

**'Tourable' Difference:
Exploring identity and politics on a tour of Lake Titicaca**

By

Caitlin Emily Craven
B.Soc.Sc., University of Ottawa, 2007

A Thesis Submitted in Partial Fulfilment of the
Requirements for the Degree of
MASTER OF ARTS
in the Department of Political Science

© Caitlin Emily Craven, 2009
University of Victoria

All rights reserved. This thesis may not be reproduced in whole or in part, by photocopy or other means, without the permission of the author.

‘Tourable’ Difference: Exploring identity and politics on a tour of Lake Titicaca

By

Caitlin Emily Craven

B.Soc.Sc., University of Ottawa, 2007

Supervisory Committee

Dr. Michelle Bonner, Supervisor
(Department of Political Science)

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

Dr. Feng Xu, Departmental Member
(Department of Political Science)

Supervisory Committee

Dr. Michelle Bonner, Supervisor
(Department of Political Science)

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

Dr. Feng Xu, Departmental Member
(Department of Political Science)

ABSTRACT

In this thesis I explore the practices of ethnic tourism on three island communities of Lake Titicaca, Peru. I employ ethnic tourism to mean the process whereby communities, peoples, or bodies are produced as sites of tourist attraction (objects of touristic gaze). Through various temporal and spatial processes of othering, these formed objects are produced as performers of a ‘tourable’ difference, primarily defined by a removal from the present space of politics through their representations as objects of the past. Thus the privilege of the mobile tourist is (re)inscribed in the practice of touring the stable difference of the ‘toured’ and appropriating this into the formation of a more cosmopolitan self.

This story, which reflects a common concern for touring as a (neo)-imperial/colonial encounter (particularly in the ‘developing’ world) is, however, insufficient for accessing the intensely contested politics of local experiences of the tour. This is particularly the case when we attempt to discuss the meaning of ‘being toured’, how this identity is experienced, and its political implications. Through an exploration of the practices of local tour guides and toured communities on Lake Titicaca, coupled with theoretical concerns for critical approaches to identity, subjectivity, and agency, I begin to explore ways of talking about the toured as constitutive and active negotiators within touristic space. Specifically, I highlight how ‘difference’ is governed and contested through practices of performing and guiding. I also reflect on how these practices (re)articulate or challenge the authorization of particular ‘differences’ as objects of the tour.

Table of Contents

Supervisory Committee	ii
Abstract.....	iii
Table of Contents	iv
Acknowledgements	v
Introducing the Politics of Tourism	1
Methods and structure (or, how the journey will proceed).....	5
Chapter One: A Guide To/Through Tourism Studies	10
Tourism as a field of study	10
The tourist as a modern subject	15
Ethnic tourism as/in anthropology.....	24
Changing the subject of tourism: Subjectivity, agency, and identity	29
Conclusion	39
Chapter Two: Tracing ‘Tourable’ Objects	41
Temporal bordering: Historicizing the object of the tour	41
Imperial times, global boundaries	43
The problematic of development	48
Touring the space of difference	51
Indigeneity in the Peruvian Andes	52
Authorized indigeneity and the politics of hybridity	65
Conclusion	69
Chapter Three: “Aquí nació el imperio, aquí nació el Perú”	71
A tourist’s history of Peru.....	71
The object of tourism policy.....	74
Picturing the lake: Origin, mystery, and tradition	79
“The sacred lake in the eyes of the world”	84
Chapter Four: Practices of Performing Difference on Lake Titicaca	88
Governing performances, contesting authenticity	89
Negotiating the free market: The problem of competition	109
Conclusion	119
Bibliography	124
Appendix	133

Acknowledgements

Writing this thesis has been the frustrating and enlivening circumscription of varied discussions and experiences—an exercise made possible by the brilliant complexities of all the people and structures who contributed to forming its pages. Les agradezco mucho a los pobladores de Puno y el lago, y a todos ellos que compartieron conmigo sus reflexiones, quejas y confusiones durante mis excursiones. As I can only express these explorations in English, I acknowledge what may have shifted in translation and appreciate those people who worked on my fluency listening in another language. I would also like to acknowledge the support of the Department of Political Science, the University of Victoria, and particularly SSHRC, which provided the necessary material tools to explore.

Throughout this process there have been strong guiding voices and encounters that have meant as much as the ‘material’ I present. I thank my supervisor, Dr. Michelle Bonner, for always being available and for teaching me a great deal through our encounters. I am particularly grateful to Dr. Warren Magnusson for his support of my various meanderings and his questions about the political. As well, I thank Dr. Feng Xu for demonstrating enormous ability to engage complexity and for her insights into translation. To those of my fellow students who read, discussed, and mused on these themes with me at length, either in the office or over our many coffee breaks, I appreciate the care, guidance, and support that have made this project possible.

The following discussions owe a great deal to my experiences of perpetual transience and discomfort, for which I am very appreciative. I am also grateful to Jennifer, for her skilful editing and for experiencing our ‘unhoming’ differently, and to my father for his challenging adherence to structure and truth. Finally, and with particular affection, to those few who have the patience to be my friends, thank you for all the hours.

to explore difference, but rather as a network of practices that produce and shape the categories of identity.

My central proposition here is that we can locate the politics of tourism not only in the macro-political-economic structures and policies that appear to produce touristic sites, but also in the constituting practices of touring and being toured within those sites. Specifically, I look at a form of touring, the ethnic tour, wherein communities and people form tourist attractions (the sites of the tourists' gaze). By exploring practices of touring three island communities on Lake Titicaca, I am interested in exploring how 'the toured'¹ engage in the practices that bind and form their identities as ethnic indigenous² 'objects' of our desires. Put simply, ethnic tourism is a site of identity politics. However, instead of locating this politics in the meeting of two or more 'identities' (cultures, ethnicities), or the exploitation of one culture by another, I turn attention to the details of producing and performing the tour wherein are formed and (re)produced the meaning of touring and being toured as an object of difference.

Ethnic tourism is the search for authentic difference, located in spaces and peoples that the privileged traveller can visit and discover. While ethnic touring has been studied in various forms as it relates to the tourist (Van den Berghe 1994, Dunn 2004), there is a limited body of work that takes the toured as its focus. Ethnographic studies have had the most intimate connection with the lives and practices of the toured (Zorn 2004, Little 2002); however, this is troubled by the ideational structures that undergird the touring

¹ I borrow the term 'toured' from Van den Berghe's (1994) term 'touree' to refer to those people who are the object of ethnic tourism. The objectifying implication of the word itself is intentional and serves to highlight our limited capacity to engage with these people.

² In this thesis I generally use 'indigenous' to describe the particular identification of peoples descended from the primary inhabitants of the Americas. At times I will quote people who use the word Indian, or the Spanish *indio*, which reflects their choice of vocabulary. However, at times I employ 'indian' strategically to highlight the racialized tensions of this form of touring.

encounter. Taking apart tourism as a practice of objectification involves reflecting on the epistemological link between the object of research and adventure (as the various desires that produce the difference ‘we’ encounter). Thus a central aim here is not only to bring the toured into focus as engaged subjects of the tour, but to posit ways of talking about this engagement that do not return them as objects of analysis to the pages of our travel journals.

I argue in this thesis that the mechanisms and structures of international ethnic tourism form a network of powers that govern and produce particular kinds of subjects/objects of the tour and that facilitate its constant reproduction as a normalized experience of a past ‘otherness’ for the modern tourist. Imperialist and historicist renderings of time and space create the ‘object’ of the tour as temporally and spatially distinct from the modern world of the tourist, effectively writing the tour as a reflexive activity for the tourist to learn about the past through an experience of traditional difference and from this come to a better understanding of the ‘self’. These structures do not exist externally to the toured; rather, they are produced in the very *practices* of the tour – in the very actions of the toured. Thus I argue that by looking at these daily practices in the particular production of touristic sites, we can see the toured not as objects of otherness or as victims of an external structure, but as agents engaged in the terms of their identities, bound in particular ways but not ultimately determined.

For ethnic touring the most common object is the ‘indigenous’ community, articulated as the most distant and authentic form of difference. The communities I explore in this piece are part of the indigenous cultures of Peru; however, instead of inscribing indigeneity as the object of analysis, my focus is on the making and performing

of toured identities through the conflictual space of the local touristic site. In other words, the central question is what are the practices and implications of making these identities 'tourable'? Through this localized analysis, I implicate the broader forms of subjectivity and structures of inequality produced through touring engagements. I contend that the making of political identities is located in much more specific interactions than, for example, relations with 'the state', and that we as researchers in this regard may have misunderstood the importance of tourism to those people who participate in it. Questions of how touristic spaces and identities are formed are not easily accessed through standard accounts of indigenous politics that focus, in the Peruvian case, on the lack of national mobilization or political parties. In a world replete with touring experiences (where touring has become one of the central markers of the well-trained student of the world), it may be that the tourist-toured relation is fundamentally important to understanding how people are formed as ethnic subjects and interact as agents. The tourist identity is one defined by privileged mobility and the perceived *right* to access peoples and spaces for learning or pleasure. Where this right is exercised, in the case of ethnic tourism, the toured are consolidated as removed from our time and privilege and attached to a particular space. While I reflect in this piece on how the toured act within this space, it is nonetheless the unequal bindings of mobility and stasis, present and past, active and passive, that are the formative conditions for reproducing the various structures that naturalize touring as an effect of difference.

I explore these ideas through the mechanisms and functioning of tourism in the Lake Titicaca region of Peru. The city of Puno, located on the shores of the lake, is one of the most popular destinations for tourists in the country. From the city-port, tourists

take boat tours out to the island communities of the Uros, Taquile, and Amantaní for day trips or overnight stays that provide access to an experience of Andean indigenous culture. On this once-in-a-lifetime ride, tourists are presented with stunning scenery and the calm, legible cultures of the lake's inhabitants. In actuality, these presentations are produced through the complex governing practices of the local tour guides, reflecting the national and international governing of space through promotional material and historical imaginings of Andean space. Amantaneños, Taquileños, and the Uros reproduce and perform these imaginings, but in ways that often conflict with the distinctions maintained by tour guides. While there are global processes at work in the rendering of touristic space, the particularities of these imaginings and how they are contested and negotiated is a question of the specific practices of the site – in this case the relationship between Puno and the islands. What will become ironically clear as I proceed through this piece is that there is nothing straightforward about these processes and practices or their implications; however, it may be that striving for complexity rather than parsimony is the only strategy available to 'write' these people as agents.

Methods and structure (or, how the journey will proceed)

My choice of Puno as my empirical site of study is primarily based on my experience as a tourist there; however, it is also a highly relevant site as the region is characterized by enormous inequality and tourism is currently the primary development strategy. Additionally, the importance of *incanismo*, the complex cultural movements valorizing Inca heritage, has produced Peru more broadly as one of the primary tourist attractions for the contemporary globe-trotter. Although I would suggest my insights are not solely applicable to Puno, my arguments are contextually based. As an exploratory exercise, my aim is to draw attention to how touristic practices form these spaces and

people through constantly negotiated performances. While I rely on certain historical patterns, my concern is the current practices and negotiations of tourism in the context of neoliberal multiculturalism in Peru (since 2001) and the rise in mass global tourism and celebrations of indigeneity (which dates back roughly to the 1970s).

Focusing on practices, I take up a particular approach to agency as a way to contribute to our understanding of political engagement. Employing conceptual tools from various works of social and political theory (primarily building on Foucaultian concepts through the work of Homi Bhabha and Judith Butler), I locate agency within the structures of power that define the terms of, but do not determine, identities and actions. I also take these conceptualizations to reflect on a particular concern for starting points. In taking up the toured, I critique the scholarly focus on tourists as the primary actors of tourism – a focus that replicates the privilege of this position. I do this not to reverse the focus, but to take the various subjects of the tour as produced through and dependent on the practices of tourism for their identities, but actively engaged in these terms. For the purpose of delimiting the argument I present the *figure* of the tourist as a way to shift the focus, which is highly problematic (though, in the end, the individual tourist is largely irrelevant for toured communities). Further, in emphasizing the toured, I am not proposing to ‘speak’ *for* them, but to trouble my own position as tourist and researcher by working with these tensions in the crafting of my narrative.

In chapter one I examine certain telling examples of tourism studies literature as a way of setting up the field and how the tourist is figured and reproduced as a modern subject. Particularly, I see certain approaches in sociology and especially ethnographic work reproducing the conditions through which the ethnic tour functions as the natural

discovery and appropriation of difference. From this, I present approaches to power, identity, and agency that provide conceptual tools for us to read touristic spaces and identities in ways that challenge these assumptions.

From this refiguring of the 'subject' of tourism, I move in chapter two to an examination of the making of (ethnic) touristic space through processes of temporal and spatial definition. I use this to engage the tensions of anthropological and touristic articulations of time and the function of history as a guide to identifying spaces and posing particular questions, while possibly eliding others. Here, and throughout, I raise the role of 'development', as a site of ambiguity where governing practices and contestations are exercised. The particular makings of space that I examine here are not comprehensive, but rather relate to how Puno and Lake Titicaca are figured. In other words, while I suspect these renderings are reflected in the practices of many other sites, they are not necessarily the only way ethnic touristic space can be made.

Chapter three poses the question of how these particular renderings of time and place are produced and practiced in discursive mechanisms of writing touristic space. I review examples of national and international tourism documents (including legislation, government reports, and promotional material) in light of the previous arguments to demonstrate *how* Puno and Lake Titicaca are imagined. This is not a comprehensive study, as there is far too much material produced on tourism each year, but rather selects particularly important documents and material published by PromPerú and MINCETUR³, and the most recent publications of international tour companies such as G.A.P.

³ MINCETUR is the acronym for the *Ministerio de Comercio Exterior y Turismo* (Ministry of International Trade and Tourism). The tourism branch of this ministry heads the *Comisión de Promoción del Perú para la Exportación y el Turismo* (PromPerú) (Commission for the Promotion of Peru for Export and Tourism).

Adventures, iExplore, Intrepid, and Gecko Tours⁴. I have found that much of the work on the imperialism (neo-colonialism) of tourism tends to focus the analysis on these practices, and so part of setting up the discursive making of touristic sites is to further complicate it.

Thus, my final chapter takes on the complexity of these seemingly totalizing practices through the ambiguity of touring encounters I explored in the field work I conducted in Puno during September 2008. The methods I employed in this work owe a great deal to anthropological approaches taken in (some of the only) studies of ethnic tourism that focus on the toured. These approaches included interviews with tour guides and NGO interns and workers, as well as participant observation of several tours⁵. However, in contrast to an anthropological focus on how people make meaning through culture, I read the daily activity of tourism through politically contested representations and terms of engagement. I locate this politics specifically in the relations between the toured communities of the lake and tour guides from Puno as one site where these identities are performed. Rather than try and reproduce an authentic representation of my 'results' (the spoken words of those I interviewed), I take seriously my role as translator (that is shaping the conversations into the language of my argument), and the function of these arguments as a political position. Further, in the context of the interviews themselves it became clear that subtle repetitions of themes or what was left unsaid was just as impactful as the spoken words. As an interesting limitation of my research, I was unable to speak directly with community members, a result of the particular academic

⁴ These companies were selected largely at random as examples of the most popular/well know international tour agencies. As all tour companies outsource tours in Puno-Lake Titicaca to local agencies, I was not able to find out whether these companies run the majority of tours to the region.

⁵ See Appendix 1 for breakdown of interviews and tours.

hurdles associated with conducting research in indigenous communities and because it can be difficult to get community members to talk to researchers as they have been the subjects of various studies and development efforts. Thus in an effort to make this project manageable, I accepted the limitations posed by these ‘missing voices’ – a limitation that pervades the reflections offered throughout this piece. Although I initially read my interviews with guides as providing only secondary ‘access’ to the toured, they also opened interesting spaces of reflection on the ambiguities of our various positions. Local tour guides are often from indigenous communities in the region and so occupy a rather strange position as part of the ‘toured’ and also connected to the tourist. As we shall see, this ambiguity is highly productive for understanding how toured communities engage with local structures and the terms on which those engagements are possible.

Throughout this piece I attempt to implicate the conditions that make ethnic tourism both possible and normal through writing the objects of our desires as subjects within power negotiating the terms of their representation. What follows, as we think through tourism, is not a call for an ethical tourism project or freedom from the restraints of tourism, but rather an engagement with mechanisms. In many ways, this project aims quite modestly to simply pose questions and concerns about our epistemological structures and practices of producing privilege through difference, but they are questions that have not received sufficient regard in how we locate the politics of tourism.

Chapter One: A Guide To/Through Tourism Studies

Tourism as a field of study

The scholarly work held together under the rubric of ‘tourism studies’ (outside tourism management and leisure departments) forms a complex field with ill defined parameters. On the one hand this is useful in that tourism does not get overshadowed by disciplinary in-fighting, while on the other hand it is problematic as no established corpus of literature exists against which to situate oneself. Those people who work on tourism tend to be established only at the fringes of the more traditional disciplines (with the possible exception of political economy). In this chapter I introduce ways of thinking about/through tourism as a way of situating myself within a broader critique of theories of the subject/agency in which I propose reading touristic space. Ultimately, I think current work on tourism does not provide effective ways of thinking and writing about the toured.

Foundational texts on tourism studies, particularly in anthropology and sociology, while setting out important arguments, focused on what was assumed to be the primary subject of the tour: the tourist. We can see this in Cohen’s (1984) work on the sociology of tourism, MacCannell’s (1976) work on the tourist as authenticity-seeker, and even in Nash’s (1981) work on the anthropology of tourism, which centred on the ‘impacts’ of tourists upon toured environments. The politics of tourism has largely been more concerned with the structures and policies through which tourism functions, which in some ways redresses the problem of focusing on the tourist as the central actor of tourism (see Hall’s (1994) work on community tourism management and Mitchell and Reid’s (2001) work on community based tourism). However, a more general trend in the politics of tourism in the Global South is to examine the effect of tourists from the ‘developed’ world on the structures and environments (cultural and natural) in the ‘developing’ world.

For example, the work of Condès (2004) and Getino (2002) assesses the costs and benefits of tourism as a development strategy when *applied* to various spaces within the developing world. Although my analysis of Lake Titicaca does utilize the insights of political economy literature (particularly tourism as a capitalist enterprise) my primary concern with approaching tourism through the activity of the tourist (or the domination of the 'centre') is that it continues to privilege the tourist as the principal actor within touristic space. This reflects the narcissistic character of tourism itself: that it is about the people who travel, their experiences, and their growth and self-reflection based on those experiences. Taking the action of the toured as *secondary* reinforces the dependence of the toured and the perceived *independence* of the tourist.

That said, there is a literature that has appeared more recently that concerns itself more specifically with the people at the point of the tour. Largely this comes out of anthropological work, specifically ethnographic studies of tourism sites. Additionally, work has been built around postcolonial theory that examines more closely the discursive and material structures through which tourism functions (see Dunn 2004, Hall and Tucker 2004, and Hollinshead 1998, 2004). However, these approaches tend to reflect the second concern raised by the tourist-centric approach: namely that the 'subject' in tourism remains unitary and figured against the social (against tourism). In other words, the modern subject remains largely unchallenged despite the fact that it is the 'modern' subject that is one of the conditions of possibility for tourism to function as it does. What is presented in these works is a desire to present the toured as equally modern without critically thinking through how this understanding of the subject against society upholds tourism as a natural practice. Further, this implicates an understanding of tourism as a

coherent, external structure that occupies spaces and against which people struggle, rather than positing 'tourism' as a collection of exercises of power that produces the subjects toured and tourist.

In this piece I approach tourism in the latter way, as a collection of practices that form an incoherent structure in which the toured and tourist are situated. Rather than posit the self-reflexive/sovereign modern figure as the standard against which we can now measure the toured (as pre-modern, as is done in tourism discourse, or as equally modern, as is done in tourism studies literature), I posit the subjects of tourism as formed through the structures/networks of tourism. Using a Foucaultian approach to subjects within power and taking conceptual tools from Judith Butler and Homi Bhabha, I present the subjects of tourism within their subjugation⁶: that is, subjects to and of power. In so doing, my project looks at the subjectivity of the toured specifically to articulate an argument about how they negotiate their position within the performance of their constructed selves. In other words, the material and discursive structures of tourism are productive of particular types of subjects to be toured (figured as objects); however, since these structures must be constantly repeated/performed, their seeming consistency is a process of negotiation. This is not to say that every performance/repetition is an act of subversion, but that, in the daily acts in which we as subjects perform the identities that are the condition of our existence as subjects, there lie spaces to interpret differently the meaning or function of those identities.

The implications of talking about the toured in this way are first to break a historicist/developmentalist line that continually presents the toured as 'catching up' to

the tourist through development. This is done by undoing the privilege of the modern subject, articulated as freedom through mobility. The second implication is that reading touristic space in this way de-naturalizes the structures and identities that allow it to function as it does. In other words, there is nothing natural, prior, or essential that is being toured here; these bodies we tour are contingent. This is not to say that identities do not *function* as real ‘things’, but it is exactly in challenging the terms of that functioning that we can locate the problem of tourism as a representative strategy that upholds a historicized/imperialist logic. Similarly there is nothing natural about the figure of the tourist whose modern identity is partially produced through the practice of touring. At the most basic level, this reading challenges the objectification of the toured and the ease with which the tourist is seen as both privileged and more important. It also implicates the more fundamental epistemological and ontological position of subject/object that functions to produce the terms through which we develop ‘knowledge’ about our world.

Let me briefly outline an example of how these issues are reflected in contemporary work on tourism development to illustrate some of its implications and pose questions to further expand its reflections. In their detailed work on tourism development in Latin America and the Caribbean, Mowforth, Clive, and Munt present tourism as introduced into countries and onto sites by governments “as a means of increasing foreign earnings and as a generator of employment” (2008: 53). To achieve this, governments can, for example, develop the infrastructure around a community or site

⁶ This position is not completely absent in tourism literature, but there is a tendency in the literature on ethnic tourism to elide how this implicates our understanding of the toured by focusing on its implication for the tourist.

of cultural heritage necessary to support the tourism industry. The issue of concern then becomes who participates in this development while the meaning and function of 'ethnic identity' is left aside. What I suggest is that ethnic tourism does not just involve the 'development' of ethnic sites, but also the continual practices of defining ethnicity and moreover defining that ethnicity as a 'tourable' object.

At times in their analysis, Mowforth et al. articulate tourism as a potentially totalizing force that can leave communities in "a position of powerlessness...[and a] complete loss of human dignity" as their 'culture' is adversely affected by tourism (2008: 144-5). As I will look at further below, I think a more complicated reading of power here can move us away from seeing tourism as so totalizing that it does in fact make 'objects' of these communities or that it can be measured in terms of costs and benefits. To complicate this picture, Mowforth et al. also present the concept of "transculturation" in spaces of ethnic tourism, which "consider[s] how the visited actually adapt and borrow from cultural practices and in turn modify their own cultural practices or ways of making a living" (2008: 146). In this sense, the stability and authenticity of identity sought by tourists is challenged, which they argue should be accepted by proponents of responsible tourism such that the toured can be understood as equally modern to 'ourselves'. However, identity here is still presented as something coherently 'held' and modified through choices rather than networks of governing practices that *appear* coherent, the performance of which implicates our ability to participate in political and social life. By presenting the 'objects' of tourism as cultural units, the naturalness of being able to tour these units, and to understand them through the touring of 'exemplary communities', remains. We are therefore prompted to ask what the function of culture/ethnicity in

tourism is, in what (problematic) ways does it order the world, and why might making ethnicity an object of our desire be problematic?

In their discussion of local politics of touring, they look at community participation as the mechanism to better tourism development (while also reflecting on some of its complexities), a sentiment commonly held by NGO workers and community members in Puno. The focus on community-based management of tourism, while important, can overlook how the toured can engage the meaning of ethnic tourism in the very performances of their 'difference'. For example, Taquile Island has a long history of strong community tourism organization that has effectively challenged many of the practices of regional tour guides. Though this does increase their ability to negotiate the terms of regional tourism, the people of Amantaní and Uros participate in the terms of touring experiences in other ways. Additionally, while Mowforth et al. do not take community participation as the panacea for tourism development, what I push in my analysis of sustainable tourism are the forms of identity being solidified through determinations of what part of 'culture' is to be sustained and what is to be developed, specifically in how these practices rearticulate the temporal boundaries between the modern tourist and the pre-modern toured.

