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Abstract

Mass tourism and mainstream development have been widely criticised as continuing in the colonial legacies of market integration on highly unequal terms, failing to benefit local people and for causing environmental and cultural destruction. Responsible, homestay tourism, where tourists stay in local peoples’ homes in the rural areas of largely developing countries, proposes an alternative to mass tourism. It has emerged within sustainable development principles of working to benefit local people and to protect ‘fragile’ natural environments and traditional cultures. However, homestay tourism privileges global markets to deliver the interdependent agendas of development and cultural revival. It is this central assumption that market mechanisms will bring sustainable development, that has largely been left unchallenged in popular and academic discussions of responsible tourism and that this thesis examines.

Travel to experience other cultures and to benefit others is a deeply rooted cultural practice among certain sectors of UK and, more widely, Northern societies. Notions of elite travel as the pursuit of educational experiences have been normalised through the legacies of the ‘Grand Tour’. Moreover, imaginations of travel as a quest to discover ‘new’ lands, resources and peoples originated in and drove colonial exploration. The idea of travel to benefit others can be traced to imperialism’s moral project, the missionary movements and the ‘civilizing mission’, whose ideals and goals arguably carry through into development discourses. While often seen as an alternative to more exploitative mass tourism, homestay tourism could be argued to validate these contentious imaginative legacies. It provides spaces for contact between tourists and ‘exotic’ peoples, while claiming to bring developmental benefits. Moreover, it offers a product to fulfil Northern, middle-class consumers’ tastes for niche, exclusive and ethical products.

This thesis aims to explore the neo-liberal approaches to sustainable development embedded in homestay tourism by bringing together a critical analysis of the intersecting genealogies of colonialism, development and class-based tastes in travel. Moreover, it examines the home as an emerging space of commodity culture. It combines these theoretical perspectives with a multi-sited study of homestay tourism in Peru. Sites are studied across multiple scales and include popular and promotional material (guide books, travel company brochures and websites), international development agencies’ policy documents and interviews with key actors from international development agencies, Peruvian State agencies, NGOs and responsible travel agents and indigenous community tourism association leaders. It also draws on observations recorded and photographs taken during participating in homestays during fieldwork in Peru.

1 Western Europe, North America, Australia, New Zealand and Japan
Drawing on postcolonial critiques of tourism, post-development perspectives that highlight the professionalisation of the development industry and literature exploring the historical legacy of colonialism and modernisation in Peru, this thesis proposes that homestay tourism needs to consider more deeply the assumptions on which it trades. It suggests that the absence of critical reflection within the industry seriously weakens its radical claims of offering an alternative to mass tourism and mainstream development.
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Chapter 1  Responsible, homestay tourism within global economies of development and demand

Responsible, homestay tourism\(^2\), where tourists stay with indigenous\(^3\) families in the rural areas of developing countries, has emerged from recent economic and development trends as well as elite preferences for exclusive travel products and concerns surrounding ethical consumption. Neo-liberal agendas for development have promoted the transformation of previously non-commodified phenomena into marketable resources to be integrated into global markets. As a result, indigenous culture and the home have become assets in neo-liberal development. These cultural and personal resources have developed into homestay tourism products in response to consumer demands for niche, ethical products, within the context of post-Fordist diversification of commodities and increasing patterns of ethical consumption. The appearance of this kind of tourism also responds to elite concerns with individuality, exclusivity and authenticity in travel experiences, which are deeply embedded in class-based binaries of mass and individual travel as well as colonial imaginations of lone exploration and contact with exotic ‘Others’ (Said [2003] 1978).

The ethical foundations of homestay tourism can principally be traced through genealogies of the colonial era of travel to benefit others (through the civilising mission and missionary movements) and sustainable development principles. The underlying premise of homestay tourism is that indigenous communities lack development and are marginalized from opportunities to develop within mass tourism development models\(^4\).

\(^2\) From now on referred to as ‘homestay tourism’ or ‘homestays’.
\(^3\) The term ‘indigenous’ (with a small ‘i’) will be used throughout this thesis to describe the local, rural people involved in homestay tourism. ‘Indigenous’ will be used to indicate a political identity. The term ‘Indian’ is avoided because of its popular use as a racially derogatory term (de la Cadena 1996, 2000; Fuller 2002), although the term has been reclaimed (with a capital ‘I’) by political movements to subvert its inherent racism (Weismantel 2001).
\(^4\) (Place 1995; Pattullo 1996; Mowforth and Munt 1998; Ashley and Roe 1999; Bennett, Roe and Ashley 1999; Ashley, Boyd and Goodwin 2000; Mitchell and Eagles 2001; Mitchell and Reid 2001; Bookman 2006; Pattullo 2006; Goodwin 2008; Hill In Press; Hill and Hill In press).
Mass tourism development is conceptualised as failing to benefit local and indigenous communities through being concentrated in the hands of elites, diminishing local economic benefits through ‘leakage’ and integrating local people into the tourism industry at the lowest levels. Mass tourism is charged with being concentrated in transnational companies and national elites, who benefit disproportionately from tourism development. Potential economic benefits to local people are reduced through ‘leakage’, that is, the major share of the cost of a package holiday is spent before arriving at the tourist destination. Mass tourism is also held responsible for integrating local and indigenous people into the industry at the lowest levels, entering the industry as low-level, low-paid service sector workers, for example, as cleaners, cooks, waiters (Pattullo 1996; Bookman 2006; Barnett 2008). Indigenous people particularly work in the informal sector as street vendors, selling handicrafts or posing for paid photographs (Henrici 2002).

Homestay tourism has evolved within these assumptions as a strategy to include indigenous communities directly in the supposed economic and developmental benefits of tourism. Benefits include gaining increased income by hosting tourists and implementing community development projects, which are funded through donating a percentage of profits from homestay businesses. These approaches also appeal to concerned tourists who want to help what they see as disadvantaged communities (see chapter 4). Homestay tourism has been established in two communities in the South of Peru for over thirty years, and a number of new projects have been set up in the past ten years in response to changes in international and national approaches to tourism and development. For communities, who seek out homestay tourism as a development strategy, this kind of tourism represents an opportunity to access global markets and

---

5 (Place 1995; Ashley and Roe 1999; Bennett et al. 1999; Ashley et al. 2000; Scheyvens 2002; Pattullo 2006; Goodwin 2008; Hill In Press; Hill and Hill in press)
6 (Pattullo 1996; Mowforth and Munt 1998; Ashley and Roe 1999; Mitchell and Eagles 2001; Mitchell and Reid 2001; Bookman 2006)
7 (Mitchell and Eagles 2001; Zorn 2004; Gascón 2005; Ashley and Goodwin 2007; Mitchell and Ashley 2007; Ashley and Mitchell 2007a; Ashley and Mitchell 2007b)
development funding, although within highly constrained economic and developmental options (see chapter 6).

Homestay tourism functions through imaginations of mass tourism development impacting negatively on indigenous communities. Mass tourism is held responsible for degrading and destroying fragile natural environments and traditional cultures in responsible tourism’s popular, promotional and policy-oriented literature. Natural environments and traditional cultures are conceptualised in this same literature as unused and unprepared for rapid environmental and cultural change brought by large numbers of ‘modern’, insensitive mass tourists. Proponents of homestay tourism hold indigenous communities as being models of sustainable and spiritual ways of life, whose intrinsic value, constituted through what they can teach the ‘West’, needs to be protected and preserved.

Responsible, homestay tourism principles propose that traditional cultures can be preserved and revived by their transformation into commodities. By viewing the environment and culture as economic resources, advocates of homestay tourism maintain that local people are given economic incentives to preserve these. Proponents of homestay tourism claim that this form of tourism differs from mass tourism (which also commodifies culture) in that cultural authenticity is preserved by restricting access to limited numbers of more discerning tourists, who are believed to be more willing to behave in culturally sensitive ways. Responsible tourists are also thought to be prepared to pay more for the ‘added value’ of these exclusive products (See chapter 5). For example, Lynch (2005: 534) in his study of ‘CHEs’ or ‘Commercial Home Enterprises’ in the UK, which he defines as small-scale tourist accommodation where the host family is present.
and which include, small hotels, guest houses, B and Bs and families hosting language students, finds that these forms of accommodation attract the highest paying overseas tourists.

1:1 Tourism and responsible, homestay tourism in Peru

Homestay tourism has appeared on the world tourism and development scenes through global economic processes, elite consumer demands for exclusive and ethical products, as well as sustainable development discourses (see chapter 4 for a genealogy of homestay tourism). However, these global contingencies are played out in distinct national contexts and in individual communities. The national context in this study is Peru, and three communities which offer homestay tourism there make up the principle part of the empirical study. Peru represents a rich site for the study of the current phenomena of homestay tourism not only on the grounds that it reflects the global trends of an increase in tourist numbers, neo-liberal approaches to tourism development, and development through tourism, but also because it aims to offer ‘authentic’ and ethical products to meet the demands of discerning consumers.

Growth rates in tourism mean that it is not surprising that tourism has been adopted by the Peruvian State as a major strategy for economic growth. Peru has experienced a substantial increase in tourists in the past decade: international tourist arrivals rose 82% from 324 thousand in 2002 to 1.8 million in 2007 and, presuming they keep the growth rate in 2007 of a yearly average of 13%, they are projected to reach 3.3 million by 2013 (Sariego López and García Santillán 2008: 15). In 2005, tourism made up 3.3% of Peru’s GDP in 2001 (Sariego López and García Santillán 2008: 15), which makes it an important part of Peru’s economy. Tourism is also a major source of foreign currency input. In 2007, international tourism arrivals took third place in the foreign currency receipts (US $ 2.222 million), after mining (US $17.328 million) and the petroleum industry (US $2.248 million). Tourism surpassed the textile export industry (US
$1.730 million) and the fishing industry (US $1.456 million) (Sariego López and García Santillán 2008: 16).

Mincetur\textsuperscript{11}, the Peruvian Ministry of Tourism, launched Pentur\textsuperscript{12} in 2005 (Mincetur 2005) and a revised plan in 2008 (Sariego López and García Santillán 2008) which are both ten year plans whose policies outline national strategies for tourism development. ‘Pentur’ sees the nature of potential tourist attractions in Peru as consisting of major sites of cultural and natural heritage; it emphasises that Peru boasts 11 UNESCO World Heritage Sites, including archaeological sites and national parks (Sariego López and García Santillán 2008). Despite offering these attractions, Pentur states that Peru is not very competitive in international markets and therefore seeks to diversify its tourism products, particularly in the fields of adventure and nature tourism.

