sight has become the integral not only for tourism but, more specifically, for the construction of nature and the environment in ecotourism. In some forms of ecotourism, the primacy of vision has turned nature into spectacle.

[42] On the hegemony of vision, see Jay (1992), Levin (1993), and Fabijancic (1995).

> Both landscapes and maps are culturally specific visual strategies which have reinforced a particular "Western" view of the world. Both reduce the complex multi-sensual experience to visually encoded features and then organize and synthesize these into a meaningful whole. They both capture aspects of nature and society through visual abstraction and representation; both express distance and objectivity from what is being sensed; and both organize and articulate control or mastery over what is being viewed and thus usher in new ways in which visuality is complicitous in the operation of power...Thus landscapes and maps deploy the visual sense as a means of control and surveillance. (Macnaghten and Urry 1998:120-1)

But landscapes and maps are dominant forms of visual sensing and, although they exclude the other senses, this does not mean that people do not utilize all their senses in their productions of nature. Indeed, not only are there visual landscapes, there are also "smell-scapes", "sound-scapes", and "feel-scapes" which are all involved in various productions of nature (Macnaghten and Urry 1998:132).[43]

In addition to the senses, natures are produced through varying ideas of time. For Macnaghten and Urry, there are two emerging, postmodern senses of time that are beginning to check the dominance of clock-time in the West. First, there is the realization of *glacial time* which is understood as "immensely long and imperceptibly changing" (Macnaghten and Urry 1998:147) and, second, there is the realization of *instantaneous time* which is imperceptibly fast.[44] In terms of ideas of nature and the environment glacial time can be identified in the Bruntland Report's view on sustainable development which proposes that people who currently populate the earth have a responsibility to save some resources and maintain the inhabitability of the earth for future generations (Macnaghten and Urry 1998:154).[45] This type of understanding of time extends people's responsibility beyond the immediacy of their life-times and beyond the realm of clock-time. Nature becomes viewed as something that extends from the past and well into the future rather than something to be

[43] Macnaghten and Urry argue that it is, in part, the senses that help to define localities (1998:132).
[44] See Lash and Urry (1994) for a more detailed account of glacial and instantaneous times.

used wantonly in the present. Instantaneous time, on the other hand, stems from new technologies that allow people to communicate around the globe. From this communication, some people come into contact with others who have very different concepts of nature. Macnaghten and Urry suggest that this allows one to become more reflexive and explore the possibility that nature and the environment are constructed from different human cultural valuations.

Nature and the environment are also produced through people's everyday spatial practices. For Macnaghten and Urry, these spatial practices are people's dwelling behaviours that create particular concepts of space in particular places. Following Lefebvre and Heidegger, these authors argue that people, as dwellers, perpetually produce concepts of space in opposition to dominant spatial conceptions. Through dwelling in places, people not only learn the dominant cultural significances of space but also may create new concepts of space and incorporate both into their spatial practices. Briefly, this means that the spaces of nature and the environment are always changing, being contested, and being created anew. As the world becomes more globalized new spatial concepts of nature and the environment become constructed from people's negotiations between the global and the local. This means that nature can extend beyond place and encompass the globe but, simultaneously, nature can be characterized by the particularity of a place. In a globalizing world, people dwell both in particular places but also understand themselves to be dwelling on the earth; and it is this dwelling on the earth that is said to unite all people as global citizens (Macnaghten and Urry 1998:152-3).

It follows from Macnaghten and Urry's discussion of the embeddedness of ideas of nature, that through their spatial practices activist ecotour operators produce particular

---

[45] This can be extended to a responsibility for non-human things as well.

conceptions of nature or the environment. These ideas of nature or the environment make up the construction of ecotour sites themselves. Whereas some ecotour organizations, simply propel and reproduce dominant, and often capitalistic, notions of nature and the environment, local, activist-oriented ecotour operators can problematize these dominant notions by highlighting their negative environmental consequences. Whereas hegemonic notions of nature and the environment can be misunderstood as having a simple correspondence to reality—and thus fetishized and reified—through activist ecotourism these dominant ideas of nature and the environment can be critiqued and new concepts disseminated. In the process, hegemonic presentations of reality become questioned and, in some cases, replaced by new ontological assumptions based upon new constitutions of nature and the environment.

Urry (1990; 1992a; 1992b) argues that tourism sites are predominantly constructed around sightseeing. As such, tourism is organized through visual signs and cues; and these are ordered according to a variety of discourses of seeing which rely upon a variety of visual metaphors and metonyms. For Urry, tourism is intricately organized around the "tourist gaze" and "different tourist gazes involve particular consumptions of space, both the configuration of different sights and markers across space and the manner in which that space is socially and culturally constructed for consumption (such as the construction of a "nature" for leisure)" (Urry 1992b:184).

Although there are a variety of gazes, Urry concentrates on five ideal-types. First, is the *romantic gaze*, which involves a sustained immersion in a particular place. This gaze involves particular cultural constructions of places as awe inspiring. Second, is the *collective gaze*, which is based upon a feeling of a shared touristic experiences. These experiences, are visually ordered around familiar places wherein people learn of their shared past and origins.

Heritage tourism is an exemplar. Third, is the *spectatorial gaze*, which involves a series of brief encounters with a variety of tourist sites for the purposes of collecting different tourist signs (i.e. through photography and souvenirs). This gaze is often associated with mass tourism, the practices through which are derived stereotypical notions of the "tacky tourist" who only superficially engages in "other" places. Fourth, is the *environmental gaze*, which involves a sustained and didactic interaction with a particular environment. This gaze scans and inspects environments not only for signs of degradation but also for romanticized, culturally organized visual cues of nature, "pristine wilderness", landscape, or even "townscapes" (Urry 1992a:2). Fifth, is the *anthropological gaze*, which involves the active interpretation of cultural signs and objects (i.e. culture tourism). Obviously, these gazes are not mutually exclusive and a tourist may practice some or all of these gazes throughout an excursion.

Urry (1992a) suggests that tourism and tourist gazes have played an important part in broadening concerns about both natural and built environments. Tourism has enabled people, especially people from the West and the Pacific Rim, to experience and compare a variety of environments around the globe, and thus, these people have had the opportunity to discover and witness different environmental threats and sites of environmental degradation. For Urry, this stems from the importance of visual consumption which is often based upon aesthetic judgments rather than reason; and these aesthetic judgements of environments stem from the widespread development of the romantic tourist gaze. The romantic tourist gaze, in turn, has become so widespread that even environmental movement organizations have begun to organize their practices around it. This gaze, which may also be characterized as an Edenic gaze (see Cronon above), is organized around a discourse that creates a dichotomy

between the urban and the country. The country appears to be closer to nature (and thus to paradise) whereas the urban is seen as a blight on nature (and is thus characterized as hell).