The tourist as a modern subject

Up to this point, I have been utilizing the figure of the modern subject without sufficiently unpacking what that figure is and its relationship to tourism. It is to this that I turn, specifically to engage other approaches to tourism that I have found useful. For the sake of simplicity, the modernity of the subject is defined through its dual position as both the "object of knowledge and as a subject that knows" (Foucault 1994: 312). In this

sense, the subject reflects on his or her experiences in/of the world and contemplates him/herself as the knower of that world. Thus the tourist travels to a particular space and employs empirical experience of that place in producing knowledge of him/herself (reflecting on his/her position as a tourist within the 'world' that is being toured). Tourism, in this sense, represents a quintessential formative exercise in which the knowing tourist consumes knowledges about the world of the other in order to gain insight into the inner world of the self. Thus in both a practical and epistemological sense tourism (particularly ethnic tourism) is linked with the discipline of anthropology as a study of difference and the observation and classification of that difference as a way of learning more about the self (Harkin 1995: 650). Importantly, here, we need to note that not all *kinds* of tourism necessarily rely on these epistemic foundations. My arguments stem from critically thinking through the practices, functions, and implications of ethnic tourism as a form that parades as 'alternative' but in many ways is still stuck within *epistemes* of modernity. Additionally, although there is a literature that focuses on the 'postmodernity' of the tour (and the tourist), I posit that these modern narratives are functionally more relevant to the practice and implication of ethnic tourism. To be able to reflexively engage with the world implies both a responsibility to experience as much of the world as possible in the betterment of the self and a right to do so as a responsible modern subject. In the discursive construction of the tourist as this modern individual, these rights and responsibilities are legitimated, thereby legitimating and naturalizing the privileged movement of some and the objectified discovery of others.

Through some examples taken from sociological work on the tourist we can look at how these structures of the acquisitive and independent traveller are made and

reinforced. Kevin Meethan builds on the political economic (consumption and production) approach to tourism, positing a more complex way of understanding the tourist as a subject who consumes. Tourism is a unique form of consumption in that the tourist travels to the site of production in order to consume, arriving with expectations that are met by the host community (2006: 2-5). As with other relationships of exchange, however, the relationship between the tourist and the toured community is also mediated by interpretation and value, thereby forming a narrative of experience, in which, Meethan argues, the tourist is an active agent. As he states, “it is the values that are inherent to specific places, or the values ascribed to activities that are undertaken in such places, together with a bundle of associated services that comprise the tourist product sold in the marketplace” (ibid.). Because the tourist is responsible for interpreting the space of the tour, they are engaged in a narrative, rather than merely taking in an objective visual display. In this sense, the narrative is the entire social space of the tour, which incorporates the visual elements of the landscape as well as the interpretation of values and meanings these landscapes hold for the tourist (ibid.: 6-7). Meethan is concerned with reinterpreting the tourist as something other than a passive spectator, essentially examining how the tourist is formed through and interacts with the space of the tour through consumption. Thus, this approach takes seriously the intersubjective possibility of tourism, though Meethan is careful to point out that he does not want to ascribe agency to nature or “the built environment” (ibid.: 9). In other places, Meethan takes seriously relationships of representation, identity, and space for the toured (2001); however, his approach focuses on how the modern tourist internalizes and interprets the space of the tour in the formation of personal narratives or biographies. There is an emphasis here on

the 'individual', separated from discourses and governing apparatuses, who experiences and interprets, which elides how this legitimates the very practice of touring as an apolitical, individual experience. If, as Meethan states, "contemporary society, in the developed economies of the West at any rate, is one where individuals exercise more control over who they can claim to be" (2006: 9), then tourism becomes the exercise of a particular *kind* of subject who is able to control the experience of otherness (temporally undeveloped) in the production of their better 'selves'.

We can take an alternative reading from Judith Adler who presents tourism as a form of "performance art" in which travellers "move through geographical space in stylistically specified ways [which]...serves as a medium for bestowing meaning on the self and the social, natural, or metaphysical realities through which [the tourist] moves" (1989: 1368). Thus travel is consumption, but the consumption of an artistic performance that carries with it other significant processes. The artistic form is an "abstract signifier" of an exceptional event (in the life of the tourist) (*ibid.*: 1369, see also Graburn 1989). For Adler, "the baseline elements of any travel performance are space, time, and the design and pace of the traveler's movement through both" (1989: 1369). This analysis captures the importance of performance (that the tourist and the toured both perform their identities as such within the interactive space of the tour) as well as the specific relationship to movement (both as the movement to different places and as the movement through time). However, the focus on movement continually privileges the action of the tourist (Adler does not deal with toured communities or environments). Additionally, for Adler the subject performs a unified identity, determined through various structures, but ultimately holding consistency as an agent struggling against these structures. As I will

look at below, articulating the subject as produced by power rather than worked *over* by power allows us to understand the mechanisms through which norms are maintained and naturalized and locate agency as the ambiguity of those norms in the production of subjects.

What Adler's approach does allow us to see is both continuity and change between various movements of travel (like artistic movements). Thus 'styles' of travel are linked through common narrative structures, and often differentiated from one another deliberately (1989: 1374). As with artistic forms, they are historically situated and supported by the various political-economic institutions of their time (ibid.: 1381). Thus we can trace the linkages between a colonial and imperial mapping and appropriation of otherness to the practice of ethnic tourism as the individualized mapping of difference. A particularly productive example Adler uses, which links Foucault's tracing from classical sciences to the modern concern for the subject, is the relative importance of the ear and the eye as means of 'capturing' touring experiences for the 'subject' to consume. Rather than a static method for experiencing travel, sight is historically situated within specific shifts in Western thought around travel and the senses. Principally she looks at the shift from the role of textual and audio representations of travel to visual, tracing the shift from the textual evidence of travel (travel records, treatises, etc.) to the emphasis on sight and the capture of visual evidence (1989b:11). Developing out of the seventeenth century, these perspectives on both the validity and value of empirical observation produced the traveller as an objective spectator of truly authentically representable spaces. In this telling, initially the eye was understood to be an objective conduit for images, to be held in repository as knowledge of the world.

However, this role for the eye and sight shifted again at the end of the eighteenth century away from science and towards judgement. “The well trained ‘eye’ judiciously attributed works of art, categorized them by style, and made authoritative judgements of aesthetic merit, as travel itself became an occasion for the cultivation and display of taste” (1989: 22). The tourist is still ultimately driven by a desire to record and reproduce knowledge; however, the way this knowledge is (re)produced has changed. The activity of the tourist in the production of knowledge, moving from an objective receptacle of ‘truth’ to an active discerner of good and bad (authentic/non-authentic) performances, is now written into the way in which the tourist is meant to observe. This has significant implications for the responsibility of the tourist in that they are no longer only the imperial ‘knower’ who maps and represents the world to those who have stayed at home. Now the tourist also takes on the persona of the cosmopolitan, capable of making judgements on the authenticity, artistry, or otherness of the site or subjects toured (attributing power to the tourist as primary actor). As Adler notes, “the form of human subjectivity such travel ritual required, honed, and exalted was one which could ‘grasp’ this vast new world of ‘things’ without being overwhelmed by it” (1989: 24). As a modern subject, the tourist retains sovereignty over the self in appropriating and reflecting on the experiences of the tour and the images of the toured. We can extend this to argue that to travel is to extend ourselves into a different range of citizenship, to shake off parochial ties to nation-hood and embrace a wider citizenship of global reach that has as its subject the cosmopolitan tourist. It is this worldliness, not unlike that of the colonial discoverers or imperial administrators, that the toured are excluded from, and precisely in their exclusion form the boundaries of the tourists’ ‘community’. The practice of ‘seeing’

is thus the political act of taking possession, not merely of the knowledge of a particular culture but also of that cultures' position within the spatial and temporal construction of the global community in relation to the 'modern' traveling citizen.

My concern here is with what happens in the spatial and temporal separation of modern and pre-modern on which this exclusion is based. In a similar way, my concern with John Urry's reflections on the mobility of tourism, which "has served to authorise an increased stance of cosmopolitanism – an ability to experience, to discriminate and to risk different natures and societies, historically and geographically" (1997: 7), is how this upholds particular interpretations of stasis (as pre-modern and un-reflexive) in the dynamics that normalize the touring encounter (between the mobile tourist and the immobile 'object' of the tour).

The role of the guide is especially relevant for understanding how the tourist as a figure is produced and upheld as the privileged actor of the tour. The figure of the tour guide has been taken up through the role of interpretation, which highlights the guide as active in the making of touristic sites. Using MacCannell's approach to touring as the search for the authentic, Fine and Speer argue that tour guide speech and performance are elements in the sacralization of particular sites for the tourist, in other words they *create* the salience of specific sites as worthy of being toured (1985: 75). Those interested in the professional function and management of guiding underscore the competence of the guide as one of the most fundamental mechanisms for a successful trip (Pond 1993: 65-6). High educational standards provide the most professional and knowledgeable guiding service which arguably provides the greatest benefit to the tourist and to the site itself (ibid.: 12, see also Black, Ham, and Weiler 2001). This type of accreditation can be

understood as a mechanism for resource management (Howard et al. 2001: 36) or as a way to protect the public from misinformation (Pond 1993; 9). Importantly, though, this certification functions to authorize and differentiate, particularly between the interpreter and their 'objects'. Interpretation is understood as the act of using 'objects' in the transmission of meaning and information to educate the tourist and to peak the tourists' interest in a space/culture (ibid.: 72-3). The emphasis on education is particularly prevalent in eco (and ethnic) touring models where the role of the guide is "to manage the experience and to inform, involve and inspire the visitor" (Weiler and Ham 2002: 52). This analysis tells us a great deal about the relationship between the tour guide and the tourist, particularly how the function of the guide is intimately linked to the privileged mobility of the tourist; however, it does not reflect on the relationship between the practice of guiding and the 'objects' of the tour. Through practices on Lake Titicaca, we shall see how this analytic relation is (re)articulated in the legislated intermediary position of the local guide, responsible for educating the tourist and assisting in the preservation of the toured.

Although reflections on guiding can obfuscate the role of the toured, there is also an important tension between understanding the guide as an interpreter of a given 'reality' or guiding as (an ambiguous) political act. In her study of tour guiding in Indonesia, Heidi Dahles demonstrates how guides can be mobilized by political structures, such as national governments, to create particular landscapes or sites that inspire, in this case, national unity (2002: 785). From this she argues that tour guides construct a staged authenticity for their tourists out of their performances, in turn guided by broader tourism policies or objectives (ibid.: 787). We shall see how the particular function of guides in

the Lake Titicaca region articulates the parameters of touristic sites and how this is crucial to understanding the political contestations over the meaning of these ‘tourable’ objects. However, in reflecting on the guide we also need to be careful not to totalize the ‘power’ of the guide and instead look at the figure of the guide situated within the exercises of power that construct the boundaries of the toured. This type of ambiguity is noted in Howard, Thwaites, and Smith’s work on indigenous tour guides in Australia who are situated within the identity being toured (2001). While their analysis points to how this situatedness complicates the relationship to tourists (and the space of the tour), it does not reflect on how the distinction within toured identities between those who guide and those who are objects might function to complicate the identity of ‘being toured’ or the terms of political engagement for that ‘identity’. They also note that the training of guides should work to find ways for the guide to be able to ‘cross’ the boundary between their indigenous identity and connect with the tourists (*ibid.*: 38). Again, this strategy produces the guide as an intermediary between two defined poles while tending to articulate the indigenous identity as stable, to which the guide can ‘return’ when necessary.

In contrast to arguments that focus on the tour guides’ relation to the tourist, Wearing and McDonald attempt to employ a Foucaultian analysis to articulate how tour guides can be employed to help achieve community empowerment. “Instead of viewing tour operators as direct ‘intermediaries’ in community-based tourism planning, we argue that they should rather be viewed as ‘facilitators’ –sources of information that eventually can be utilized and transformed into knowledge by the communities themselves” (2002: 203). Similarly, Echtner argues that community-based tourism can provide opportunities in which historically subordinated groups can access resources for economic benefit and

develop entrepreneurial skills (1995). However both these analyses centre on training and 'empowering' autonomous subjects, able as agents to 'escape' from the exercises of power that produce touring structures to 'forge alternatives'. In the end, the question Wearing and McDonald pose is how guides, operators, and communities can strike a balance between conservation and development (2002: 204-5); however, this is presented as a prescriptive project that does not think through what these terms mean and how their opposition to one another can be mobilized in the governing of touristic spaces and 'tourable' identities.

These studies represent responses to the types of tourist-centres approaches outlined above, provoked by a desire to acknowledge the modernity (the coevalness) of the toured as a way to challenge the privileged modernity of the global traveller. We saw this earlier with Mowforth et al. and it is the approach taken in ethnographic work that focuses on the agency of the toured in constructing and manipulating the terms of the tour. There is much that I value from this approach, particularly the position that the toured use their cultural performances in very particular ways. As with the development literature, what I hope to add to this discussion is critical reflection on the subject and what that can mean for the way we talk about and challenge tourism as a practice.

Ethnic tourism as/in anthropology

The rise of ethnic tourism (also called cultural tourism) as a specific mode of travel has meant increased interest from various disciplines in its forms and functions; however, it has also meant a problematic positioning of the ethnic tour in anthropology as it calls into question the making of the anthropological object and the nature of

ethnographic research.⁷ It is in this literature that the subject of the toured has been most seriously engaged therefore I think it is important to look briefly at the problems posed by the connection between tourism and anthropology and the specific work of anthropologists on this theme.

Anthropology has a well established body of criticism on its use of ‘otherness’ and its particular constructions of objects of study as outside both modern time and modern space (Fabian 1988, Clifford 1986). For anthropology to become accepted as a legitimate discipline, many of the earlier connections between ethnography and travel narratives were, if not effaced, significantly downplayed (Pratt 1986). The study of tourism (which is currently in the process of legitimating itself) makes the downplaying of these connections uncomfortable, and in turn calls into question the figure of the ethnographer (as researcher/tourist). My own position as researcher for this thesis was mired in this unease that is at once disconcerting and productive in the critical linkages it has forced me to make.

Anthropological work on ethnic tourism⁸ focuses on two main areas: ethnographic studies of specific sites/groups, and the relationship between ethnicity, tourism, and artisan work⁹. Here I want to focus on two approaches to taking up the toured as subjects, setting aside the literature of craft commercialization. Pierre Van den Berghe, a widely

⁷ Cultural tourism is generally used for types of touring to Europe and North America – ethnic almost always refers to the Global South, or indigenous communities in Canada, the US, Australia, and New Zealand. I use ethnic because the communities I look at have become ethnicized and because it accesses the postcolonial tensions of tourism. It should be noted that ethnic tourism is also used in some cases to refer to the touring of ancient ruins/monuments when these are linked to a specific ethnic group (as for example in Silverman’s work on Inca tourism in Cuzco). I will spend more time later looking at the links here, particularly with reference to tourism in the Peruvian national consciousness. However, for the purposes of this thesis, I am maintaining a fairly simple definition of ethnic tourism to refer to the touring of communities, homes, and bodies.

⁸ For an excellent review of anthropological work on tourism see Stronza (2001).

⁹ See especially Ariel de Vidas 1995, Cohen 1989, Nash 1993 Scrase 2003, Stephen 1991, and Zorn 2004

cited scholar on ethnic tourism, defines the ethnic tour through its object, in his words as the search for the other “in as untouched, pristine, authentic form as he [sic] can find it” (1994: 9). This approach rearticulates the tour as a type of anthropological quest (enshrined in his title, *The Quest for the Other*) in which the tourist is the site of activity as he/she moves through the space of the tour, incorporating its treasures into him/herself. Van den Berghe also takes on the tour as an encounter, a form of “ethnic relations” between two or three distinct groups (ibid.: 122-3). This separation into spheres perpetuates an idea of the tourist and the toured constituted outside their interaction, which implicates the space of the tour as the ‘outside’ to modernity’s ‘inside’. In reducing the space of the tour to encounters between essentialized groups rather than a political space of contested subjectivity, this type of analysis locates power in the tourist – an approach to power that underestimates both the agency of the toured and the complex and productive relationship between power and subject formation.

Similarly, Harkin presents the exoticism of the ‘other’ as an *episteme*, a cultural problematic that is inscribed in touring and anthropological practices (1995: 656). The exotic is rendered discrete from the domestic, but is made legible (‘tourable’) in such a way that it can be consumed by a touring culture without causing undue ‘harm’ to the identity of the domestic (ibid.). The complex rendering of cultures into objects of exoticism also erects the façade of the other as “an object *sui generis*”, taken up by the tourist or anthropologists and eliding the function of the practices of tourism and anthropology in the making of meanings of difference. While anthropological practices have become much more complex within critical ethnography, the underlying

mechanisms of rendering otherness still apply to the practice of touring. Harkin concludes:

The truly extraordinary assumption that, to the native, life as lived appears as a coherent whole is largely a function of ethnographic narrativity...It is the final narrative framing of fieldwork – isomorphic with the framing on the experiential level – with its artificial bounding of space, time, and frequently of society, which constitutes the primitive culture as an ethnographic object.

(*ibid.*: 665-6)

This linkage, which we will return to in chapter two, makes tourism both a study *in* anthropology and a form *of* anthropological practice as tourists seek to capture native culture in coherent presentations.

In her review of anthropological work on tourism, Amanda Stronza argues that both the effects of tourism on the tourist and the motivations of toured communities to develop tourism have been largely unstudied by anthropologists (2001). Her concern here is to formulate a research project that can access the agency of the toured in more complicated ways than merely as cultural units appropriated and affected by tourists. In contrast to Van den Berghe, Walter Little's ethnographic work on Guatemala Mayas in the tourism industry is exemplary of more nuanced anthropological work, and comes closer to my (and Stronza's) concern for the agency of the toured. For Little, Maya market vendors strategically use their identity in ways that lead to material and political gain (2004: 6-8). Exploring the everyday lives of these vendors, their "ordinary practices", he finds examples of significant changes in the economic, social, and political relations of Maya women both to their home communities and to larger Guatemalan

society (ibid.: 10-12). Two important points come from this. First, he takes seriously the position of the toured and tourist to “reinterpret and resist dominant discourses” (ibid.: 39). By taking seriously the localized activity of tourist and toured, he presents their political engagement with structures and situations in creative and complex ways. Practicing ethnography in this way, he is seeking to undo some of the objectifying functions of ethnographic analysis that reflect the touring encounter with objects of otherness. The second point to take from Little is his analysis of this very distinction: tourist and other. As with most analyses of ethnic tourism, Little notes how crucial the dichotomies of self/other (present/past) are for the construction of the tour and the tourism site; however, he takes seriously the way in which the everyday practices within a tourism site disrupt and challenge these dichotomies and “challenge[] the distinction between, or illusion of, past and present, host and tourist” (ibid.: 43). Little positions tourism as an ambiguous relation of power in its localized performances, an important step in unpacking sites of agency and forms of subjectivity within the tour. Ethnic tourism therefore becomes less a form of ethnic relations, and more a space in which ethnicity is politically formed. What I want to add to Little’s work is a greater concern for the implication of these practices as the conditions of engagement for the subjects of the tour and the broader implications for the meaning of difference as it is packaged as ‘tourable’.

From this brief reflection on some approaches to tourism in the social sciences, we can see how studies of tourism, particularly when centred on the tourist, can reproduce some of the patterns that privilege the tourist and naturalize the terms of the tour (i.e. the tourist as acquisitive and independent, cultures as held units to be explored). Essentially, while these studies are all more complex than I have made them out to be, my point is to

implicate tourism as a political enterprise of identity formation wherein the figure of the tourist is regenerated in the practices of touring. Through this, the mapping of difference is depoliticized as something expected and natural. By working through other conceptualizations of identity, subjectivity, and agency, I present an alternative way of locating the toured, which forms the basis for the substance of this piece.

Changing the subject of tourism: Subjectivity, agency, and identity

To challenge some of these limitations of tourism studies, I propose beginning by conceptualizing power through a Foucaultian lens in order to present the subjects of tourism as produced through power and therefore acting as agents *within* power rather than against it. Thus the structure of tourism is not something that the subject as agent refutes or accepts (it is not an external power that acts on the pre-constituted subject), but rather forms the conditions through which the subjects of tourism are produced, through which their identities are formed. Many of the authors I have looked at so far would readily agree that incorporation into a tourism regime changes the subjects of that regime; however, through a more complex way of reading the subject I focus on the implications and alternatives of positing the very conditions for existence/engagement of the subjects of the tour as the disciplinary structures through which that subject comes into being.

To understand this we must first move away from a concept of power as juridical force enacted *upon* subjects, to a “technology of power” (Foucault 2007 [1976]: 154). Power in this sense is not the singular enactment of force from a discrete enforcer onto a discrete (subordinated) subject, but rather a network of mechanisms (ibid.: 156). It is not the sovereign ruler who exercises power upon a population, but rather technologies and networks that function continually within populations to regularize, normalize, and discipline (Foucault 1978: 95-6). In this sense, we are subjected to powers that daily

produce and reproduce the very meaning of the normalized body or subject. In the classic Foucaultian examples of the military, the school, and the medical clinic, he articulated how these technologies mobilize and produce the good and efficient soldier, student, and patient – in effect producing the proper body of a soldier, student, or patient through disciplinary techniques (2007 [1976]: 161). Thus power functions to produce subjects that are productive, efficient, ordered, and function in turn to normalize these subject forms as ‘natural’ and thereby efface their production in networks of power. As we shall see in my discussions of temporal and spatial othering in tourism, technologies of power work to produce well ordered spaces of the tour (presented as unambiguous and natural) and, particularly, the governed bodies (identities) of the toured. The ethnicity of the toured is thus not ‘natural’ to be taken up by tourism, and it is not merely ‘constructed’ through processes of sociological and cultural development; it is produced through powers that regulate boundaries and meanings of ethnicity that serve political functions. In other words, binding the toured other as an object of the past is more than just essentializing or freezing their culture (denying its capacity to change) but preserves the political status of the tourist as the privileged modern against the pre-modern subject. And in so doing, the structure of touring (the leaving of one’s home to view difference in other places) becomes natural and acceptable as the inevitable by-product of ‘difference’ that simply exists between people and places.

Building on this approach to power, Homi Bhabha looks at the substantive and discursive effects of a diffused rather than totalized colonial power. In *The Location of Culture* (1994), Bhabha presents a critical challenge to understandings of power and subjectivity in postcolonial theory. He posits that colonized identities are produced

through the continual enunciation (repetition) of difference (thus like Foucault the continual workings of power to produce a discursive and material meaning of difference). Like Edward Said, he sees the colonial power exercised in the ability of the colonizer to interpolate the colonized through their representations and stereotypes (Said 1978); however, in challenging the contrapuntal reading given by Said, he suggests that this interpolation is fragmented and ambivalent. The colonizer needs the colonized to *be* different and contradicting subjects in order to dominate. The colonizer is himself also a subject produced through power, disciplined as the master figure, but always in an ambivalent condition as he relies on the colonized to define his position.

One site where Bhabha locates this ambivalence is in the concept of colonial mimicry. For Bhabha “colonial mimicry is the desire for a reformed recognizable Other, *as a subject of difference that is almost the same, but not quite*. Which is to say, that the discourse of mimicry is constructed around an *ambivalence*; in order to be effective, mimicry must continually produce its slippage, its excess, its difference” (1994: 122, emphasis in original). In other words, the colonized are meant to become like the colonizer, through the civilizing discourse, but must always retain some aspect of difference, or otherness, some mark of being outside in order that the colonizer can continue to justify his domination. Thus the relationship is a complex dynamic of the master/slave dichotomy where both figures are master and slave at the same time. As he states, “both colonizer and colonized are in a process of miscognition where each point of identification is always a partial and double repetition of the *otherness* of the self – democrat and despot, individual *and* servant, native and child” (ibid.: 139, emphasis in

original). In this particular colonial relation, the idea of absolute power is disrupted as an ambivalent set of practices that complicate the making and meaning of identities.

