Cultural Tourism in the Pacific

Lamont Lindstrom

Abstract

As intensifying global communication and transportation systems undermine the autonomy and particularity of world cultures, "culture" itself has paradoxically emerged as a dominant way of representing the distinctive identities of individuals and groups. At the same instant that the world system fragments the localism on which cultures once grew, it hardens and hyper-values whatever cultural differences remain. Increased concern about identity, and how this is to be delineated, animates growing interest in "cultural tourism" (also called indigenous or ethnic tourism). Many Pacific states hope to profit from larger numbers of tourists, but cultural tourism affords both opportunities and dangers. The wider touristic marketplace sets the exchange value of local cultures. In the Pacific, these are most frequently packaged as either savage or noble primitivism. Moreover, tourism may reinforce or challenge local power structures, and lead to disputes within host communities. Cultural tourism promotes a doubled identity as people's gaze turns back on themselves as a tourist spectacle. Doubled identity, however, is a pervasive aspect of late modernity and cultural tourism is its symptom and not its cause.

Keywords: tourism, culture, identity, primitivism, world system

Recently something strange has been happening with the word "culture." Not very long ago, few people at all had much interest in culture, aside from scattered anthropologists and eccentric folklorists. But nowadays, talk about culture, tradition, custom, and ethnic difference is increasingly common. Business people have discovered culture as a marketing device. Doctors and psychologists stumble over culturally different disease etiologies and therapies. Language instructors teach culture so that students better understand a foreign tongue. Philosophers calculate the rationality of cross-cultural relativity. Politicians, in the United States, preach tolerance of cultural difference and the benefits of the multicultural "tossed salad" rather than that old fiery melting pot of nationalist stew. And the tourist industry for some time has taken special note of the cross-cultural experience as one of its rationales. "Cultural tourism" (also sometimes called "indigenous" (Hinch and Butler 1996:9) or "ethnic" tourism) is a hot market item. But within all of this noisy, growing discussion, the concept of culture at once appears to be getting both easier and harder to grasp.

I believe there are connections between this ballooning interest in cultural difference, including cultural tourism, and the emergence of powerful global communicative and transportation technologies. Devices such as the telephone, the fax, the computer-linking world-

---

Department of Anthropology, University of Tulsa, Tulsa, OK 74104 USA

wide web, spinning satellites, and supersonic jets quickly move ideas, products, and people from place to place all over the world. We have by now often heard that we are witnessing the emergence of a global system in which no neighborhood is independent, no locality isolated. We all live in communities that are both local and global. We hear voices that come from all sides; we eat food and consume products that originate from near and far; and we regularly encounter both neighbors and strangers.

This is the increasingly common human experience of today, and probably of tomorrow as well, and it is raising difficult problems of identity and allegiance. We are who? And who are our friends and fellow citizens? People turn to their culture (including religion, language, and traditions) to seek answers to these questions. They, sometimes nostalgically, hypervalue and over-define home culture, worrying over their identities. Or, more positively, they develop interests in *different* cultures that can also tell them who they are and what they are like, by informing them of what they are unlike (MacCannell 1989; Ascher 1985:70; Nash 1996:53).

What are some of the prospects and constraints on cultural tourism in the Pacific that emerge from the cultural, economic, and political structures of what looks to be an increasingly integrated global system- that infamous "new world order?" As an anthropologist, I start with a review of what has been happening to the concept of "culture" itself, and also that of "tourism." The ways in which these concepts recently have become unsettled help us understand, on a different level, what people confront- and not only in the Pacific- when they entertain visitors "culturally." I start with a quick history of the idea of "culture."

CULTURE

Culture has been a powerful 20th century rhetoric that understands human difference. (See Kroeber and Kluckhohn, 1952, who trace the emergence of "culture" as an anthropological category; see, e.g., Dominguez 1992 for a contemporary view of the further uses, and dangers, of the term.) Culture is not the only rhetoric of comprehending difference. It still competes with older, also forceful, languages that explain human difference as a matter of race, of nature, or psychology, or geography, of evolutionary stage, and so forth. Fundamentally, the cultural argument accounts for human difference in terms of more-or-less shared systems of local knowledge, rather than in terms of the facts of nature or genetic essences. The key claim of a culturalist explanation of human difference is that difference is a matter of learning rather than of nature. People and their lives are therefore ultimately malleable. This rhetoric of changeable human difference sometimes has led to an arrogant cultural imperialism- the powerful send out cultural missionaries who insist that those living differently must alter their lives to come closer to the ruling norms of Christianity, modernity, capitalism, or what have you. But a cultural logic also, especially when turned to understand one's own society, can lead to a liberal, optimistic and dynamic faith in human improvement- that my children don't need to live as I live, or suffer as I suffer, if only they

might somehow change their culture.