In part, it is through ordering the tourist gaze that activist ecotour operators construct their activist spaces—however, following Macnaghten and Urry, I will discuss how the other senses are also utilized. More specifically, activist ecotour operators call attention to dominant constructions of nature (representations of space) through ordering the tourist gaze but through this gaze they also construct and espouse their own concepts of nature (spaces of representation). It is their spatial practices and their particular spaces of representation that allow them to both challenge dominant constructions of nature and highlight the spatial implications of these notions.

Colin Ranson, *Nature Calls Eco-Tours Ltd.*

Colin conducts his ecotours in a variety of Vancouver Island's parks. There he counters the capitalistic notion of nature as a resource by highlighting the interconnections between organisms (recall the banana slug in Chapter Two). Instead of viewing nature as something to be mastered for human gain, Colin espouses the idea that humans are a part of nature and must rely on their interconnections to other organisms for survival. By highlighting things in nature, such as the banana slug, and describing their interconnections with human practices, Colin is attempting to provide visual metonyms. These metonyms come to represent the whole of nature as Colin conceives of it. In part, it is from these visual metonyms that Colin constructs a tourist gaze.

For Colin, the capitalistic notion of nature is, in part, to blame for upsetting the balance of ecological interconnections. Recall Colin's comments on environmental degradation:

> The main problem with the degradation of the forest is clear-cut logging. There's no doubt about it You can seen it all the while The main reason why we don't have any salmon is clear-cut logging. Things like Jordan River used to be a major, major sockeye salmon run. Well, they put the mining in there, they put a forestry camp in there, they dammed up the lake and put the reservoir up there. They thought salmon was unlimited just as they thought trees were unlimited. We take a lot of clients around and they say, "you don't have any forestry problems around here, look at these trees". They don't realize that a lot of those aren't marketable yet. And they also haven't been beyond the horizon. You know, you go back... if you take a ride up to the Carmanah Valley and go off the beaten track...you see the damage that's been done there...

Colin clearly expresses the idea that notions of nature as a resource are to be blamed for environmental degradation. More specifically, mining, forestry, and power generation are to be blamed for upsetting nature's balance. Also, note Colin's answer to why some tourists do not understand "forestry problems": for him, it is because they have not *seen* the consequences of clearcut logging and they do not understand that in the forestry industry "trees" are commodities that become marketable over time. In his production of nature, Colin attempts to counter the idea that trees are *merely* commodities with market value by instilling the idea that trees have intrinsic value beyond economics and human use. When tourists do not ostensibly understand a dominant production of nature, however, Colin must first demonstrate it and then offer his alternative valuation. Before highlighting how dominant ideas of nature have negative environmental impacts, Colin must first ensure that a dominant idea of nature is understood.

Through ecotourism Colin creates a space wherein he can show ecotourists how nature is affected by human interventions that stem from particular productions of nature. For example, when he takes a tour to a reforested area of the Juan de Fuca trail, Colin calls attention to the fact that although it may visibly appear to be a pristine wilderness, it remains an area of negative human intervention:

> we usually start the Juan de Fuca at Parkinson Creek which is an old clear cut that's been re-forested. But we do point out that they didn't replant any Maravelous Fir in there even though the Maravelous Fir was part of original mix of trees. The forestry people don't like that because it is full of pitch and it gums-up all their machines and everything and it's not really a commercial tree…

Colin problematises reality by highlighting the problem of relying merely on sight. What appears to be an area untouched by human labour is in fact a re-forested area. Further, re-forestation did not restore the area's original diversity. In part, this is because the forestry industry had thought that it would log this area again in the future and that the Maravelous Fir would inhibit this practice. This area of the Juan de Fuca trail, then, is somewhat of a constructed wilderness that has been ordered through spatial practices informed by dominant representations of space—more specifically, this representation of space is informed by capitalistic conceptions of nature. Colin endeavors to call attention to the artifice of the area in an attempt to demonstrate how dominant ideas of nature have impacted the natural landscape and upset the ecological balance.

Through his deep ecological narratives (see Chapter Two), his construction of a tourist gaze through visual metonyms, and his foregrounding negative human interventions in nature, Colin attempts to reconceptualize his clients' ideas of nature and instill a spiritual sense of interconnectedness. Colin's spatial practices are informed by his spaces of representation; and these spaces of representation are informed by his deep ecological point of view. Through his local context of action, Colin highlights dominant representations of space and demonstrates how these have had negative consequences. He also provides his ecotour clients with an alternative point of view from which they can become more reflexive of their place within the interconnections of nature.

Bill Kosloski, *Go-Green Eco-Adventures*

Like Colin, Bill primarily conducts his ecotours in park areas. He chooses his sites based on features that he takes to be representative of his concept of nature:

> Essentially, [we choose] areas that we've traveled in ourselves and that exhibit unique qualities like a diverse ecosystem, or its easily accessible, or it has something interesting or representative of the environment on Vancouver Island…The Clayoquot trail is great because it's very characteristic of an old-growth water shed which there's not many left on Vancouver Island; it's one of maybe six that are left out of something like ninety-two that were once present on Vancouver Island.

Through his ecotours, Bill wants to foreground specific attributes of Vancouver Island's environment. As I noted in the previous section, Bill takes logging and mining practices as the primary causes of environmental degradation. Through his talk of the Clayoquot trail, Bill espouses a sense of an endangered nature; and it is, in part, this endangered element that Bill wishes to highlight during his tours—he also characterizes nature, or the environment, as something that is inherently diverse.

During his tours, Bill organizes a series of gazes wherein at one moment tourists are looking upon extreme environmental degradation and, soon after, are gazing upon a relatively untouched old growth watershed area:

> The one Clayoquot hike that we do is a great eye opening tour because when you start the tour, you start it in a clear cut and a lot of the streams have just been destroyed there. So, it's real easy to see the apparent damage of logging. And when you hike onto the trail you actually hike into a watershed that hasn't been logged and…it really doesn't take much explaining to really show what's going on.

Bill has organized two environmental gazes that juxtapose two different areas that demonstrate the spatial consequences of particular human practices that are based upon particular ideas of nature. In the first gaze, tourists see where logging practices have taken the notion of nature as a resource and, as a result, the natural landscape and ecosystem are

destroyed. This is contrasted through a second gaze which is organized around the conception of nature as pristine wilderness. This nature is visually contrasted with the first; and because nature has not been destroyed, the view of nature as a pristine wilderness appears more sustainable and aesthetically pleasing. Further, this second idea of nature can be regarded as the spatial consequences of preservation and conservation efforts. This appears as a pristine wilderness *because* various environmental movement organizations have succeeded in limiting logging in the area.