We can take up the ambivalence of colonial authority to see how tourism narratives ambivalently form the toured as subjects/objects. On the one hand the toured are figured as representations of our others, completely removed and distant. The indigenous community in the far-away reaches of South America is an example of our most distant others, outside modernity and our present time. Yet at the same time, this is complicated by the function in certain places of discourses of sustainable development that wants to 'bring' these communities up to 'us'. Thus the toured are subjected through powers that discipline their ethnicity as 'outside' yet demand them to be responsible subjects moving towards the 'inside'. In Puno this contradiction plays out in practices that go to the very meaning of ethnic tourism itself. In the uncertainty over who the subjects/objects of the tour should be, we can locate negotiations of the pull of these positions. However, it is a contradiction that exists within the very formation of the subjects of the tour. In other words, negotiating this ambivalence is part of the process of becoming an object/subject of the tour. Herein we locate the politics of tourism at this level, that is, the politics of enunciating/performing various subjected bodies in ways that rearticulate or pose problems for the smooth narratives that govern these bodies.

Foucault's conceptualization of power has produced various and complex reflections on resistance. Articulating the subject as formed through power ultimately raises the challenging question of agency. For Foucault "just as the network of power relations ends by forming a dense web that passes through apparatuses and institutions, without being exactly localized in them, so too the swarm of points of resistance traverses

social stratifications and individual unities” (1978: 96). The local and irregular networks of resistance become the sites where the exercises of power are most intimately contested. Thus the people of Taquile Island wear clothing that inscribes their bodies as worthy of touring and, though this clothing continues in some ways to be a marker of inferiority when worn in Puno, at times use bodily presentations of their ethnicity for specific purposes.

Judith Butler takes this irregularity of agency as located *within* our dependence on power for the conditions of existence. She states, “if, following Foucault, we understand power as *forming* the subject as well, as providing the very condition of its existence and the trajectory of its desire, then power is not simply what we oppose but also, in a strong sense, what we depend on for our existence and what we harbor and preserve in the beings that we are” (1997: 2, emphasis in original). The powers that produce us as subjects are the conditions that allow us to ‘be’ in the world, thus the only way of acting in the world is predicated on an acceptance of how our subject is to exist within the world. Thus the meaning of existence in the world is social and can never be thought prior to sociality. For Butler, subjects hold within themselves the desire to live (the desire to exist), which necessarily means the desire to accept the terms of existence. However, going back to Bhabha’s point about lack of totalizing power and Foucault’s heterogeneity, the subject is only partially interpolated by power.

To persist in one’s being means to be given over from the start to social terms that are never fully one’s own. Those terms institute a linguistic life for the ‘one’ who speaks prior to any act of agency, and they remain both irreducible to the one who speaks and the necessary conditions of such speech. In this

sense, interpellation works by failing, that is, it institutes its subject as an agent precisely to the extent that it fails to determine such a subject exhaustively in time. (ibid.: 197)

Rather than taking up this language of ‘failure’, I am most interested here in the implication of the subject as a position of becoming, whose identification at any moment in time is only produced through a repetition.

Butler approaches the subject and structure in mutual processes of becoming through the concept of performativity, which I take up here in conjunction with Bhabha’s work on enunciation to articulate an approach to agency. It should be clear that I am using these concepts as strategies in making my argument; this is not a thesis on critical subjectivity or the psychoanalytic foundations of these texts. Using these concepts takes us to interesting ways of reading touristic space, which does not imply that they are unproblematic.

In *Gender Trouble* Butler takes the body as her site of analysis and argues that rather than being a blank space on which identities are inscribed, the body is produced through regulated performances to signify the essentialized gender identities that are part of the ‘normal’ heterosexual frame. Building on Foucault’s understanding of subjectivity, she argues that “the naturalized notion of ‘the’ body is itself a consequence of taboos that render that body discrete by virtue of its stable boundaries” (1990: 181). Thus the body is figured as a unit, in which identities are incorporated such that the body *becomes* certain things, but always first *is* a body. Performance is the mechanism through which the body ‘appears’ internally sound, so that the internal consistency of the ‘subject’ is produced on the surface of the body through acts and gestures. This is what sustains the fictive

essence of identity, and normalizes the identities that exist and are repeated through performance. Through repeated performance identities come to *function* as existing things. “Such acts, gestures, enactments, generally construed, are *performative* in the sense that the essence or identity that they otherwise purport to express are *fabrications* manufactured and sustained through corporeal signs and other discursive means” (ibid.: 185, emphasis in original). Thus performance is repetition of enactments of seemingly stable and coherent identities that are anything but stable and coherent. It is the requirement of repetition wherein we locate the politics of identity (where what are at stake are collectively held meanings of identity that condition particular modes of participation and patterns of inequality).

If we take this idea and read ‘the body’ through tourism, we can see how ethnic tourism narratives produce the ‘bodies’ (the various types of bodies) necessary to perform the identities of the tour. The body of the indigenous toured is a fictive identity that is repeated in the daily performance of the tour. This idea of fictiveness does not imply falsity, for that again presumes a sovereign subject who as a whole takes up or puts aside identities. “[I]t is not a transcendental subject who enables action in the midst of such a convergence. There is no self prior to the convergence or who maintains ‘integrity’ prior to its entrance into this conflictual cultural field. There is only a taking up of the tools where they lie, where the very ‘taking up’ is enabled by the tool lying there” (Butler 1990: 199). A variety of expectations (including what to wear, what to eat, how to act, what language to speak, and the demand of pastness) produce the boundaries of action of the bodies of the toured, and form the image that is repeated for the tourist to consume. While this is not limited to the ethnic tour, what happens in the tour is a heavily governed

production of the body of the toured to meet the expectations of the tourist and fulfill the necessary function of establishing the pre-modern/modern border. When we read this not as the misuse of an 'authentic' ethnic/indigenous identity, but rather the political construction of ethnic bodies based on produced notions of otherness caught up in relations of power and knowledge, we can read the daily activities of tourism as part of that political regulation that allows the tourist to consume identities as normalized objects/products.

Reflecting on theories of the subject in this way allows us to engage more complex discussions of agency in the local. In conceptualizations of the modern subject, agency is the action of a uniform actor who holds sovereignty over the self. If this sovereignty is challenged by the power of discourse (determination), the subject loses its power and thus its agency (possibility to act without coercion) (Butler 1990: 195). Butler continues, "[e]ven within theories that maintain a highly qualified or situated subject, the subject still encounters its discursively constituted environment in an oppositional epistemological frame. The culturally enmired subject negotiates its constructions, even when those constructions are the very predicates of its own identity" (ibid.). Thus Marie-Françoise Lanfant, widely cited for her critical work on identity in tourism, poses the question: "we are trying to understand the way in which the actors at all levels of experience face the problem of their identity objectively and rationally, and how subjectively they take on the metamorphoses and, particularly, the images of themselves which they receive from others" (1995: 7). Identity here is still located as something taken *on* by the subject, forcing the question from how practices of touring create

artificially coherent articulations of difference to how ‘actors’ can rationally come to have sovereign control over that identity (as an object of analysis).

Thus championing the site of agency as the site of free action for the individual ignores the way identities are situated and made possible only through technologies of power and where the agent can only *act* in the process of articulating an identity. Internal and external become indistinct, or the border between them is blurred, in that there is no ontologically prior inner that can absorb or reject an exogenous outer force.

Indeed, to understand identity as a *practice*, and as a signifying practice, is to understand culturally intelligible subjects as the resulting effects of a rule-bound discourse that inserts itself in the pervasive and mundane signifying acts of linguistic life... the subject is not *determined* by the rules through which it is generated because signification is *not a founding act, but rather a regulated process of repetition* that both conceals itself and enforces its rules precisely through the production of substantializing effects. (ibid.: 198, emphasis in original)

It is not, therefore, a universal and independent ‘I’ that acts, but rather a subject formed constantly, and ambiguously, through repetition/performance that produce the *appearance* of stability, but that is never stable.

The need for a coherent site of agency is reflected in the emphasis in tourism on the tourist as the ‘actor’ of the tour. The modern ‘I’ who tours is formed by the tour in the sense of incorporating knowledge into the self, but the tourist is articulated as an independent agent, negotiating the tour, but not predicated on it. The toured are, in this formulation, inactive products of the terms of the tour and therefore cannot be agents

because they are *determined* by the terms of the tour. Alternatively, what we get from Butler's formulation is a situated agent engaging with the terms of identity, an articulation of agency that refuses to privilege our historically situated notions of modern freedom as autonomy. In other words, the point is to implicate *how* (all) identities function to bind, what becomes allowable from this functioning, and where other engagements with these terms might be possible.

Similarly for Bhabha the repeated enunciation of cultural difference functions to produce it as 'truth', but also creates anxiety by never being fully the same. Thus he argues "the stereotype, which is its [colonialism's] major discursive strategy, is a form of knowledge and identification that vacillates between what is always 'in place', already known, and something that must be anxiously repeated" (1994: 95). As with gender, the ethnic/racial stereotype is naturalized through its repetition, not enunciated in one moment in time. What I want to pull from these discussions is how articulations and performances of difference order and guide the possible forms of politics that are encountered in particular spaces. Moving away from the making of the 'self', I use these reflections as starting points for reading the ambiguity and incoherence of identity formation as both necessitating complex governing practices and producing sites where the toured engage in the politics of defining their identities. In other words, we shall see how the interactions of tour guides and tour communities on Lake Titicaca reflect practices of governing the ambiguities of difference (making it 'tourable') and provide sites where representation is contested precisely through the performative nature of identity.

In the following chapters I reflect on sites and practices where we can locate and rethink the meanings of touristic experience in light of these conceptualizations of power as productive, but not totalizing, of identity as functionally existing, but performative, and of agency as embedded within daily practices.

Conclusion

Building on my engagement with approaches to tourism studies, through this introductory chapter I have presented my approach to studying ethnic tourism and particularly those who are toured. It is clear that I have left out important parts of the literature in an effort to circumscribe the particular debates I am hoping to provoke. Specifically, though, I have taken on power and the subject in tourism studies to explore other ways of talking about tourism and the maintenance of the modern subject as a condition of possibility for the ethnic tour to function.

This exploration is tied within its own political tensions, particularly the issue of positionality. From Butler, and particularly Bhabha (due to his affiliation with the South Asian Subaltern Studies Group), we find the problem of researching the performances of identities to which one is not affiliated (more broadly, the problem of the relationship between anthropology and its object). I have rather audaciously proposed to locate powers and agencies that are far removed from my own experience, but function within broader structures that form the terrain of my own identification. Rather than attempt a

resolution, I focus on mechanisms and implications not to efface this tension, but to affect a productive discussion¹⁰.

I now turn to the temporal and spatial construction of the ethnic tour through which tourist and toured are relationally produced as modern subjects or objects of historical difference. As we shall see, this is ultimately predicated on an imperial mapping of otherness that reflects the understanding of the tourist as a modern subject who moves through and appropriates the world around him/her. Through this process we will finally situate ourselves in the particular production of the ethnic tours of Puno-Lake Titicaca in order to specifically engage the ambiguous practices of performing touristic space.

¹⁰ There is also a tension in the use of postcolonial thought (particularly in my reliance on Bhabha). For many Latin American scholars one of the central problems with postcolonial theory is that, as it was founded through the work of Said, Fanon, and the South Asian Subaltern Studies Group, it both reflects familiar refrains about colonial and post-colonial politics and society in Latin America while almost entirely excluding the region from its study (Castro-Klaren 2008: 131-2). Without becoming too invested in this debate, I acknowledge the specificities and the geopolitics of knowledge at work here, though I do not agree that this negates my use of the conceptual tools of Bhabha and other postcolonial thinkers.

Chapter Two: Tracing 'Tourable' Objects

Temporal bordering: Historicizing the object of the tour

As I suggested in the previous chapter, anthropology's link to ethnic tourism is both practical and epistemological. Thus anthropological *knowledge*, like the practice of tourism, is constituted by readings of 'our' movement through time and space towards the object/subject that is the goal of that knowledge. These mechanisms for temporally and spatially marking and defining 'tourable' difference are governing practices that order our experience of that difference and form the terms through which the subjects toured and tourist engage.

In *Time and the Other*, Johannes Fabian argues that anthropology has employed a particular reading of time in the making of its object, the 'other', primarily through the denial of coevalness, or the denial of existence within the same time (1988). Making my argument in reverse, Fabian argues that the historical linkage between travel and anthropology is crucial to understanding how anthropology has made its object out of mapping difference as *distance*. Distancing functions as an epistemological tool in ordering the world:

a discourse employing terms such as primitive, savage (but also tribal, traditional, Third World, or whatever euphemism is current) does not think, or observe, or critically study, the 'primitive': it thinks, observes, studies *in terms* of the primitive. *Primitive*, being essentially a temporal concept, is a category, not an object, of Western thought. (17-8, emphasis in original)

The inheritances of a knowledge of the world based on the mapping of distance as temporally different and the relationship of authenticity to temporal position (i.e. the more unmodern, the more authentic/original), are both premises in which the tour functions

and, as we shall see later, is ambiguously situated. Although those who practice anthropology have become critical of the epistemological groundings of the discipline, these groundings continue to inform the specific ‘objects’ sought and studied in anthropological texts, and more importantly here the object of the ethnic tour as a plebeian anthropological exercise.

Importantly, the denial of coevalness does not function to exclude the other from our world, but rather serves as a defining barrier. In Fabian’s words, “[o]ur *temporal* dismissal of the Other is always such that he remains ‘integrated’ in our spatial concepts of logic (such as order, difference, opposition)” (1988: 127, emphasis in original). Similarly, Bhabha and other postcolonial scholars have argued that to understand the construction of the nation state, one must see its constitution in relation to the practices of colonialism and the spatial and temporal discourses of otherness/difference through which the colonial world was imagined and materially produced/regulated. In the tour, as a form of anthropological fieldwork, the ability to appropriate history through present experiences of the past is the productive binding of difference that forms the subject/object of the toured figured against (but constitutive of) the figure of the tourist. Ethnic tourism, like anthropology, is the concern for the human (or the playground of human interaction, culture). It is the concern for the formation of the tourist through knowledge of histories of their origin, the specific mapping of what different people ‘are’ across space, and, in combination, the necessarily temporal mapping of these differences in the representations that produce the subject/objects of the tour.

In the following two sections I approach this argument more specifically first through discussion of the imperialism of tourism and particularly imperial boundaries of

time, and second through reflection on the importance of development in the construction of 'alternative' ethnic tourism and what this implicates as an unstable usage of time. Later, I will explore the specific spatial production of difference on Lake Titicaca and how this interacts with these temporal imaginings.

Imperial times, global boundaries

The argument that ethnic tourism produces difference as temporally outside our modernity (as pre-modern others) is not particularly new or innovative, but it is a highly normalized spatio-temporal arrangement that pervades the practice and dissemination of the tour and the tour experience. Although there are various 'levels' of ethnic tourism, from the more adventurous to the massified guided tours of Lake Titicaca, they are all linked through the importance of discovery and acquisition/appropriation of knowledge. In this sense, the ethnic tour is a process of mapping that, far from merely reflecting the colonial/imperial enterprise, functions through and reforms its epistemology.

One of the most persuasive accounts of the imperialism of tourism is given by Cynthia Enloe in her analysis of the imperial powers that produce tourism and the specific gendered experiences of these powers. Tourism is a replication of colonial exploration, massified in a way that facilitates access to knowledge of the other. In her description of world's fairs (of which ethnic tourism is a disseminated version), she refers to the "living postcards, clichés of cultures apparently at opposite ends of the modernity scale" (1989: 26). Like a world's fair, a packaged ethnic tour is a simplified encounter with a difference, an otherness, which presumably exists in a pre-modern form and can be taken up and used in the justification and definition of modernity. Binding the other in time is a premise for the performance of the latitude of a modernity in which the tourist can travel across space to experience post-colonial but pre-modern sites. This performance involves

taking up (and remaking) the narratives of the colonial encounter as the historical discursive institutions through which space and difference are understood (see Dunn 2004, Hall and Tucker in Hall and Tucker 2004).

A more material analysis of the imperialism of the tour also reproduces this temporal distancing of touristic spaces. Tourists travel because they have the means to travel, which means are markers of an identity that those who are toured seemingly lack. The productivity of the 'core' permits leisure and travel to the periphery (Nash 1989: 39), a process that is never reversed. The denial of coevalness is reproduced in a mapping of development that spatially and temporally defines the modern 'core' from the 'pre-modern' periphery and the rights of that core to *their* heritage. Similarly, the consumption of artisan goods can also be seen as the consumption of 'prior' or 'unalienated' forms of labour, thereby positioning production out of 'our' time (Scrase 2002). My intent is to problematize the ease of this dichotomy; however its importance is first as the discursive means through which the toured are produced and second, in setting up the border as one conceptual tool to make sense of the complexity of touristic space.

The 'encounter' narrative of tourism facilitates the use of the border as a way of accessing the activity of touristic sites. Through tropes of 'encounter', the tour maintains the divisions of ethnicity, race, gender, and temporality that allow and produce the criteria of difference that makes a space 'tourable'. The pre-modern, ethnic identity of the toured is performed as a border between and for the tourist in their production as modern global subjects. The implication of this bordering is the manner in which it functions to uphold the privileged status of the tourist as a mobile, modern subject against the stasis of what is toured. While I have not theorized this position in much length here, we can consider

unpacking the relationship through a concept of citizenship. The exclusion of the toured as the boundary between the tourist and his/her past is a mechanism through which the tourist legitimizes his/her rights as a cosmopolitan traveller to visit, discover, and appropriate the places and 'cultures' in which the toured live. The point for this thesis is that the performance of the tour continually draws these exclusionary boundaries (though as we shall see in complex and ambiguous ways).

In the globally defined movement of modern tourism, the ethnic tour is articulated as access to 'heritage': the traveller's past (as global citizen) available in the present for the traveller to experience. Enloe has argued that imperial identities were in part formed through the tour where "the stay-at-home listeners would develop a sense of imperial pride as they heard another woman describe her travels among their empire's more 'exotic' peoples" (1989: 24). If we take this up through a more globally defined empire (which is problematic, but useful here) we can see the ethnic tour as a mechanism for producing global identities through pride in a global heritage, found in the 'cultural heritage' of the world's other peoples. This is most clearly articulated in the work of UNESCO and the World Heritage Sites promoted by international bodies and national governments. In this way the ethnic tour functions to justify a kind of cosmopolitanism that celebrates and consumes difference and otherness in neatly defined packages, forming and reforming the tourist as traveller and global citizen. Whereas Harkin presents this cosmopolitanism as a "metalanguage of cultural relativism" (1995: 660), if we go back to Adler's proposition of the tourist as a *judge*, we can see the moralizing implications of writing spaces as 'worthy' touring grounds and the *tourist* as the authority in determining this worthiness.

Now, it is not the work of this thesis to critically engage with this global citizen; rather, much like my reflections in chapter one, I have set up the tourist as a figure to elaborate my more immediate concern, which is the toured. The trope of the border is useful precisely in that it is more complicated than my initial conceptual meanderings let on. This border is not simply entrenched in time, but rather through practices. If the border is not merely exclusionary but rather the internalization of difference, then it is also the site of the practices that remake and constitute that difference. In his discussion of indigenous populations in the Andes, Andrew Canessa has challenged the defining feature of indigenous identity as more than “simply a function of marginalization”, but rather integrally produced by and producing of national identities (2005: 7). We shall see this re-emerge in reflections on the spatial rendering of the tour, particularly in the use of history to tell stories and identities of space. For now, it is important to reflect on the epistemological conditions of writing history that involve the particular framing of subjects/objects within history.

Both producing difference as distance and the touring of heritage as the production of the past as a present (and presentable) experience are implicated in the practice of writing history as itself an object of knowledge. An e-brochure published by the Peruvian government describes the country as “an encounter between the ancient and the modern, a place where past and present live side by side” (Discover Peru: 2). This statement is a blatant and normalized production of a historicized rendering of touristic ‘objects’ as containers and markers of the past that, by virtue of being so, are worthy of cosmopolitan consumption. If we consider that modernity conceptualizes and appropriates time as both empty and linear (thus natural), then both time and history are

objects separated from our cultural and social conditions (Chakrabarty 2000: 73). While history (as a discipline) does not ignore its situatedness (its lack of naturalness), for Chakrabarty the primary function of the naturalness of time is that it

lies in the belief that *everything* can be historicized. So although the non-naturalness of the discipline of history is granted, the assumed universal applicability of its *method* entails the further assumption that it is always possible to assign peoples, places, and objects to a naturally existing, continuous flow of historical time. (ibid.: 73-4, emphasis added)

Presented and performed as an object of study, the past functions to reinforce the sovereignty of the modern subject, able to get in and out of ‘it’ in order to know and study ‘it’ (ibid.: 243). In the present experience of touring, the tourist moves into and consumes the past in its simplest form, setting the conditions for a mass consumption justified as an educational device for the ‘good’ global citizen. Following Chakrabarty, the denial of coevalness is produced through “our capacity to deploy the historicist or ethnographic mode of viewing that involves the use of a sense of anachronism in order to convert objects, institutions, and practices with which we have *lived relationships* into relics of other times” (2000: 243, emphasis added). The denial of coevalness also functions as the denial of mobility, as those who are relics of the past are written as incapable of moving in and out of time and therefore incapable of being ‘modern’. Bound to culture, they are also bound to time, an oppositional requirement of the perceived freedom of the traveller. As we shall see, the stasis of the toured is governed on Lake Titicaca through practices that deny any type of coeval action thereby facilitating the smooth appropriation of the living past into the modern narrative of the tourist.

I have been cautioning that we must be careful not to totalize this position. As I argued, the rendering of subjects in the tour is a continual production of the norms of difference allowable for ethnic tourism to function and make sense of the modern world. What I am presenting here is a general discussion of how ethnic tourism relies on temporal divisions to produce its object (and its actor – the tourist). Later, in chapter three, I look at examples of the discursive mechanisms through which this logic is (re)produced and maintained. In presenting the trope of the border, I am complicating the picture by arguing that the practices *at/in* the border, where the figures of tourist and tour come into being, are a complex politics in which the toured are agents, not as equally modern subjects, but within the very mechanisms of power that produce who they ‘are’. At this point, though, I want to turn to a particular ambiguous site of temporality in the ethnic touring of Lake Titicaca: sustainable development.

The problematic of development

This historicizing of the toured becomes crucially problematic when coproduced with the logic of combating material inequality while recognizing the value of cultural difference. Development presents an interesting site of ambiguity for the tour as it at once maintains the authentic pastness of the toured and demands their movement towards the present of a developed modernity. In many circles ethnic tourism is presented as a responsible alternative form of travel, particularly for the benefits it supposedly brings to the local population. This is a particularly powerful discourse in the Lake Titicaca region where the issues of autonomous control and participation are paramount for many communities. Conceptually, ethnic tourism can include many different destinations and relationships; however the juxtaposition of modernity with indigeneity here is intimately tied to global movements to increase living standards for indigenous populations and a

global celebration of indigeneity as an important aspect of our heritage. Ethnic tourism is therefore the commodification of difference within poverty and exclusion that structures it as not only a mechanism for ‘modern’ tourists to learn about the indigenous culture preserved from the past, but also ‘help’ these cultures preserve themselves at the same time they reap the benefits of a capitalist economy.

Yet here exactly is the rub, for these discourses function at odds demanding both preservation and change along very particular lines. Tourism policy “implies a willingness to meet the expectations of those foreigners who want political stability, safety and congeniality when they travel” (Enloe 1989: 31) meaning that spaces must be made accessible and legible, while not losing the charm of their draw. This is the foundation of sustainable cultural development: economic modernization that does not affect the cultural aesthetic of the ‘environment’ or ‘object’ being toured, so that tourism as a commercial enterprise can be maintained (and so that cultural recognition can be preserved). The debate that has generally surrounded this issue concerns the loss of cultural authenticity or the loss of market share when sites and people become too modernized (see Condès 2004, Zorn 2004). Modernization (moving into the present) must never be so complete that the pastness of the toured can no longer be located. Put another way, we must always be able to identify the toured in the past, and our experience of the tour as the temporary experience of the pre-modern while anxiously negotiating the discourses of development that tell us that we should all be modern. In the context of Puno (and other areas of Latin America), this restricted modernization can be seen through Charles Hale’s concept of the *‘indio permitido’* (the authorized indian) who is

dedicated to the free market, committed to economic/material development, but still visually 'ethnic' enough to define the indigenous roots of the country (2004).