The cultural rhetoric of learnable and changeable human difference also sometimes leads to fear of cultural decay, and a nostalgia for so-called disappearing worlds. Some feel that they can "lose" their culture, particularly when global tourism invades once isolated communities. Since culture is shared knowledge of how to live, it is of course impossible to be without- although one's stock of cultural knowledge can change, shrinking in one area as people forget or do not learn from their parents, while expanding in other areas. Anytime strangers interact, they have to invent new cultural rules and regularities to understand their interaction, so by definition local culture changes as tourists come into the picture and people have to learn how to deal with each other. An important question here is who must learn the most about the other? Local people, or the tourists?

The notion of culture, thus developed at the beginning of this century, presumed localism- a group of people living together in one space over time, learning a shared tradition. Although few if any human communities were in fact entirely isolated, slow technologies of communication and transportation ensured the maintenance of strong local cultural cores. A sense of "home" was rarely in question. Today, however, given new technologies that "deterritorialize" or "decenter" ideas, goods, and people, the question "where is my home?" is for more and more people impossible easily to answer. Anthropologists recently are seeking new terms to replace "culture" and "society" since these words were invented to describe a way of localized living that increasingly no longer exists within a unitary global system. Although anthropology as a discipline developed and cultivated categories of culture and society to explain human behavior and difference, many anthropologists today would like to think beyond "culture" since the term no longer adequately captures the contemporary human condition (see, e.g., Appadurai 1991; Rosaldo 1989).

Paradoxically, as anthropologists are now seeking new terms, and are attempting to erase "culture" as old-fashioned and inadequate, many others at this point in history are fixating on culture as an immediate problem- just because, I think, they sense this nervous loss of "home" and today's insecurities and uncertainties about their personal identity. Anymore, our sense of home is variable and fading and the global system huge, indiscriminate, and confusing. We fear that our culture is disappearing, which of course it cannot do, but rather just change. We indulge in a nostalgic search for the truer, naturally better culture of our parents and grandparents. We overvalue certain parts of everyday life as authentic and real, while dismissing others as fake or tawdry inventions. These emotions also charge cultural tourism, as host localities fear loss of control of home culture, while tourists may be seeking experience of some remnant, seemingly still "authentic" human existence, feeling themselves estranged from their own eroded homes (MacCannell 1989:3). All culture, since human, is authentic- but the nostalgic urge for so-called real tradition and the desire to experience cultural difference that drives cultural tourism emerge from our modern condition where we face the difficult task of constructing personal identities while stuck in between the local and the global, the community and the world.

TOURISM

One popular technique of identity construction is to tour. Why else do people travel if not, somehow, to work on their selves? To relax, learn, discover, encounter, enjoy, experience- we all know those experiential verbs in which the tourist industry revels. There are all sorts of tourism- leisure, ecological, sexual, religious pilgrimage (see Smith 1989:4-6)- but as the global system interlinks my home and your home, and as strangers more and more have to be dealt with, it is no surprise that cultural tourism is increasingly popular. It is no longer possible to be truly strange, to be entirely outside the global system.

Tourists search out cultural difference in order to work on their understandings of themselves: To locate common humanity beneath cultural variations and, conversely, to shore up remaining identity distinctions between self and other. The author of a recent handbook on cultural tourism notes:

> Culture is very much tourism's main attraction. Without culture to make the difference, every place would seem blandly the same. Without a belief in new or different sensations and benefits at journey's end, what incentive would there by for any of us to make a visit that is discretionary in type (Boniface 1995:vii)?

At the end of cultural touring, you go home- and that home may now have renewed firmness and meaning; you know yourself better again by knowing who you are not. Like homecoming Muslim pilgrims from Mecca who take on the new social identity *haji,* cultural tourists return home with altered identities. The photographs, bricabrac, and souvenirs decorating their living rooms testify to the remade self. People consume travel and cross-cultural experiences to make claims about who they are when they go back home.