Bill's ecotours, then, visually demonstrate how different conceptions of nature and related spatial practices have impacted upon the environment. In the first, where nature is viewed as a resource for human use, the environment is adversely affected; in the second, where people organize to conserve or protect nature based on its inherent value, the environment is preserved. The environmental gaze becomes crucial to making these distinctions. For Bill, when tourists *see* the effects of different ideas of nature, he does not feel that much explanation is needed. The spatial organization of the natural landscape speaks for itself.

However, it is not just sight that helps to make these connections between different notions of nature and their spatial results. Bill suggests that simply immersing oneself in the wilderness is effective and this necessarily involves a variety of different senses:

> Anybody who's spent any time, I believe, in the forest or the outdoors really starts to have an appreciation for it and you can just, if you're not even talking about it, people are just walking through old growth trees and stuff, they can really start to have an appreciation for what's around them. And they start thinking about the issues more and opening up their eyes.

When moving through the forest, it is relatively difficult to shut out the diversity of sensory information. Indeed, it is important to acknowledge that people sense the world in different ways: through sounds, smells, tactility etc. So, the forest, and consequently ideas of nature,

can be experienced and expressed through the diversity of sensory experiences it presents. For Bill, simply being in the forest will trigger an appreciation.

Bill's idea of nature as a diverse environment can be discerned from his opinion on forestry tours that some logging companies conduct:

> The forestry tours? It's just a promotion of their industry essentially. I mean what are they taking people through? They're taking people through a mono-culture plantation...but if you were to look closely at some of the ecological values...you can take a walk through a second growth forest, a second growth farm basically, and then go through an old growth forest and point out a few things and you'd see the difference in diversity.

The forestry tours are not nature tours but rather plantation tours. According to Bill, these re-forested areas do not contain the original diversity the areas once contained. Recall Lefebvre's comment on abstract space and the signs of nature. Lefebvre suggests that where dominant representations of space support abstract, capitalist spaces, signs of nature can be mistakenly taken for nature itself. Through the hegemony of vision, abstract space can be made to look like natural spaces. Bill appears to be making a similar complaint. Although re-forested areas can be aesthetically pleasing, the original diversity of the natural landscape can never be simply recreated through human practices. This diversity is a product of time, glacial time, and human interventions cannot simply recreate this within a short period. Although human efforts can help to preserve and conserve the natural environment, the diversity of these areas is constructed over a wide time-span.

Bill's spaces of representation, specifically his ideas of nature and the environment, inform the spatial practices of his ecotours which, in turn, challenge dominant spaces of representation. Predominantly through the organization of an environmental tourist gaze, Bill demonstrates how different ideas of nature have spatial implications for the natural landscape. More specifically, like Colin, he shows how the idea of nature as a resource

negatively impacts upon the environment through various logging practices. He also shows how human efforts based upon different ideas of nature, especially nature as pristine wilderness, have helped to preserve and conserve some natural environments.

Selena Blais, *Canadian Wilderness Ecotours*

As I noted in the previous chapter, Selena's ecotours are geared mainly toward Vancouver Island residents and rather than conduct these tours on parkland, she takes these local tourists to protected wilderness areas as well as threatened areas where the WC^2 is currently campaigning. For Selena, witnessing these areas first hand is very important for mobilizing support for Vancouver Island's environmental movement:

> My trips, I have four trips, and two of them are to threatened wilderness areas and two of them are to recently protected areas. So, I want people to see the threatened areas and I also want them to be thankful for what we've, conservation groups, not only the WC but lots of conservation groups, have been working so hard for in the past...my main things is to get people active in a campaign. Even if I take them to a recently protected area, there are still issues in those areas that need to be dealt with as well.

As in Colin's and Bill's ecotours, Selena attempts to demonstrate how the natural landscape is produced through various socio-spatial practices; and it is through the organization of an environmental tourist gaze that she achieves this. It is through visibly demonstrating how particular areas are affected by human conceptions of nature that Selena attempts to mobilize support for local environmental campaigns. By taking people to newly protected wilderness areas, she can show that environmental campaigns, which are based upon alternative ideas of nature, can indeed succeed. Also, she can use her tours to discuss how further action is needed in order to maintain these protected areas. In the case of threatened areas, she can show people the visible effects of logging practices which are based upon a particular conception of nature as a resource.

For Selena, one does not have to have a wilderness experience in order to appreciate nature but she does feel that wilderness experiences can accentuate the desire to be more environmentally active:

> When I started working for the WC, I didn't get out to the wilderness for like a year and I was like "why am I talking about these areas? I haven't even been to these areas. I'm talking about the Walbran, I still haven't been to the Walbran and I've been talking about it for four years". I don't know what's actually, I know the world's tallest spruce grow there and I can talk about them but I haven't actually seen them. *But once you see them, you know what you've been talking about for four years and why I've been doing it.* (my emphasis)

Selena feels that through witnessing the material reality of these areas, as opposed to relying solely on abstract ideas and various images, people will be inspired to appreciate nature. Her ecotours are organized around this idea.

As in Colin's and Bill's tours, Selena organizes an environmental tourist gaze that highlights socio-spatial effects on the natural landscape:

> I'm not looking for scenic corridors along the highway…I'm not looking to hide the clearcuts. I'm taking people right into the clearcuts and saying, "I don't care if you think this looks good or if it looks bad. It is bad". Clearcutting is not the way to go.

A main objective of this environmental gaze upon a clearcut area is to ensure that the environmental degradation of the area is understood to be "bad". Because her tours are meant to motivate people to become more active in environmental campaigns, the environmental gaze becomes a proselytizing mechanism that is organized around Selena's idea that direct experiences within nature will motivate people more than merely relying on secondary accounts and visual images. By organizing a gaze upon environmental degradation, Selena is demonstrating the spatial effects of the idea of nature as a resource. She is demonstrating that human ideas, and the practices based upon those ideas, have real environmental consequences. In opposition to the idea of nature as resource, Selena attempts

to promote a more Edenic idea of nature as pristine wilderness; and this idea of nature is gazed upon during her tours to protected areas.

Selena's sense of nature is also informed by an understanding of glacial time.

> I love second growth forests. I have nothing bad to say about them. But I don't want all the old growth to be gone to just make new, second growth. And that's definitely the way the forest industry looks upon it: it is that "old growth is gone for a reason and that's because second growth is just as good blah, blah, blah". It's not the same. It's tree farms and it's not an old growth forest. Those trees will never become an old growth forest. Those trees will never get to grow a thousand years. Are you crazy. They're gone in seventy years. So, I guess that's my viewpoint...They'll [tourists] have to go from their tour [forestry tours] to mine [laughs] [in order to compare second growth to old growth].