As I will examine in chapter four, tourism in Lake Titicaca is governed in part through the exercise of authority over the terms of development. However, in the ambiguous spaces opened by its illogical foundations we can locate the negotiated performances and contestations of the identity of the toured. In one sense, when applied to ethnic tourism, sustainable cultural development is about splitting the material and cultural (re)production/performance of given communities in a way that refuses (or simply ignores) the economic/material foundations of what has been produced as the 'difference' of the toured. In other words, the economic inequality between the tourist and toured is not only a predicate condition for tourism in the global economy (making tours cheap and accessible for mass tourists), but part of the networks of power that produce the subject/figure of the toured as economically *different* from the tourist. In this sense, 'development' seems to misunderstand what ethnic tourism is about. If ethnic tourism is about the authentic representation of what a community presumably 'is', that representation is inherently linked to *all* facets of that identity which make the performance of that authenticity possible. Possibly the temporal bordering of the toured is salvaged when we understand that development is predicated on positing the toured as having 'started' in the past in the first place and that development is practiced in ways that burden the toured with the responsibility of demonstrating their willingness and ability to modernize, while maintaining the boundaries of their difference. However, if we look at ethnic tourism not as the expression of 'authentic' identity, but as a series of governing practices then sustainable cultural development is nothing more than one of

many mechanisms, one that happens to be more obviously ambiguous. That this development is also practiced *for* the tourist (to make their stay/experience more comfortable) reinforces the privilege of the tourist position, in itself is a very complex area of discussion. Ultimately, what will resurface in the course of this piece is the specific politics that define the terms of identity and the tour as a whole in the Lake Titicaca region, located in this unstable use of time.

Up to this point I have been speaking broadly to the temporal making of the toured without becoming too invested in how temporal distinctions can be implicated and negotiated differently in various touristic sites. I have started to explore this question by presenting a particularly productive instability that informed much of my experience in Puno. What this indicates is how the uses of time are specifically located within spatial divisions that co-constitute the extensive process of constructing 'tourable' difference. With this in mind, I turn now to the making and meaning of indigeneity in the Peruvian Andes and the complex historical structures in which the touring space of Puno is formed.

Touring the space of difference

Engaging the practices of temporal distinction involves examining broad historical and epistemological patterns that produce our objects of study/gaze. Of course the practice of examining these is made problematic by their breadth. Similarly, taking up spatial practices of othering requires a more concrete, yet equally problematic, use of historical narrative to guide us to the specificities of the space we engage. My question in this section is how the process of figuring the toured is connected to various other productions of indigenous Andean identity? This question, and the questions posed in the general work on Andean politics in Peru, do not necessarily guide us to the main point of this piece, which reflects on the complexity of the toured identity in its continual

formation. In particular, the dominant comparative work on Peru focuses a great deal of attention on the apparent ‘lack’ of indigenous politics resulting from either a lack of political ‘space’ for indigenous engagement or the weak cohesion of indigenous identity (particularly the division between the Andes and the Amazon) (see Van Cott 2000, Yashar 2004, 2006, Warren and Jackson 2002, Albó 2004, and Burt 2004). These arguments, which emphasize the relationship of indigenous people to state structures and indigenous identity as a political mobilization, do not get us at the question of local makings of indigeneity and the processes and practices through which political identities are formed. We would not be prompted to ask questions about the relationship between toured communities and tour guides (as a site of identity politics), or even present ‘the toured’ as a form political identification. All of which is to say that the story I present below is a tool to get us to the site of analysis, but if we want to think seriously about situating politics differently, we have to also reflect on history as a guiding practice.

Indigeneity in the Peruvian Andes

The meanings and practices of colonialism in what we now call the Americas differed significantly from those places in which much of contemporary postcolonial theory is founded. There is a significant body of literature on postcolonial theory in Latin America, particularly through the Latin American Subaltern Studies Group, and while it is not the place here to go through this work in any detail, I would like to point out three important divergences that influence the meaning of indigenous space in the Peruvian Andes.

Walter Mignolo (2000) has argued that contrary to positions taken by Said on the making of the modern imperial order in the 19th century, the colonialism of the 15th and 16th century, particularly from the Iberian Peninsula, was foundational to modernity.

Importantly, for Mignolo, the Americas differ from the orient in that they were constructed not as 'others', but as *extensions*, albeit inferior, of Europe as a cultural (and theological) space. Thus, the Latin American vice-royalties became sites of occidentalization during Spanish and Portuguese rule, to be civilized as inferior reflections of Europe. Similarly, the process of internal colonialism of the post-colonial, post-'independence', creole states differed from what occurred in other areas of the colonial world in that the American states developed *alongside* the nation states of Europe in the 18th and 19th centuries. Finally, through his discussion of language and the geopolitics of knowledge, Mignolo points to the multiple levels of subalternization that are the result of the decline of Spain during the same period that the imperial powers in the east (France, and particularly England) reached their zenith. Thus, Spanish, the language of citizenship in most of Latin America, is globally subalternized to English (and French), a relationship played out in internal ethnic relations as well as between the dominant *mestizo* culture of Latin America and the white/European culture of North America and Europe. What becomes important later in the discussion of tourism in Puno is the double subordination of indigenous languages (specifically Quechua and Aymara) in the face of international tourism, such that language is one of the key sites where the politics of tourism plays out.

Though we can locate a starting point for our history in many places and times, let us craft our narrative out of the national, post-independence experience of Peru. Scholars examining the construction of the Peruvian nation-state following independence in 1824 point to its reflection of the duality of Spanish colonial rule – a duality that continues to function in the division of touristic space where the main touristic sites are located in the

Andes while ‘modern’ Peru occupies the coast¹¹. This division was based on the idea of an ‘indian’ republic and a ‘Spanish’ republic, both juxtaposed to the ultimate authority of the Spanish nation (Thurner 1997: 5). Following the creole independence movement, and the consolidation of the idea of Peru as a *nation* on par with those in Europe, civilizing the indigenous population became a tool for consolidating national unity (ibid.). However, for Thurner “with the deep past of colonial political history, postcolonial nation-making in Andean Peru could not be the wished-for tabula rasa of enlightened Creole invention but, instead, a dense and multilayered entanglement of colonial ethnic ‘republican’ politics past and postcolonial national ‘republican’ politics present” (ibid.: 8). What he notes is that for the new construction of the post-colonial nation to take place, elites had to both efface/elide certain parts of the colonial history while they “[were] also obliged to find some ingenious way to recover and appropriate the precolonial past for national history” (ibid.). Like Thurner, Florencia Mallon has argued that for Peru, unlike Mexico, the relationship between the nation and the indigenous population was never one of assimilation or incorporation because the Peruvian state was never able to fully incorporate the idea of indigeneity into the national imagination the way that the Mexican idea of *mestizaje* was (1995: 315-7)¹². In the space of this continued division at the national level, tourism policy (along with other movements including multiculturalism) ‘rewrites’ the nation with duality intact, but where the ‘other’

¹¹ I say dualistic here fully aware that I am locating my discussion in the Andes and entirely excluding the Amazon. This is for the sake of simplicity and also because in the production of touristic space in Peru, the Andes and Amazon remain geographically, discursively, and economically separated. For a good discussion of this issue see Green, Shane (2006). Getting over the Andes: The geo-eco politics of indigenous movements in Peru’s Twenty-first Century Inca Empire, *Journal of Latin American Studies*, 38, p. 327-54.

¹² *Mestizaje* refers to the promotion of mixed heritage as a national identity. It is most commonly associated with Mexico and, for the purposes here, its most important feature is that it promotes the dual heritage (indigenous/European) of *all* Mexicans, rather than a divided heritage of the nation.

Peru of the Andes can be celebrated and brought into the national imagination as the centre of tourism and the origin of national heritage.

We might also trace the discourses of tourism policy to another legacy of the nascent nation building of the 19th century: the de-historicized indigenous subject. This perspective was able to valorize and celebrate the Inca heritage of Peru, while at the same time de-valorising the contemporary indigenous people of Peru as having “little or nothing to contribute to the progress of modern civilization. In short, contemporary Indians had no history, no contemporaneity. They were simply, and irremediably, hung over” (Thurner, 1997: 12). For Thurner, this idea continued through *indigenista* literature, which (as we will see later) also celebrated the past “while betraying contempt for contemporary Indians” (ibid.). Currently manifested in ethnic tourism’s focus on preservation, which articulates the indigenous subject of Peru as only valuable to the nation in an authentic, non-corrupted form, this reflects a modified dualistic imagining that privileges modern Peru while it mystifies ‘deep’ Peru (the Andes) as a site of origin that exists (and *needs* to exist) outside modern time. This story brings the Andes into the fold of the nation by producing the region as a site of origin (a site of the national past) in a way that functions to ascribe particular identities to the people within it.

The history of this relationship between the past (located in the Andes) and the present (situated on the coast) can be told as one of outbreaks—spillages of the past into the space of the present—specifically through the Tupac Amaru II uprising in the 1780s and the rise of *indigenismo* in the 20th century. However what Thurner and Mallon take on in their subaltern historical projects of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries is to write the agency of indigenous engagement, not merely in the periodic ‘outbreaks’ but in

the daily spaces of articulating an indigenous Peru. Thurner argues that indigenous actors in the sierra were engaged with the liberal discourse of the nation state as a way to claim local rights to their benefit, partly constructing the foundation of the complex indigenous land and rights system that exists today (1997: 137-9). Mallon makes similar arguments about the engagement of indigenous actors in nation-state-making following the disaster of the War of the Pacific (1879-1883). The point of these efforts is to “subvert those accounts of Peru’s (and Latin America’s) republican history that deny historical subjectivity to ‘ethnic’ subalterns by placing them, intentionally or not, outside history” (Thurner 1997: 147). This reflection on negotiation is part of my appeal in this thesis and, though these histories are still telling particular (political) stories, we can bear their complexity in mind through our exploration of histories of contemporary indigenous-state relations in Peru.

The national imagining of indigeneity in Peru has been deeply influenced by the history of the *indigenismo* movement that developed in Peru and other Andean countries in the early twentieth century as a way to understand indigenous identity as a valorized part of the nation. *Indigenismo* as a cultural and ideological movement can be traced back to nineteenth century literature that took up the ‘indian problem’ within the national context. People associated with this movement in Peru include Luis Valcárcel, Manuel Gonzalez Prada, and later in the 1940s-60s José María Arguedas. Beyond its cultural bearings, *indigenismo* also served as a national political project, as attested to by the socialist *indigenismo* of José Carlos Mariátegui, founder of the Peruvian Communist Party. In this form, “‘authentic ‘indigenistas’, who should not be confused with those that exploit indigenous themes for mere ‘exoticism’, collaborate, consciously or not, in a

political and economic effort to assert [indigenous] rights” (Maríategui in Kokotovic 2005: 25). The movement celebrated the Andean culture of Peru’s indigenous population and sought to develop that culture and its people by developing its art and literature. Early valorization of indigenous culture was heavily racialized, and though in its later form it became more concerned with ‘culture’, it was underscored by both racial understandings and paternalism. This later *indigenismo* (begun in the 1940s) was guided by a “vision in which indigenista advocacy would pave the way for indígena agency” (Garcia 2005: 71). For Arguedas, this involved emphasizing the modern articulation of indigenous culture in conjunction with its tradition, reflected in contemporary intercultural movements:

Intercultural activists today, like Arguedas, are concerned with the cultural politics of both modernity and tradition. Much of their work is an attempt to return to an indigenous/traditional identity, although they are still clearly influenced by Arguedas’s attempts to perpetuate a modern idea of the Indian against the notion of cultural purity. As it was for Arguedas, for intercultural activists the emphasis still lies on national belonging as indigenous peoples, proud to be different. (ibid.: 73)

Indigenismo locates the indigenous actor within an essential culture/identity, prompting the search for indigenous agency in the assertion of the identity (for rights, recognition). Thus the temporal figuring of the Andean haunts attempts to define ‘relations’ between the still separated spheres of indigenous and non-indigenous Peru. Again, through this we come to tourism as the clash between cultural forms and power as the fight between these forms. However, by framing indigenous agency in this way, we leave only partially

examined the productive mechanisms that produce that identity in the detail of its daily performance governed through powers that produce its boundaries.

The ‘writing out of the indian’ is widely cited as one of the most profound reimaginings of indigenous-state relations in twentieth century Peruvian history. Following his 1968 military coup President Juan Velasco Alvarado consolidated a corporatist citizenship regime in Peru (Yashar 2004: 229). Unlike earlier articulations of citizenship that had maintained boundaries of ethnicity between indigenous and non-indigenous subjects, Velasco re-wrote the dominant discourse from ‘*indios*’ to ‘*campesinos*’, and the ‘day of the Indian’ to the ‘day of the peasant’ (Degregori 1993: 122). Under this system, the limit of difference in Peru became class, not ethnicity or race (ibid.), a class-based discourse that obfuscated its internal racism. In combination with the discourses of modernization theory, Yashar argues this focus on class was neither able to completely ‘erase’ ethnicity from the sierra (2004: 232), nor solve the tensions between the coast and sierra regions that continue to divide Peru (Klarén 2000: 342). This conflictual position was reflected many times during my interviews as guides employed the word *campesino* to avoid or ‘move beyond’ racism, while acknowledging the distinctions between the coast and sierra. However, if we leave this conflict as an effect of state discourse, we may not access some of the more complicated ways indigeneity is mobilized and defined in particular spaces, which we will return to in chapter four.

Again, to complicate this story of what happened in the 1960s and 70s, while in official discourse ‘indian’ was replaced with the seemingly more ‘progressive’ *campesino*, “the glorious Inca past continued to be extolled in official literature and

pronouncements, and Quechua was proclaimed the second national language of the country” (Klarén 2000: 342). These seemingly contradictory discourses are a pattern of ambiguity reflected in the sustainable cultural development that pervades tourism narratives and policy. Reflecting on Bhabha’s mimicry, we can see a demand here for the colonized to fulfill competing roles and the expectation that this can be governed in such a way that the dominating position will be reproduced. As with the above point, what the colonized do with this ambiguity cannot be understood simply through what was ascribed to them by elites, but in how this functions in its reproduction as a contestation over meanings and identities.

A contemporary history of indigeneity in Peru requires us to reflect on the *Sendero Luminoso* (Shining Path) guerrilla movement of the 1980s and 90s¹³. This sierra-based movement deeply impacted national imaginings of indigeneity (as well as global imaginings of Peru) and has led to significant and various scholarships. In its simplest articulation, *Sendero Luminoso* follows a strict Maoist doctrine that aspires to overthrow the state structure and institute a communist system¹⁴. The movement began in the Andean city of Ayacucho because of which it was conceptually linked to previous movements in the sierra and thus seen as another (spatially defined) indigenous uprising. In contrast, the *Sendero* ideology was specifically class-based, at times showing deep contempt for Andean culture and disregarding forms of Andean socialism (García 2005). However, at various moments and places, the movement built support within communities and strategically used such things as security provision and fighting

¹³ The smaller and lesser known MRTA (*Movimiento Revolucionario Tupac Amaru*) also contributed to the violence of this period.

corruption in combination with violence to gain control (Burt 2007: 12), thereby developing more complicated relationships to indigenous communities and leaders. Although indigenous community leaders were frequently killed, in places like Puno the *Senderos* “managed to transform an intense but highly localized work of implanting itself in rural support bases into a guerrilla war column” (Rénique 1998: 331). The government response to the movement was violent repression, often including massacres of Andean communities who had been taken over by *Sendero* forces. This response was mediated by intense racism and prejudice towards the people of the sierra, as seen in the stories of soldiers sent to randomly kill, rape, and brutalise ‘cholos/as’,¹⁵ (“Vietnam in the Andes” in Degregori et al 2005: 357-63).

In the early 1980s, during one of the most violent periods of the civil war (which was never officially declared), the Peruvian government issued a report on the death of several journalists that reflected the broader feelings about the war’s causes. The report “absolved the beleaguered Belaúnde administration of responsibility for the killings by attributing them instead to the ‘backwardness’ and isolation from national life of the *comuneros* of Uchuraccay, who maintained that they had attacked the journalists because they mistook them for guerrillas” (Kokotovic 2005: 167). For Kokotovic, the *Sendero* movement reaffirmed both a belief in the backwardness of indigenous peoples as well as a fear of indigenous space taking over the space of the nation. The vision of the ‘other’ Peru became one of fear, but also compassion for their backwardness and inability to

¹⁴ Although the leader of the Sendero movement, Abimael Guzmán, was captured in 1992, the movement has continued in various parts of the country, specifically in the coca/cocaine producing regions (not in Puno).

¹⁵ Cholo/a is a derogatory word used in Peru to describe someone who has migrated from a rural sierra community to the city (principally Lima, but also Arequipa and even Cuzco). However, it is also used to signify a complex of hybrid identities, and can be interpreted as meaning just a Peruvian, depending on usage. In this case, however, it is meant to be demeaning and signify ‘dirty indians’.

relate to the modernized coast (ibid.: 171-2). This fear was translated into hostility towards the internal refugees of the war who became the *desplazados* (displaced people) living in the *barriadas*, or shanty-towns, on the outskirts of the major cities (Kirk in Degregori et al., 2005: 370-83). In a reflection on earlier migration (in the 1950s and 60s) from the sierra to the coast, Kokotovic, quoting Efraín Kristal, states ““once Indians arrived in the city, curiosity about them decreased considerably because for the first time in Peruvian history urban inhabitants found themselves obliged to coexist with Indians”” (2005: 126). Again we see distance as crucial both to the production of difference itself and to the maintenance of that difference as authentic and worthy of interest. Equally, we can see ambivalence in these discourses moving between fear and wonder, a desire to keep the other out and a desire to observe the other as a signifier of difference. These contesting discourses are subtly articulated (though never completely resolved) in contemporary tourism policy that focuses on rural tourism development as a way to teach the *campesinos* to be more modern and to prevent the “*despoblacion*” (depopulation) of the sierra (*Lineamientos* 2006). These writings of indigeneity are part of the binding of the acceptable (‘tourable’) object, historically patterned and situated in a contested field of identities and desires.

The history of the *Sendero* movement prompts us to ask questions about the impact of this violence on political space in Peru and, particularly with relation to Bolivia and Ecuador, on indigenous mobilization. A key argument is that any growth in ethnic identification or consciousness in the 1970s (in the Aymara population of Puno, for example) was fractured by government and leftist party responses to the violence that viewed talk of ethnicity as racist and dangerous (Albó 2002: 189). Interestingly, what has

come out in much of the literature is a challenge to the assumption that the movement destroyed spaces for political engagement (see Yashar 2004, Van Cott 2000) in favour of examining the local politics of the movement (Degregori et al 2005, Rénique 1998). We can see some of the interesting local implications through the work that takes up the departments of Cajamarca and Puno. As in other areas of Peru local mobilizations such as the *rondas campesinas*, or peasant patrols, have been credited with slowing the advance of the *Senderos* (Starn in Degregori et al 2005: 456-7). There is also a complex history of mobilization and contestation in Puno in which the Sendero movement was situated and through which the various actors negotiated the demands of *Sendero* and government forces (see Klarén 2006, Rénique 1998). Rénique challenges the assumption that the war destroyed all spaces for mobilization by examining the role of the rural population in negotiating between the guerrillas and the government, affirming or denying the policies of each, and in the end siding with the government in such a way as to avoid the violent repression that had occurred in Ayacucho (ibid.: 331-2). He also locates this negotiation within longer standing regional conflicts with the state over land tenure. His work highlights the complexity of this period of violence and the differentiated experience of that violence in various communities and departments. Thus while the *Sendero* movement was and is a ‘national story’, it is not a singular one. Further, while tourism development is articulated as a process of rural renewal, the history of the civil war is not explicitly present within Puno (as a touristic space defined largely by its safety¹⁶), and in many ways the market practices of neoliberal policies appear to play a more significant role.

¹⁶ This is articulated particularly in comparison to the regions where the economy is fuelled by drug production and the larger and more dangerous cities for tourists (especially Arequipa).

A particularly powerful ‘marking’ point in the narrative of Peruvian history came with the 1990 election of Alberto Fujimori, the subsequent end of the intense *Sendero* conflict with the capture of the movement’s leader Abimael Guzmán in 1992, and the move towards neoliberal economic policies. The most significant effects of Fujimori’s regime were the centralization of the state (particularly following the *autogolpe*¹⁷ of 1992 where congress was dissolved and power centralized in the executive), and the final dismantling of a corporatist regime for full neoliberal economic policies (Burt 2004: 256-7). While this economic shift to liberalization and privatization has impacted tourism generally, of interest here are the practices of the free market in the production of touristic space and toured identities in Puno. Particularly the various pieces of legislation around competition including what was referred to during my interviews as the ‘*Ley de Libre Oferta y Demanda*’ (Law of Free Supply and Demand) have meant the proliferation of tourism agencies and intense competition as a defining feature of the space. This move coincided with a new constitution in 1993 that “‘recognizes and protects the ethnic and cultural plurality of the nation’ by guaranteeing the right of all people to use their own language before the state (Article 2). The constitution also recognizes and ‘respects the cultural identity of rural and native communities’ (Article 89)” (García 2004: 164). At the same time, the authoritarian responses to social movements during the 1990s restricted the possibility of national mobilizations or challenges to the neoliberal model (Burt 2007: 17). Following from these analyses, what has been of wide interest to scholars is the question of social mobilization since the reinstatement of democratic elections in 2001 and particularly the impact this might have on indigenous representation

¹⁷ ‘*Autogolpe*’ literally translates as ‘self-coup’ and refers to Fujimori’s centralization of authority in the office of the presidency –effectively exercising a coup d’etat without changing the head of state.

and identity based mobilization. However, the broad focus on ethnic mobilization tends to elide other governing practices such as touristic performance in the engagement and production of indigenous identities and the delimiting of boundaries of participation.

An interesting example of the implications of locating politics in messier interactions is found in Maria Elena García's work on bilingual education. She examines the development of bilingual education (made national policy in 1989). Rather than focus on the indigenous activists who promoted it as recognition of multicultural Peruvian citizenship, she wrote an ethnographic account of how this policy was negotiated by communities around the Andean city of Cuzco (2005). What García highlights in her work is the local politics of defining indigenous citizenship, where parents did not want their children educated in Quechua as they saw their right as Peruvian citizens to be educated in Spanish (*ibid.*: 90). In this example, citizenship becomes a practice of contested meanings that are locally articulated and defined. Interestingly here as well, the particular policy reflects the practices of locating and 'preserving' the reproduction of difference/diversity for the larger identity of the nation. Similarly, tourism policy is partly based in recognition of cultural diversity, which is an enticing draw for many communities. However, what I look at later is how the local practices of this policy define the meaning of indigeneity, as the practices of bilingualism define indigenous citizenship. Official recognition of essential identities is part of a long political process at the state level, but like the broad structures of tourism policy, it is through reflecting on its practices that we can access local complexity in the negotiation of those identities. With this in mind, what I work through briefly below are particular contemporary

discourses that reflect the historical patterns I have been discussing, highlighting how they inform the governing practices of touristic space in the Andes.

Authorized indigeneity and the politics of hybridity

The concept of neoliberal multiculturalism (the recognition of identity combined with liberalized economic policy) can be seen as the central governing structure whose practices work to define and produce acceptable forms of difference in many parts of contemporary Latin America including Peru (Hale 2004: 16). As opposed to *mestizaje*, whose primary focus is on a mixed and shared heritage, multiculturalism focuses on the varied and diverse nature of Latin American society and, in particular, the indigenous portion within it, as part of a well-balanced and ‘just’ state. Hale notes the continuity between this and neoliberal individualism in that “the core of neoliberalism’s cultural project is not radical individualism, but the creation of subjects who govern themselves in accordance with the logic of globalized capitalism... [thus distinguishing] between good ethnicity, which builds social capital, and ‘dysfunctional’ ethnicity, which incites conflict” (ibid.: 17). Ethnicity, within the national and global project, is limited through definition of acceptable difference, which in the making of indigenous difference Hale terms the “*indio permitido*” or the “authorized indian” (ibid.).