The tourist industry caters to these desires by packaging up the experience of cultural difference- custom dances in hotel bars and airports; tours of villages; suitcase-sized carvings in gift shops; local foods, or tame versions of these at least, in restaurants; and so on. Where difference is hard to come by, it must be manufactured. Every Japanese prefecture, for example, has created a slate of differences to feed to tourists. One may be known for carved fish, another for gaudy glassware; one is famous for pork cooked in sake; another for wood marqueterie. These cultural differences are both real and manufactured, in the sense that they are protected and nourished because they can be sold to tourists hungry for the sensation of difference that feeds the self.

It is in this sense that tourism can promote culture since people are careful to husband and manage their cultural resources, whether these are dance, local language or dialect, art style, or a cuisine (Ascher 1985:13). They manage culture both because it now can be sold, and because these aspects of culture are what have now come to define *them* and their home within the global community. People in Kagoshima (where I was fortunate to live in 1995-1996), are known to make and drink sweet potato brandy, or *satsuma imo shochu,* and so they are careful actually to drink this- and they of course also sell it to tourists in

Kagoshima airports and train stations. This is not simple-minded or greedy touristic capitalism, however. Kagoshima people truly do define themselves, and map their identity, as sweet potato brandy rather than Japanese sake drinkers. The relationship between tourism and identity works both ways. When people come to gaze at us, we learn something about who we are as well. And which cultural difference in particular tourists look at becomes part of out identity, like it or not.

PACIFIC

This brings us to the Pacific. If cultural difference is now a global commodity that people package and sell to one another, feeding difficult and challenging processes and desires of individual identity construction within an obscurely complicated global system, then Pacific islanders may well cash in. The novelist Gertrude Stein once made a famous remark about the city where I was born- Oakland, California- that there is no ''there there.'' Everything is bland and tasteless, no culture, no difference. The Pacific, on the other hand, and Melanesia in particular, has plenty of ''there''- *fulap kastom,* in Melanesian Pidgin English. At a symposium on the concept ''culture area'' at the 1995 American Anthropological Association meetings, participants concluded that Melanesia has a sterling future in the global cultural marketplace because of the richness and the depth of its cultural and linguistic differences. (For recent discussions of Pacific tourism, see Hall and Page 1996; Douglas 1996b; see also Nash 1996.)

And it is true that islanders have great skills at creating and maintaining difference, distinguishing family from family, village from village, valley from valley, and island from island. It takes much energy to produce and maintain through time the fantastic range of language difference, for example, that exists today in Melanesia. People clearly have brilliant techniques for creating distinctions and discriminations for purposes of identity construction at the local level. Such devices include traditional systems of copyright and patent that protect rights to cultural and linguistic forms, traditional systems of apprenticeship and education that transmit these forms from one generation to the next, and recognized techniques for the production of novelty, including dreaming and other avenues of inspiration (see Lindstrom 1990).

Culture, particularly in its most easily packaged forms of dance, carved, painted, and woven artwork, food, and architecture, is readily available in Melanesia. Unlike Oakland, or perhaps even Kagoshima, one does not have to work very hard to locate some striking culture to display. Oakland faces great difficulty attracting cultural tourists; Melanesia and the Pacific perhaps have the opposite problem. There is too much culture- so just whose culture should be packaged and sold in the global tourist market?

It is painfully obviously that this touristic marketplace, as I will note in a moment, is not a level playing field. People come to it with preconceptions and desires that give various cultures different exchange values. Outside the tourist marketplace cultures may set their

own values. But within the marketplace, a culture's exchange value and its basic market meanings or significance, are set by ruling global currencies. And these ruling exchange values and currencies of meaning, at least at the moment, flow strongly out of European ways of understanding.

In particular, they emerge from European notions of social and natural evolution- a 19th century rhetoric for explaining human difference that 20th century rhetorics of culture never fully succeeded in silencing. Whereas the culturalist rhetoric explains human difference in terms of local history and a multiplicity of historical events and contacts, the earlier evolutionary rhetoric accounted for human difference by stacking this up on a single ladder of progress. Some people are more complex, others are simple; some people are cultured, others more natural; some people are civilized, others more savage or, as say the French, *sauvage,* wild.