Selena's idea of pristine wilderness is informed by a sense of time outside of human practice; and it is human practices based upon treating nature as a resource that disrupt the "natural" effects of this flow of time—the production of old growth forests. For Selena, things in nature have inherent rights based upon their natural life-spans ("Those trees will never get to grow a thousand years"). However, a capitalistic view of nature as resource negates these rights ("They're gone in seventy years"). Selena's and the forestry industry's ideas of nature incorporate different senses of time: for Selena, nature is a product of a glacial time outside of human practice; for the forestry industry, nature is useful in so far as it has a harvesting time—and this harvesting time is based upon the turn-over of capital investment.

For Selena, ecotourism provides a means whereby she can oppose dominant ideas of nature and instill alternative ideas in local ecotourists with the hope that they will become more active in environmental campaigns on Vancouver Island. Selena's Edenic ideas of nature as pristine wilderness form her spaces of representation (her ecotour sites) and guide her spatial practices (her ecotours). In opposition to her spaces of representation, are the forestry industry's dominant representations of space (nature as a resource). This encoding

of space reproduces the abstract spaces of capitalism by tying spatial organization to capitalist market relations and treating things in spaces according to their exchange values. During her tours Selena organizes an environmental gaze in order to show how such ideas of nature have negative consequences.

Conclusion

Each ecotour operator in this research calls attention to how human practices both positively and negatively impact upon nature. None of the ecotour operators presents nature as something untouched by human activity, or simply "out there" waiting to be discovered and passively consumed. Nor do any of these ecotours involve an uncritical consumption of nature. All three operators construct environmental tourist gazes in order to foreground how logging practices on Vancouver Island have been detrimental to the environment and local ecosystems. Bill's and Selena's tours juxtapose this gaze with gazes on protected areas. These gazes attempt to demonstrate that human efforts can indeed positively affect natural areas. Colin, on the other hand, constructs an environmental gaze based on metonyms that are meant to represent the whole of nature. These metonymical devices are used to construct an idea of a global, interconnected environment.

By calling attention to how some natural areas are constructed and organized through human practices and how these practices are based upon particular ideas of nature, none of these ecotour operators can be said to fetishize place. As I mentioned earlier, fetishizing places involves obscuring the social relations involved in their constructions and presenting these places as things for consumption. Based upon a postmodern cultural paradigm, post-tourist, activist ecotourism foregrounds these social constructions, and the social relations that construct places, rather than merely passively accepting what is seen as an indicator of

an "authentic reality". Indeed, in some instances, post-tourism practices can be understood as the search for the construction and organization of place. This is not to suggest that these ecotour operators do not present an idea of an "authentic" reality. All three's concepts of nature assume a real nature that is being affected by human practice. A main goal of their forms of ecotourism, however, is to instill an environmental awareness in tourists and encourage more activist environmental identities through visually elucidating the material impacts of different ideas of nature and the environment through the organization of tourist gazes.

Implicit in all three operators' conception of place, is an idea that Vancouver Island, as a locale, is influenced by various global processes. These global processes involve global capitalism, global tourism, and "the environment" as a system of global interconnections. Global systems can be rather abstract and difficult to act upon. So, each ecotour operator defines her/his own "local contexts of action" that are more action oriented. These "local contexts of action" involve a negotiation between the local and global; within these contexts, the local is seen as a manifestation of larger global processes. Following Lefebvre, these "local contexts of action" define the ecotour operators' various spatial practices; and these spatial practices are informed by their spaces of representation, or how they conceptualize space in opposition to dominant representations of space. "Local contexts of action" are activist spaces wherein these activist ecotour operators oppose dominant ideas of nature as a resource and attempt to espouse their own alternatives, which are embedded in their daily lives.

Conclusion

In this thesis, I have argued that, in some cases, ecotourism can be understood as a form of environmental activism, and I have attempted to elucidate the processes and characteristics that make this so. To this end, I have relied on various theoretical perspectives. These include the regulation school's approach to political economy, Beck's idea of reflexive modernization and the world risk society, and Lefebvre's Marxist theory of the production of space. My discussion is also informed by current theoretical understandings of social movements, of tourism and the organization of "tourist gazes", of the social construction and consumption of nature and the environment, and of the processes and consequences of globalization. This eclectic use of theory reflects the topic. If, as I have argued, activist ecotourism is given form by postmodern de-differentiation, then multiple theoretical orientations are useful in bringing to light how different processes and practices come together in this unique form of tourism/activism.

Activist ecotourism can be characterized as a post-Fordist form of post-tourism. This means that its practices are organized in specialized and flexible ways and incorporate a postmodern cultural paradigm rather than a modern one. As a form of post-tourism, activist ecotourism is marked by processes of de-differentiation, which means that various practices become conflated and simultaneous through ecotourism. For example, work, leisure, and activism become so intertwined that it is difficult to make discrete observations about each without regard to the others. Such de-differentiation affords the opportunity for creative social and political endeavors. In activist ecotourism, operators can earn a living while also practicing a form of environmental activism—but these work and activist activities cannot easily be separated from leisure practices either.

This does not mean that these people are simply capitalizing on the popularization and commodification of "nature" and "the environment". I have argued that ecotour operators, as activists, construct, elucidate, and disseminate alternative ideas of "nature" and "the environment" rather than merely reproducing dominant and reified conceptions. Indeed, their tours often offer critiques of popularized and commodified nature. Through ecotourism, these operators attempt to instill environmental/ecological identities that are more politically viable than the less controversial "green" identities available through various popular cultural practices. In part, this is achieved through the organization of tourist gazes that foreground the material impact of different conceptions of nature and the environment and invite ecotourists to reflect upon their own assumptions and lived practices.

This form of self-reflection can be divided into three forms of reflexivity: cognitive, aesthetic, and hermeneutic. Cognitive reflexivity characterizes individuals' rational attempts to contemplate their being-in-the-world, whereas aesthetic reflexivity characterizes their affective contemplations of becoming-in-the-world. Both of these forms of reflexivity involve a self-aware and purposeful creation of self-identity. Hermeneutic reflexivity, on the other hand, is a collective effort. It is constructed through the creation of shared epistemological and ontological understandings. This form of reflexivity becomes the basis of voluntary communities, such as social movement organizations, or subpolitical actions.

Activist-oriented ecotours are not environmental movement organizations; rather, they are part of the submerged network of the environment movement. As part of this network, these ecotours do some of the "cultural work" necessary for cognitive, aesthetic, and hermeneutic reflexivity. This "cultural work" involves producing and disseminating new significations and new ways of understanding, and existing in, the world. Through activist ecotourism,

ecotourists learn not only about the particular environmental politics of an area, but also about how to connect their lives to these environmental issues. The establishment of such a connection may motivate political action and membership in an environmental movement organization, or it may change the way an individual conducts her/his everyday life. It may result in both.