The concept of the *indio permitido* is quite apt for a discussion of ethnic tourism in this context and reflects similar discussions in both Butler and Foucault’s work on governed/normalized identities that define the terms of and regulate deviance. Additionally, its boundaries are defined through the continued performance of permissibility, not as an overarching ‘power’ that acts *on* subjects. Ethnic tourism effectively makes ethnicities marketable, which thereby implies a governing structure for ethnicity’s incorporation in the market. The mechanisms through which difference is

authorized produce the ordered ethnic subject and condition the entry of that subject into political existence. What is privileged as acceptable is the expression of indigenous identity that reproduces/repeats the boundaries examined above – as temporal and spatial othering that functions to produce that subject as an object and marker of cultural heritage. These subjects are useful for the market and, in this case, particularly for the state as a way it can imagine *its* ‘ethnicities’. The ‘other’ of the *indio permitido*, the rebellious ‘indian’ not dedicated to a just *nation*, becomes the threat for those who might not want to participate in a tourism structure.

Governance proactively creates and rewards the *indio permitido*, while condemning its Other to the racialized spaces of poverty and social exclusion. Those who occupy the category of the *indio permitido* must prove they have risen above the racialized traits of their brethren by endorsing and reinforcing the divide. (ibid: 19)

Creating the terms of acceptable difference is a foundational practice exercised through ethnic tourism, within which boundaries are formed through complex negotiation at the same time that they retain the semblance of coherence.

The management of difference presents an external image of Peru as one of development and relative stability, evinced in the discourses surrounding the Bolivian conflict in September 2008 and the holding of the APEC summit in Lima in November of the same year (interestingly, the APEC Youth Summit was held in Puno at the beginning of October). At the same time there continues to be enormous inequality in the sierra accompanied by protests and strikes. It is in this context that governed indigenous identities are mobilized to define the state as it ‘develops’ alongside preservation of its

deep cultural heritage. In this way, the practices of governing and performing the tour are linked to broader national, regional, and global political relations. As I suggested before that the dependence on tourism is not divorced from the particulars of its daily practice, this daily practice is equally connected to and implicated in broader structures and histories.

Thus, the space of indigeneity in Peru is historically contested and produced through imaginings of otherness and nationalism that bind and produce the Andes in particular ways. The spatial definition of Puno is further complicated and governed by the internal distinction in the sierra between Cuzco and its rural surroundings. Marisol de la Cadena uses a historical reading of indigenous performance in Cuzco to present de-Indianization as an anti-racist strategy taken up by indigenous people living in the city to celebrate their indigenous culture while challenging the historic stigmas against it. De-Indianization appropriates *mestizaje* in a way that challenges the notion of mixing as a form of progress towards 'whiteness'. In her words it "consists of (among other things) producing, celebrating, and staging a very 'impure' indigenous culture, which is empowering because it has been stripped of such elements of Indianness as illiteracy, poverty, exclusive rurality, and urban defeat" (ibid.: 317). Interestingly, this reflects a strategic use of ethnicity that can challenge hegemonic ideas of racial and social order, in a process that is an active construction and appropriation of dominant structures through performances of a 'different' indigeneity: the indigenous mestizo. Far from an accepted assimilation into a single understanding of *mestizo*-ness, de-Indianization articulates alternative forms of being *mestizo* (being 'mixed' or 'hybrid') in Peru, and in Cuzco in particular. However, this articulation of a positive indigenous identity, like the '*indio*

permitido', is a celebration of indigenous culture within a dominating system that structures its boundaries. Similarly, in reflections on *incanismo* as a cultural movement, Hill notes that it shares with the capitalist state a central focus on tourism as the means to development and participation in the market as the mechanism for political power (Hill 2007: 436). Thus the markers of poverty that de la Cadena notes above can remain signifiers of 'backwardness' while hybridized forms of dance and ritual festivals can be considered 'eclectic'.

As a practice, de-Indianization as a form of hybridity functions in part to maintain outer boundaries of an otherness that is unworthy of removing the stigmas of Indianness. As de la Cadena notes,

de-Indianization emphasizes the difference between indigenous culture as a postcolonial phenomenon and 'Indianness' as a colonized, inferior social condition. The discourse of de-Indianization allows grassroots intellectuals to reinvent indigenous culture stripped of the stigmatized Indianness that the elites assigned it since colonial times. However, since this liberating process itself continues to define Indianness as the utmost inferior condition in the region, it leaves room for racism to persist. (2000: 7)

Using hybridity in this way necessitates poles against which the hybrid can forge a middle ground, which in the Peruvian context become a rearticulation of the colonial divide. De-Indianization removes from its sphere of agency and 'emancipation' those people who continue to live in rural communities and who can still be racialized through cultural markers that construct their ethnicity as 'pure' or 'authentic' indians. Importantly, these communities are the ones most highly valued in the ethnic tourism market because they

are most removed from the core of dominant society and the most unsullied or unspoilt by interaction with that society (again in a framing of interaction as colliding spheres). Cuzco is articulated in Peruvian tourism as a unique meeting ground between traditional and modern Peru, and thus its very hybridity is an important marketing tool. While this in itself is quite complex it is beyond the scope of my project to get into a detailed analysis of how this process works and is played out on a daily level (see Silverman 2002, Van den Berghe and Flores Ochoa 2002, Hill 2007). What I most want to take from this discussion of hybridity and tourism in Peru is the way it works to position rural indigenous communities, for example those of Lake Titicaca, within a spatial and temporal complex of exclusion. These specific structures of articulating difference in the Andes are part of an important conceptual framework in which the making of touristic space is practiced.

Conclusion

In this chapter I have presented a working through of some of the logical, material, and discursive structures that function to produce the object of the tour as both temporally and spatially discrete and distinct from the tourist. Beginning with temporality, I posited that the toured are formed as objects of the past through the epistemological link of the denial of coevalness. As I presented, and as we shall see in the chapters that follow, this temporal distinction is constantly challenged by the ambiguities of a development rhetoric that demands movement towards modernity while seeking to preserve tradition. The second half of this chapter looked at the specific spatial othering in which toured communities in Puno are located. This has involved tracing particular imaginings and productions of indigeneity in Peru to unpack the intersecting meanings of indigenous space in the Andes.

The reading I have produced here of the various makings of time and space are problematic in their broad and superficial paintings of complex processes, but guide us to the particular questions of my argument. For now, the first question before us is to ask *how* these temporal and spatial borders are specifically maintained and reproduced. It is to this question that I turn in the following chapter where I investigate some of the ways the space (and time) of Lake Titicaca are produced in current policy and government and tour company documents. Though this is only one set of practices and my analysis is not comprehensive, it will illustrate how the objects of this space are constructed to open up discussion of the specific practices of these constructions.

Chapter Three: “*Aquí nació el imperio, aquí nació el Perú*”¹⁸

The sentiments of this poster tagline reflect much of what I have been suggesting about the easy appropriation of spaces into historicized narratives. A simple line connects the Inca Empire to the nation state Peru, locating in Puno the expectation of an original history that obfuscates its complexity and denies its coevalness. What I have suggested so far in this piece is that the spatial and temporal construction of the ethnic tour reproduces colonial and imperial projects of mapping and producing knowledge about peoples and spaces to tell a history of our ‘selves’ and our modern world. Given this, there is nothing surprising about the above statement; however, it is in such statements that ‘difference’ is defined and reproduced. In other words, these statements are practices of making differences legible and ‘tourable’. In this chapter I examine how the conceptual and epistemological frameworks I examined in chapter two are written into the discursive constructions of Lake Titicaca and the islands. Using framings of history, national policy documents, and national and international promotional material, I show the field in which toured subjects are currently produced. While I will undo some of the simplicity of this argument in the following chapter, these productions draw tourists to particular sites, creating expectations and meanings of particular spaces and from this define the terms of who these ethnic subjects/objects ‘are’ and their possibilities for political engagement.

A tourist’s history of Peru

As we saw in chapter two, tellings of Andean history guide us to particular questions and conclusions about the space. We also saw how the complex history of Andean indigenous politics produces contested meanings of the space that legitimate

¹⁸ “Here the empire was born, here Peru was born”

particular practices and identities. Similarly, history is a powerful mechanism in the production of imaginaries of touristic space, particularly in its linkages to projects of nationalism (see Silverman 2002, Pretes 2003). If we look briefly at the history of Peru produced by the governmental agency PromPerú we can see first the absurdity of the simplistic story being told and, more importantly, the particular function it serves in writing out/over what does not fit in the production of a narrative of what Peru, as a touristic destination, *is*.

Here, the story of colonialism begins with “the encounter between two worlds”: the indigenous Incas and the Spanish conquerors. The violences of this process are denied through statements such as “the indigenous population was to dwindle during the first few decades of Spanish rule” (*Peru at a Glance* “The encounter between two worlds” ¶1). The narrative of nation-formation is built on an explicit link between the Creole independence movement and the indigenous uprisings (particularly the Tupac Amaru II rebellion) of the 18th century, further linked to the state-making project that represented Tupac Amaru as a ‘national’ hero. In linking these stories we can champion the Peruvian state form as an ongoing democratic project, rather than reflect on the internal colonialism of the state structure and the structures of racial, ethnic, and gender inequality that are lived through, among other things, ethnic tourism. The most important function of this story is to ‘capture’ the ‘richness’ of Peruvian history without causing discomfort; in other words, make the good easy to consume and nutritious to the historicizing soul.

There is almost an ironic humour underlying the telling of the story of Peru here. The brief mention of religion states that “the missionary work of the Catholic priests blended with ancient Andean beliefs, forging a fusion of beliefs that still exists today”

(*Peru at a Glance* “The encounter between two worlds” ¶4). It continues “The Spaniards also brought along African slaves, who together with Spaniards and the indigenous population, form part of the social and racial fabric of Peru” (ibid.). Employed in this way, the past becomes a container of practices that are removed from our experience (and responsibility) and the space where we have cultivated the diversity of the present. While we tour the remnants of this fusion, we enter the past briefly to view it as an artefact, only to return to the present where these processes are understood as having been smooth and, regardless, are now closed.

It is also not without significance that the indigenous population of Peru is totally absent from the final section, “Peru Today”. Quite clearly, it would be impossible to ‘sell’ Peru through histories of political and social conflict, but this is precisely the point. The function of this history is to sell a particular narrative of the Peruvian state, and pass itself off as acceptable truth. The fact that indigenous people are not part of Peru’s present is both expected, in that indigenous Peru is an experience of the past, and odd in that it appears to tell a story of a unified Peru that contradicts the basis of tourism: its duality. However, what it does imply is that the disunity of Peru, as an effect of a colonial encounter that is *now* over, is an apolitical, cultural circumstance. The traveller is thus ‘free’ to appropriate this natural space and time of the tour.

Now, quite obviously, it would be rare to find a tourist who would accept this story as complete and it may seem naïve to demand responsibility to truth from a promotional website; however, this is explicitly not my point. The writing of history serves particular functions, and in the case of ethnic tourism, histories function to make the tour comfortable and natural (that is to make difference consumable and make it such

that the consumption of difference is a social reality). There is no ultimate truth in either of the histories I have employed, but ethnic tourism is based on a supposed access to truth and authenticity. What PromPerú's history is exemplary of is how tourism simplifies and depoliticizes space and subjects by claiming an authoritative representation of truth and claiming to contain in their totality spaces, histories, or differences. What is disturbing about this website is *not* that it is unexpected, but that it is *normal*, and that this articulation of history and knowledge is upheld and (re)constituted in the practices of touristic spaces like Lake Titicaca. Bearing in mind how this history functions for the international tourist, let us turn now to how current tourism policy reflects many of these depoliticizing and objectifying functions.

The object of tourism policy

Tourism policy is located in the complex historical practices and identifications of spaces and peoples employed in ways that legitimate governing authority of the definitions of difference. Here I am concerned with how current national policy in Peru, as governing practices, articulates and objectifies the toured, situating their passive responsibility to 'be' authentic against the aims of development/conservation and national integration taken on by the government and its agents. Again, this starts with the telling of another story.

During the 1960s and 70s, the tourism industry in Peru was, like many other industries, run through heavy state control and public investment. These investments are credited with bringing tourism to national economic (and political) importance (Desforges 2000: 185). However, as in much of Latin America in the 1980s, state debt and economic recession decreased the ability of the state to finance tourism. In addition, the rise of the *Sendero* movement made Peru a risky place for international tourists to visit, also causing

a massive decrease in the industry (ibid.). When Fujimori was elected in 1990 he instituted what was (cleverly) called ‘el fuji-shock’, which privatized state industries and cut back on subsidies (ibid.: 186). The effect for tourism was a drastic change in responsibility with private enterprise now becoming responsible for tourism development and left ‘free’ to compete. “The remaining role for the state is in co-ordinating the circulation of knowledge about the Peruvian tourist product” (ibid.). While this means that public organizations have less of a role in the daily management of tourism, the question of who produces knowledge of a touristic space is a heavily contested issue, and thus broad national productions are important in facilitating the local articulations of ethnicity, space, and control.

Currently, tourism falls under the purview of the *Ministerio de Comercio Exterior y Turismo* (MINCETUR) and its various sub-organizations including PromPerú (*Comisión de Promoción del Perú para la Exportación y el Turismo*). One of the most prevalent themes in the tourism documents produced by the Peruvian government is the development of a national imagination/conscience motivated towards tourism. In the *Ley para el Desarrollo de la Actividad Turística* (Law for the Development of Tourism Activity) one of the key objectives of the legislation is to “foment the tourism consciousness” (Article 4, 1998, my translation). In fact, one of the basic principles of tourism is “to contribute to the process of identification [identity formation] and national integration with the participation of and benefit to the community” (Article 2, 1998, my translation). The idea here is that tourism is a mechanism for those ‘outside’ the nation, but within its borders, to become fully integrated, or rather fully ‘inside’ the *story* of the nation. This involves the “creation of citizen consciousness around the economic and

social importance of tourism development for the country” (Article 6, 1998, my translation). Interestingly, this document defines the act of tourism as an “interrelationship between tourists, tourism service providers, and the State” (Article 3, 1998, my translation). This need to make tourism a national project and to nationalize its production is not a theme unique to Peru; however, the implication here is that tourism can serve a deeply political role in the production of the ‘nation’. At the same time this functions through the depoliticization of touristic sites that are understood as natural – that is pre-existing. Thus the internal politics of ethnic tourism, as a process of identity formation, that serve particular political functions in defining the cohesive nation, are obfuscated by the seeming consistency of these ‘identities’.

One of the sites where we can locate this writing of the toured prior to politics is in the theme of conservation which, as I have already suggested, is a deeply contested terrain. Again, one of the basic principles of tourism is “to conserve the Cultural Heritage of the Nation, the natural environment, forms of life, customs, identity, among others of the communities in which tourist attractions are found” (*Ley para el Desarrollo*, Article 2, 1998, my translation). The connection between ecology and culture posits them both as stable markers of the nation’s heritage and as cohesive ‘things’ in need of protection from change. Conservation implies both an object to conserve and a particular attitude towards change. There is something about change or ambiguity that is too modern and, like mobility, it functions to define a modern identity. This is fairly simplistic, but it produces a particular site where performances negotiate acceptable meanings of change – pushing at something that is primarily situated as negative.

A second key point here is that conservation is the domain of the state, thereby re-emphasizing the proprietary rights of the state or nation *over* everything within its juridical border. More succinctly, this authorizes the state as the body that determines the sites of tourism (the markers of cultural heritage) and, through regulatory policies, structures those sites or spaces along lines useful to the national project. In the sense of juridical power, we can say the state is empowered to determine within its own borders what qualifies (means) itself, and what does not, and protect that meaning against all other contesting powers/authorities. Taking up a Foucaultian reading, though, we can see these policies as mechanisms that define touristic spaces and the meanings of those spaces within the broader imaginary of the 'state'. As part of a network of mechanisms, taking up these touristic spaces in this way is an important but not totalizing appropriation and definition of meaning and identity that informs and conflicts with various other mechanisms at work. What becomes particularly troubling in the context of Peru, though, is that the particular exercises of power that define spaces as worthy to tour directly impact the material survival of the communities involved. Thus this process of defining spaces as 'tourable' deeply implicates both the limits of difference (what is acceptable and who can participate) and who can receive material benefits.

Within national policy, the form of tourism that I engage with is referred to as *turismo vivencial* or *turismo rural* (experiential tourism, or rural tourism). In a similar way that *campesino* de-raced *andino/non-andino* relations, these descriptors focus on space and the relationship of the tourist to the 'experience', rather than on the particular performances of ethnicity required for the toured to be worthy objects. The focus on rural, which reinforces the particular spatial separation of the modern-urban centres of

Peru and its rural outposts of the past, also functions as part of the justification of tourism as a development strategy. In “Guidelines” published by MINCETUR for tourism development in rural communities, key themes include community participation and the development of good business skills in conjunction with conservation and valorization of tangible cultural markers (*Lineamientos* 2006: 5). The contradictions here (both between the logics of development and conservation and between participation and objectification) are not reflected in the document because identity is taken up as a ‘fact’ that can be located rather than a process. Thus we can think of managing tourist attractions without critically engaging what it means to posit identities as ‘objects’ of management.

This takes us to the final point, which concerns the act of ‘finding’ tourist attractions. Again, this reproduces tourist attractions as pre-existing spaces of pastness to be discovered and tourism as an exogenous force that comes into these spaces and transforms them into commodities. This relationship was repeated to me by certain tourism operators in Puno, who claim to have ‘discovered’ Taquile and Amantaní as touristic resources. Cultural identity is thus re-inscribed as essential and ‘there’ as an ontological whole to be captured and displayed. Prior to the ‘introduction’ of tourism, these communities exist in a dehistoricized, inactive space waiting to be discovered by the tourism developers, the new explorers. Following the ‘arrival’ of tourism is the question of management, which is the primary policy concern. We can only get to this point, though, if we insist on eliding and removing from our analysis the people who compose the tourist attraction daily. We can only get out of this analysis if we insist on taking this composition (and its complexity) seriously.

Another way of phrasing the question to reflect this concern is who is considered a legitimate actor in touristic space and for whom is this space conserved? Particularly in the context of Puno the practices of defining space and identity are exercised by the tour guides who service the tourist as the subject/agent of the tour. Official tour guides in Peru must be state certified, meaning they must have completed a university level degree in tourism (with courses in history, anthropology, and business) in order to practice as guides. Part of the legislated function of tour guides is to “contribute to the preservation of archaeological monuments, parks and natural reserves, as well as the cultural identity and ethnic pluralism of our people” (*Ley del Guía de Turismo*, Article 3.3, 2005, my translation). Guides are thus conduits through which the ‘nation’ preserves itself, and through which the boundaries of difference and history are articulated from a position of privilege and access to knowledge. Importantly, Article 5 details the responsibilities of the guides, entirely understood as their responsibility towards the *tourist* (ibid.). Guides thus exercise a paternalistic responsibility of conservation over the toured (over their natural space and culture), solidifying the boundaries of the toured as objects to be taken up and presented to the tourist. What we shall see in the next chapter is how this illusion of control is disrupted at points where it is exercised such that the objectification produced in these policies in both a limiting and limited strategy of articulating difference.

Picturing the lake: Origin, mystery, and tradition

As I have been suggesting, these themes are also taken up in the visual and textual representations of Lake Titicaca and Peru more generally, produced in international and national promotional material (including websites and brochures). While this is not the place to engage a very deep or comprehensive analysis of these productions, I take up

some of the more relevant examples to illustrate my point about the practices of defining touristic space.

As I explored in chapter one, tourism is generally understood from the perspective of the tourist, not only because these people are more materially privileged, but also because tourism is founded in a particular reading of the subject as the modern appropriator of knowledge and experience. Similarly, the emphasis within the visual and textual productions of touristic *destinations* reflects the belief that the tour is a space for the tourist to engage and exercise their agency while the toured maintain their position as stable signifiers of otherness. Thus we get the names of tours such as “Peru Uncovered” and “Peru Panorama” (GAP Adventures) that imply the tour is about what is hidden from the tourist and thus it is itself an object of discovery or uncovering for the tourist to undertake. Similarly, companies such as iExplore (aptly named) employ the slogan “come back different” to capture and rearticulate the meaning of the tour for the tourist. Accompanied by tropes of exceptionalism, the tour is an appeal for fulfilling the *needs* of the tourist, as for example the need to see and appropriate Lake Titicaca written in the phrase “no Peru tour is complete without a photograph of this natural wonder” (Southern Explorations, ¶9).

With all this focus on the tourist, what is of more concern here is the production of the toured and specifically the spaces the toured are positioned to occupy. One particular example of this is the connection made between the ‘natural’ wonder of the lake and the people who live on it. Lake Titicaca, “the cradle of Incan civilization” (Southern Explorations, ¶9), is a site of origin that can signify both a deep past and the tranquility of nature, which exists prior to politics and society. The calmness of the lake is reflected in

the way its inhabitants are depicted as tranquil and amiable, living an authentic, natural life in this visually stunning place.

A clear example of this conflation of nature, indigenous culture, and tranquil (apolitical) space is found on the PromPerú website:

The lake contains numerous islands whose inhabitants continue to live as their ancestors have in custom and tradition. One example are the Uros people who live on “floating islands” artificially made from totora reeds, and navigate the waters of the lake in their fishing boats made from the same reeds. Taquile, Suasi, and Amantaní are known for the kindness of their residents, their ancestral skill in weaving, their pre-Columbian constructions, and lovely countryside. (*Ciudades y Destinos*, ¶3, my translation)

The representation of these communities as ‘kind’ and the conflation of this kindness with the loveliness of the countryside form discursive boundaries around the particular types of subjects the toured are expected to be. As a field in which subjectivity is formed, this is not a determining ascription of identity, but rather forms a space in which the toured reiterate this identity as a negotiation of its binding.

The concept of binding is particularly important because of the physical separation of the island communities from the mainland city of Puno. Puno is on the very edge of the Peruvian state, but, like the tour guide, exists in an ambiguous relation between modernity and the past. Puno is the gateway to the past space of the islands, but its division between past and present is complicated in that it is also defined for tourists as a colonial site. In this way the islands become doubly subordinated or removed (as their languages, Quechua and Aymara, do). This is particularly evident in photo galleries that

never depict islanders interacting in the city. Of the 18 photos in the PromPerú section on Puno, only five are of the city itself. The remaining photos are removed from the city, spatially, in the same way that their inhabitants are removed from their specific identities and times. Spatially they are held within and as a part of their islands (none are named – they are defined as Taquilean Inhabitant, etc., or not at all). Temporally they are held in a pre-modern stasis that is undefined and yet excluded from sites in the present. There is no knowledge of exact location, the prerogative of the modern subject able to interact with and reflect on his/her environment, as for these ‘objects’ of the tour it is irrelevant. The fact that the ‘when’ is both excluded and also ambiguous is doubly problematic, yet reinforcing, for it makes it possible to map these encounters as being outside the present time yet in an obscure and irrelevant outside (in other words, even the details of the exclusion are not important).

Similarly, separation is articulated through authoritative descriptions of the lake. On its website, PromPerú begins “[t]his lake is very important in Andean mythology since, according to legend, Manco Capac and Mama Ocllo, children of the sun god and founders of the Inca Empire, emerged from its waters,” and continues in the following paragraph with “Peru and Bolivia share sovereignty over this navigable lake, the highest in the world” (“Province of Puno”, ¶10-11). First we read the mystical description followed by the authoritative declaration of sovereign authority. The first evokes the experience of the tour as something that can access this mysterious past, while the second declares the modern political ‘reality’ of the lake. Used together, they imply an authoritative power over both aspects by the Peruvian state (as the appropriator and

container of Inca/pre-Inca heritage) as well as their distinct separation so as to avoid the ambiguous and complex implication of both in the historical moment of the present.

Where national promotion speaks of authority, international distinctions are made through the mystery and tradition of the land and its people. Intrepid writes for their tour entitled “Sacred land of the Incas”:

On Peru’s border is the mystical Lake Titicaca, a huge inland sea dotted with many culturally distinct islands. Ancient beliefs and traditions still hold true in many of the villages in the area. Learn about life on the lake during a homestay visit with a local family (2008: 30).