Pentur’s emphasis on the more niche products of adventure and nature tourism reflects Mincetur’s research findings on the kind of tourists visiting the country. According to Mincetur’s ‘Perfil del turista extranjero 2007’ (International tourist profile), referred to in Pentur 2008-2018 (Sariego López and García Santillán 2008: 48), the majority of actual and potential tourists visiting, or considering visiting, Peru from abroad are interested in combining cultural and nature tourism. It also notes that these tourists are not typical mass tourists or sight-seers, but are looking to participate in new experiences and activities. About half of international tourists to Peru are from Latin American countries, while the other half comes from the major world tourism markets of the US, the UK, Japan, France, Germany and Spain. As for national tourists, according to Promperú’s ‘Perfil de Vaccionista Nacional, 2007’ (National holiday-maker profile) in Pentur (Sariego López and García Santillán 2008: 49), the majority are family groups (of parents and children) and groups of young people. Their reasons for travelling

\textsuperscript{11} Ministerio de Comercio Exterior y Turismo, Ministry of Foreign Trade and Tourism\textsuperscript{12} Plan Estratégico Nacional de Turismo, National Strategic Plan for Tourism
are for rest, relaxation and to escape their daily routine. Climate and the natural environment influence their choices of destinations within Peru.

Promperú, the state agency charged with tourism promotion, distinguishes Peru within global tourism markets as an ‘authentic’ destination. Authenticity is conveyed by calling on imaginations that evoke a distant past, exploration and contact with ‘exotic’, indigenous people. Promperú promotes a specifically Inca past with Machu Picchu and the advertising banner ‘Peru-Land of the Incas’ (Promperú 2008) as the focus of its recent campaigns. It was Eduardo Mariano Rivero, an early nineteenth century explorer and archaeologist who described Peru as ‘the land of the Incas’ (Castro-Klarén 2003: 193). By adopting Rivero’s epithet Promperú evokes the past through archaeological discovery within imaginations of the Romantic period of discovery. Moreover, the centrality of Peru’s Inca heritage in its tourism image is supported by the status of Machu Picchu and Cusco, the Inca capital, as World Heritage Sites and on various ‘must-see’ lists; Machu Picchu has recently been voted one of the ‘7 New Wonders of the World’, in a list that includes the Taj Mahal and the Great Wall of China (Francis 2007). Promises of ‘authentic’ encounters with its indigenous people, the present-day descendents of the Incas, are suggested by colourful images of local people, which also feature predominantly on Promperú’s web pages.

Responsible, homestay tourism fits into the state’s promotion of Peru as an authentic tourist destination through its Inca heritage and presence of indigenous peoples who represent a living link to this past by facilitating tourists’ encounters with indigenous people and learning about traditional ways of life. It also corresponds to government plans to diversify its tourism products and develop niche markets. Pentur 2008-2018 (Sariego López and García Santillán 2008: 53) states that the Vice ministry of Tourism have in recent years started to

---

13 Also see illustration 0:1, p.2 which shows a member of the indigenous community at Bienvenido posing as the Inca for paid photographs outside a neighbouring archaeological site in Southern Peru. He can be seen to be adopting a commodified identity of being a descendent of the Incas.
promote ‘turismo rural communitario (TRC)’, which translates literally as ‘rural communal tourism’, or for Northern markets, as responsible, homestay tourism. The reason outlined in Pentur for pursuing this kind of niche tourism is the great presence of ‘living’ cultures in the country, which are seen as giving Peru a competitive advantage in international markets. This kind of tourism is also viewed as generating positive economic and social impacts for rural communities, examples of which include the improvement and maintenance of infrastructure and local services such as roads, public transport and businesses.

Pentur cites the ‘I Encuentro de Turismo Rural Comunitario’ (First meeting of rural communal tourism) in November 2007 in Cusco as being organised with the aim of raising awareness of this kind of tourism among different actors in the public and private sectors. This movement towards hybrid public-private funding models reflects neo-liberal approaches to tourism as a development strategy have been promoted by the Peruvian State since the Fujimori administration (1990-2000). Community-based, homestay tourism in Peru originated in the 1970s on the island of Taquile on Lake Titicaca as a community-owned and managed enterprise, which even had its own travel agency (Zorn 2004). However, the promotion of this kind of tourism among public and private actors at the above event reflects the transitions to neo-liberal models of tourism funding. That is, rather than communities owning and running their own tourism businesses, they are being drawn into depending on outside state and private sector agencies in order to function.

The case-study of Taquile illustrates this shift from communal ownership and management of homestay tourism to the current dependency of communities on external, private sector, actors to facilitate homestay tourism. Ypeij and Zorn (2007: 119), who have studied community-based, homestay tourism on Taquile extensively, note that debates on sustainable and responsible tourism have recently focused on the importance of including local people in tourism development. However, they argue that participation often assumes that tourism
initiatives come from external agencies and that local communities are ‘passively waiting until outsiders present their plans’ (Ypeij and Zorn 2007: 119). They present the case of Taquile as demonstrating that the islanders want to go beyond participation to regaining control of tourism on the island.

Ypeij and Zorn (2007) describe the community of Taquile as initiating tourism on the island themselves. As tourism increased, they managed the distribution of tourists along communitarian lines, sharing tourists equally among families according to the traditional ‘turn’ system. The community also regulated the pricing and sale of handicrafts through a community shop in the main square. However, Ypeij and Zorn (2007) note that these systems of community control of tourism are breaking down in the face of competition with the neighbouring island of Amantaní, which also offers homestay tourism. They argue that external travel agents now only make a brief stop at Taquile for a tour and lunch, staying overnight on Amantaní. Community members are also bypassing the community handicraft shop by selling individually (at lower prices) to tourists. These trends illustrate the shift from the original communal organisation of homestay tourism to neo-liberal models of market integration based on private intervention and the privileging of individual enterprise and competition between providers of products.

From originating on the islands of Taquile and Amantaní in the 1970s, homestay tourism is now present throughout Peru. Many Spanish language schools (which are predominantly in the capital, Lima, and the tourist centre of Cusco) offer homestays to their students as a way of practising their Spanish and learning about life in a Peruvian family. This sector represents homestays in urban, middle-class families, while the focus of this study is homestay tourism in rural areas, in indigenous homes. There are no official statistics for the scale of rural

---

14 I experienced this trend when I booked a package tour of Amantaní and Taquile in January 2005. It was extremely difficult to organise an overnight stay on Taquile through travel agents, as this departed from their standard packages. I did, however, manage to stay overnight, although I was the only one in my tour group who did this.

15 This was also my experience when I visited Taquile in January 2005. As I walked through the island, villagers would invite me into their and offer to sell me weavings.
homestay tourism in Peru, either in terms of geographical distribution, the numbers of communities and community members involved in this activity or the numbers of tourists staying with rural communities. However, enquiries made during field work in Peru and a web-based search for the Spanish term 'turismo viviencial, Peru' and the English 'homestay tourism, Peru', reveal this tourism phenomenon to be small-scale, yet widespread and increasing in Peru. Homestay tourism exists in those communities throughout Peru which are near major, established tourist centres and visits are organised through Lima-based or Northern travel agents. There are communities involved in homestay tourism in Northern Peru, near Cajamarca (the community of La Encañada) and near Huaraz (the community of Amistad in this study). In Southern Peru, there are communities offering homestay tourism in the Sacred Valley near Cusco (the communities of Willoq and Q'Eros), near Arequipa (the communities of Sibayo and Cañón de Cotahuasi), at Bienvenido, between Cusco and Puno (one of the sites in this study) and in the Puno region (the communities of Taquile, Amantani, Uros, Anapía and Encuentro (in this study)). In the Amazon, near Puerto Maldonaldo the community of Queros and near Iquitos the community of San Andrés offer homestay tourism.

1:2 Neo-liberal agendas and the Peruvian State's plans for development through tourism

Neo-liberalism: genealogies and definitions

Leading economic geographers are involved in the project to track the trajectory of neo-liberalism and to define its economic, political, philosophical and cultural manifestations across time and space. Most concede that neo-liberalism originates in the philosophical ideas of economists Milton Friedman and Friedrich von Hayek (Harvey 2005). Standard accounts describe their ideas as being transformed into political policy and adopted by the so-called 'Chicago Boys' (Bondi and Laurie 2005: 2; Harvey 2005: 8) Chilean graduates of a joint

16 (See chapter 3 for numbers of families and tourists involved in the homestay projects in this study.)
programme between the University of Chicago and Santiago’s Catholic University, who trained under Friedman in the 1970s. These graduates were then responsible for implementing the first neo-liberal experimental reforms in Pinochet’s Chile. The results of this experiment inspired the adoption of neo-liberal policies by Reagan and Thatcher in the 1980s and then ideas and experiments in neo-liberalism converged in the ‘Washington Consensus’ of the 1990s (Harvey 2005). Peck and Tickell (2002: 380) describe the transitions through these phases: from a utopian, or ‘proto’ neo-liberalism, based on Friedman’s and Hayek’s philosophical ideas; to the ‘roll-back’ (of the state and market regulation) in the political arena of the 1980s; to the ‘roll-out’ (across the globe) phase of technocratic approaches to spreading neo-liberal policy packages across the globe through the funding regimes of the IMF (International Monetary Fund), WB (World Bank) and WTO (World Trade Organisation) in the ‘Washington Consensus’ of the 1990s.

Most economic geographers agree on the basic characteristics of neo-liberalism. These consist of a decrease in the state’s role in the provision of particularly social services (Larner et. al. 2007), but an increase in the state’s role in policing and security to enable the implementation of neo-liberal policies (Harvey 2005); the de-regulation of goods and services and increased competition between providers of these; and the creation of markets for goods and services where none previously existed, for example, environmental goods. Harvey (2005) defines neo-liberalism as follows:

Neoliberalism is in the first instance a theory of political economic practices that proposes that human well-being can best be advanced by liberating individual entrepreneurial freedoms and skills within an institutional framework characterised by strong private property rights, free markets, and free trade. The role of the state is to create and preserve an institutional framework appropriate to such practices. The state has to guarantee, for example, the quality and integrity of money. It must also set up those military, defence, police and legal structures and functions required to secure private property rights and to guarantee, by force if need be, the proper functioning of markets. Furthermore, if markets do not exist (in
areas such as land, water, education, health care, social security, or environmental pollution) then they must be created, by state action, if necessary.