In order to prepare an ecotour site for this "cultural work", activist ecotour operators identify "local contexts of action". These localized contexts provide more actionable means of addressing environmental problems. Because the global environment can be rather abstract and difficult to motivate action around, finding specific areas for activist ecotourism involves the identification of locales that are affected by a variety of local and global processes and practices. Rather than simply treating these sites as self-evident reflections of reality, activist ecotour operators call attention to how each local environment has been socially organized and produced through a variety of local and global relations, and through different conceptions of nature and the environment.

These "local contexts of action" become activist spaces. Following Lefebvre, I have argued that the production of activist space involves three dialectical moments: spatial practices, representations of space, and spaces of representation. To reiterate, spatial practices reflect people's actual socio-spatial behaviours; representations of space reflect dominant ideas and organizations of space; and spaces of representation reflect people's creative uses and organization of space during the course of their everyday lives, and often in opposition to planned representations of space. "Local contexts of action" are created and organized by activist ecotour operators' resignifications of the spaces of "nature" and "the

environment". But activist ecotour operators also blur the spaces of work, leisure, and activism; in activist ecotourism, work and leisure spaces overlap with activist spaces.

These activist spaces of ecotourism are produced through various practices. In some instances, these spaces may be produced through educational research wherein ecotourists are invited to participate in the generation of scientific knowledge that counters dominant scientific notions of "the environment" and environmental risks. In other cases, ecotourists may be exposed to local knowledges and conceptions of nature and the environment. These local knowledges may be those espoused by environmental movement organizations to counter the claims of the forestry industry and/or local governments. Or, the production of activist spaces through ecotourism may involve the dissemination of particular ecological philosophies (e.g., Deep Ecology). In all these cases, the spaces of nature and the environment are resignified through ecotour operators' everyday practices and through ecotourists' consumption of an ecotour.

The visual cuing of an ecotour site also plays an important role in the production of activist spaces. As I noted above, activist ecotour operators order particular "tourist gazes" that demonstrate the material impact of different practices. These practices are based upon various conceptions of nature and the environment. As opposed to forms of modern, mass tourism that do not problematize the social construction of a tourist site, postmodern, post-tourism often involves the search for this social ordering. It is this search for the social in the natural landscape that provides ecotourism with its activist potential. By demonstrating how the social and natural cannot easily be separated, activist ecotour operators can help their clients to become more reflexive of the relationships between human practices and environmental degradation. This increased reflexivity, be it cognitive, aesthetic, and/or

hermeneutic, may help change people's environmental attitudes and behaviours and, in some cases, motivate, or increase, participation in environment movement organizations.

Urry (1992a) suggests that the growth of visual consumption through tourism has heightened many people's interest in the environment. I have argued that although this is true, the environmental movement in general has also played an important part. The environmental movement has been successful in raising environmental awareness and in inserting concerns about "the environment" into various social, political, and economic discourses. One drawback of this accomplishment, however, is that dominant institutions—often ones that have played a major role in environmental degradation—have developed their own ecological discourses in order to re-legitimate themselves as "green" institutions. As a result, "the political dimensions of environmental issues—their ability to foster collective discussion and contestation over meanings and relations—are swallowed up by instrumental, technocratic orientations" (Sandilands 1997:78).

The cooptation of environmental politics is also evident in some forms of tourism. Indeed, some ecotours can simply capitalize on the popularization and commodification of the environment, while refusing to reflect upon the ecological impact of their own touristic practices. These ecotours often cater to tourists with popularized and non-controversial "green" identities. An important difference between this type of ecotourism and "activist ecotourism" is that in the former, the consumption of the environment is an end in itself, whereas in the latter, the consumption of the environment is, ideally, a means to develop or increase tourists' reflexivity and environmental action. Where some ecotours merely want to provide an experience of particular environments, activist ecotourism attempts to change ecotourists through the experience.

In this thesis, I have not attempted to gauge the success of activist ecotourism. Instead, I have focused on the contemporary social, political, economic, and cultural changes that have made this form of tourism/activism possible, and I have discussed how three Vancouver Island ecotour operators practice environmental activism through their tours. My goal has been to explore the activist spaces that these people create during the courses of their everyday lives, spaces that may defy conventional notions of the appropriate spaces for political action. Indeed, when one thinks of social movements and political action, tourism generally does not come to mind because its practices are predominately thought of in terms of leisure. However, leisure, work, and activism can overlap, and in the process people can create spaces and opportunities for unconventional political endeavors.

Works Cited

Adams, W.M. 1996. *Future Nature: A Vision for Conservation*. London: Earthscan.

Altheide, David and John Johnson. 1998. "Criteria for Assessing Interpretive Validity in Qualitative Research". Pp. 283-312 in *Collecting and Interpreting Qualitative Materials*, edited by N. Denzin and Y. Lincoln. Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Amin, Ash. 1994. "Post-Fordism: Models, Fantasies and Phantoms of Transition". Pp. 1-39 in *Post-Fordism: A Reader*, edited by Ash Amin. Cambridge, USA: Blackwell.

Arnold, David. 1996. *The Problem of Nature: Environment, Culture, and European Expansion*. Cambridge, MA: Blackwell.

Atkinson, Paul and Martyn Hammersley. 1998. "Ethnography and Participant Observation". Pp. 110-33 in *Strategies of Qualitative Inquiry*, edited by N. Denzin and Y. Lincoln. Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Bandy, Joe. 1996. "Managing the Other of Nature: Sustainability, Spectacle, and the Global Regimes of Capital in Ecotourism". *Public Culture* 8:539-66.

Beck, Ulrich. 1992. *Risk Society: Towards a New Modernity*. London: Sage.

_____. 1994. "The Reinvention of Politics: Towards a Theory of Reflexive Modernization". Pp. 1-55 in *Reflexive Modernization: Politics, Tradition and Aesthetics in the Modern Social Order*, edited by Ulrich Beck, Anthony Giddens and Scott Lash. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

_____. 1995. *Ecological Politics In An Age of Risk*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

_____. 1996. "Risk Society and the Provident State". Pp. 27-43 in *Risk, Environment, and Modernity: Towards a New Ecology*, edited by Scott Lash, Bronislaw Szerszynski and Brian Wynne. Thousand Oaks: Sage.

_____. 1996. "World Risk Society? Ecological Questions in a Framework of Manufactured Uncertainties". *Theory, Culture and Society* 13:1-32.

_____. 1997. *The Reinvention of Politics: Rethinking Modernity in the Global Social Order*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Boo, Elizabeth. 1990. *Ecotourism: The Potentials and Pitfalls*. Vol. I. Maryland: World Wildlife Fund.

Britton, S. 1991. "Tourism, Capital, and Place: Towards a Critical Geography of Tourism". *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 9:451-78.