Temporally and spatially removed, these islands function as lessons for the traveller in pursuit of globally mapped and appropriated difference. As holders of a mysticism that we have lost, these people are shaped as markers of a past identity, bound to a particular space and conserved for the next group of tourists.

Through these types of practices the external production of Puno-Lake Titicaca entices and guides tourists into its space where its expectations form desires and boundaries for the people who become its objects. Once you arrive, you realize that Puno is saturated by tourism. The authenticity of its cultures is plastered on every sign, implicitly and explicitly present in every advertisement. Every other store sells crafts and alpaca wear, or runs guided tours of the islands. Each tour that leaves the mainland follows a pattern, a particular story that functions like the tourists’ history and brochures to produce a certain repeated and governed identity of the lake and the people who live on it. In a city filled each passing day with new travellers to service, the lake exists as the

city's definition – that mystical, natural, sacred lake out on which we find the objects of our various desires.

“The sacred lake in the eyes of the world”¹⁹

At seven in the morning a bus arrives at my hostel to take me down to the port. Despite my protestations and declaration that I am capable of walking the twenty minutes down Titicaca Avenue, I am told that the tour agencies cannot allow me to do that as ‘anything might happen to me’ (a statement that is plainly absurd for anyone who has spent significant time in Puno). But, the spatial separation must be maintained between the central core replete with hotels and various trappings of colonialism and the port, the gateway to the lake. We come to the port, and our guide tells us that we should pick up a few things to bring to our host family on Amantani; rice, fruit, pencils and paper for the children, coca leaves (but under no circumstances should we give candy). We then find our lancha, docked among the dozens waiting to embark. As we pass by, I notice the colectivo where taquileños sit among piles of food purchased on the mainland for the trip home. A couple of adventurous tourists have joined their authentic voyage, but we continue on to our company boat. Before we set out, a man comes aboard to play for us on the charango, always the same song (though no one else would notice). Finally, in the early morning sun, we depart.

Everyone who writes about Lake Titicaca remarks on its beauty; it is an exceptionally stunning place. The sun is bright during the dry season, and the sky reflects in the water a magnificent colour of blue contrasted against the earthy browns of the altiplano. Even when it is overcast, there is a strange beauty in its vastness. By far, the

¹⁹ The title for this reflection came from an advertisement for a tour agency in Puno. The reflection itself is based on cobbling together my various touring experiences, not one in particular.

boat rides were the best part of my whole experience, and the thing I miss the most. Inside the boat, I listen to the guide tell us about the lake, waiting until I can go out and sit on the roof and watch the lake in the peace of the cool, thin mountain air. The presentation begins with a physical description of the lake, its depth, temperature, wildlife (everything you could want). After this comes a very brief description of the cultures of the lake, made truly of the lake as extensions of its naturalness. We are also told that tourism is helping these communities develop by bringing them money, but we are warned not to let our adventure change these communities. We cannot give the Uros children candy or tips, because that will change their culture; we cannot give tips to Uros men because they will use the money to get drunk; what we can do is bring supplies for education because education is always permissible.

On the Uros, floating islands made of totora reeds thirty minutes from Puno, we sit together on a low bench and watch a presentation on how the islands are constructed and maintained. The guide presents this to us while in the background local men act out a model construction. Women sit making handicrafts and do not speak until they are called on to sell their beautiful wares and sing to us. For those of us who will pay five soles, we can take a special ride in one of the reed boats, which the guide tells us is yet another way to help these communities. We then continue in the lancha another two and a half hours to Amantaní.

Maybe fifty other tourists arrive with us at the dock on Amantaní. Walking up the rising terraces that divide the island as far as its summit some four thousand metres above sea level, we are taken by our hostess to the house where we will spend the night. According to our guide, Amantaní is home to a 'traditional' Quechua culture that we can

explore and get to know with the help of our hostess. Instead, though, that afternoon our guide takes us up the three hundred metre trek to the temple of Pacha Mama (Mother Earth) where we can watch the sun set over the lake. On returning to our host family, we are fed, quinoa soup and omelettes, and then dressed in brightly coloured traditional poleras (skirts), fajas (thick woven belts), and ponchos to attend the evening dance that is put on for each visiting group of tourists. A trip to the outhouse in the dark, and this rural Andean experience is complete.

The following day we take the lancha thirty minutes from Amantaní to Taquile where we climb again from the port to the main square. Along the way, the guide stops to give us a demonstration of local culture, interpreted through various examples of weaving. The intricately woven cloth the guide shows tells us who the Taquileños are, and how their precious difference and deep past proudly exist in this tiny corner of the world. After we reach the main square, we are given fifteen minutes to wander before going as a group to lunch. Taquileños dressed in traditional clothes decorate our view as we meander into the textile cooperative and photograph exhibit. With the guide's helpful directions and suggestions we eat lunch at a restaurant (trout from the lake served on specially made ceramic platters) and finally return down to the lancha to depart back across the blue expanse of the lake to Puno.

Back at the port, the tour agency has again arranged for a bus to take us back to our respective hotels. This time, my insistence is rewarded, and I am able to leave the group and walk back alone. The following day (or even that night), most of tourists I was with will be leaving Puno for Cuzco, La Paz, Arequipa, or Lima. They and I move through this site on the way somewhere else, appropriating its difference and beauty into

the mental worlds we inhabit. The only difference is time. I move at a slower pace, but I am still in transit knowing there is an end point when the object of my experience will be appropriated as part of something else. The only question that momentarily comes to mind is: next week, when we perform this ritual again, what will it be?

Chapter Four: Practices of Performing Difference on Lake Titicaca

Although I have not specifically used this language, the suggestions I have made thus far can be seen as largely concerned with representation; that is, the textual, visual, and epistemological representations that form the discursive boundaries of ethnic identity on Lake Titicaca, as a deeply historicized indigeneity. However, we can also think of representation in a broader political sense as questions of who speaks for whom, or for what, in what capacity, and in what authority. Presented in this way, the representations of identity produced through common sensibilities and normalized structures of otherness produce the conditions for engagement – the terms on which the toured enter into political negotiation of how tourism is to be practiced. Importantly, these terms are reproduced through the practices of repetition and performance (though never exactly in the same way). Returning to my reflections in the first chapter, one’s ability to engage in politics is contingent on performing an identity that will secure one’s ‘existence’ and define the terms (or boundaries) of one’s engagement. However, this contingency is not determining and is produced in relation to others – thus we return to representational practices as political.

In this chapter I engage with the local practices of representational politics that (re)produce and contest the terms of identity. I locate this in the formation of particular political identities, the toured and the tour guide, as a crucial site of controversy in this region and as a largely overlooked political relation. I present these as political identities because in the local context they are the terms on and through which people can engage in producing what tourism means and looks like. Tour guides practice within an ambiguous space and with a very murky identity, which reflects the general ambiguity of identity that I posited in chapter one, that is undermined by the seeming coherence of the toured. By

examining what the toured and tour guides *do* in this space we can challenge any reduction to simplistic narratives or dichotomies of who these people *are* and instead focus on what is produced and implicated in/by these actions/performances. The first section of this chapter examines some of the complex performances and practices of the tour in which tour guides work to maintain the dichotomies of past/present, original culture/tourist, while becoming enmeshed in its ambiguities. In the final section I reflect on a conference I attended while there, which took up the free market as a nodal point around which we can see broader contestations over representation and identity. While the performances of the daily practice of touring are situated in the reproduction of certain structures, they can at times be quite individuated. While my contention is that these are still a site of politics, the conference demonstrated a more openly collective form of negotiating practices of representation, while at the same time being predicated on and reproducing the articulation of identities formed through touring practices.

Governing performances, contesting authenticity

As I highlighted earlier, tourism in Puno is fiercely competitive. The governing market policy allows for the unregulated opening of private tourist agencies and other tourist related businesses, of which now there are over one hundred²⁰. Many tour agencies have agreements with hotels, hostels, and taxi services, so that tourists are presented with a package of services that they are encouraged to use when they check into their hostel. Hostel and hotel owners commonly say that the tour companies they use are the best, cheapest, and most reliable, while others will try and rip you off. My personal

²⁰ According to a list provided by PromPerú, there are 107 tour companies; however, this includes tour agencies that organize tours, boat operators, and tour bus companies who provide guided tours to Sillustani and other areas outside Puno. My point is merely to highlight how extensively tourism competition has defined the workings of this space.

experience here was that as I interviewed and dealt with ‘outside’ tour companies, I had to be very careful and strategic with the owners of my hostel, who tried to convince me that one of the central points of my thesis should be to argue which tour agencies are the ‘best’.

Many other island and mainland communities are in the process of developing tourism structures similar to those on Taquile, Uros, and Amantaní; however, none have been quite as successful to date. The regional conference, which I look at later, was primarily about this type of expansion and development. Legally, Taquile and Amantaní are considered *comunidades campesinas*²¹ and therefore have autonomous control of their islands, meaning that tourists must pay an ‘entry’ fee to visit (usually about five soles or less than two dollars). The Uros living on the lake are *tenientes gobernadores*²², which is made problematic by the fact that they are also located within the Titicaca National Reserve (RNT), as well by the fact that their islands are artificial. Made from totora reeds that grow in the lake, these islands can be constructed, reconstructed, and moved depending on the situation. However, the Uros have been able to maintain enough control that, like Taquile and Amantaní, they are paid by tourists who want to enter their land. For many “the town and surrounding region are considered ‘wild’ and violent, according to a nineteenth-century discourse that links geography, race, and character together” (Orlove 1993). At the same time, Peruvians call Puno the “‘heart’ of Peruvian folklore” (Zorn 2004: 8) (it has been designated the *capital folklórica*). Thus, those living in Puno have a complex and ambiguous relationship to the islands that are both the source

²¹ *Comunidad campesina* or ‘peasant community’ is a designation given to indigenous communities in the Andes and attached to particular territorial rights. It was introduced through the 1968 Agrarian Reform Law which distinguished communities in the Amazon as *comunidades nativas* (native communities).

of their economic development and representations of racial and ethnic inferiority/backwardness (at the same time that they share cultural identities as Quechua and Aymara *andinos*).

Tourism to the islands began to develop in the 1970s, and though this was stalled during the civil war, it has continued to boom since 2000. Taquileños were the first to develop tourism, in the early 1970s, after the successful sale of textiles. Amantaneños did not organize tourism on their island until 1978 (Gascón 2005: 54), meaning that they followed many of the touristic patterns of the Taquileños, while at the same time needing to differentiate themselves. The struggle for Taquileños has been one of trying to maintain control of the autonomously developed tourism industry in the face of growing competition from private tour companies on the mainland. The work of the Danish NGO Axis and Bolivian NGO PRAIA has been instrumental here. In contrast, for Amantaní the struggle has been both with mainland tour companies but also with the competition from Taquile. As Taquile develops a communitarian form of tourism that is able, to a certain degree, to include participation from most inhabitants, tourism to Amantaní has resulted in more segregate benefits (Gascón 2005). In addition, Taquile is a more ‘attractive’ site for tour companies for a number of reasons. For one thing, it is closer to Puno which means that tour guides can take people to Taquile without having to worry about spending the night there. Additionally, Taquile is internationally known for its cloth production and has received much international attention since the 1970s making it more likely that tourists will already have heard of it. In 2005 textile production on Taquile was designated a “Masterpiece of the Oral and Intangible Heritage of Humanity”

²² This is a type of residency that reflects the Uros’ claim to live on the lake, but also the fact that the Agrarian Reform Law does not apply to (artificial) territory on water (Kent 2006: 91).

by UNESCO. However, because of the strong history of local organization and communal tourism, Amantaní represents an easier target for mainland tour companies. In addition, recent improvements on Taquile have been criticized for making it look less authentic (*too* developed for ethnic tourism) and thus Amantaní represents an untapped resource for authentic tradition-seeking tourists (Zorn 2004). Tourism on the Uros functions similarly but is distinguished by the uniqueness of the artificial islands. Because of this, the islands are framed as completely ‘other’, outside our modern time and our modes of social organization. The Uros have historically been the subject of regional legends and have been characterized as “taciturn, introverted”, and leading a “silent life” (Canahuire 2002: 15). Though the Uros have been very active in contesting their position with mainland tour companies and the RNT, they have also been intensely objectified and forced to negotiate charges of lack of authenticity and poor environmental management (Kent 2006).

Tourists who come to Lake Titicaca hear and experience the tour mediated through the voice and action of the guide who speaks and translates the otherness of the toured into a simple and legible narrative (not coincidentally the guides are also responsible for paying the island communities on behalf of the tourists out of the general price of the tour). Articulations of the broader narratives we looked at in chapters two and three are repeated and performed in how the tour is conducted and the particular divisions the guides authorize through their actions. One of the main contributions I take from Bhabha is that translation is a process through which colonial power enunciates its authority and representations. Thus, expanding on the story I told of my experiences on these tours, I want to examine some of the ways guides perform the objectification and

pastness of the toured as practices that authorize the guides as representatives of the toured and the toured as representatives of the indigenous past.

In its simplest analysis, the authority of the guide is exercised through the separation of the toured and tourist (past and present, traditional and modern) and the guides' ability to move between these seemingly fixed spaces. This, in particular, involves preserving the stasis of the toured (temporally and spatially) in contrast to the mobility of the tourist. The connection to nature and the reliance of the toured communities on their particular environmental surroundings is one mechanism in this separation. On tours to the Uros, guides will talk about the organic and natural lifestyles of the Uros people, which they argue lead to their longevity. These people are at once removed from the modern 'problems' of manufactured lifestyles and paternalistically valued as in tune with their natural surroundings. They are both extensions of the lake, thus linked to its originary time, and teaching devices for a modern world that has lost its ability to live harmoniously with nature. For guides this articulates the very meaning of *turismo vivencial*; as one told me it is a way for tourists to learn how a simple life can be a happy life (Personal interview, September 19, 2008)²³.

The position of the guide, as the sole voice able to interpret the past is also produced through a very physical objectification of the toured. During a tour on Taquile, our guide would stop people as they were walking by and pull them in front of the group to 'show' Taquileño culture on the body of a community member who became the object of our gaze and discovery (Tour 5). This is one extreme example of a process that can be much subtler, but nonetheless problematic. For example, many guides deny that

²³ All interviews were conducted, recorded, and transcribed by me. All names of guides/operators are pseudonyms. See Appendix for breakdown of interviews and participant observation.

community members are involved in tourism development and insist that the management of tourism is the purview of the guiding agencies. During one interview, Gloria, a tour agency owner, lauded her company as the first to set up in Puno over twenty years ago and as the leader in ‘discovering’ the touristic resources of Taquile and Amantaní. Despite the work of Taquileños in the 1970s and the continued engagement of community members, Gloria maintained that it was companies from the mainland, and her company in particular, that had taught the communities how to prepare themselves for tourism (Personal interview, September 12). In this case there is not only an appropriation of the authority to represent these communities, but for some this has translated into a myth of discovery that mimics the adventure and mobility of the tourist. This view is not uniformly held, but in attempting to ‘be’ like the tourist, guides mimic an authority that maintains the distinctions on which the tour is predicated (what it needs for its survival).

In the same way, the guides use practices of objectification to mimic the toured (that is access knowledge of the toured identity). Particularly this means that knowledge comes from the guide because the guide can both understand the toured and translate that information appropriately to the tourist. When asked where the information of the tour comes from guides invariably answer from books, personal experience, the internet, or university courses. Not one guide even *suggested* the possibility that any of the information could come from the toured communities themselves. Gloria was very proud that her guides were so well-versed in the legends and stories of the lake, passed along from professors or from a ‘natural’ knowledge that comes from being a *puneño* (Personal interviews, September 12). These guides play roles that oscillate between a totalizing ‘us’ of all the people in the region, and a distinction of ‘them’ of the toured who become

characterized by their pastness, uniqueness, and authenticity. If we take this back to representation, we can see the tour guides as representing both 'sides' (both 'identities') of tourism and, through articulating movement between those positions, actually inscribing the border itself as natural and unambiguous. As we shall see, this oscillation deeply affects the terms on which tour guides negotiate their position/identity, particularly in the effect this has on their identification as 'indigenous' within a politics that defines indigeneity through the practices of tourism.

The governing of this border is also complicated by internal contestations as guides are fully aware of the power they exercise in representing the toured and negotiating the terms of that representation. Guides used the word 'manipulate' to describe what they do with tourists, and while some accept the possibilities this offers them to say what they want, others are more embarrassed of what this means. Jorge told me that because the information available is so incomplete, and especially because tourists do not know anything about Andean culture/history anyway, guides are very much free to say whatever they want. The restriction placed on the guide, he argued, is that you cannot appear not to know the answer to a question (you cannot appear not to have the whole truth) so it becomes easier to lie (Personal interview, September 12). Thus the guide exercises authority to speak truth, but is also bound by that truth never to be able to reflect its limits or complexity. Another guide, Alejandro, expressed an opposing view that took the ignorance of tourists and the limits of time and knowledge as an open space to educate them. He saw his role as a tour guide to promote and develop humanity, and so he would take his richest clients to the poorest islands (or areas of the

islands) to teach them about poverty issues and, in effect, how to be better people (Personal interview, September 20).

As we look deeper into this relationship, it becomes more complicated and more absurd to try and discuss it in all its detail. Given this, it is the detail that is important and it is the details to which we must look. What I want to turn to now are three areas where we can locate the ambiguity of the negotiations between toured and tour guide: namely in the politics of language, the meaning of indigeneity, and returning once again to the contradictions of sustainable cultural development. Boundaries of identity and terms of participation are produced in these contestations. While I have translated the thoughts of the people I interviewed into the language of my argument, the aim here is to reflect their positions by introducing a different way of talking about them.

As seen in chapter two, language is an important marker of indigeneity in Peru and is tied to broader linguistic hierarchies and histories. Language plays an intimate role in the production of touristic space, and is used constantly in the performance of othering. Through legislation, tour guides in Peru are required to speak at least one foreign language (*Ley de Guías de Turismo*, Article 5.3, 2005), and in Puno they are expected to be able to conduct tours in English, French, German, or Italian. The tours I went on with mainland companies were either monolingual English tours or bilingual English/Spanish. Despite the official recognition of Quechua and Aymara, Spanish is still widely considered the language of citizenship and authority (Garcia 2005). In Mignolo's reflection on the colonial/imperial understanding of time, "to be civilized is to be modern, and to be modern means to be in the present. Thus, the denial of coevalness became one of the more powerful strategies for the coloniality of power in the subalternization of

languages, knowledges, and cultures” (2000: 285). In the form of the ethnic tour the historicizing of languages is done through an idea of progression from Aymara/Quechua to Spanish and finally to the fully modern languages of English and French. The double subordination of Aymara and Quechua is important here, because, as Mignolo argues, colonial history and the decline of Spanish dominance meant that the site of knowledge production and authority moved to English and French. Thus, while Spanish is widely spoken globally, its status of ambiguity (as a European language spoken primarily in large areas of the ‘developing’ world), makes it easier to keep Aymara and Quechua completely out of the frame of the modern, global traveller.

Following from the argument that language hierarchizes temporal position, this requires a governing of the uses of language to continue making the temporal distinctions on which the tour is founded. Just as the guides move between the spaces of toured and tourist, they can also move through the spaces of language as the majority of guides are first language Quechua or Aymara themselves. So the presentation of the Uros is invariably explained by the guide with the help of community members in the background who do not speak but set up a model copy of the island. We can read this ‘silence’ as engagement on/with the terms of how toured identity is to be performed, but it ultimately maintains the subordinated position of language and the subjects of that language. During one tour, the community member spoke to us in Aymara which the guide then translated into Spanish and English. Despite the fact that this man spoke Spanish fluently, he maintained for the performance of the tour his authentic otherness and pastness by speaking the ‘ancestral’ language, which the guide was then authorized to move into modernity by moving it through Spanish and then to English. Again, the argument that

this is an engagement does not imply an ‘overthrowing’ of the guide’s authority. In a separate case it was the guide who maintained the borders by telling us that we would not be able to speak to the community members at all as they spoke very little Spanish. While there are many monolingual Quechua and Aymara speakers in these communities, a large proportion, particularly those involved in tourism, are at least moderately bilingual, which of course conflicts with the temporal bindings of language. But the authorized position of the guide meant that those on this tour simply did not attempt to engage in conversation with the community members. These examples show ways in which the subject positions of the tour are interpreted, constructed, and performed through this engagement with language as a mechanism for producing the meaning of identity.

However, the use of language also becomes strangely puzzling in the context of touristic performances on the Uros. Part of the touristic show on the Uros is to have the women sing children’s songs to the tourists in Aymara, Spanish, English, and sometimes French. It is unclear whose idea this performance was (when I asked about it I could not get a straight answer), but it does seem at first to challenge my claim about the ‘pastness’ or exclusion of the toured from the markers of modernity. However the performance itself is completely absurd and *as it is presented*, it becomes more of a joke for tourists or quaint *attempt* by these women to be modern. It rearticulates the historicist logic by presenting language as progressive movement while ultimately maintaining the firm border at the limit of actually participating in the vocal representation of themselves to the tourists.

Again my aim is not to articulate the toured as victims of a dominating force. Linguistic performances are not a function of actually *being* in the past, but rather engagements with the tools of identity. Thus, these types of performances are a useful entry point into a discussion of the toured as they engage with the terms of ethnic tourism, and through their bodies perform a governed identity appropriated at times for strategic purposes. To return again to my use of Butler and “to understand identity as a *practice*” we must see that “the subject is not *determined* by the rules through which it is generated because signification is *not a founding act, but rather a regulated process of repetition* that both conceals itself and enforces its rules precisely through the production of substantializing effects...‘agency,’ then, is to be located within the possibility of a variation on that repetition” (1994: 198). Thus Taquileños, for example, perform an identity of authentic indigenous culture, but articulate that authenticity in ways that challenge the governed presumptions and expectations of what authenticity is. On Taquile they have refused performances that clash with their own understanding of authenticity, in particular the demands from PromPerú that they sing and dance in the main square for tourists (Personal interview, September 16). For one NGO worker I interviewed, what was happening on the Uros reflected a lack of authenticity and a caving to the external pressures of agencies that interpret who these people are and how they should ‘act’ their identity. Using a language of ‘pure’ authenticity, she claimed the Taquileños’ act of resistance as their agency to be ‘themselves’ (ibid.). We can rephrase this as an act appropriating the performed repetition of identity that constructs the body of the toured in a way that reinterprets the guide - and agency - articulated yet naturalized assumptions of what authentic *andino* identity is. This argument is similar to the one

made by the NGO worker, but differs in that it does not posit resistance as the challenge of an ontologically prior 'truth' combating a falsity, but rather focuses on the effects of competing claims of authenticity. Even in rephrasing the issue in this way, authenticity remains as the strategic tool through which the terms of identity are contested; thus part of the rephrasing here is to pose a rethinking of the particular implications of this trope.

Going back to the earlier discussion of how tour guides oscillate between the two positions that they maintain, we can look at the meaning of indigeneity itself as a contested terrain of identity formation. One of the implications of approaches to identity politics that look solely at how identities act is that they miss the internal complexity of the particular formations and definitions of identity that implicate other important political relations. In particular we can examine how definitions of indigeneity are not totalized and are made within local interactions. Looking at the traces of indigenous identity in Peruvian politics from chapter two and the productions of indigeneity as a touring attraction in chapter three, one might expect to see a nationally defined indigeneity celebrated in the production of touring experiences in Lake Titicaca. However, the conversations I had indicated a much more locally complex understanding of indigeneity that did not merely reflect the macro processes of nation building. Even if we look at indigeneity as implicated in ongoing colonial relations, this is insufficient for accessing the complexity of local experiences of identification. Studied in this way, ethnic tourism does not locate the production of *an* indigeneity in Peru, but rather the various experiences of an indigenous/non-indigenous division, in this case in the relationships between toured communities and tour guides.

For all the people I spoke to the term indigenous connotes negative ascriptions and relationships that are, in many ways, too complicated for the tour to deal with. For this reason during tours guides never use the word indigenous. At times they will make reference to the ‘native’ communities of Taquile, Uros, and Amantaní, but this is also seen as a very touristic phrase (Personal interview, September 16). For Jorge, indigeneity means original and authentic for tourists and, though he agrees with this conceptualization, he cannot use it as for people in Puno indigenous means inferior and he does not want to offend the communities he describes (Personal interview, September 12). For others the aspect of tradition and the access to pre-history are important for the tour, not the present contestations over identity. José articulated indigeneity as people who live with customs and history passed through generations through oral communication (Personal interview, September 19). Thus it is easier in some cases to keep indigeneity off limits for the tour and focus on the temporal distinction of the toured.