As Michel-Rolph Trouillot (1991) has noted, European identity construction during the last several centuries came to depend on the existence of what he calls the "savage slot"- Europeans could only understand themselves as real, civilized humans by contrasting their lifeways with those of seemingly less civilized, although in many ways freer, peoples. Needless to say, the savage as imagined in Europe mostly reflected internal European class and gender politics and was very distant from the reality of non-European lives. Still, the evolutionist paradigm remains very strong, as perhaps can be seen in a Bizarro sketch- this a popular cartoon that appears in many U.S. newspapers (drawn by an artist who went to school in Tulsa, Oklahoma, my current hometown). The sketch depicts a group of savages, dressed in feathers and bone, sitting around their campfire. One says:

> All those in favor of building an airport and a luxury hotel, advertising for tourists on a worldwide basis, then eating anyone who shows up, say "Aye."

The joke plays ironically with European evolutionist presumptions and desire to tour cultures. The canny savages, who are cannibals of course, exploit this cultural tourism to stock their cooking pots.

And it is certain that many cultural tourists coming into the Pacific arrive with evolutionist dogma still haunting their minds and, perhaps, similar cannibal jokes tripping from their tongues. Anthropology has not been all that successful in spreading the word of its culturalist logic of human difference. Many people continue to listen to evolutionary storylines instead that inform their own identity construction. In these myths, as it is impossible for us now not to know, there are two kinds of uncivilized savagery- the ignoble and the noble. And since Bougainville, Rousseau, and John Williams, the Pacific has furnished both sorts of savage to the European imagination. Still today, significant numbers of cultural tourists in the Pacific will be seeking the dangerous thrill of the primitive, while others will be on pilgrimage to experience the noble wisdom of human ancestors. Both these sentiments, for example, were particularly notable in Dennis O'Rorke's documentary film, *Cannibal Tours,* that captured the cultural sensitivities, and also the cultural appetites, of European and American tourists who sail up the Sepik River of Papua New Guinea on a small cruise ship

By Dan Piraro

ALL THOSE IN FAVOR OF BUILDING AN AIRPORT AND A LUXURY HOTEL, ADVERTISING FOR TOURISTS ON A WORLDWIDE BASIS, THEN EATING ANYONE WHO SHOWS UP, SAY "AYE".

Reprinted by permission of the artists.

(see MacCannell 1992:25-26).

People construct their lives in different ways and various desires drive them to spend their money to go on a cultural tour. Some of us, happy in our modernity, seek occasional dallies into what we hope to be savage wildness and unrestrained freedom before we return refreshed to our comfortable, orderly suburbs with a new Sepik mask for our living room wall. Others of us, not happy in our modernity, seek through touring to rediscover a truer,

more human past when man lived in harmony with nature, uncorrupted by the pollutants of modern civilization. The Pacific has long provided cultural material to serve both these desires. Pacific cultural goods brought to the global tourism marketplace have great difficulty not being read as signs of either primitive paradise, or primitive adventureland. These currencies of meaning now circulate universally and they set the global market value of Pacific cultural differences, however these may be valued locally.

It is of course possible to change the system of global values and one's particular location within ruling currencies of understanding, although it is probably not easy to do so. Oklahoma, where I ordinarily live, has hardly any value at all within the global touristic system. Recently, though, it has attempted to reposition itself as "Native America," drawing on its history as Indian Territory within the United States. It aims to capture a larger tourist market share by stressing the native noble savagery of its inhabitants- including me. Tourists, presumably, will be induced to visit Oklahoma to experience the thrills and the harmony of our natural state. It remains to be seen, however, whether this campaign will have much effect on the wider market, which continues to devalue Oklahoma as a culture-less place.

Even if the advertising campaign should succeed, Oklahoma is still trapped within an evolutionist rhetoric that only permits one to be either a noble or an ignoble savage. Each of these values has its own benefits and drawbacks. In the first case your culture gets respected as natural and ancient wisdom, but all your cultural products have to be environmentally friendly and some tourists will get upset when they discover your televisions and the kids' Nintendo machines. In the second case, you have to put up with tourists in search of how "humans used to live" while figuring that you may break down and eat them at any moment. The situation of the Pacific, and Oklahoma, within the global marketplace's currencies of value limits each's range of market options, until global measures of value can be in some way changed. It also warns us to pay attention to how the touristic marketplace differently empowers its participants.