(Harvey 2005: 2)

Harvey (2005) describes a set of interconnected political and economic approaches, whose goal is ostensibly to promote widespread economic and social wellbeing and whose guiding principles centre on the individual’s freedom to function unfettered in the market. The role of the state within this scenario is to create the appropriate institutional, regulatory and security conditions to enable free markets and to create new markets in previously non-commodified areas of society.

**Neo-liberalism: critical perspectives**

While the above sets out a basic genealogy and definition of the general characteristics of neo-liberalism, these are contested and debated by their authors. The main points of critical enquiry surrounding neo-liberalism are outlined in the following.

Critical perspectives focus on neo-liberalism as a achieving (a debatable) hegemony through the deployment of discourses that build assumptions that it is ‘common sense’. Several commentators suggest that neo-liberalism has achieved universal acceptance as ‘ubiquitous common sense’ (Ward and England 2007: 2) or as being the ‘common sense of the times’ (Peck and Tickell 2002: 381). They seek to destabilise its apparent hegemonic position by avoiding ‘grand narratives’ through showing neo-liberalism to be a ‘hybrid process’, constructed through ‘situated meanings’ (England and Ward 2007: 257) and grounded, embodied experiences. Neo-liberalism is conceptualised by these critics as being realised, not through a dis-embodied, external force, but through embodied networks make up of multiple scales and actors (Bondi and Laurie 2005; Larner et al. 2007). Ward and England (2007: 17) argue that: ‘people and states involved
in [neo-liberalism's] production and performance have formed policy and practitioner networks that stretch across boundaries and borders’. These accounts demonstrate that neo-liberalism is not a unilinear, uniform, top-down imposition from the centre to the periphery, but functioning through messier, mixed-up spatialities and temporalities. For example, Wendy Larner (2003: 510) suggests: ‘developments in the periphery may be as significant, if not more so, as those in the ‘core’ in explaining the spread of neo-liberalism’. These accounts create spaces for agency on the part of the states and actors involved in neo-liberal projects and therefore for other possibilities to grow.

Several commentators see neo-liberalism as an uneven process, both unevenly developed across the globe and engendering uneven development between and within states, and point to the differences in neo-liberalism's trajectory in distinct parts of the world, and in differing times. Ward and England (2007: 3) propose the plural ‘neoliberalisations’ in order to highlight the different processes manifest in multiple trajectories of neo-liberalism, rather than a uniform, static end-state. Larner et. al. (2007) also emphasise the notion of difference, of neo-liberalism emerging from different origins and diverse actors across multiple spatialities and temporalities. More concretely, Harvey (2005) argues that neo-liberalism emerged from different points on the globe in response to the break down of post World War II Keynesian state-led economic models. He cites the revolutionary turns in economic and political policies in the early 1970s in Pinochet's Chile and in the late 1970s and early 1980s in Deng Xiaoping's China, Ronald Reagan's United States and Margaret Thatcher's Britain as evidence of distinct sources of neo-liberalism.

Harvey's critique of neo-liberalism focuses on the uneven development of neo-liberalism and his thesis that it is: ‘a political project to re-establish the conditions for capital accumulation and to restore the power of economic elites’ (Harvey 2005: 19). By taking a Marxist perspective based on class-struggle, Harvey reveals neo-liberalism as a project which, rather than creating wealth across society, promotes the redistribution of wealth to upper class minorities.
He argues that while neo-liberalism advances the idea that competition within and between states promotes fairness, efficiency and ultimately brings widespread benefits to all, the increase in inequalities within and between states reveals neo-liberalism’s original aim of elite gain: ‘neoliberalism [should be] recognised as a failed utopian rhetoric masking a successful project for the restoration of ruling-class power’ (Harvey 2005: 203). Moreover, in his class-based analysis, Harvey (2005) suggests that neo-liberalism is not simply an imposition on the part of Northern economic and political powers on developing countries, but that its policies are actively promoted by national elites in order to pursue their own interests. In a similar vein, Colás (2005: 78) argues that: ‘developing countries are not hapless victims or passive objects of global neoliberalism; they are, like other states, populated by classes and forces with their own interests and strategies.’

The relationship between neo-liberalism and development is explored through processes of professionalization and auditing cultures, whereby alternative development and activism is seen to be co-opted and mainstreamed into neo-liberal approaches. Mainstreaming is particularly facilitated through development NGOs dependency on North-South funding, whose criteria is bracketed by neo-liberal agendas, and disciplined through auditing mechanisms (see chapters 2 and 6).

**The way in which this thesis approaches neo-liberalism**

The way in which this thesis approaches neo-liberalism is to see it as a project that has many parallels with colonial projects. That is, it can be viewed as functioning through hegemonic discourses (Harvey 2005; Said [2003] 1978) which are global in their reach, and as promoting the integration of new regions into global markets and previously non-commodified phenomena into marketable resources. This thesis seeks to go behind the ‘common sense’
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17 (Mawdsley et. al. 2002; Bondi and Laurie 2005; Simpson 2005; Jenkins 2008)
assumptions upon which neo-liberal approaches to homestay tourism are based in order to reveal their, often contradictory, origins. It does not see neo-liberal projects as explicit impositions by external imperial powers, although it recognises the coercive power of institutions such as the IMF, WB and WTO in funding development projects with strings attached to implementation according to neo-liberal principles. Rather, it sees neo-liberal approaches as actively sought out by elites within states and interpreted and implemented differently by diverse states. The specificity of neo-liberalism is explored through an analysis of Peruvian economic and political history and approaches to development. This traces current debates surrounding development and tourism to the particularly Peruvian legacies of modernisation theory and post-independence racial geographies. For example, it places representations of indigenous culture deployed in homestay tourism as within a legacy of elite appropriation of indigenous culture, which is converted into folkloric performances and representations for elite gain. This thesis also approaches the state’s role in the implementation of neo-liberal agendas as one of creating economic, social and security environments that are conducive to the smooth functioning of markets. Moreover, it sees neo-liberalism as being embodied through networks of multiple actors at multiple scales, which are explored through the multi-actor and multi-scalar methodologies (see chapter 3). It particularly explores neo-liberalism as permeating the development industry through processes of professionalization and auditing. The implications that these perspectives have on strategies for change will be explored in the conclusions (chapter 7). Tourism fits into international development agendas and state development plans, of which the Peruvian State is no exception, in the following ways.

**Tourism and development**

Tourism is widely believed by international development agencies to bring widespread economic development. This assumption is supported by claims in the tourism industry literature that tourism is the world’s fastest growing industry (UNWTO 2008). This literature also proposes that developing countries
represent a growing market. For example, the UNWTO\textsuperscript{18} notes that increasingly outbound tourism from Western Europe and North America has been to ‘emerging source markets’ (UNWTO 2008: 3). Moreover, DFID\textsuperscript{19} (2004) maintains that tourism is the main source of income for a third of developing countries. These assertions, together with tourism’s compatibility with predominant neo-liberal development models, make tourism a high priority in developing countries’ plans for economic development.

Within neo-liberal agendas for development, the adoption of tourism is seen as an ideal development strategy for developing countries because it is virtually unfettered by trade barriers and because it relies on natural and cultural resources, which developing countries are thought to have in abundance and which are free (Bookman 2006). The natural environment and indigenous culture are presented as providing opportunities for commodification and ‘adding-value’ through their promotion to the especially niche markets of alternative, adventure and eco-tourism (Oliart 2004). These particular markets provide the opportunity of opening up ‘remote’ regions within nations to development through integration into global markets. Currently indigenous culture, which is central to homestay tourism products, is advanced by international agencies, such as the UNWTO (UN 2002a), the Peruvian State (Mincetur 2005; Promperú 2007) as well as NGOs\textsuperscript{20} and responsible travel agents as a key asset in development through tourism. As a development strategy, homestay tourism further fits neo-liberal agendas of ‘rolling back the state’ (Johnson 1999: 49; Bondi and Laurie 2005) by exerting minimal demands on state investment by being implemented through hybrid models of public and private investment and internationally funded NGO-led project-based models (see chapter 3 for details on funding models of responsible, homestay tourism sites in this study).

\textsuperscript{18} United Nations World Tourism Organisation
\textsuperscript{19} The UK’s Department for International Development
\textsuperscript{20} Non-Governmental Organisations
The Peruvian State’s plans for development through tourism

The Peruvian State can be seen to be following neo-liberal agendas for development through tourism, whose policies are outlined in its ten-year national strategy for tourism development, ‘Pentur’ (Mincetur 2005; Sariego López and García Santillán 2008). This document states that the main reason for pursuing tourism as a development strategy is that tourism generates decentralised employment and widespread development. Peru's distinctive natural environment and ‘socio-cultural values’ (Sariego López and García Santillán 2008: 14) are constituted by the Peruvian State as commodifiable goods, and their preservation is seen as integral to establishing a competitive advantage in Peru's tourism products. Sustainable tourism development is defined by the Peruvian State, in Pentur, from a neo-liberal perspective: the protection of the natural environment and traditional cultures are delivered through market-based incentives to provide good quality tourism products with staying-power in the market. While the Peruvian State recognises that the majority of its tourists visit iconic sites on established tourist routes (Sariego López and García Santillán 2008), it is not pursuing a typically mass tourism model, typified by the construction of enclaves of luxury beach resorts and the dependency that the reliance on one tourist market as seen in the tourism development in the Caribbean (Freitag 1994; Pattullo 1996).

Instead, the Peruvian State’s strategies for tourism development echo Mexico’s in that it is diversifying its tourism products to respond to a wide range of niche markets, policies which are set out in Pentur (Mincetur 2005; Sariego López and García Santillán 2008) (see chapter 5). Mexico, a Latin American country with certain similarities in the products it offers tourists, including world famous archaeological sites, ethnic and bio-diversity, has followed a state-led policy from the late 1960s and throughout the 1970s. This policy departed from the private sector’s concentration of tourism in Mexico City and key archaeological sites to the state’s planning, financing and constructing the five key resorts of Cancún, Ixtapu, Los Cabos, Loreto and Huatulco, where the state even owned some of the
tourism enterprises (Collins 1978; Clancy 1999; Brenner 2005). However, state-led tourism in Mexico is not confined to beach resorts, but also embraces diverse and niche tourism sectors. These include ethnic tourism, focusing in on Mayan culture (Little 2004), which the state initially facilitated as a development strategy and then which evolved through private enterprises (van den Berghe 1995).