Burningham, Kate and Martin O'Brien. 1994. "Global Environmental Values and Local Contexts of Action". *Sociology* 28:913-31.

Craik, Jennifer. 1997. "The Culture of Tourism". Pp. 113-36 in *Touring Cultures: Transformations of Travel and Theory*, edited by Chris Rojek and John Urry. New York: Routledge.

Crang, Philip. 1997. "Performing the Tourist Product". Pp. 137-54 in *Touring Cultures: Transformations of Travel and Theory*, edited by Chris Rojek and John Urry. New York: Routledge.

Cronon, William. 1996. "Introduction: In Search of Nature". Pp. 23-56 in *Uncommon Ground: Rethinking the Human Place in Nature*, edited by William Cronon. New York: Norton.

Culler, Jonathan. 1981. "Semiotics of Tourism". *American Journal of Semiotics* 1:127-40.

Eden, S.E. 1993. "Individual Environmental Responsibility and Its Role in Public Environmentalism". *Environment and Planning A* 25:1743-1758.

Eder, Klaus. 1996a *The Social Construction of Nature.* London: Sage

_____. 1996b. "The Institutionalization of Environmentalism: Ecological Discourse and the Second Transformation of the Public Sphere". Pp. 203-23 in *Risk, Environment, and Modernity: Toward a New Ecology*, edited by Scott Lash, Bronislaw Szerszynski and Brian Wynne. Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Elam, Mark. 1994. "Puzzling Out the Post-Fordist Debate: Technology, Markets and Institutions"".. Pp. 43-70 in *Post-Fordism: A Reader*, edited by Ash Amin. Cambridge, USA: Blackwell.

Esser, Josef and Joachim Hirsch. 1994. "The Crisis of Fordism and the Dimensions of a 'Post-Fordist" Regional and Urban Structure". Pp. 71-97 in *Post-Fordism: A Reader*, edited by Ash Amin. Cambridge, USA: Blackwell.

Evernden, Neil. 1992. *The Social Creation of Nature*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Eyerman, Ron and Andrew Jamison. 1989. "Environmental Knowledge as an Organizational Weapon: The Case of Greenpeace". *Social Science Information* 28:99-119.

_____. 1991. *Social Movements: A Cognitive Approach.* Pennsylvania: Pennsylvania State University Press.

Fabijancic, Tony. "The Dialectics of Modernity: Reification, Space, and Vision".

Rethinking Marxism. 8(3):90-108, 1995.

Fox, Warwick. 1995. *Toward a Transpersonal Ecology: Developing New Foundations for Environmentalism*. New York: State University of New York Press.

Frow, John. 1991. "Tourism and the Semiotics of Nostalgia". *October* 57:123-51.

Giddens, Anthony. 1984. *The Constitution of Society*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

_____. 1990. *The Consequences of Modernity*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

_____. 1992. *The Transformation of Identity*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

_____. 1994. "Living in a Post-Traditional Society". Pp. 56-109 in *Reflexive Modernization: Politics, Tradition and Aesthetics in the Modern Social Order*, edited by Ulrich Beck, Anthony Giddens and Scott Lash. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Gregory, Derek. 1994. *Geographical Imaginations*. Cambridge, MA: Blackwell.

Hajer, Maarten A. 1996. "Ecological Modernization as Cultural Politics". Pp. 246-68 in *Risk, Environment, and Modernity: Toward a New Ecology*, edited by Scott Lash, Bronislaw Szerszynski and Brian Wynne. Thousand Oaks: Sage.

_____. 1995. *The Politics of Environmental Discourse: Ecological Modernization and the Policy Process*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Harvey, David. 1990. *The Condition of Postmodernity*. Cambridge, MA: Blackwell.

_____. 1996. *Justice, Nature and the Geography of Difference*. Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Hinchliffe, Steve. 1996. "Helping the Earth Begins at Home: The Social Construction of Socio-Environmental Responsibilities". *Global Environmental Change*. 6:53-62.

Hvenegaard, Glen T. 1994. "Ecotourism: A Status Report and Conceptual Framework". *The Journal of Tourism Studies* 5:24-35.

Jamison, Andrew. 1996. "The Shaping of the Global Environmental Agenda: The Role of Non-Governmental Organizations". Pp. 224-45 in *Risk, Environment, and Modernity: Toward a New Ecology*, edited by Scott Lash, Bronislaw Szerszynski and Brian Wynne. Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Jay, Martin. 1992. "Scopic Regimes of Modernity". In *Modernity and Identity*, edited by Scott Lash and Jonathan Friedman. Cambridge, MA: Blackwell.

Jokinen, Eeva and Veijola. 1997. "The Disoriented Tourist: The Figuration of the Tourist in Contemporary Cultural Critique". Pp. 23-51 in *Touring Cultures: Transformations of Travel and Theory*, edited by Chris Rojek and John Urry. New York: Routledge.

Kofman, E. and E. Lebas. 1996. "Lost in Transposition: Time, Space and the City". Pp. 3-60. In *Writings on Cities*. Edited by E. Kofman and E. Lebas. Cambridge, MA: Blackwell. 3-60.

Krippendorf, Jost. 1989. *The Holiday Makers: Understanding the Impact of Leisure and Travel*. Oxford: Heinemann.

Lash, Scott. 1989. *Sociology of Postmodernism*. New York: Routledge.

_____. 1993. "Reflexive Modernization: The Aesthetic Dimension". *Theory, Culture and Society* 10:1-23.

_____. 1994. "Reflexivity and Its Doubles: Structure, Aesthetics, Community". Pp. 110-73 in *Reflexive Modernization: Politics, Tradition and Aesthetics in the Modern Social Order*, edited by Ulrich Beck, Anthony Giddens and Scott Lash. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Lash, Scott and John Urry. 1994. *Economies of Signs and Space*. London: Sage.

Lefebvre, Henri. 1976. *The Survival of Capitalism: Reproduction of the Relations of Production*. London: Allison and Busby.

_____. 1979. "Space: Social Product and Use Value". Translated by J.W. Freiberg. Pp. 285-95 in *Critical Sociology*, edited and translated by J.W. Freiberg. New York: Irvington.

_____. 1991a. *Critique of Everyday Life: Vol. I Introduction*. New York: Verso.

_____. 1991b. *The Production of Space*. Cambridge, MA: Blackwell.

_____. 1996. *Writings on Cities*. Cambridge, MA: Blackwell.

Levin, David Michael. 1993. *Modernity and the Hegemony of Vision*. Edited by David Michael Levin. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Lofland, John. 1995. "Analytic Ethnography: Features, Failings, and Futures". *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography* 20(1):30-67.

MacCannell, Dean. 1976. *The Tourist: A New Theory of the Leisure Class*. New York: Schocken Books.