POWER

We can think about touristic power effects and relations on two levels- the global and the local. Globally, the system assigns different cultures a value depending on how they fit within dominant rhetorics of human difference. Oklahoma is worth so much; Kagoshima worth so much; Madang worth so much. Just as the developed world now produces the majority of consumer goods, so does it produce today's ruling ideas and cultural values, at least those that rule tourism. One can deny the validity of those currencies, but one has to use them if the goal is to sell yourself to tourists. It makes sense in these terms that Pacific tourist venues advertise their scenery and opportunities for relaxation, but also the touristic pleasures of experiencing happy, friendly people- not yet corrupted by modernity- and the thrills of sensuous dance and vibrantly primitive art. A brochure advertising a small hotel on Tanna, Vanuatu- my own favorite Pacific place- promises that tourists can experience

an "active volcano, custom villages, potent kava, cargo cultists, strong traditions, exciting festivals, gigantic banyan trees, magnificent wild horses, long black and white beaches, velvet nights, and much more."

One's cultural offerings and products, no matter how these are taken at home, are thus always rewritten and transformed by the demands of the global system, and it is increasingly difficult if not impossible to opt out of that system. Even if one bans tourists altogether, all of us now live lives conjoined by global communicative and economic flows. Ideas and goods constantly invade our communities, even if we can manage to chase outsiders away. Of the three, people are the easiest to manage and control; we can close our borders to humans, but goods and information leak through our walls. And the argument that touristic contact increases human understanding of cultural difference is a good, if not always accurate, thesis. (Some tourists perhaps leave more ignorant than when they arrived, presuming their cross-cultural experience merely to have confirmed their prejudices.) If our societies and economies welcome or at least put up with foreign goods and imported ideas, we may as well meet the people who produce those goods and ideas. If our children are watching Rambo tapes, meeting Sylvester Stallone up the Sepik River can't hurt; if they rent *True Lies* on video, let them shake Arnold Swartzneger's hand in person; if they listen to Boyz to Men, an encounter with African-Americans would be informative; if they buy a Toyota Landcruiser, let them talk with some of the Japanese autoworkers who built that vehicle. Even passing contact with tourists could help place incoming goods and ideas in different, hopefully clearer, perspective (Hinch and Butler 1996:5; but see Ascher 1985:13).

Given the global economy at the moment, however, these encounters are not equivalent or balanced. Pacific islanders are brilliant travelers but far fewer of them tour North America, Europe, Japan and Australasia than the numbers of tourists from those regions that come into the Pacific (see Mone 1980). Today, most touristic encounters in which islanders participate take place within the Pacific- outsiders are guests, and islanders hosts. In a more equal marketplace, these roles would more readily reverse and more traveling Pacific Islanders would encounter Europeans and Asians on their own home grounds.

Cultural tourism, however, need not be international. General Motors Corporation once tried to hawk its cars with the jingle "See the USA in your Chevrolet"; and Japanese tourists dutifully visit and purchase the *omiyage,* or local goods, that by design distinguish each of Japan's 47 prefectures, as well as their cities and towns. This sort of travel informs nationalist identity-building, as people tour their country discovering both shared lifeways and local distinctiveness with fellow citizens. Domestic cultural tourism in the Pacific is less developed than international, although traditionally many people traveled extensively in search of knowledge, new lands, and new interpersonal connections. When I lived in Papua New Guinea in 1988-1989, the newspapers carried stories of youth groups trekking, sometimes fecklessly, from distant villages into the cities. This is an incipient form of cultural tourism, when people hit the road to experience the city and also life in villages and towns along the way (but see Douglas 1996a:262).

Domestic cultural tourism brings together strangers who share the important identity of fellow citizen. Such nationalist tourism should be encouraged and not just to raise revenues.

Many international tourists in Japan, for example, share facilities with Japanese tourists and this weakens the pernicious duality where outsiders do all the looking, and insiders do all the being looked at. If tourists from Sydney and tourists from Simbu Province together share the dinner table to watch a Madang dance show, or share the same bus to tour a village cultural center, this changes the overall touristic power equation.

At the local level, cultural tourism challenges power structures, in ways judged good or bad, depending on a person's position within those local power regimes. Tourism brings people, money, goods, ideas, and sometimes disease into a locality and all these imports can be seized upon as resources, or denounced as dangers, again depending on their various political effects (see Lewis 1989). Cultural tourism can empower one village versus its neighbors if that village captures most of the revenue from passing tourists. It can empower one artist or school of artists versus others if a particular art style comes to be known as characteristic of a place (see discussions of tourist art in Rajotte and Crocombe 1980). It can empower the more cosmopolitan young versus their elders who then may complain bitterly about cultural erosion. It can empower men versus woman, or sometimes women versus men, depending on the access of each gender to the touristic economy. It can empower rural areas versus national centers- as tourism brings in money and ideas to the hinterlands that potentially unsettle political systems. Leaders in more than one country have expressed fears of tourism that stem, at least in part, from concern that uncontrolled outside access to villages could disturb their elite positions. But, more commonly, tourism also sustains existing political structures. Many political elites have proven eager enough to get into bed with international tourist developers, profiting from land sales and rents and from ownership of the touristic infrastructure.