The delivery of decentralised employment and good quality tourism products follow neo-liberal models of market integration, and neo-liberal models of administration and funding. Pentur (Sariego López and García Santillán 2008) proposes the implementation of tourism policies through decentralised tourism networks through DMOs\textsuperscript{21}, which are to be funded through PPP\textsuperscript{22} models and international funding bodies, all of which are promoted by the UNWTO (see chapter 5).

1:3 Post-Fordist diversification of products

The development of responsible tourism products, including homestay tourism, can be seen as coming out of the post-Fordist market transition from uniform, mass products to a plethora of niche products for individualised markets. Promperú sets out a wide spectrum of specialised (non-mass) tourism products on its website (Promperú 2008). These products cater for diverse markets, such as tourism which focuses on culture, nature and adventure, and which are then subdivided into more specialised interests such as archaeology, indigenous communities, surfing and trekking. Pentur sets out policy statements which promote the decentralisation of tourist destinations within Peru, concentrating on developing routes between or emanating from established tourist attractions, and routes that diverge from the major tourist destinations of Southern Peru of Lima-Arequipa-Puno-Cusco (Sariego López and García Santillán 2008). The establishment of alternative routes provides new products for consumers who

\textsuperscript{21} Destination Management Organisations
\textsuperscript{22} Public-Private Partnership
are demanding alternatives to mass products and destinations. These are promoted by Promperú (2008) in the form of ‘tourist circuits’ and also by influential international tourist guide books such as the Lonely Planet (Rachowiecki and Beech 2004), which proposes various routes to take the tourist ‘off the beaten track’, thus appealing to tourists who desire more ‘authentic’ experiences (see chapter 6).

Homestay tourism in Peru has emerged as both a specialised product for a niche tourist market which values alternatives to mass tourism products and destinations, and most recently as part of the Peruvian State’s policies of decentralising tourism destinations. The sites in this study, which have been established either in proximity to major tourist destinations or on routes between major tourist destinations, reflect these two trends. (See chapter 3 for a detailed examination of the sites in this study.)

1:4 Ethical consumption

Western European countries and the USA are among the world’s highest spenders on outbound tourism (France is in first position as the highest spender, followed by the UK, the USA, Germany and China (UNWTO 2008)). It follows that the tastes of tourists from these sending countries have a strong influence on the kinds of tourism products that are developed in receiving markets. Developing countries have been quick to respond to changes in tourism tastes and markets (see chapter 4). Responsible tourism discourses have largely emanated from the West. The origins of current ethical motivations for travel within Western Europe have their roots in the British colonial era, where travel to benefit local people was heavily influenced by the civilising mission and missionary movements (McEwan 2000; Pratt [2008] 1992). Moreover, the more recent post-Fordist diversification of products has resulted in an increase in consumer choice, which has seen power shifting from producers to consumers. Increased consumer power has combined with growing consumer awareness of the ethical issues, for example of labour conditions and environmental concerns, implicit in
diverse products, from coffee and clothing to holidays to enable informed and concerned consumers to demand more ‘ethical’ products. Responsible tourism is also situated in established critiques of mass tourism and sustainable development discourses, which also originate in the West (see chapter 2).

1:5 Elite concerns

While homestay tourism can be seen as a response to consumer-led demands for more ethical consumption, it can also be seen as emerging to meet elite concerns with individuality, exclusivity and authenticity. These concerns can be traced through binaries of elite travel and mass tourism in eighteenth and nineteenth century Britain, and imperial tropes of exploration and discovery of the same period. These class-based binaries are deeply embedded in popular imaginations of (elite) travel and (mass) tourism (Crick 1996; Butcher 2003; MacCannell [1999] 1976). Travel as an individual, elite pursuit of educational experiences and high culture can be traced to the eighteenth century Grand Tour, when travel was the preserve of leisured, aristocratic elites (Turner and Ash 1975; Butcher 2003; Urry [2002] 1990). Travel began to open up to an emerging wealthy class of industrialists at the time of the British Industrial Revolution who imitated established elite tastes by sending their sons on Grand Tours. Thomas Cook furthered the widening of travel to non-elites by creating the first package tours for the Victorian working classes, thus delivering travel as a leisure pursuit to the masses and heralding mass tourism (Turner and Ash 1975; Butcher 2003).

Moreover, homestay tourism’s constitution of authenticity as personal contact with indigenous peoples can be understood as elite tourists’ re-enactment of colonial tropes of contact (Hulme 1986; Pratt [2008] 1992). Thus representations of encounters between tourists and hosts in homestay tourism’s promotional literature evoke imaginations of imperial travellers being welcomed by hospitable ‘native’ hosts. By its constitution as an elite product, homestay tourism claims to fulfil sustainable development principles, while maintaining its profitability by targeting fewer, but higher paying, middle-class consumers.

Methodology

This study explores homestay tourism in Peru by focusing on three case studies of rural, indigenous communities through multi-scalar research, encompassing international, national and local levels. It employs the principle methodologies of multi-scalar and critical genealogical analysis in order to contribute to new ways of critically examining homestay tourism. Multi-scalar approaches allow the analysis of the contrasting and converging discourses of the multiple institutions and actors whose interactions produce responsible, homestay tourism. Critical genealogical analysis reveals the often highly conservative roots of responsible, homestay tourism and the inequalities in power that permeate through the discourses through which it is constituted.

The data examined was largely collected during fieldwork in Peru and consists of: institutional documents (state and NGO policy documents), promotional material (guide books, travel company brochures and websites) and interviews with key actors (international development agencies, Peruvian State agencies, NGOs and responsible travel agents and indigenous community tourism association leaders (both male and female). This thesis also draws on personal observations recorded in field notes and photographs taken while participating in homestays in Peru.

Peru and the three communities that empirically underpin this study present ideal sites to explore the structures and dynamics of professionalisation and development at play in the constitution of homestay tourism. The current policy context at both the international and national levels, the growing trends of the commodification of cultural ‘authenticity’ and professionalisation of ‘alternative’ development and travel intersect in the current national arena and specific communities in this study.
1:7 Contribution

Where mass tourism is popularly and professionally vilified for its lack of taste, inauthenticity and lack of sustainability (principally through its failure to include local people in its assumed developmental benefits and its destructive impacts on natural environments and traditional cultures), responsible tourism is advanced as countering these failings. If responsible tourism is criticised, it is for failing to deliver its own agenda or to comply with its own standards. An example of this is the recent debate over ‘greenwashing’ in the popular UK press: in an article in the Observer Travel Supplement providers of responsible tourism products were revealed to be failing to fulfil their own, and tourists’, expectations of environmental standards (Robbins 2008).

I argue that models of alternative tourism are critically examined within their own parameters. This means that the assumptions on which they are based, class-based distinctions of taste and ethics, colonial constructions of travel, and sustainable development through neo-liberal market integration, are rarely discussed. Responsible homestay tourism is examined as a form of ethical consumption that can be traced through tropes of responsibility to distant others as a response to lack and need that have their roots in the colonial era. Furthermore, ethical consumption is currently promoted as both morally and socially superior than its mass counterpart.

I propose that alternative tourism is based on a series of false dichotomies, principally between niche and mass tourism, both which promote development and poverty alleviation through market integration. I explore the ways in which the home is transformed into a commodified space while being represented as a site of authentic, non-monetary encounters with indigenous people. However, alternative tourism seems to be more concerned with curbing the more destructive effects of market integration through limiting tourism development to the small-scale, and emphasising the revival of intrinsic cultural values, than the commercial viability of sustainable tourism products (see chapter 4). It is
responsible homestay tourism's promotion of responsibility through cultural
difference between tourists and communities that allows unequal relationships
and socio-economic inequality to persist. Indigenous communities are defined as
superior to developed, Northern societies in terms of spirituality and
sustainability. However, their relationship with tourists and tourism is presented
as one of responsibility on the part of tourists and tourism and need on the part
of communities (for cultural revival and sustainable development). Development
is limited to the small scale, because of Northern concerns over cultural and
environmental sustainability, and ethics are defined by the choices of individual,
niche, consumers. I argue that it is these conservative parameters which
diminish the potential for more widespread development and more equal
conceptualisations of responsibility in homestay tourism.

This thesis also challenges the assumptions on which ideas of cultural
authenticity and sustainability in tourism are based. These centre on
past/present, staged/non-staged binaries (MacCannell 1973) and Butler's
(1980) destination lifecycle model, where the authenticity of destinations
inevitably decline with increasing numbers of tourists. Post-colonial
conceptualisations of hybridity and non-linear, or knotted, time (Chakrabarty
2000) are explored in order to break down these binaries and as a way of
escaping the inevitability of the destination lifecycle model.

Although the names and nuances of alternative tourism approaches change, the
basic underlying beliefs in tourism as a development tool in order to facilitate
poverty alleviation and sustainable development do not. Critical perspectives on
the power of international funding agencies (notably Goldman's (2006) work on
the World Bank) will be called on to explore the ways in which international
funding agencies dominate discourses underlying homestay tourism.

The professional and practitioner-oriented literature also focuses on
implementing auditing mechanisms to ensure that standards are complied with,
which is evident particularly in the case of current discussions of Fair Trade
tourism (Font 2007; Tourism Concern 2007). Mawdsley, Townsend, Porter and Oakley’s (2002) work reveals a political dimension to the culture of auditing which they argue functions as a disciplining device in order to make NGOs conform to dominant development agendas. NGOs need to replicate international donor’s development agendas and discourses, and to prove they can deliver successful projects within these agendas, in order to gain further funding. Thus debates concentrate on ‘how’ alternative tourism as a development intervention is implemented, and on addressing failures to deliver its proposed developmental agendas, rather than on examining the power relations that determine these agendas or on alternatives that lie outside of tourism and development. Development as a dominating conceptual framework of modernisation has been criticised by the post-developmentalists24 as a failed project. Goldman (2006) notes that individual development projects are predominantly marked by their failure. Given this legacy, evidenced by often low visitor numbers to homestay tourism sites (see chapters 3 and 4), the need to explore homestay tourism more critically becomes important.

This thesis draws on critiques of development as an industry (Ferguson 1990; Chambers 1998) whose concentration on models and techniques, disseminated and evaluated by a professional class of development experts, serves to deny the politics and power relations in its underlying neo-liberal agenda, passed down from powerful, Northern development agencies and funding bodies25. It is the development, and responsible tourism, industries’ focus on models, rather than the underlying political and economic structures and power relations through which development and tourism are constructed, that this thesis proposes to discuss. While there are established postcolonial critiques of mass tourism as integrating predominantly former colonial territories into neo-colonial representational and material structures, there are only a small number of critiques of alternative forms of tourism as functioning within these highly
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unequal imaginations and systems\textsuperscript{26}. This thesis proposes to open up homestay tourism to this particular critical lens.