Indeed this might suggest that by excluding the conflict over indigeneity, the tour guides/agencies are in fact binding the toured further by only articulating their identity in the past, pre-colonial, and uncomplicated way. This only makes sense, though, if we ignore the role of the communities themselves in defining the boundaries of acceptable indigenous identities. For some of those guides who identify as Quechua or Aymara, coming from the small communities around Puno, there is a sentiment that their identity cannot be celebrated in the same way that these toured communities can (Personal interview, September 10). It must be separated from the toured and performed in hushed tones, as it cannot be worn with “pride or security” (ibid.). These sentiments are also exhibited in the desires of surrounding communities to develop their own touring

structures so they too can be recognized as valuable cultures and important parts of regional heritage. Guides and non-toured communities are in a complicated position 'outside' the toured communities, but also 'inside' through broader affiliations with an 'indigenous' or *andino* identity that they do not represent. Thus we do not start from a position of an existing indigenous identity, but rather examine the practices that produce the terms that make any claim of identity possible. If my suggestion that tourism is one of the key current mechanisms for defining indigeneity broadly in Peru is accurate, then it becomes relevant to look at who the local representative figure of this identity is, within what position this figure can act, and how practices of exclusion affect the forms of negotiation that are possible.

Our final site to examine here is the specific practices of articulating sustainable cultural development that govern touristic performance, but are also deeply contested. To summarize, I use sustainable cultural development to mean the economic development of communities (their *material* modernization) done in tune with, and separated from, preservation of the cultural markers (those things that make them tourist attractions). Performing this move requires negotiating a fine balance between what are understood as the necessities of modern life and the danger of slippage out of the past (out of the space of the other) either fully into the space of the present, or into a liminal space that cannot be smoothed over for touristic consumption. In other words, tourism as a capitalist enterprise requires simple representations of spaces and peoples in order to write them as distinguishable goods worthy for consumption.

As seen in chapter three and as articulated by people in the region, the importance of preserving tradition is at the heart of all the arguments made about development. For

some guides, these communities will preserve themselves not only to fulfill the expectations of tourists, but also because they have stayed the same during all the years of tourism development and any sort of modernization does not suit them (Personal interview, September 12). In contrast, for Alejandro and others, it was from the role of the tour guide as an educator that he drew the authority and responsibility to educate the toured. His argument was that tourists have a fleeting relationship with the toured, but guides spend more time on the islands and see the problems every day and so have an obligation to tell the communities when they are doing something wrong (Personal interview, September 20). There is an acknowledgement of the conflictual aims of development and preservation, but through pressures and narratives, guides and agencies attempt to govern the space of the tour based on the expectations of modernization. The crucial point to keep in mind is that the governing of the tour is founded in the various complexes and representations that I have previously examined in the production of tourism narratives. It is the *practice* of this governing that is located in the actions of the tour guide and agencies that continually validates and enforces ideas about what touristic space ought to be, while simultaneously opening ambiguous spaces of contestation.

At the Regional Conference on Rural Tourism Development, representatives from many of the lake communities outlined the work they were doing to promote and create tourism in their communities. At the end of this two day event, which was the first of its kind in Peru, and by all accounts a successful effort, a MINCETUR representative from Lima gave a speech in which he re-iterated everything that these people had just finished saying, and gave them steps they needed to take to improve the quality of touristic services. The fundamental themes he outlined were the need for these people to be

friendly and punctual, to provide clean services (develop a 'culture of cleanliness'), and demonstrate to visiting tourists that Peru is developing (Conference Presentation, September 26). Aside from the presentation's patronizing character (which was at once believable and incredible), the presentation served as a clear demarcation of who the toured were meant to be in the context of the nation of Peru. The demands of development and the need to appear to deal with Peru's enormous inequalities mean that the toured are responsible for fitting as objects of Peru's past while simultaneously appearing to be 'helped' to move forward towards full modernity.

The 'culture of cleanliness' (*cultura de limpieza*) is one of the key governing structures used in tourism development in the region. For many communities at the conference the key barrier to attracting tourists is seen to be the lack of this culture of cleanliness in their population. Many of the presentations included pleas for support in the developing of this culture and emphasized what they had already done on this front. Toilet facilities and garbage pickup became markers of organized tourism development. What is interesting here is the replay of notions of 'dirtiness' in the indigenous population and the need to mimic 'cleanliness' for the modern tourist to feel comfortable while experiencing otherness. Also important is the idea that this is a 'cultural' shift done on behalf of the tourist as a remedy for a lack in the indigenous population. Thus both what is 'sustained' and what is 'developed' are in this case in the service of the tourist, not to change the indigenous communities too much, but to make them 'acceptable'.

On the one hand, development ensures an easier appropriation of spaces/cultures for the tourist, while on the other hand by authorizing certain kinds of development (circumscribing the space of the '*indio permitido*') tour guides/agencies perpetuate a

paternalistic mentality that binds the toured to the past by articulating their incapacity to negotiate the present. Several guides expressed their frustration at the way young children on Taquile and the Uros will hang around the touristic spaces selling small crafts or snacks as a way to earn money instead of being in school (Personal interviews, September 19, 20)²⁴. These guides proposed that their role as mediators is to teach the Taquileños about the value of education so that they will send their children to school, or maintain the cultural integrity of the Aymaras by teaching them not to let their children beg for money or candy (ibid.). For Francisca, the problem with tourism development in the region is that the toured communities cannot handle the introduction of money to their way of life, thereby causing a crisis that could only be averted by guides taking an active role in teaching the toured how to handle money (use it ‘properly’) (Personal interview, September 19). These attitudes are performed during the tour where guides will tell you not to give money or candy to children because it risks changing their culture, while in the same breath they say that we should give pencils, fruit, and other education supplies as a way to positively affect the communities (Tour 3). Clearly this point is not about the relative merits of candy or pencils, but the language used to talk about change and the practice of authorizing a particular kind of change while delegitimizing another. These practises are the enactment of broader national policies on sustainable development that highlight the need for respect of ‘our’ cultures and the participation of communities (*Lineamientos*, Section III, 2006: 5). National objectives include the teaching of market capacities to the toured communities so that they can develop their ‘services and products’ better (ibid.), objectifying and essentializing their culture and forcing them into

²⁴ This is what the guides told me, not something I factually verified. There are usually a few children in the main square in Taquile and on the roads, but I do not know how this affects their schooling.

trajectories aimed at the elusive ‘modernity’, but these objectives are exercised in locally specific ways, articulating the tour guide in a particular role that reauthorizes their position ‘between’ past and present. What is also important here is that acting out these historicized distinctions was a performance for me as well. As a researcher and a tourist, inserting ambiguities into the guiding practice, I became something else for the guides to negotiate in a way that re-inscribed their authority.

Given this, we can see the governing practices of development as a site where the very meaning of *turismo vivencial* is engaged in the competing performances of guides and toured community members. Guides describe the toured in an ‘ontological crisis’ in which they are losing a sense of themselves because of tourism and the desire for money (Personal interviews, September 19, 20). I rephrase this ‘crisis’ as the terms of entry that toured communities negotiate in one way by using the lines between public and private. What I mean here is the split between what is seen as being ‘for’ the tourist, and what is seen as strictly private for the community. The experiential element of ethnic tourism implies that access, particularly in small, rural communities should by default be complete. The attitude of many of the guides I interviewed was that these communities needed to be open and sharing for tourists to want to come visit them and be acculturated by the experience (Personal interviews, September 19, 30). One particular travel-story from a tour I went on to Sillustani highlights this way of thinking. On the way back to Puno we were passing by rural homes made of adobe and the guide asked if we wanted to stop so that people could take pictures of the houses. This was framed as a cultural ‘encounter’, rather than what it was: an objectification of a culture into a picture frame. After the guide said that we were going to stop somewhere, two girls started calling out

for him to stop now, at the house they could see outside their window (Tour 3). It was as if the fact that these were homes where people actually live and work, and not just presentations for tourists, did not enter their minds. It was as if it were obvious that, anyone who lives out here, who dresses like this, must be at the service of the tour, which takes over the space as the only prism through which it is interpreted. Or it was as if the guide's invitation was sufficient to open up the whole space to the tourist for exploration. Likewise, the very presence of tourists is not at all problematic, but rather because we have paid, and travelled all this way, we have some rights over the people we find here.

My question is what happens when the exercise of those rights is taken up by the toured? The way the toured practice the split between public and private reflects a deeper negotiation of the terms of ethnic tourism and the rights of the tourist. So on the one hand, people on the Uros and Amantaní give tourists full access as a way of making tourism more authentic while on the other hand Taquileños have entrenched this border for mainland tours as a way to preserve the community itself and not allow it to be consumed by a touristic performance. Again, these positions return to authenticity as the only strategy, but reflect active usage of the terms of the tour. Amantaní and Uros do not have the same history of organization as Taquile and so perform their 'identity' as fully accessible – though in a way that appropriates some of the meanings of that access. During a homestay on Amantaní, one tourist asked our host questions about the tourism structure, how many tourists she receives, and her income and expenses. The sense of entitlement mirrored the previous example, but was also interesting because of the possibility of deception. While Amantaneños compete ferociously with one another for guides to bring tourists to them, our host gave a picture of tourism on Amantaní as

rotating and communally structured (Tour 4). However, the presumption is that the former representation would not be well received by tourists, so it is easier to flatten the tour by smoothing over conflicts. In a similar example, the Uros will bring tourists into their homes to counter rumours and accusations from the mainland and other communities that they are not authentic and do not actually live on the floating islands. In this way the toured access the exceptionalism that is fundamental to tourism, and particularly ethnic tourism, in strategic ways through performing the very access that is considered natural in the construction of the ethnic tour.

In contrast, Taquileños are in a position where they can perform this distinction as a clear boundary that functions, as with the other examples, as a strategic tool. So, for example, a wedding that took place while I was there was a completely non-touristic event. In general, tourists could not come to the church service and were kept away from any of the celebrations. In this case what happens is that guides ignore the event and tourists use the passing wedding party as a photo opportunity without any explanation of what they are seeing. Thus, objectification becomes further entrenched by sacrificing control of the representation. In other words, the meaning is privatized, but the physical presence of tourists makes this privatization problematic. At the same time, maintaining these limits is a very conscious choice of how Taquileños choose to understand tourism. As was articulated to me, *turismo vivencial* is not the prism through which they think their entire lives. For them, maintaining these distinctions is central to maintaining their integrity and authenticity, something, again, that the Uros are seen to be 'losing' (Personal interview, September 16). Again we can phrase this differently as contested meanings of authenticity that interpret *turismo vivencial* as unable to preserve authentic

identity. Privacy is the mechanism for preservation, not access or the practices of guides. The mechanism of privacy is also a tool to authorize the local tour agency as a ‘truer’, more acceptable form of tourism. The tourists on this locally run tour (who spent the night on Taquile) were invited to go to the wedding ceremony and celebration (Tour 2). Thus access is a mechanism for privileging a particular kind of tourist and authorizing community based tourism as the mode of doing tourism ‘properly’.

Thus the contradictions of sustainable development are not only in what is preserved and what is ‘developed’, but question the very meaning of the ‘authentic’ and the mechanisms for its preservation. This in itself is a fairly simple point, but the crucial element here is that these contestations play out in daily practices in which toured communities are deeply engaged and invested. Ultimately the themes of language, indigeneity, and sustainable cultural development are linked by their implication in ‘authenticity’ as a conceptual foundation of ethnic tourism, and of identity more broadly. Even in constructivist approaches to identity, there is something about authenticity that authorizes representation. In other words, it authorizes positions from which we can speak, positions that are produced in the detail and messiness of everyday life. While these positions are made possible and limited by norms and historical structures, they are not determining and so while there is much within the practice of ethnic tourism that binds the toured in unequal and disrespectful ways, it is in reflecting on this binding as a *process* that we can refuse an objectification of the toured and speak of agency in the politics of defining difference.

Negotiating the free market: The problem of competition

In this final section, I turn to a slightly different point of entry into the discussion I have been engaging with so far. Any analysis of tourism development must take

seriously its structure within a capitalist framework that writes spaces and cultures as goods and services to be bought sold. I have already reflected on how this requires governing those 'goods' through the practices that create the '*indio permitido*' of the ethnic tour. What I want to take here is a specific aspect of capitalism – the open competition between tour agencies in Puno – as a site where tour guides and communities enter into contestations that function to form the identities of the conflict. In other words, the terms of representation are negotiated in the contestations over the effects of the competitive market structure. On the one hand, tour guides reflected on the problem of competition in a way that re-inscribed the historicist rendering of the toured and their own position of authority while at the same time being bound by the logic of tourism as a capitalist enterprise. On the other hand, toured communities have taken up the effects of this intense competition as a nodal point around which to organize. The ability to access this organization is predicated on rearticulating 'tourable' identities, but also reflects challenges to what and who represents that identity (*who* the toured are expected to 'be').

As I have noted repeatedly, competition in Puno is intense; in a city of one hundred thousand there are over one hundred agencies competing for the same set of tourists. According to free market policies, anyone is free to open a tour company provided they have the capital to invest (Personal interview, September 12). Under the state's neoliberal policies, monopolies over touristic sites are prohibited, meaning that the people of Taquile, Uros, and Amantaní do not have legitimate rights to claim sole authority over tourism to their islands (Zorn 2004: 162). What happens on the mainland, though, is that hostel and hotel owners have made connections with particular tour companies, particular transportation companies, and particular restaurants so that they

present a package to the tourists staying there of which services to use. Thus, there is a growing oligopoly as certain hotels have taken over service provision for a large number of tourists. As tourists are bombarded with people on the street selling tours to the islands, it becomes easier for hotels to recommend 'their' company, as the one that will not rip you off or the one that helps the communities the most (depending on what the tourist is perceived to want).

Due to the limited amount of time that tourists spend in Puno, the principal mechanism tour companies have to compete with one another is price. Mainland tour companies will do anything to lower prices from paying the communities as little as possible to not paying them at all (waiting so long to pay the communities that the obligation to pay actually expires) (Personal interview, September 12). Tour operators see this as an unfortunate situation as it means that touristic services are not competing in quality (the professionalism of the guide, language quality, types of *lanchas*), but only in price (Personal interview, September 19). As a complex group of people, tour guides express various positions on the effects of this competitive structure; however what I want to highlight is the way that criticisms of the market structure are performed and function as an objectification and temporal othering by continually presenting the toured in the past (unable to negotiate the present). These criticisms thus function to rearticulate both the logic of capitalism and the naturalness of ethnic tourism as a clash between bounded tradition and modernity.

As I said before, tour guides criticize the commodification of culture and the intense competition in tourism for causing an 'ontological crisis' for the toured. If we look back at how the guides exercise an authority over the terms of sustainable

development, we can see how criticism of commodification turns on itself as another historicized production of the toured. What is articulated here is that competition and capitalism are modern structures that can be negotiated by the tour guides, but are alien to the mentalities of the toured. Crucially, challenging the effects of capitalism is the role of the tour guides/agencies as the people in between, the mediators of tradition and modernity. So, for example, one of the prevailing attitudes is that the people of Taquile, Amantaní, and Uros are only interested in receiving as much money as possible. Thus guides tell stories of people on Amantaní offering them special treatment to encourage them to bring tourists to their ports or homes in the future (Personal interviews, September 12, 19). The problem, as the guides articulated it, is that this is not *who these people are* and they cannot possibly understand how to deal with the clash between their traditional lives and the modern capitalist structure. This implicates the toured as outside the modern political-economic structures that make tourism possible. Again, tourism is presented as an external force applied to the pre-existing natural identities of the Andes. In the telling of history in chapter two, I looked at the interactions of indigenous and non-indigenous Peru that implicate definable distinctions (meanings of difference) that should be seen as the effects of power. 'Who these people are' takes their reality as 'apolitical' and thus refuses to reflect on the powers exercised in this situation.

In an alternative way, tour guides discursively remove the toured from negotiating tourism by locating competition in the practices of the guides. Thus, while some guides responded as above by saying that the toured compete for money but do not know how to handle it, some responded by saying that there is no competition between the islands at all, all the competition is located between touring agencies (Personal interviews,

September 10, 19). This was linked to an idea that the culture of these places is unique and flows directly from the past without interruption (Personal interview September 19) and therefore exists prior to the external imposition of tourism. The toured live passively with their surroundings and natural culture, oblivious to the problems that surround them. Part of the purpose of highlighting this is to show again how the guides performed for me as well the tropes of ethnic tourism in a certain way that preserved their role as actively engaged and the toured as simply 'there' to be taken up and appropriated. Importantly, this is not an intentional position, but reflects how the broader narratives of tourism are enacted by their repetition in daily action and discourse.

Despite the protestations of the guides that the toured are either passive or incapable, communities have taken up the effects of neoliberal policies in various ways. This is certainly not the first time toured communities have challenged the competitive market structures of tourism. Past examples include a strike at the port on Taquile in 1989 that blocked any boats from docking (Zorn 2004: 133), the development of clientalist relations with tour agencies by *lancheros* on Amantaní to use their own boats to bring tourists and guides to the island (Gascón 2005: 59), and a series of conflicts over tourism policy between the RNT and the Uros community tourism committee (Kent 2006). The main goal for Taquile right now with the development of their community based tour agency is to set up barriers to challenge the current situation where mainland tour companies pay whatever they want to Taquileños (Personal interview, September 16)²⁵. While Taquileños articulate the changes they want in economic

²⁵ The development of this agency is not 'new', but rather an attempt to take back the control that was lost during the 1990s with the neoliberal shift that denied Taquileños rights to monopoly over travel to their island and opened up free competition on the mainland (Zorn 2004: 132-4).

terms, this also challenges how they are represented as toured objects. On tours from the mainland, guides take tourists on a climb up to the main square, where they spend fifteen minutes looking around and perusing the artisan goods after which they go to lunch and leave. By taking over the guiding function, Taquileños are trying to spend more time engaging with tourists and encouraging them to stay overnight with a family (Tour 2). In contrast to the tours from the mainland, the Taquileño guide made a point of including some of the history of the island (particularly its former role as a political prison), which is completely removed from the presentation given by mainland guides (Tour 2). After completing the demonstration, the guide explained that this was a small portion of the island, its culture, and its history and that he could never ‘show’ the whole island to the group (*ibid.*). As we saw before, these limits of ‘truth’ are not easily expressed in the context of the tour.

It is important not to exaggerate this practice as having transformative possibilities. What guides on Taquile are doing is mimicking the practices of mainland guides while appropriating the space that functions to interpret and represent culture. While they do this in a way that challenges the terms of the representation, they are limited by the various structures of tourism that influence the production of touristic spaces, which might be consciously acknowledged or unconsciously articulated. In fact there may have been nothing intentional here at all, but we can still reflect on the implication of articulating the relationship of knowledge and tourism differently.

The terms of representation have also been contested in a very specific way through a regional conference held in response to the effects of liberalized tourism development. On September 25 and 26, 2008 the First Regional Conference on Rural

Tourism Development was held in the Municipal Building in Puno's central square. The conference was organized and attended by some fifteen rural communities on and around Lake Titicaca who had developed or were in the process of developing local tourism. The goals of the conference were to discuss the experiences of the various communities and propose problems and potential solutions to be compiled in a single document to be presented later that year at the nation level tourism development conference. This was the first time anywhere in Peru that regionally organized discussion had led to a conference of this kind or any type of collective document. In his opening speech, the mayor of Puno described it as "*un día trascendental*". While I hesitate in placing undue importance on this event, its significance is in how it reflects a culmination of frustrations and negotiations within ethnic tourism that, in this case, has been taken up through the strategy of collective action.

The primary problem articulated at the conference was that mainland tour companies impose unfair prices and control the terms of development in tourism. The primary solution articulated was to strive towards local control of tourism so that the economic benefits can be fairly distributed. Those communities who are just starting to insert themselves in regional tourism were adamant about avoiding the earlier mistakes of other communities who had allowed tour companies to exploit them. Expanding on these economic concerns, the community members reflected on the representational practices of ethnic tourism and strategized about ways of doing tourism differently. One interesting concern articulated was that schools are not enforcing cultural recognition (ie not teaching students about indigenous culture or language). Thus tourism was highlighted as one of the few spaces to engage with representations of identity and influence its terms. One of

the issues this raised was the link between the competitive practices of guides and their limited knowledge of the communities they purport to represent. The authenticity of the community guide was proposed as the solution to this problem. Conversely, the breakaway group that discussed 'identity' highlighted the positive role of tourism in allowing them to recapture traditions and wear them in positive ways, as they did during the conference. Echoing Elayne Zorn's arguments about textiles on Taquile, they expressed these possibilities as an anti-racist strategy to promote indigenous identities in positive and meaningful ways (2004: 14). There was also a great deal of concern raised over the influence of urban life and the possible erosion of the cultures they were working to recapture. While this at first seemed like a rearticulation of the traditional/modern divide, the argument made was that "we have been taught that being modern means leaving our culture behind", but this is an understanding "we" can change. What is reflected here is that these communities wanted to present ways of coping with the dominant understanding of modernity that allow for different ways of being in the world.

Again, we have to be careful here that these strategies not be taken as transformative, but rather as working within and in many ways reproducing the logics and epistemic structures of ethnic touring. The performance of ethnic difference was an important part of the conference, as each community presentation displayed its uniqueness and *value*. There was nothing that directly reflected upon the basic structure of the tour, as a commodity produced by the toured through preservation to be consumed by the tourist. Presumably any community members who conflicted with this approach to touring (and there *are* people who adamantly oppose tourism in the region) were simply not invited to participate in forming the terms of a toured identity. Essential authenticity

continued to haunt the proceedings as the aims of the conference were still articulated as producing the ‘best’, most ‘authentic’ product for tourists to consume. My analysis of the conference is a rephrasing of the nodal point of analysis away from preserving or regaining control of ‘authenticity’ to the various functions and strategies of articulating difference. The point here is therefore quite modest, though easily overlooked. In using conflictual spaces to access issues of identity formation, toured communities engage the terms of ethnic tourism (the terms of their representation) and access the ability to represent difference by performing ‘tourable’ otherness.

In many ways, this chapter concludes in an untidy and rather sceptical place, but such is the character of the topic here. The problems we started with, the imperialist mapping and appropriating of time and space for the benefit of the privileged tourist, remain. What I have reflected on here is the complex process of articulating these structures in the practices of tour guides and community members. However, the point in highlighting practices and contestations is to refuse to see these structures as determining. At the same time, we must be cautious that we not become enchanted with our search for agency and elide what is troubling here. I have explored the actions of toured subjects through reflection on their production as ‘tourable’ objects through various mechanisms and the performances of identity that are the conditions for their participation in this political space. The challenge this presents is first to acknowledge touristic space as a site of complex politics, rather than merely structured by the broader political-economy and, second, to implicate what being toured means for how people engage and challenge their unequal situation. To be ‘toured’ is a fundamental political identity in regions of the

world like Puno, and as such it deserves us posing questions about the practices that form the boundaries of those identities and the terms of participation they produce.

Conclusion

I have suggested in this thesis that complicating our reading of touristic space requires reflecting on the productive mechanisms and practices that produced toured (and tourist) identities within the contested activity of daily performances. Starting from this position, I have presented an argument about the role of those who are toured within these mechanisms, as subjects bound within particular imaginings of historicized time and space. By taking the implications of the subject as a product of power seriously, we can challenge the definitions of difference that appear natural as they produce 'tourable' objects, and highlight the problematic tensions produced by a touring experience thought of as a form of leisure for the privileged tourist. However, by taking up the concepts of enunciation and, particularly, performativity in identity, we can avoid the totalizing narrative these governing productions seem to lead us to and rather focus attention on the practices of daily experiences and expressions of tourism as sites where political identities are formed. Expressed in another way, we are talking about the terms of representation, both as the discursive production of identity and as the position or authority to speak or act on behalf of others.