The recent history of Pacific tourism is full of conflict, not surprisingly so given the resources and the political and economic danger that tourism offers. Tourist entrepreneurs and local people fight over land, beaches, and water. Landowners on Anuha Island (Solomon Islands), for example, fought among themselves throughout the 1980s over plans to develop the island as a tourist resort- local conflict that ultimately killed that project (Sofield 1996). People also argue over the right to perform particular dance styles or ceremonies for tourists to watch. People on Pentecost Island (Vanuatu) continue to struggle over rights to perform the "land dive" ceremony that celebrates the first fruits of their annual yam crop, but also attracts considerable tourist interest (de Burlo 1996). Elsewhere, as on Tanna, Islanders dispute who should receive tourist fees for climbing neighborhood volcanoes. Ritual organizers debate whether tourists should be allowed to attend religiously important ceremonies and, if they do, whether they should pay for this privilege. And governments try to prevent art dealers from selling and exporting the nation's cultural heritage (Lindstrom and White 1994).

Tourism *is* politics insofar as it requires constant decision-making about access to resources, the packaging of culture, and the distribution of revenue. As tourist numbers increase one can expect political dispute and argument to likewise increase. Tourism affects people differently, depending on their local political position and economic interest. Tourist purchasing-power may imbalance a local economy so that, for example, the lobster catch

once enjoyed by everyone now all goes into tourist bellies. But lobster catchers profit. Tourists in search of sex threaten existing social relations. But young men and women may profit, experientially if not also monetarily. Tourist requirements may unsettle the timing and staging of local festivals and ceremonies. But hotels, guest houses, and tour guides profit from these rearrangements however troublesome. Cultural tourism unavoidably impacts people politically, no matter how well it may be planned and managed.

It is difficult, however, to divert cultural tourists- to repel them from one's home, particularly if one lives in a place, such as the Pacific, which enjoys high exchange value within the touristic marketplace. As the global economy now thoroughly encompasses the local, issues of identity and the desire to find this through touring will become even more pressing. At the same instant that the world system diffuses, fragments, and decenters the localism on which cultures once grew, it hardens and hyper-values whatever cultural difference remains. Increasingly deterritorialized individuals are motivated to tour and to seek out packaged cultural differences in order to work on their identities and life stories. And if many people are interested, through travel and other means, to consume cultural difference, others are interested to sell this. In this tourist marketplace, certain selected forms of culture congeal so that they can be more easily displayed, photographed, sold, and transported. Culture, and the people who display this, become commodities in the touristic marketplace, as Ascher has argued:

> Driven by a variety of needs to attempt to earn a living from tourism, communities sell not only their labour but themselves, offering themselves as merchandise; as a result, they are to some extent converted into a fetish, a spectacle, and reduced both to serving the function expected of them by tourists and to accepting what the tour operators offer them in exchange (1985:13).

Still, localities- although invaded and commoditized by the global- do continue to exist. People are not all the same; lifeways remain distinct in significant ways. It is important to protect one's sense of home, and not just for local identity purposes but also so that the tourists will continue to come. If your cultural location looks just like the one across the island, or worse yet like a suburb of Sydney, Tokyo, or Los Angeles, you are out of business. Again, in this way tourism "protects" culture as people try to maintain their distinctive value within the tourist marketplace. But these attempts, of course, change the feel of that culture. You no longer just live in your own way, but rather live in your way so that you can be watched, and can sell the opportunity for others to come and participate with you.