The public and private bodies (international development agencies, NGOs and travel agents) that facilitate flows of funding, knowledge and tourists that make homestay tourism materially and representationally possible are global in their reach, and spread identical discourses across the world. However, this thesis sees neo-liberalism as not simply a North-South imposition, but as having multiple sources and being produced over multiple scales. Moreover, it emphasises agency on the part of Southern elites in the adoption of neo-liberal projects, who aim to further their socio-economic advantages. Within this view of neo-liberalism, homestay tourism is seen as functioning within specific cultural contexts in different countries. This thesis therefore both draws out the common strands of global critiques of development and tourism, while grounding the study in specifically Peruvian histories and geographies of indigenous communities and their relationship to development. It calls on previous empirical studies of tourism in Peru\textsuperscript{27}, and specifically homestay tourism in Peru\textsuperscript{28}, as well as a wider literature on Peruvian history and geography\textsuperscript{29}, in order to explore the often fraught interactions between international development discourses and agendas and national contingencies. Furthermore, the inclusion of the national level in order to examine the ways in which the adoption of international approaches to tourism are played out in specific contexts departs from many studies of tourism which focus on relationships between international tourism policies and local communities and between tourists and their hosts as though they took place in a vacuum.
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By bringing together perspectives on the professionalisation of development, postcolonial critiques of tourism, post-development perspectives and nationally grounded experiences, this thesis aims to contribute to new approaches to critically examining homestay tourism. It aims to advance current debates in development geography, on neo-liberalism and responsibility, and in tourism studies, on authenticity and sustainability. It proposes that proponents of homestay tourism lack critical engagement with the assumptions surrounding culture and development on which it is based, which undermines their radical claims to foster socio-economic development and cultural revival among indigenous communities. Moreover, its advocates’ failure to consider the national contexts in which it operates results in simplistic assertions that indigenous culture can be ‘added into’ development and homogenised representations of indigenous culture for tourist consumption. This thesis suggests that agents involved in homestay tourism need to explore the often contentious historical geographies of indigenous peoples and their relationship to development in order to understand the tensions that can arise over the employment of indigenous culture for development in homestay tourism.

1:8 Thesis outline

Chapter 2 sets homestay tourism within the historical and geographical context of the colonial legacy of imaginations which influence the demand-side of the tourism equation: responsible tourists and the industry that both responds to and constitutes these demands. It also provides critical perspectives on these imaginations from postcolonial critiques of tourism, post-development perspectives that highlight the professionalisation of the development industry and literature exploring the historical legacy of colonialism and modernisation in Peru. Chapter 3 sets out the methodology and methods employed to examine the multiple sites and engage with the multiple actors involved in the constitution of homestay tourism.
Empirical chapters 4, 5 and 6 will explore homestay tourism through the intersecting lenses of critical approaches to development, its professionalisation, postcolonial theory and Peruvian debates on development and national identity. Taking a critically genealogical approach, the empirical data that forms the main body of this thesis will be excavated at multiple scales, reflecting both the ‘demand’ and ‘supply’ sides of the homestay tourism equation, in order to uncover the flows of power that run through the discourses which produce this responsible tourism phenomenon. Empirical data on the demand-side, explored in chapter 4, includes international institutional documents outlining sustainable development principles and their application to tourism as well as Northern promotional materials and popular sources. This chapter looks to the critical literature on development and its professionalisation in order to uncover the ways in which sustainable development discourses have been mainstreamed into market-led development through the commodification of cultural revival. It also calls on postcolonial perspectives on tourism and recent debates in geography on responsibility to trace the imaginations of cultural authenticity and travel motivated by a higher moral purpose that inform homestay tourism’s conceptualisation of development and culture back to their highly conservative roots.

Chapters 5 and 6 are dedicated to the national and local scales in order to explore how international development discourses are played out at these levels, and how national and local attitudes influence their reception. They also show the agency on the part of national and local elites in adopting neo-liberal approaches to development and the ways in which neo-liberalism becomes adapted to local contexts. Chapter 5 examines the ‘supply-side’ of responsible tourism at the national level. Peruvian State policy documents outlining plans for national tourism development, debates on sustainable tourism development in the Peruvian press and the perceptions of key actors in Peruvian State tourism institutions are explored in order to discover the ways in which international discourses on tourism, development and culture interact with the specific
contingencies of the national scale. This chapter looks at the Peruvian State's adoption of post-Fordist approaches to decentralised and diversified tourism as a strategy to deliver widespread development and of neo-liberal policies to preserve environmental and cultural resources through their commodification. It investigates Peru's historical legacy of post-independence geographies of indigenous spaces hindering modernisation and progress in order to examine current national concerns with rural communities’ access to global markets and elite attitudes to local people's protests at their marginalization within tourism development. Critical perspectives on neo-liberalism's appropriation of indigenous cultural identity as a commodified resource supports arguments that this process denies the political possibilities of indigenous identity as a rallying point against uneven development. Postcolonial perspectives reveal the power relations embedded in representations of indigenous culture as existing in the past, which serve to depoliticise developmental difference, and to reinforce the economic and identity positions of elites.

Chapter 6 analyses the ways in which homestay tourism and its relationship to development and culture is interpreted and implemented at the local level through the accounts of consultants, travel agents and community leaders and their interpretations of tourists’ demands. It places homestay tourism’s agenda to revive indigenous culture within wider Latin American social movements and middle-class preoccupation with national identity. It looks at critical perspectives on the formation of national identity in Peru and grassroots indigenous political movements throughout Latin America to argue that homestay tourism, as an extension of the Peruvian State and World Bank's agenda to incorporate indigenous culture and communities into neo-liberal development strategies, depoliticises indigenous identity. It also explores critiques of the professionalisation of the development industry to examine consultants’ and communities’ preoccupation with training in order to deliver products that are suitable for tourist consumption. It proposes that the need to deliver successful homestay tourism projects in order to ensure further funding
dulls critical perspectives on funders’ views of development and culture. Moreover, it looks at the use of traditional community mechanisms of reciprocity and exchange as the cultural capital of the poor, which is employed by community elites, travel agents and consultants in homestay tourism in order to distribute the developmental benefits of tourism more equitably throughout communities. I argue that this also pacifies dissent and renders communities safe for market integration through tourism. However, systems of reciprocity and exchange can be seen as opening up spaces within neo-liberalism which challenge its reinforcement of racialised hierarchies and processes of socio-economic differentiation.

Chapter 7 will sum up the major arguments of this thesis, explore their implications and will offer some suggestions for policy makers and tourism professionals. It will argue that more reflexive approaches towards the commodification of indigenous culture in homestay tourism as a development strategy are needed if responsible tourism is to truly offer an alternative to its mass counterpart.
Chapter 2  Responsible, homestay tourism: conservative roots and critical perspectives

Homestay tourism is generally promoted as being ‘alternative’ to mass tourism, promising to take tourists ‘off the beaten track’. This ‘niche’ form of tourism is imaginatively constructed within a set of differences to mass tourism: where mass tourism excludes local people from tourism development, homestay tourism projects work directly with local communities; where mass tourism destroys fragile environments and authentic cultures; homestay tourism protects and revives traditional ways of life. It is built through sustainable development principles of constraining the market-led growth typified by mass tourism. Within the sustainable development principles deployed in homestay tourism, market-led development is restricted by limiting tourism development to small-scale projects; restricting tourist numbers; allowing access to only the ‘right’ kinds of tourist, those who are genuinely interested in ‘authentic’ cultural experiences and sensitive to fragile environments and cultures (and who are willing to pay more for the ‘added value’ offered by niche products); and by controlling tourist behaviour (see chapter 4).

While indigenous communities are defined for tourist consumption through their remoteness from markets and development, they are simultaneously positioned in terms of their need for market integration and development. Homestay tourism is proposed to fulfil this perceived lack of development in ‘sustainable’ ways. This chapter will draw on critiques of sustainable development as being ‘mainstreamed’ into neo-liberal development agendas through applying market mechanisms to environmental protection. It will argue that the market values that have been applied to the natural environment, as a previously non-commodified commons, for example in eco-tourism, are being employed in homestay tourism. Indigenous culture in homestay tourism will be examined as a commodified ‘cultural commons’. These arguments will be extended to this form of tourism to explore the ways in which the sustainable development principles
deployed in homestay tourism privilege market integration to deliver cultural preservation and revival, as well as development.

Recent critiques of professionalisation and development will be called on to argue that, the emphasis within the field of development on ‘getting the model right’, principally, sustainable, as opposed to mass tourism, depoliticises development projects’ underlying neo-liberal agenda of increasing market integration and mechanisms. Peruvian histories and geographies of development and their relationship with indigenous communities will also be explored in order to discuss the tensions arising from the unproblematic ‘adding in’ of indigenous culture to development interventions.

This chapter is divided into three sections, each examining different genealogical strands that collude in the discursive and material creation of homestay tourism: colonial imaginations of alternative travel, the imperial idealisation of rural life and lost authenticity and notions of sustainable development as turning away from development as the achievement of modernity through economic growth. Throughout these sections, it explores the ‘demand-side’ of the responsible tourism equation and the constitution of responsible, homestay tourism through imaginations of travel and development paradigms emanating from the global North from responsible tourists and the responsible tourism and development industries. It also looks at the ways in which the ‘supply-side’, developing countries, and Peru in particular, have adopted tourism as a development strategy, and the ways in which indigenous communities interact with homestay projects.

2:1 Alternative tourism?

This section will examine the foundations of the imaginations deployed in homestay tourism to question the notion that this kind of ‘niche’ tourism is ‘alternative’. It will argue that, by being imaginatively constructed as ‘alternative’
to mass tourism, homestay tourism denies its highly conservative roots in colonialism and its present day continuation of colonial practices of market integration. While homestay tourism is promoted as being imaginatively situated outside the constraints of conventional society and global capitalism, a critical examination of the genealogies of ‘alternative’ tourism will reveal this form of travel to be based on highly conservative imaginations which have served as engines of colonialism and class-based differentiation. These genealogies highlight the continuities of colonial systems of integrating previously non-commodified resources into global markets within the processes of producing homestay tourism. That is, indigenous culture becomes an economic resource for developing countries, the responsible tourism industry (travel agents, NGOs, consultants), for example, NGOs gain funding to establish homestay projects, and indigenous communities. The homestay experience is also a resource for tourists who can trade in the cultural capital gained from the experience to reaffirm their superior ethical and class positions and to achieve access to higher socio-economic status.