Macnaghten, Phil and John Urry. 1998. *Contested Natures*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Magnusson, Warren and Rob Walker. 1988. "De-Centring the State: Political Theory and Canadian Political Economy". *Studies in Political Economy*. 26:37-71.

Magnusson, Warren. 1996. *The Search for Political Space: Globalization, Social Movements, and the Urban Political Experience*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

_____. 1997. "Globalization, Movements and the Decentred State". Pp. 94-113 in *Organizing Dissent: Contemporary Social Movements in Theory and Practice*. Edited by William K. Carroll. Toronto: Garamond Press.

_____. forthcoming. "hyperspace: A Political Ontology of the Global City". In *Governing Modern Societies*. Edited by Richard V. Ericson and Nico Stehr. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Marx, Karl. 1976. *Capital: A Critique of Political Economy Vol. 1*. New York: Penguin.

_____. 1977. *Karl Marx: Selected Writings*. Edited by David McLellan. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Massey, Doreen. 1993 "Power-Geometry and a Progressive Sense of Place". Pp. 59-69 in *Mapping the Futures: Local Cultures, Global Change*. Edited by Jon Bird et al. New York: Routledge.

McLaren, Deborah. 1998. *Rethinking Tourism and Ecotourism: The Paving of Paradise and What You Can Do To Stop It*. Connecticut: Kumarian Press.

Melucci, Alberto. 1989. *Nomads of the Present: Social Movements and Individual Needs in Contemporary Society*. London: Hutchinson Radius.

_____. 1994. "A Strange Kind of Newness: What's "New" in New Social Movements?" Pp. 101-30 in *New Social Movements: From Ideology to Identity*, edited by Enrique Larana et al. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Molotch, Harvey. 1993. "The Space of Lefebvre". *Theory and Society*. 22:887-895.

Mowforth, Martin and Ian Munt. 1998. *Tourism and Sustainability: New Tourism and the Third World*. London: Routledge.

Munt, Ian. 1994a. "The "Other" Postmodern Tourism: Culture, Travel and the New Middle Class". *Theory, Culture, and Society* 12:101-23.

_____. 1994b. "Eco-Tourism or Ego-Tourism?" *Race and Class* 36(1):49-60.

Myers, G. and P. Macnaghten. 1998. "Rhetorics of Environmental Sustainability: Commonplaces and Places". *Environment and Planning A* 30:333-353.

Naess, Arne. 1989. *Ecology, Community, and Lifestyle*. Translated and Edited by David Rothenberg. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Oelsclaeger, Max. 1991. *The Idea of Wilderness: From Prehistory to the Age of Ecology*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Peck, Jamie and Adam Tickell. 1994. "Searching for a New Institutional Fix: the After-Fordist Crisis and the Global-Local Disorder". Pp. 280-315 in *Post-Fordism: A Reader*, edited by Ash Amin. Cambridge, USA: Blackwell.

Ritzer, George and Allan Liska. 1997. ""McDisneyization" and "Post-Tourism"".. Pp. 96-109 in *Touring Cultures: Transformations of Travel and Theory*, edited by Chris Rojek and John Urry. New York: Routledge.

Rojek, Chris. 1994. *Ways of Escape: Modern Transformations in Leisure and Travel*. Maryland: Rowman and Littlefield.

_____. 1995. *Decentring Leisure*. London: Sage.

Rojek, Chris and John Urry. 1997. "Transformations of Travel and Theory". Pp. 1-19 in *Touring Cultures: Transformations of Travel and Theory*, edited by Chris Rojek and John Urry. New York: Routledge.

Sandilands, Catriona. 1997. "Is the Personal Always Political? Environmentalism in Arendt's Age of 'the Social'" Pp. 76-93 in *Organizing Dissent: Contemporary Social Movements in Theory and Practice*. Edited by William K. Carroll. Toronto: Garamond Press.

Sharpley, Richard. 1994. *Tourism, Tourists, and Society*. Cambridge: ELM.

Shaw, Gareth and Allan Williams. 1994. *Critical Issues in Tourism*. Cambridge, MA: Blackwell.

Smith, Neil. 1984. *Uneven Development: Nature, Capital, and the Production of Space*. New York: Basil Blackwell.

Swinglehurst, Edmund. 1982. *Cook's Tours: The Story of Popular Travel*. Dorset: Blandford Press.

Szerszynski, Bronislaw. 1996. "On Knowing What to Do: Environmentalism and the Modern Problematic". Pp. 104-37 in *Risk, Environment, and Modernity: Toward a New Ecology*, edited by Scott Lash, Bronislaw Szerszynski and Brian Wynne. Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Urry, John. 1990. *The Tourist Gaze: Leisure and Travel in Contemporary Societies*. London: Sage.

_____. 1992a. "The Tourist Gaze and the "Environment"".. *Theory, Culture, and Society* 9:1-26.

_____. 1992b. "The Tourist Gaze Revisited". *American Behavioral Scientist* 36:172-86.

_____. 1994. "Time, Leisure, and Social Identity". *Time and Society* 3:131-49.

_____. 1995. *Consuming Places*. New York: Routledge.

Whelan, Tensie. 1991. "Ecotourism and Its Role in Sustainable Development". Pp. 3-22 in *Nature Tourism: Managing for the Environment*, edited by Tensie Whelan. Covelo: Island Press.

Williams, Raymond. 1972. "Ideas of Nature". Pp. 129-45 in *Ecology, the Shaping Enquiry*, edited by Jonathan Benthall. London: Longman.

Wolff, Janet. 1990. *Feminine Sentences*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Wood, Megan Epler. 1991. "Global Solutions: An Ecotourism Society". Pp. 200-06 in *Nature Tourism: Managing for the Environment*, edited by Tensie Whelan. Covelo: Island Press.

Wynne, Brian. 1996. "May the Sheep Safely Graze? A Reflexive View of the Expert-Lay Knowledge Divide". Pp. 44-83 in *Risk, Environment, and Modernity: Toward a New Ecology*, edited by Scott Lash, Bronislaw Szerszynski and Brian Wynne. Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Yearly Steven. 1991. *The Green Case*. New York: Routledge.

_____. 1996. *Sociology, Environmentalism, Globalization.* Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Appendix: Interview Questions

1. How did you get started with conducting ecotours? Was this influenced by your environmental activism or sense of a need for environmental protection? Or did your environmental activism arise from your experiences with ecotourism? Have you ever been an ecotourist? If so, where? Would you like to discuss your experience?

2. How long have you been involved in ecotourism? How has ecotourism changed during this time? How have your ecotours changed? Why do you think these changes occurred? Was there any event that caused you to change the way you conduct your tours?

3. What are your goals in providing tourists with an ecotour "experience"? What makes a good ecotour? What makes a poor ecotour? What makes a good ecotour guide? What makes a poor ecotour guide? What makes a good tourist? What makes a poor tourist? Do you have any stories about a good or bad ecotour experience?