This is the most striking existential effect of cultural tourism- when people gaze at you then you can no longer think of yourself independently. When tourists gaze at us, we too look along with them back at ourselves and we thus become doubled- someone who looks and someone who gets looked at. Our culture no longer is a lifeway; it is also a commodity. A dance is no longer just a dance, but rather becomes a spectacle. Pots become art; axes become artifacts; yams become local delicacies on hotel menus; and houses become typical

examples of local style. Our identity becomes in this way doubled. We live and we watch ourselves live. We cannot escape having both a self, and representations of that self- or packaged stories about who we are and how we are different that we offer to stranger tourists and also back to ourselves. But this doubled identity is a pervasive aspect of late 20th century life everywhere- Kagoshima, Oklahoma, and Madang alike- and cultural tourism is just its symptom and not its cause. These, then, on the cultural level, are some of the constraints and prospects of cultural tourism in the Pacific today.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

REFERENCES

Appadurai, Arjun. 1991. Global Ethnoscapes: Notes and Queries for a Transnational Anthropology. In Richard G. Fox (ed.), *Recapturing Anthropology: Working in the Present,* pp. 191-210. Santa Fe: School of American Research Press.

Ascher, Francois. 1985. *Tourism: Transnational Corporations and Cultural Identities.* Paris: UNESCO Press.

Boniface, Priscilla. 1995. *Managing Quality Cultural Tourism.* London: Routledge.

de Burlo, Chuck. 1996. Cultural Resistance and Ethnic Tourism on South Pentecost, Vanuatu. In Richard Butler and Thomas Hinch (eds.), *Tourism and Indigenous Peoples,* pp. 255-276. London: International Thomson Business Press.

Douglas, Ngaire. 1996a. Papua New Guinea. In C. Michael Hall and Stephen J. Page (eds.), *Tourism in the Pacific: Issues and Cases,* pp. 256-272. London: International Thomson Business Press.

Douglas, Ngaire. 1996b. *They Came for Savages: 100 Years of Tourism is Melanesia.* Lismore: Southern Cross University Press.

Dominguez, Virginia R. 1992. Invoking Culture: The Messy Side of Cultural Politics. *South Atlantic Quarterly* 91(1):19-42.

Hall, C. Michael and Stephen J. Page (eds.) 1996, *Tourism in the Pacific: Issues and Cases.*

London: International Thomson Business Press.

Hinch, Thomas and Richard Butler. 1996, Indigenous Tourism: A Common Ground for Discussion. In Richard Butler and Thomas Hinch (eds.), *Tourism and Indigenous Peoples,* pp. 3-19. London: International Thomson Business Press.

Kroeber, A. L. and C. Kluckhohn. 1952. *Culture: A Critical Review of Concepts and Definitions.* Papers of the Peabody Museum of American Archaeology and Ethnology, vol. 47. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University.

Lewis, Nancy David. 1989. *AIDS and Tourism: Implications for Pacific Island States.* Honolulu: Pacific Islands Development Program, East-West Center.

Lindstrom, Lamont. 1990. *Knowledge and Power in a South Pacific Society.* Washington, DC: Smithsonian Institution Press.

Lindstrom, Lamont and Geoffrey M. White (eds.) 1994. *Culture, Kastom, Tradition: Developing Cultural Policy in Melanesia.* Suva: Institute of Pacific Studies, University of the South Pacific.

MacCannell, Dean. 1989. *The Tourist: A New Theory of the Leisure Class* (second edition). New York: Schocken Books.

MacCannell, Dean. 1992. *Empty Meeting Grounds: The Tourist Papers.* London and New York: Routledge.

Mone, S. Eleni. 1980. Tourism in Reverse: The Reaction of Islanders Abroad. In Freda Rajotte and Ron Crocombe (eds.), *Pacific Tourism As Islanders See It,* pp. 164-167. Suva: Institute of Pacific Studies, University of the South Pacific.

Nash, Dennison. 1996. *Anthropology of Tourism.* Oxford; Tarrytown, NY: Pergamon.

Rajotte, Freda and Ron Crocombe (eds.) 1980. *Pacific Tourism As Islanders See It.* Suva: Institute of Pacific Studies, University of the South Pacific.

Rosaldo, Renato. 1989. *Culture and Truth: The Remaking of Social Analysis.* Boston: Beacon Press.

Smith, Valene L. (ed.) 1989. *Hosts and Guests: The Anthropology of Tourism* (second edition). Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Sofield, Trevor H. B. 1996. Anuha Island Resort, Solomon Islands: A Case Study of Failure. In Richard Butler and Thomas Hinch (eds.), *Tourism and Indigenous Peoples,* pp. 176-202. London: International Thomson Business Press.

Trouillot, Michel-Rolph. 1991. Anthropology and the Savage Slot: The Poetics and Politics of Otherness. In Richard G. Fox (ed.), *Recapturing Anthropology: Working in the Present,* pp. 17-44. Santa Fe: School of American Research Press.