Colonial origins

The imaginative origins of alternative forms of tourism are found in colonial visions of individual exploration. An example of the replication of imaginations of adventure and discovery can be seen in the names of major UK-based adventure travel companies, who offer homestays as part of their packages: Explore; Exodus; Intrepid; Journey Latin America (see chapter 4). Postcolonial

---

30 The term post-colonial/postcolonial (with or without a hyphen) is contested within postcolonial theory and the use or omission of the hyphen reflects different theoretical positions. Sidaway (2002) discusses the significance of the hyphen and sees post-colonial with a hyphen as emphasising the notion of a break with the colonial past for formal colonies of European powers, while postcolonial without a hyphen indicates continuities in unequal geopolitical power relations beyond the colonial era.

Given the complex and multiple conditions described by the terms ‘post-colonial/postcolonial’, it is worth clarifying how these will be employed in this thesis. I will use the term ‘post-colonial’ when referring to Peru’s and other Latin American countries’ historical and geographical positions as former colonies of Spain and Portugal. Otherwise, I will use the term ‘postcolonial’ to emphasise the continuing structures of socio-economic and representational inequality in which I will argue that homestay tourism operates.
geographical perspectives have revealed the construction of imperial knowledge of, and power over, diverse territories through exploration, fieldwork, travel writing, maps and exhibitions (Blunt and McEwan 2002). Travellers’ tales of exploration and discovery, presented through books and lectures at, for example, the Royal Geographical Society in London, popularised ideas of British colonial expansion of the mid-nineteenth century as heroic, individual quests to discover new lands for the British Empire. Sharp (2008) points out that British nineteenth century explorers played a central role in colonial expansion, in their activities of exploration, surveying and mapping ‘new’ territories. She argues that travellers’ tales of adventure played an integral part in conveying representations of different lands and peoples as ripe for colonial ventures, and thus normalised this colonial project. Butler (2008: 4) also proposes that travel writing underpinned colonial impulses through its representations of the imperial powers’ cultural superiority over other territories:

Travel writing also helped to support European and US imperialist agendas (either explicitly or implicitly) by reinforcing the imperialist world-views of their home countries. The travellers’ home countries represented the paragon of civilisation, and, thus, put the writing travellers in a position of supposed superiority over other lands.

So, while homestay tourism trades on its alternative lineage of travel (as opposed to mass tourism) as an adventurous, individual pursuit, these imaginations were also deployed in support of highly contentious imperial projects. Although established postcolonial critiques of tourism focus on an undifferentiated or mass tourism\(^{31}\), there are emerging critiques which apply these perspectives to alternative forms of tourism\(^{32}\). Postcolonial critiques of tourism, and increasingly alternative tourism, see tourism as a continuation of the colonial processes of domination. For example, Horne (1984: 211) imagines tourists as walking among ‘monuments to the wreckage of Europe’s greatest ambition-to rule the world’,


\(^{32}\) (Butler 1992; Hutnyk 1996; Mowforth and Munt 1998; Butcher 2003)
and Cohen (1972: 182) positions tourists as embodying colonial roles: (…) the easy-going tourist of our era might well complete the work of his predecessors, also travellers from the West-the conqueror and the colonialist.’

These critiques advance the idea that tourism replicates colonial imaginative geographies and practices, in that tourism exploits global material and representational inequalities. On the material level, rather than closing the gap between the developed and developing worlds, these postcolonial critics argue that tourism exploits these inequalities, inherited from the colonial era. Kaplan argues that tourism and tourists both benefit from postcolonial global inequalities that make travel for leisure possible, that is, increased wealth and leisure time in the developed world, and, continued economic inequalities in developing countries that make travel cheap:

Imperialism has left its edifices and markers of itself the world over, and tourism seeks these markers out, whether they consist of actual monuments to field marshals or the altered economies of former colonies. Tourism, then, arises out of the economic disasters of other countries that make them ‘affordable’.

(Kaplan 1996: 63)

Crick (1996: 25) also comments that tourism exploits neo-colonial structures of inequality through tourists seeking out destinations that are ‘cheap’ compared to their own economies. He argues that this affordability is a result of poverty, which is a result of the colonial legacy:

Tourists do not go to Third World countries because people are friendly, they go because a holiday there is cheap; and cheapness is, in part, a matter of the poverty of the people, which derives in some theoretical formulations directly from the affluence of those in the formerly metropolitan centres of the colonial system.
Said argues that ‘Orientalism’ (the term he uses to describe the French and British colonial projects in the Middle East) is both ‘a mode of discourse’ and ‘historically and materially defined’ ([2003] 1978: 2-3). He proposes that Orientalism’s duality as a discursive and material force was instrumental in the European project of colonial domination from the Enlightenment onwards. Said’s assertion of the interdependence of the material and representational projects of colonialism, through a Foucauldian ([1969] 1972) perspective on the power of discourse, is extended to an examination of the continuities of colonial constructions of the world in development discourses. Thus, Escobar (1995: 7) argues that development discourses are rooted in colonial era imaginations: ‘Representations of Asia, Africa, and Latin America as Third World and underdeveloped are the heirs of an illustrious genealogy of Western conceptions about those parts of the world’.

Postcolonial critiques of tourism extend the analysis of the working of power through the mutual constitution of the material and representational to tourism. These critiques see tourism not only as functioning through and perpetuating material inequalities that reflect colonial relations, but also as working through, and re-creating colonial imaginations of the world. Kaplan (1996) sees tourists as requiring, and participating, in the re-construction of colonial and developmental divisions of the world:

If the tourist traverses boundaries, they are boundaries that the tourist participates in creating; that is, an economic and social order that requires ‘margins’ and ‘centres’ will also require representation of those structural distinctions. The tourist confirms and legitimates the social reality of constructions such as ‘First’ and ‘Third’ Worlds, ‘development’ and ‘underdevelopment,’ or ‘metropolitan’ and ‘rural’.

Representations deployed in homestay tourism follow in, and reconfirm the inequalities inherent in colonial relationships. Specifically homestay tourism is promoted through colonial tropes of contact and seemingly reciprocal, non-monetary exchange between travellers and ‘native’ peoples. However, Pratt
([2008] 1992) argues that travel writing in the British imperial era deployed imaginations of equal exchange that masked highly exploitative colonial mercantile expansionism. Her analysis of the travel accounts of Mungo Parks, a major figure in the Victorian exploration of West Africa, proposes that they normalised entrance into global, capitalist markets through representations of friendly, fair, reciprocal exchange:

(...) expansionist commercial aspirations idealise themselves into a drama of reciprocity. Negotiating his way across Africa, Parks is the picture of the entrepreneur. Yet the decidedly non-reciprocal momentum of European capitalism can scarcely be discerned in his lone and long-suffering figure (...) Trade he does, but never for profit.

(Pratt, [2008] 1992: 79, italics the author’s own)

Homestay tourism is promoted within reciprocal notions of ‘giving back to’ the people whose countries tourists enjoy and equality is also implied in the term ‘cross-cultural understanding’ (see chapter 4), which erases the monetary aspects of tourist-host interactions and by evoking imaginations of pre-market reciprocity. While mass tourism has been criticised for exploiting post-colonial economic inequalities, ‘alternative’ tourism can equally be seen as replicating colonial imaginations that mask the very inequalities in which it functions and benefits. Hutnyk (1996: 210) calls into question alternative tourism and charity’s insistence on fairness and exchange by highlighting the highly exploitative global divisions in which both operate: ‘So where is the exchange of tourism and charity if the products of labour are sold and exchanged, and their values set, far away? It would be important not to lose sight of the difference between airline tickets and souvenirs.’ Thus I draw on critiques of the role of representations in underpinning the material purposes of colonial projects. I argue that homestay tourism is constructed through colonial imaginations of exploration and discovery and specifically non-commodifed, reciprocal contact which mask the structural inequalities within which it operates. While these inequalities are highlighted in critiques of mass tourism, they are being increasingly applied to
alternative tourism, and this exploration of homestay tourism follows in these critical perspectives.

**Professional travellers**

Colonial tropes of travel for adventure and discovery are carried through into ideals of travel as a form of youthful rebellion against the constraints of ‘mainstream’ society, typified by the ‘dropping out’ counter-culture and the hippy-trails of the 1960s and 70s (Butcher 2003). Simpson (2005: 448), in her study of the British gap year, notes that youth travel has been concerned with the search for time and space out of formal educational and career paths: ‘Traditionally a gap year represented a break from formal education or employment in order to find time to engage in “extra-ordinary” experiences.’ However, drawing on Bourdieu’s (1984) conceptualisation of the interconnections between cultural and economic capital, Munt (1994), Desforges (1998) and Simpson (2005) argue that models of alternative, independent travel have been adopted by middle-class British youth as strategies to distinguish themselves in increasingly competitive educational and employment markets. That is, these authors argue that, through independent and ‘gap-year’ travel, young people accumulate cultural capital that can be converted into economic capital on their return. For example, young travellers and backpackers’ trade on their travel experiences within professional structures back ‘home’: for example, taking a gap-year involves increasingly commodified and formalised activities which enable its participants to gain ‘added-value’ in the educational and employment markets (Simpson 2005). Thus the ‘dropping out’ of the 1960s and 70s which once stood imaginatively outside mainstream society, is now incorporated into neo-liberal markets of education and employment. The incorporation of ‘alternative’ forms of travel into market structures marks a new wave of neo-liberal mainstreaming of ways of travel that once stood outside and in opposition to conventional social structures. However, genealogies of
homestay tourism reveal rather more conservative roots, in class-based prejudice against lower-class forms of mass consumption.

**Class-based distinction**

While homestay tourism is presented as ‘alternative’ it replicates highly conservative class-based notions of morally superior, elite travel. Travel for personal fulfilment and education in Britain, as the youthful pursuit of ‘real’ life experiences finds its foundations in the eighteenth century ‘Grand Tour’, when travel for young, male aristocrats was believed to contribute to their personal and cultural development (Turner and Ash 1975; Butcher 2003; Urry [2002] 1990). Travel preferences emerged as a form of class-based distinction at the time of the British Industrial Revolution when aristocrats viewed newly wealthy industrialists with distain for debasing the Grand Tour by encroaching on upper-class tastes by sending their sons on Grand Tours (Butcher 2003). Thomas Cook was also criticised for offering travel as an educational and spiritual activity to the masses. Cook was motivated by the Victorian values of philanthropy and paternalism to create the first package tours for the industrial working classes: his first trips were excursions to the countryside where working class people could enjoy fresh air, and included temperance meetings and lectures (Turner and Ash 1975; Butcher 2003).