Building from my own experience as a tourist, I located this discussion in the specific touring practices of the island communities of Lake Titicaca. My argument here has been that these practices, fraught with complexity and ambiguity, work to maintain a specific distinction between the tourist and toured that positions the toured communities in the past, incapable of interacting with (or negotiating properly) the present modernity. While this seems simplistic, the complexity of the practices involved challenge us to move away from presentations of the toured as either objects of discovery or victims of oppressive structures. In presenting ways of reading the toured as agents, I am speaking

to a literature that has largely been unable to locate this agency. In doing so, I also want to challenge the presumption that the search for agency is the search for freedom from the fetters of a structure that unfairly reduces toured communities to something less than human. We are not on a path progressing towards an equal and just tourism; we are only negotiating the conditions and structures as we perform them – negotiations that could be done differently.

Thus my aim has been to implicate other ways of reading touristic space; however, in doing so, my piece has traced a similar line/logic in its narrative that returns us to an analysis of ‘ourselves’ as tourists. As a good, reflexive author, my empirical analysis has been interpreted through the experience of a tourist/researcher and as such, I hold no position of authority to speak on behalf of the people frequently excluded from our reflections on transnational movement. That said, what is interesting about reflecting on practices of touring/researching is the function of the study of the human in producing structures of knowledge and mappings of difference that uphold one another.

The question of difference is at the heart of the practice of ethnic touring and its broader implications for presenting a global subjectivity. Here I have argued that the way we understand the identity politics of touring implicates how we read the actions of the toured – specifically that the practices of touring are more than the encounter with difference, but rather are mechanisms in the making of difference *as* ‘tourable’. Further, by emphasizing the complex processes and exercises of power through which this difference is performed, I am challenging the dangerous implications of touring/researching practices that map difference in contained units while simultaneously using the complexity of the cosmopolitan in the ascription of modern privilege. In other

words, I am concerned with how these practices negate the messiness of how identities are lived and performed in the formation and governing of particular types of subjects/objects who exist at the behest of those who travel. In the context of Lake Titicaca, I have explored how ethnicity is particularly salient in its function as an ordering *practice*, and touring as a process of defining ethnic difference in ways that uphold certain privileges and epistemic desires for objects of discovery and knowledge. I have very consciously limited my analysis to the production of ethnicized identity possibly at the expense of reflections of the gendering (or other identity practices) of toured identities (see especially Aitchison (2001) for gender and tourism). In part this comes from my particular and personal investment in the makings and meanings of ‘ethnicity’, but this implicates further complexities and bindings. In the end, this concern for practices does not mean we cannot speak at all of ethnicity, or that ethnic identification has no value, but that the ‘value’ of ethnic definitions is in their usages, both as governing structures and as strategic mechanisms.

I highlighted sustainable development as a particularly productive and ambiguous governing structure for ethnic difference on Lake Titicaca. My aim in this regard is not to discount the work being done by scholars and practitioners of development, particularly on the community-based participation model, but to pose questions about the performance of the tour rather than focus only on its management. In other words, what I want to propose is that if community-based tourism is to be presented as an alternative form of travel, those who work within it should think seriously about what is reinforced by the content of the tour itself. This is a large and complicated question; however I think a productive point of departure is situating touristic performances within a political frame.

As with any empirical work, the location of my exploration implicates further questions for practices of touring in other places. I have said very little about the connection between eco and ethnic touring, crucial to the touring of communities in the Amazon, or the implications of other political-economic conditions for the formation of sites and differences. That said, the intensity with which the structures of tourism govern Puno is both troubling and, I suspect, very widespread. I do not think that we, as tourists or people with aspirations of travel, have given enough thought to the complex implications of how what we aspire to ('being' well travelled and knowledgeable about the world) implicates more than just our ability to participate in global politics or be worthy of globally responsible thinking. For the people of Puno this is a strategy for living that governs the terms of participation, and though I have argued that they engage in the making of these terms, this does not alleviate our complicity in reproducing the conditions that make possible our accustomed practice of mapping difference.

I started this piece with a poem that describes the lake as an object to be desired, whose vast unfamiliarity and beauty guide the adventurous wanderer to the point of self-changing discovery. I have not strayed very far from this refrain; I have only at times been able to point at places of discomfort. It may be fitting, then, to end with a story from my adventures. During one of my interviews, the guide I was speaking with asked me why I was interested in tourism. After pausing a moment, caught off guard, I responded rather ironically (and unsure of what I actually meant) that I thought it was an interesting form of communication. She responded by telling me that tourism is something universal, something we all need and can experience together and that someday, travelling will count like water and food as one of the basic requirements of being human.

I suppose “on this water, under this sky” we can all be human, and experience that self-indulgent liberation of forgetting who we ‘are’, provided we can also elide how who we are becomes possible through the practices and powers that define, govern, and arrange identity and difference.

Bibliography

- Adler, Judith. (1989a). Origins of sightseeing. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 16, p. 7-29.
- . (1989b). Travel as performed art. *The American Journal of Sociology*, 94(6), p. 1366-91.
- Aitchison, Cara. (2001). Theorizing Other discourses on tourism, gender and culture: Can the subaltern speak (in tourism)? *Tourist Studies*, 1(2), p. 133-47.
- Albó, Xavier. (1991). El retorno del indio. *Revista Andina*, 9(2), p. 299-345.
- . (2002). *Pueblos Indios en la Política*. La Paz: CIPCA.
- . (2004). Ethnic identity and politics in the central Andes: The cases of Bolivia, Ecuador, and Peru. In Burt and Mauceri (eds.) *Politics in the Andes: Identity, conflict, reform*, Pittsburgh, PA: University of Pittsburgh Press, p. 17-37.
- Ap, John and Wong, Kevin. (2001) Case study on tour guiding: Professionalism, issues, and problems, *Tourism Management*, 22, p. 551-63.
- Ariel de Vidas, A. (1995). Textiles, memory and the souvenir industry in the Andes. In Lanfant, M. et al (eds.) *International Tourism: Identity and change*, London: Sage, p. 67-83.
- Ballengee-Morris, Christine. (2002). Cultures for sale: Perspectives on colonialism and self-determination and the relationship to authenticity and tourism. *Studies in Art Education*, 43(3), p. 232-245.
- Baud, Michiel, Ypeij, Annelou, and Zoomers, Annelies. (2006). El turismo como estrategia para el desarrollo sostenible. In Ypeij, Annelou and Zoomers, Annelies (eds.) *La Ruta Andina: Turismo y desarrollo sostenible en Perú y Bolivia*, Lima: IEP, p. 9-36.
- Bhabha, Homi. (1994). *The Location of Culture*. New York: Routledge.
- Black, Rosemary, Ham, Sam, and Weiler, Betty. (2001). Ecotour guide training in less developed countries: Some preliminary research findings. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 9(2), p. 147-56.
- Brysk, Allison. (2000). *From Tribal Village to Global Village: Indian rights and international relations in Latin America*, Stanford: Stanford University Press.

- Burt, Jo-Marie. (2004). State making against democracy: The case of Fujimori's Peru. In Burt and Mauceri (eds.) *Politics in the Andes: Identity, conflict, reform*, Pittsburgh, PA: University of Pittsburgh Press, p. 247-68.
- . (2007). *Political Violence and the Authoritarian State in Peru: Silencing civil society*. New York: Palgrave.
- Butler, Judith. (1990). *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the subversion of identity*, New York: Routledge.
- . (1997). *The Psychic Life of Power*, Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Canahuire Ccama, J. Alfonso. (2002). *La Misteriosa Cultura de los Uros: de Ayer y Hoy*. Puno: Sociedad de Integración Cultura Andina.
- Canessa, Andrew. (2005) (ed.). *Natives Making Nation: Gender, indigeneity, and the state in the Andes*, Tucson: University of Arizona Press.
- Castro-Klarén, Sara. (2008). Posting letters: Writing in the Andes and the paradoxes of the postcolonial debate. In Moraña, M. et al (eds.) *Coloniality at Large: Latin America and the postcolonial debate*, Durham: Duke University Press, p. 130-57.
- Chakrabarty, Dipesh. (2000). *Provincializing Europe: Postcolonial thought and historical difference*, Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Clifford, James. (1986). Introduction: Partial truths. In Clifford and Marcus (eds.) *Writing Culture: The Poetics and politics of ethnography*, Berkeley: University of California Press, p. 1-26.
- Cohen, Erik. (1984). The Sociology of tourism: Approaches, issues, and findings. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 10, 373-92.
- . (1989). The Commercialization of ethnic craft. *Journal of Design History*, 2(2-3), p. 161-8.
- Comisión de Promoción del Perú para la Exportación y el Turismo. (2007). *Plan Operativo Institucional 2008*. Oficina de Planeamiento y Presupuesto.
- Condès, Sebastien. (2004). Les incidences du tourisme sur le développement. *Revue Tiers Monde*, 45(178), p. 269-91.
- Crick, Malcolm. (1989). Representations of international tourism in the social sciences: Sun, sex, sights, savings, and servility. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 18, p. 307-44.

- Dahles, Heidi. (2002). The Politics of tour guiding: Image management in Indonesia, *Annals of Tourism Research*, 29(3), p. 783-800.
- De la Cadena, Marisol. (2000). *Indigenous Mestizos: The Politics of race and culture in Cuzco, Peru, 1919-1991*, Durham: Duke University Press.
- Degregori, Carlos Iván. (1993). Identidad étnica, movimientos sociales y participación política en el Perú. In *Democracia, etnicidad y violencia política en los países andinos*. Lima: IFEA/IEP, p. 113-29.
- Desforges, Luke. (2000). State tourism institutions and neo-liberal development: a case study of Peru. *Tourism Geographies*, 2(2), 177-92.
- Dunn, Kevin. (2004). Fear of a black planet: Anarchy anxieties and postcolonial travel to Africa. *Third World Quarterly*, 25(3), p. 483-99.
- Eber, Christine and Rosenbaum, Brenda. (1993). "That we may serve beneath your hands and feet": Women weavers in highland Chiapas, Mexico. In Nash (ed.) *Crafts in the World Market*, Albany: State University of New York Press, p. 155-180.
- Echtner, Charlotte. (1995). Entrepreneurial training in developing countries. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 22(1), p. 119-34.
- Enloe, Cynthia. (1989). On the beach: Sexism and tourism. In *Bananas, Beaches, and Bases*, Berkeley: University of California Press, p. 19-41.
- Fabian, Johannes. (1983). *Time and the Other: How anthropology makes its object*, New York: Columbia University Press.
- Fine, Elizabeth and Speer, Jean Haskell. (1985). Tour guide performances as site sacralization. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 12, p. 73-95.
- Foucault, Michel. [1976] (2007). The Meshes of power. In Crampton and Elden (eds.) *Space, Knowledge and Power: Foucault and geography*, Hampshire, England: Ashgate, p. 153-162.
- . [1978] (1990). *The History of Sexuality: Volume I*. Translated by Robert Hurley. New York: Vintage.
- . [1970] (1994). *The Order of Things: An archaeology of the Human Sciences*. New York: Vintage.
- GAP Adventures. (2008). *Peru Travel and Destination Guide*. G.A.P. Adventures – Adventure Travel and Eco Tours, Accessed August 2008 at

- http://www.gapadventures.com/destination_guide/overview/Peru.
- García, Maria Elena. (2005). *Making Indigenous Citizens: Identities, education, and multicultural development in Peru*, Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- García, Maria Elena and Lucero José Antonio. (2004). Un país sin indígenas?: Rethinking indigenous politics in Peru. In Postero and Zamosc (eds.) *The Struggle for Indigenous Rights in Latin America*. Brighton: Sussex Academic Press, p. 158-88.
- Gascón, Jorge. (2005). *Gringos como en sueños: Diferenciación y conflict campesinos en los Andes peruanos ante el desarrollo del turismo*. Lima: IEP Ediciones.
- Gecko's Grassroots Adventures. (2007-2009). Worldwide. Author.
- Getino, Octavio. (2002). *Turismo: Entre el ocio y el neg-ocio: Identidad cultural y desarrollo economic para América Latina y el Mercosur*. Buenos Aires, Argentina: Ediciones Ciccus
- Graburn, Nelson. (1989). Tourism: The sacred journey. In Smith (ed.) *Hosts and Guests: The anthropology of tourism*, Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, p. 21-36.
- Hale, Charles. (2004). Rethinking indigenous politics in the era of the 'indio permitido'. *NACLA Report of the Americas*, p. 16-21.
- Hall, Colin Michael. (1994). *Tourism and Politics: Policy, power and place*. Chichester, England: John Wiley and Sons.
- Hall, Colin Michael and Tucker, Hazel (eds.) (2004). *Tourism and Postcolonialism: Contested discourses, identities, and representations*, New York: Routledge.
- Hall, Gillette. and Patrinos, Harry. (eds.) (2006). *Indigenous peoples, poverty, and human development in Latin America*, New York: Palgrave MacMillan.
- Harkin, Michael. (1995). Modernist anthropology and tourism of the authentic. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 22(3), p. 650-670.
- . (2003). Staged encounters: Postmodern tourism and aboriginal people. *Ethnohistory*, 50(3), p. 575-85.
- Harvey, David. (1990). Between space and time: Reflections on geographical imagination. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, 8(3), p. 418-34.
- Hill, Michael D. (2007). Contesting patrimony: Cusco's mystical tourist industry and the politics of *incanismo*. *Ethnos*, 72(4), p. 433-60.

- Hollinshead, Keith. (1998). Tourism, hybridity, and ambiguity: The relevance of Bhabha's 'third space' cultures. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 30(1), p. 121-56.
- . (2004). Tourism and new sense: Worldmaking and the enunciative value of tourism. In Hall, C.M. and Tucker, H. (eds), *Tourism and Postcolonialism*. New York: Routledge, p. 25-42.
- Howard, Jonathon, Thwaites, Rik, and Smith, Brenda. (2001). Investigating the roles of indigenous tour guide, *The Journal of Tourism Studies*, 12(2), p. 32-9.
- Intrepid Travel. (2008). Latin America. Fitzroy, Australia: Author.
- Kaplan, Flora. (1993). Mexican museum in the creation of a national image in world tourism. In Nash (ed.) *Crafts in the World Market*, Albany: State University of New York Press, p. 103-126.
- Kapoor, Ilan. (2003). Acting in a tight spot: Homi Bhabha's postcolonial politics. *New Political Science*, 25(4), p. 561-77.
- Kent, Michael. (2006). From reeds to tourism: The transformation of territorial conflicts in the Titicaca National Reserve. *Current Issues in Tourism*, 9(1), p. 86-103.
- Klarén, Peter. (2000). *Peru: Society and nationhood in the Andes*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Lanfant, Marie Françoise. (1995). Introduction and Chapter 1: International tourism, internationalization, and the challenge to identity. In Lanfant, M. et al (eds.) *International Tourism: Identity and change*, London: Sage, p. 1-23, 24-41.
- Latin American Subaltern Studies Group. (1993). Founding Statement. *boundary 2*, 20(3), p. 110-21.
- Little, Walter. (2000). Home as a place of exhibition and performance: Mayan household transformations in Guatemala. *Ethnology*, 39(2), p. 163-81.
- . (2004). Outside of social movements: Dilemmas of indigenous handicrafts vendors in Guatemala. *American Ethnologist*, 31(1), p. 43-59.
- . (2004). *Mayas in the marketplace: Tourism, globalization, and cultural identity*, Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Mallon, Florencia (1995). *Peasant and Nation: The making of postcolonial Mexico and Peru*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

- Meethan, Kevin. (2001). *Tourism in global society: Place, culture, consumption*. New York: Palgrave.
- . (2006). Introduction: Narratives of place and self. In Meethan et al (eds.) *Tourism, Consumption, and Representation*, Cambridge: CABI, p. 1-23.
- Mendieta, Eduardo. (2008). Remapping Latin American studies: Postcolonialism, subaltern studies, post-occidentalism, and globalization theory. In Moraña, M. et al (eds.) *Coloniality at Large: Latin America and the postcolonial debate*, Durham: Duke University Press, p. 286-306.
- Menodza, Zoila S. 2008. *Creating our own: Folklore, performance, and identity in Cuzco, Peru*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Mignolo, Walter D. (2000). *Local histories/global designs*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Ministerio de Comercio Exterior y Turismo del Peru. (2006). *Lineamientos para el desarrollo del turismo rural comunitario en el Peru*. San Isidro.
- Mitchell, Ross. and Reid, Donald. (2000). Community integration: Island tourism in Peru. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 28(1), p. 113-139.
- Montoya, Rodrigo. (1993). Libertad, democracia y problema étnico en el Perú. In *Democracia, etnicidad y violencia política en los países andinos*. Lima: IFEA/IEP, p. 103-112.
- Mowforth, Martin, Charlton, Clive, and Munt, Ian. (2008). *Tourism and responsibility: Perspectives from Latin America and the Caribbean*. London: Routledge.
- Nash, Dennison. (1981). Tourism as an anthropological subject. *Current Anthropology*, 22(5), p.461-81.
- . (1989). Tourism as a form of imperialism. In Smith (ed.) *Hosts and Guests: The anthropology of tourism*, Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, p. 37-52.
- Nash, June. (1993). Introduction: Traditional arts and changing markets in Middle America. In Nash (ed.) *Crafts in the World Market*, Albany: State University of New York Press, p. 1-24.
- . (2001). Globalization and the cultivation of peripheral vision. *Anthropology Today*, 17(4), p.15-22.

- Orlove, Ben. (2002). *Lines in the Water: Nature and culture on Lake Titicaca*, Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Pond, Kathleed Lingle. (1993). *The Professional Guide: Dynamics of tour guiding*, New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold.
- Pratt, Mary Louise. (1986). Fieldwork in common places. In Clifford and Marcus (eds.) *Writing Culture: The Poetics and politics of ethnography*, Berkeley: University of California Press, p. 27-50.
- Pretes, Michael. (2003). Tourism and nationalism. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 30(1), p. 125-142.
- PromPerú. (n.d.). *Ven al Perú –Cultura, Naturaleza, Aventura –Viajes y Turismo*, Accessed August 2008 at <http://www.peru.info/peru.asp>.
- Rénique, José Luis. (1998). Apogee and crisis of a ‘Third Path’: *Mariateguismo*, ‘people’s war,’ and counterinsurgency in Puno, 1987-1994. In Stern, Steve J. (ed.) *Shining and Other Paths: War and society in Per, 1980-1995*, Durham: Duke University Press, p. 307-35.
- Republic of Peru. Normas Legales. *Ley del Guía del Turismo*, (2005), ley no. 28529. Retrieved online April 13, 2008 from www.mincetur.gob.pe/newweb/Portals/0/documentos/ley_guiatur_2005.pdf.
- Republic of Peru. Normas Legales. *Ley para el Desarrollo de la Actividad Turística*, (1998), ley no. 26961. Retrieved online April 23, 2008 from www.mincetur.gob.pe/turismo/LEGAL/Ley%2026961.htm
- Ruffo, Armand Garnet. (1994). On Lake Titicaca. *Callaloo*, 17(1), p. 264.
- Said, Edward. (1979). *Orientalism*. New York: Vintage.
- . (1994). *Culture and Imperialism*. New York: Vintage.
- Scrase, Timothy. (2003). Precarious production: globalization and artisan labour in the Third World. *Third World Quarterly*, 24(3), p. 449-61.
- Silverman, Helaine. (2002). Touring ancient times: The present and presented past in contemporary Peru. *American Anthropologist*, 104(3), p. 881-902.
- Skinner, Jonathan. (2006). Modernist anthropology, ethnic tourism and national identity: the Contest for the commodification and consumption of St Patrick’s Day,

- Montserrat. In Meethan et al (eds.) *Tourism, Consumption, and Representation*, Cambridge: CABI, p. 253-71.
- Smith, Melanie. (2003). *Issues in Cultural Tourism*. London: Routledge.
- Smith, Melanie and Robinson, Mike (eds.). (2006). *Cultural tourism in a changing world*. Clevedon, UK: Channel View Publications.
- Southern Explorations. (2005-2009). *Machu Picchu and Lake Titicaca, An Andean Natural Wonder*, Retrieved online August 2008 at <http://www.southernexplorations.com/peru-MachuPicchuLakeTiticaca.htm>.
- Stephen, Lynn. (1991). Culture as a resource: four cases of self-managed indigenous craft production in Latin America. *Economic Development and Cultural Change*, 40(1), p. 101-130.
- Stronza, Amanda. (2001). Anthropology of tourism: Forging new ground for ecotourism and other alternatives. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 30, p. 261-83.
- Tanaka, Martín. (2006). From crisis to collapse of the party systems and dilemmas of democratic representation: Peru and Venezuela. In Mainwaring, S. et al (eds.) *The Crisis of Democratic Representation in the Andes*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, p. 47-77.
- Turner, Mark. (1997). *From two republics to one divided: Contradictions of postcolonial nationmaking in Andean Peru*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Tosun, Cevat. (2001). Limits to community participation in the tourism development process in developing countries. *Tourism Management*, 21, p. 613-33.
- Van den Berghe, Pierre. (1994). *The Quest for the Other: Ethnic tourism in San Cristóbal Mexico*, Seattle: University of Washington Press.
- Van den Berghe, Pierre and Ochoa, Jorge Flores. 2000. Tourism and natavistic ideology in Cuzco, Peru. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 27(1), p. 7-26.
- Voase, Richard. (2006). Narrating the tourist destination: Narrating the 'undiscovered' and the paradox of consumption. In Meethan et al (eds.) *Tourism, Consumption, and Representation*, Cambridge: CABI, p. 284-300.
- Warren, Kay B. and Jackson, Jean E. (eds.) (2002). *Indigenous Movements, Self-Representation, and the State in Latin America*, Austin: University of Texas Press.

- Wearing, Stephen and McDonald, Matthew. (2002). The Development of community-based tourism: Rethinking the relationship between tour operators and development agents as intermediaries in rural and isolated area communities. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 10(3), p. 191-206.
- Weiler, Betty and Ham, Sam. (2002). Tour guide training: A model for sustainable capacity building in the developing world. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 10(1), p. 52-69.
- Wood, Robert E. (1998). Touristic ethnicity: a brief itinerary. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 21(2), p. 218-41.
- Yashar, Deborah. (2006). Indigenous politics in the Andes: Changing patterns of recognition, reform, and representation. In Mainwaring, S. et al (eds.) *The Crisis of Democratic Representation in the Andes*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, p. 257-94.
- . (2005). *Contesting Citizenship in Latin America: The rise of indigenous movements and the postliberal challenge*. Cambridge, MA: Princeton University Press.
- Ypeij, Annelou. (2006). La cultura y la lucha por la inclusion social: Un análisis de los planes de desarrollo y turismo en la region andina. In Ypeij, Annelou and Zoomers, Annelies (eds.) *La Ruta Andina: Turismo y desarrollo sostenible en Perú y Bolivia*, Lima: IEP, p. 37-57.
- Ypeij, Annelou and Zorn, Elaine. (2007). Taquile: A Peruvian tourist island struggling for control. *European Review of Latin American and Caribbean Studies*, 82, p. 119-28.
- Zorn, Elayne. (2004). *Weaving a Future: Tourism, cloth, and culture on an Andean island*, Iowa City: University of Iowa Press.

Appendix

Interviews and Tours and Events Attended

Interviews

Type	Number
Tour guides	
• formal interviews	4
• informal interviews	2
Tour agency owners	3
Interns working with Danish development NGO AXIS²⁶	2
Worker from Bolivian community based tourism development NGO PRAIA	1

Tours

Tour Company	Type of Tour	Date
Inka Tours	Day tour to Uros and Taquile	September 10, 2008
Taquile Island Community Based Tour Agency	2 day tour to Uros, with overnight stay on Taquile	September 16-17, 2008
Inka Tours	Day tour to ruins at Sillustani	September 21, 2008
AllWays Travel	2 day tour to Uros, Taquile, Amantaní, with overnight stay on Amantaní	September 23-24, 2008
Kontiki Tours	Day tour to Uros and Taquile	September 30, 2008

Events Attended

Type	Date/Location
First Regional Conference on Rural Tourism Development	September 25-26, 2008 Municipal Building, Puno
Parade for International Day of Tourism	September 28, 2008 Central Square, Puno

²⁶ The interns interviewed were working for AXIS as part of a field-study term with their respective university programmes and as such are not representatives of this organization.