4. How do you choose the specific locations for your ecotours? Are these places close to your home? Close to your community? What makes a good ecotour site? What aspects of the B.C. environment do you try to foreground? Does this involve tours of destructive human interventions in the natural environment (clear-cut logging areas...)?

5. How is Vancouver Island a good location for conducting ecotours? How is the business/economic climate for ecotourism (e.g. employment opportunity, government involvement, number of ecotours etc.)? Do you interact with the B.C. government (Ministry of Small Business, Tourism, and Culture)? If so, what is your relationship? How has the B.C. government helped and/or hindered you in your business?

6. Do you have a relationship with other people conducting ecotours? Are these relationships competitive or is there mutual support and respect? Do these relations stem from Vancouver Island? Other places in B.C.? Canada? Are you in contact with ecotour operators/guides from anywhere else in the world?

7. Where do you advertise? Do you have a "web-page"? What clientele do you *try* to attract? Whom do you attract? Are any of your clientele from locations outside of Canada?

8. According to most definitions of ecotourism, ecotours should promote an environmental awareness through educative and interactive tours conducted by knowledgeable (usually "local") guides. Does this accurately reflect how you conduct your ecotours? What are the specific aspects of your ecotours that reflect an educative program? How do you "teach" environmentalism? How successful do you feel you have been?

9. How do tourist respond to your ecotours? Generally, do you feel that they gain a respect for the environment after an ecotour? Or are tourists mainly interested in seeing the "sites" of Vancouver Island? In other words, in your experience, are the tourists you

have guided more interested in Vancouver Island's scenery or are they genuinely interested in environmental protection? What's the difference between just "seeing the sites" and learning about the environment?

10. Do you feel that tourists can become environmental activists through ecotourism? Does environmental activism involve a diversity of action? Is ecotourism inspirational? Do you think it promotes a desire to get involved in the environmental movement?

11. Aside from your involvement with ecotourism, describe your activities within the environmental movement? Do you regularly participate in an environmental organization (meetings, organizing, protesting, fund-raising etc)?

12. Are you familiar with the Ecotourism Society or any other international (or national) ecotourism organization? If yes, are you involved? Please describe your involvement? If no, would this be the type of environmental organization you would be involved with?

13. There are many perspectives within the environmental movement; consequently, there may be some conflict between environmental organizations. Has an environmental organization ever criticized you or your business for conducting ecotours. If so, would you like to discuss this criticism? Do you know of any criticisms of ecotourism in general that you would like to discuss?

14. Are your ecotours endorsed by any environmental movement organizations like the Western Wilderness Committee, the Sierra Club, Greenpeace etc.? If so, please describe the relationship between your ecotour and the environmental movement organization? Do they send you customers? Do you recommend them to your clients? Do they "officially" endorse you through their literature? Do you include their endorsement in your brochures?

15. What environmental "philosophy" do you subscribe to? How do you incorporate these particular views on environmental activism into your ecotours? Do you consider your ecotours as part the general idea of "sustainable development"? Or do you see your ecotours as an alternative to, or something other than, "sustainable development"? For example, do your ecotours follow a more "radical" or "deep" ecological idea? Do your ecotours provide a critique of the economy and its effects on the environment in general? Or are you mainly concerned with preserving/protecting specific areas? In other words, is there any specific environmental "camp" that you feel corresponds to your views on, and involvement in, the environmental movement.

16. What do you feel are the most dangerous human activities that cause environmental degradation? In your opinion, how are these solvable? What do you think is ecotourism's role in solving environmental problems?

17. How do local environmental issues affect your ecotours? How about global environmental issues? Are there differences between local and global environmental issues?

18. Can ecotourism cause environmental degradation? What are the environmental risks of ecotourism?

19. Do you think it matters if ecotours are owned and controlled by tourism corporations? Or do you think ecotours are better conducted as small businesses by "locals"? Why?

20. How do you feel about making a living through ecotourism? Do you feel there are any "conflicts" between working in the tourism industry and also being involved in the environmental movement?

21. From your perspective, what makes up the "environment"?

22. Can ecotourism also be considered cultural tourism? Do you feel that tourists learn about your culture through an ecotour? What is your cultural affiliation? Do you incorporate any discussion of Indigenous Peoples, their cultures, politics (especially land-claims) into you ecotours?

23. The tourist industry is very important to Vancouver Island's economy. Predominantly, Victoria is modeled upon a notion about "Englishness." In other words, heritage tourism is a remarkable phenomenon in Victoria. Do you think heritage tourism of this sort is a form of ecotourism? Are history, architecture, and museums part of environmental preservation? In other words, is the "environment" restricted to mountains, trees, fauna, streams, oceans etc.? Or can ecotourism include "cultural" things.

Vita

Surname: Hart — Given Names: Randle Joseph

Place of Birth: Surrey, British Columbia, Canada
Date of Birth: January 4, 1971

Educational Institutions Attended:

University of Victoria	1997-2000
University of Victoria	1993-1997
Kwantlen University College	1989-1990; 1992-3
Western Washington University	1992

Degrees Awarded:

B.A., honours	University of Victoria, 1997

Awards:

University of Victoria Graduate Fellowship	1997-1999
Robert Hagedorn Graduate Scholarship	1997-1998
Howard E. Petch Research Scholarship	1997-1998
Sociology Honours Essay Award	1996-1997
Roy E. L. Watson Scholarship	1996-1997

Committees:

University of Victoria Sociology Chair Search Committee	1999
University of Victoria Faculty of Social Science Strategic Action Planning Committee	1999-2000

Teaching and Research Assistantships:

Teaching Assistant, Sociology 103 *Canadian Society*	1999 (Summer Session)
Teaching Assistant, Sociology 385 *Sociology of Aging*	1999 (Summer Session)
Research Assistant, *Dr. Zheng Wu*	1999-2000

Presentations:

Zheng Wu and Randy Hart. "Marital and Nonmarital Union Separation in Canada." Paper presented at the Workshop on "Assortative Partnership Decisions, Division of Work in the Household and Union." Special Research Centre 186, University of Bremen, Bremen, Germany, December 10-11, 1999.

Partial Copyright License

I hereby grant the right to lend my thesis to users of the University of Victoria Library, and to make single copies only for such users or in response to a request from the Library of any other university, or similar institution, on its behalf or for one of its users. I further agree that permission for extensive copying of this thesis for scholarly purposes may be granted by me or a member of the University designated by me. It is understood that copying or publication of this thesis for financial gain shall not be allowed without my written permission.

Title of thesis:

New Natures in Tourism: Local Ecotourism and Environmental Activism

Author [redacted]

Randle Joseph Hart
April 17, 2000