Thus today’s traveller/tourist and responsible tourist/mass tourist dichotomies find their roots in ideas surrounding travel as a hard, active pursuit of authentic and educational experiences, whereas tourists are represented as passive consumers of superficial sights and packaged experiences33. (See chapter 4 for visual representations of active responsible and passive mass tourists.) Boorstin ([1973] 1961: 85) sums up these dichotomies as follows:

A traveller, then, was working at something; the tourist was a pleasure-seeker. The traveller was active; he went strenuously in search of people, of adventure, of experience. The tourist is passive; he expects interesting things to happen to him. He goes ’sight-seeing’. (...) He expects everything to be done to him and for him.

Homestay tourism commodifies binaries of mass/individual travel to present a product that offers its consumers the opportunity of re-confirming, or achieving, middle-class status against notions of mass tourists and tourism. Staying with indigenous communities becomes a resource with the potential to increase the cultural, and economic, capital of a certain class of tourists.

**Ethical consumption?**

While ideas surrounding travel as an educational experience and for self-fulfilment can be traced back to the Grand Tour, travel for the benefit of others can be seen to originate in contentious roots in the British colonial era, the moral imperative of the ‘civilising mission’ and missionary movements. Homestay tourism is promoted as an ethical alternative to mass tourism: as protecting fragile environments and cultures and as having developmental benefits for local communities. Responsible tourism is promoted as a response to Southern communities’ perceived lack of development and loss of culture. This ‘right’ kind of tourism is presented as fulfilling a need by bringing economic benefits and the motivation to preserve cultural authenticity. The role of ethical tourism in responding to lack and need implies responsibility on the part of Northern tourism operators and tourists towards distant others.

**Creating lack, being needed**

Homestay tourism is promoted as having a deeper, more spiritual and moral purpose than mass tourism, which is represented as being simply about superficial pleasures (see chapter 4). This sense of moral purpose is founded on
defining the communities in which homestay tourism operates in terms of ‘lack’ and ‘need’. Indigenous communities are conceived in terms of their ‘lack’ of development and as losing or having lost their culture (Andolina, Laurie and Radcliffe in press) and, therefore, in need of homestay tourism to bring development and to revive traditional culture (Radcliffe and Laurie 2005). The creation of representations of lack and need are embedded in the British colonial era, the moral imperative of the ‘civilising mission’ and missionary movements and continue in development discourses.

Colonial imaginations saw regions and peoples targeted for imperial expansion, and recent colonies, in terms of their ‘lack’ of European values of integration into global markets and civilization, and therefore ‘needing’ imperial intervention. The natural spaces of territories prior to invasion or recently colonised territories were imagined as wild and dangerous, needing to be tamed or as ‘empty spaces’, with no value, needing intervention to be made productive (Kaminsky 2008; Sharp 2008; Pratt [2008] 1992). The inhabitants of pre-colonial and newly colonised territories were represented by colonial powers as lacking in the values of Christianity and civilisation. Thus the civilising mission and missionary movements promoted colonial endeavours as a moral imperative in the service of distant Others (McEwan 2000; Pratt [2008] 1992). It has been argued that the ‘second wave’ of European imperialism of the late 18th century found its moral justification in representations of selfless endeavour (Said [2003] 1978) at a time when imperial adventures were being set against the Enlightenment’s ideals of humanism, reason, egalitarianism and democracy. Pratt ([2008] 1992: 72) argues that the legitimacy of European imperialism experienced a crisis and the colonial project looked to a new, moral imaginative imperative, which it found in: ‘the civilising mission, scientific racism, and technology-based paradigms of progress and development.’ Postcolonial

As Pratt notes ([2008] 1992), many Latin American colonies had gained, or were gaining independence at the time of the second wave of imperialism and colonisation, when Britain and France were embarking on their imperial projects. ‘Colonial’ in Latin America, therefore, signifies a prior historical period, accompanied by distinct motivations and imaginations. However, I trace representations of responsible tourism’s moral purpose to British and French colonial imaginations because this is the legacy inherited by European travel agents and tourists.
perspectives that see imperialism's imagined noble purpose as erasing the more morally unpalatable aspects of colonialism continue in critiques of development.

Post developmental perspectives see continuities between colonial representations of colonised territories in terms of lack and need in development discourses. Gronemeyer (1992: 59) sees development discourses of need and help, particularly in the aid industry, as echoing the erasures of imperial missionary movement, masking self interest and structures of exploitation:

Self-interest is now the decisive factor in the provision of help which, to rid itself of the ugly flavour of exploitation, is termed ‘enlightened and constructive’. It inherited universalism from the idea of the Christian mission and accepted the challenge of encompassing the whole world.

I propose that homestay tourism follows in the above colonial and development imaginations of travel for a higher, moral purpose, for the benefit of both tourists and their hosts: tourists are represented as motivated by the search for experiences which will ultimately lead to self-improvement and fulfilment, as opportunities for life changing experiences; their hosts are presented as being in need of development and benefitting from homestay tourism as a means to develop. I argue that the creation of lack and need echoes colonial justifications of imperial projects and validates homestay tourism as a development intervention.

Current debates in development geography surround the definition of needs from differing moral philosophical approaches, in short from either the perspective of universal humanity or cultural difference. For example, Smith (2000a ) argues against the post-modern turn in geography, which approaches needs through cultural difference. Rather, he supports an earlier universalist, moral view of needs as absolute, universal requirements for human survival and well-being (such basics as food, shelter and access to health care). Corbridge (1993: 499) also argues for a ‘minimally universalist account of human needs
and our responsibilities to them', that is, human beings are responsible for the basic needs of others because of our common humanity.

Indigenous communities involved in homestay tourism are presented as lacking in the fulfilment of basic needs and material goods relative to the North. However, they are simultaneously imagined as benefitting from superior spirituality and sustainability through their cultural difference to Northern tourists (see chapter 4). I propose that this conceptualisation of both absolute and relative lack builds a moral case for homestay tourism, and the presence of tourists, as a development intervention. However, imagining the morally superior spirituality of indigenous peoples limits development beyond basic needs.

**Responsibility for distant others**

Responsible tourism proclaims in its very name that it is 'responsible'. This assumption of responsibility functions within sustainable tourism paradigms of responsibility for the environment and cultures of those places visited by tourists. Imaginations of responsibility also function in opposition to popular representations of mass tourism as fecklessly destructive of fragile environments and cultures. Within the concept of responsible tourism lies the assumption that Northern actors are responsible for, in Stuart Corbridge's\(^{35}\) (1993: 499) terminology, 'distant strangers'. As Smith (2000a) (above) points out, debates within the moral geography of development have focused on need as universal, on the basis of human similarity or as culturally relative, based on concepts of difference. Discussions on the responsibility to respond to need are also based on dichotomies of similarity/difference.

\(^{35}\) See also Corbridge 1994 and Corbridge 1998.
Clive Barnett (2005: 6) presents notions of responsibility as being usually based on groups’ proximity, in terms of ‘identity, shared interests and partiality’, noting that Smith (2000b: 93) remarks that ‘distance leads to indifference’\textsuperscript{36}. Barnett’s proposition that formations of identity based on difference between self and other are organised spatially has implications for geography's moral intervention in debates on responsibility, suggesting that ‘to develop values of mutuality, inclusion and responsibility, it is necessary to bridge distance or extend the scope of recognition’ (Barnett 2005: 7). He advances the concepts of reciprocity and mutual hospitality as ways of bridging the distance between self and other: ‘subjectivity is formed in opening up towards otherness in a relation of welcome’ (Barnett 2005: 8).

Doreen Massey (2004; 2005) also argues against identity formation through essentialised difference, which implies distance and a denial of responsibility toward those with whom we do not share a common identity. She challenges geographers to think of space, and identities, as relational, urging a breaking down of the binaries of the global and local, to open up spaces of political engagement within Ash Amin’s ‘politics of connectivity’ (in Massey 2004: 6). Moreover, she contends that within academic development geography and more popular geographical imaginations of development there has been a tendency: ‘to turn space into time, geography into history’ (Massey 2005: 2). By this she means that development is conceptualised as linear, unidirectional, time, whereby ‘developing’ countries will inevitably ‘catch up’ with ‘developed’ nations (Massey 2005: 2). She argues that the reproduction of these Modernist grand narratives of progress denies that there are alternatives to a singular, linear version of history: ‘(...) this conceptualisation of spatial difference as temporal sequence is a way of pronouncing that there is no alternative’ (Massey 2005: 2). She proposes that the concept of space needs to be reclaimed in development geography in order to reveal the present-day connectedness of the global North and South, and the North’s implicit role in contemporary inequalities:

\textsuperscript{36} See also Chatterjee 2003 and Silk 1998.
This particular evasive imagination ignores the effects of the current forms of ‘connectedness’ (space as relations, practices), and this in turn not only renders it less likely that a majority of ‘others’ can ‘catch up’ but also cunningly conceals the implication of ‘the developed world’ within the production of this inequality now.

(Massey 2005: 2)

Massey argues that exchanging time for space erases the political possibilities of ‘coevalness’ (Massey 2005: 2), of co-existence within the same temporality and global spatialities, and therefore equal validity. The privileging of linear time also denies spaces for alternative developmental paths to the inevitable transition from developing to developed status. She calls for responsibility based on an interconnected spatial, and present co-existence, which is echoed in Harvey’s (1996: 360) call for ‘an ethics of solidarity built across different places’.

Rather than promoting an ‘ethics of solidarity’ (Harvey 1996: 360), based on similarities between tourists and hosts, homestay tourism functions through notions of difference between the predominantly Northern societies of tourists/guests and the Southern societies of hosts. Placing host communities in remote geographies and the distant past, rather than seeing their connectedness to present, global processes that promote inequality, of which Northern tourists are a part, denies a more equal conceptualisation of responsibility based on similarity and solidarity. Furthermore, by assuming moral superiority through its difference to mass tourism, proponents of responsible tourism fail to see this form of tourism as working within (and reproducing) the same structures of global inequality as mass tourism.
Responsibility as ethical consumption

In common with colonial endeavours, indigenous spaces and cultures are brought into global markets by being given a utilitarian value offered by the demands of this particular kind of tourism and tourists. Responsible tourists are imagined as wanting to ‘get off the beaten track’ and to see and experience authentic local cultures, and therefore indigenous culture becomes a commodified resource, enabling its own revival and preservation, and offering opportunities for economic and social development (Laurie et al. 2005; Radcliffe 2006; Radcliffe and Laurie 2006; Watts 2006). In a departure from colonial schema, rather than being constituted as valueless, indigenous cultures are imbued with intrinsic value, as being models of authentic spiritual, egalitarian and sustainable living. It is this intrinsic value that conveys the superior sense of moral mission of homestay tourism, that it has a deeper, higher purpose, to revive ‘lost’ cultures and help communities to develop.

Intrinsic and utilitarian values intersect in the market-driven, consumer-led movement towards more ethical products and services which is imbued with the power to promote sustainable development. Goodwin (2005: 4) credits responsible tourism with the power to both create responsible clients and as responding to consumer demands for responsible products: ‘Responsible tourism is market driven, both responding to changing consumer demands, and enabling people to experience the difference, creating demand for new products and experiences’. Responsibility as consumers is therefore conceptualised through the agency of individual consumers and the choices they make (Jackson 1999; Gregson and Crewe 2002). Responsibility is defined by both the responsible tourism industry and tourists through imaginations of authentic contact with the natural environment and traditional communities: ‘(...) responsible tourism is market driven, both responding to and creating tourists who demand a more real encounter with the environment and the community, based on values of respect for other people and their places.’ (Goodwin 2005: 3). Responsibility for otherwise distant others is defined, particularly in homestay
tourism, through individual, personal contacts with those others and the places they inhabit. Responsible, homestay tourism's emphasis on individual moral agency and experiencing difference between the consuming self and the consumed other is problematic. Barnett et al. (Barnett, Cloke, Clarke and Malpass 2005) argue that conceptualisations of consumer responsibility in ethical consumption can reproduce uneven power relations between active consumers and passive producers:

(...) ethical responsibility remains a form of benevolence, reproducing a set of oppositions between active consumers and passive recipients. Apart from anything else, this construction might well mitigate against the effective maintenance of networks of solidarity.

(Barnett et al. 2005: 42)

By conceptualising relationships of responsibility based on difference, the potential for a more political approach to responsibility through solidarity is diminished. I propose that, emphasising the power of individual tourists (chapter 4), through the choices they make as consumers, and through their enlightened treatment of individual distant others (chapter 4), lessens the potential for collective responsibility and action, based on more universalist approaches to responsibility. Moreover, the emphasis on individual relationships elides the political structures that promote inequality.

While it can be argued that ethical consumption functions through difference between the consuming self and distant others, it also can be seen to be imaginatively produced through socio-economic differentiation among consumers. The following section will explore class-based distinctions of types of travel and their supposed moral superiority.
Class-based prejudice?

Colonial notions of benefiting others, and class-based prejudices against mass leisure pursuits intersect in homestay tourism’s proposed mission to protect natural environments and traditional cultures and to benefit communities economically and developmentally.

Barnett et al. (2005: 28) propose that ethical consumption is produced through tropes of difference, which in turn reproduce class-based distinction within consuming countries: ‘(...) ethical consumption practices often work through registers that, while outwardly universalistic in their ethical and political claims, are related to routines of differentiation, discrimination, and distinction.’

Butcher (2003) proposes that class-based anxieties over lower class encroachment on elite tastes continue to be expressed in contempt for mass tourists and tourism today. However, he argues that this distain is now expressed through ‘selfless’ moral concerns over the destruction of environments and cultures by mass tourism:

(...) today's critics of tourism identify themselves as radicals, champions of ‘culture’ and ‘the environment’, unlike in the past when antipathy towards tourism formed part of an unashamed conservative outlook. New Moral Tourism is thus presented as a selfless critique; for others, not just for oneself.

(Butcher 2003: 39)

Butler (1992: 40) also argues that alternative tourism displays class-based prejudice against mass tourists, typified by their high numbers and lack of appropriate behaviour while favouring smaller numbers of well-behaved, middle-class tourists: 'In fact, one might argue that at the root of much of what is being proposed as alternative tourism is disguised class prejudice. Large numbers of (...) lower class tourists are not welcome (...) but small numbers of
affluent, well-educated and well-behaved tourists are.’ The constitution of homestay tourism within particularly sustainable development discourses enables the idea of limiting tourists on the grounds of quantity and quality. Representing a product as being available to limited numbers of tourists who are represented as genuinely interested in authentic experiences and contact with local people lends the ‘added-value’ of being niche to homestay tourism. Responsible tourists are presumed to be more affluent, middle-class and, therefore, willing and able to pay more for this exclusive experience (Butcher 2003) (see chapter 4 for profiles of responsible tourists.) Moreover, homestay tourism capitalises on notions of superior ethics and class positions, which makes niche products notionally more exclusive and, therefore, more expensive. The offer of increased cultural capital is, therefore, converted into ‘added value’ economic capital for tourism providers.

While homestay tourism is constituted as ‘alternative’, it draws on dominant discourses of travel in the colonial era, which were deployed in the service of economic exploitation and class-based socio-economic differentiation. Moreover, homestay tourism is presented as ‘alternative’ to its mass counterpart. However, this binary relationship reveals problematic class-based prejudice and questionable ethical genealogies. I have endeavoured to show the continuities between colonial projects and tourism and how colonial imaginations are mined for their economic and developmental potential in today’s responsible tourism products. The next section, on sustainable development, will investigate homestay tourism as a strategy to promote sustainable development, placing it within genealogies and critiques of sustainable development as continuing in neo-colonial impulses of market integration.

2:2 Lost authenticity?

This section explores homestay tourism’s sustainable development agenda to revive ‘lost’ indigenous cultures through the commodification of idealised representations of indigenous ways of life. I will argue that this form of tourism
trades on notions of authenticity which function through past/modernity binaries, which originate in the Enlightenment. Homestay tourism represents rural, indigenous communities as models of sustainability, spirituality and co-operation in opposition to a destructive, materialistic and individualistic modernity (see chapter 4). I claim that the constitution of indigenous culture as lost and in need of revival maintains colonial imaginations that reproduce unequal power relations between North and South and promotes and maintains development interventions based on projects of cultural revival. These relations are embodied in contacts between Northern tourists and their indigenous hosts, where responsible tourists are imbued with the power to revive ‘lost’ cultures through demanding to experience ‘authenticity’ in the kind of tourism product they choose (see chapter 4). Homestay tourism privileges Northern conceptualisations of ‘authenticity’ as fixed to an imaginary past, and also as a yardstick by which to judge tourism products. Within popular constructions of tourism’s impact on cultural sustainability, tourism destinations display ‘authenticity’, which increasingly becomes corrupted and trivialised as it is ‘staged’ for tourist consumption. I propose that these imaginations, by fixing ‘authentic’ indigenous culture to notions of the past and inevitable corruption deny views of postcolonial cultures as hybrid, dynamic and creative, and indigenous communities as displaying agency and pragmatic adaptation in their engagement with cultural performances in homestay tourism.

The imperial idealisation of rural life

The idealisation of indigenous ways of life in tropes of the ‘noble savage’ (Widdowson and Howard 2008: 49) rose to prominence at the time of the Enlightenment as a reaction to the social upheavals and alienation caused by the widespread industrialisation, urbanisation and break with rural ways of life.

The idealisation of indigenous ways of life pre-date the ‘second phase’ of European imperialism: for example, Bartolome de las Casas’ employed utopian representations in defence of the indigenous peoples of the Spanish New World (Castro 2007). However, I have chosen to concentrate on imaginations that are a more recent influence on Western notions of indigenous communities because of their influence on the imaginations deployed in responsible, homestay tourism.
of the European Industrial Revolution. Romantic philosophers, most notably Rousseau\textsuperscript{38}, were influenced by accounts from the ‘New World’ (of North America) of peoples who lived in harmony with nature, and with each other. Within these imaginations, indigenous peoples were cast as living in idyllic, egalitarian societies, which were contrasted with the exploitation wrought by the Industrial Revolution, global capitalism and the hierarchies of European society (Hanke 1973; Hulme 1986; Widdowson and Howard 2008). The Romantic idealisation of what were temporally constituted as ‘pre-Fall’ ways of life was cast against a destructive ‘modernity’ in order to critique economic and social transitions in Europe, and as a philosophical contribution to the French Revolution. However, while visions of utopian societies were being deployed to call European inequalities and exploitation into question, the indigenous peoples who inspired these imaginations were being integrated into European ‘modernity’ and global capitalism with brutal rapidity.

In the following section I argue that anxieties surrounding the Enlightenment projects of modernity and progress carry on into imaginations deployed in conceptualisations of authenticity in present day tourism and especially in homestay tourism. That is, imaginations of the lives of ‘Others’ serve as self-criticisms of tourists’ lives ‘back home’. Moreover, the part played by imperialism in the ‘destruction’ of past paradises is transferred to mass tourism and tourists.

**Authenticity and tourism**

Imperial temporal designations of recently colonised territories to a Romantic and idealised past, imbued with a sense of loss, carry through into travel writing and commodified representations in tourism promotion (see chapter 6). Said ([2003] 1978: 170) describes French travellers’ representations of Egypt in the late nineteenth century as being: ‘the Orient of memories, suggestive ruins,\

\textsuperscript{38}Rousseau wrote before the French Revolution, and saw the native peoples of North America as representing particularly egalitarian social structures. His ideas influenced the Revolutionary ideals of liberty, equality and fraternity and its mission to sweep away the oppressive and exploitative social relations of the ‘ancien regime’ (old regime).
forgotten secrets, hidden correspondences’ (Said [2003] 1978: 170). Lutz and Collins (1993) highlight the National Geographic’s role in promoting views of the world’s ‘others’ to a mainstream North American (and more generally Northern) audience. They note that the magazine reproduces binaries of the past and modernity, and cite the depiction of women as embodying the past, denoted in the magazine’s use of photographs of women in traditional dress. As an example, they quote the following caption under a photograph of veiled women walking through the old quarter of the city from the magazine’s January 1985 article on Baghdad: ‘In the shadows of antiquity, women in long black abayas walk in one of the older sections of the city’ (Lutz and Collins 1993: 182).

For tourism theorists, tourism represents the search for authenticity, within past/modernity binaries. MacCannell’s ([1999] 1976) classic conceptualisation of tourism as a modern-day quest for authenticity highlights tourism’s constitution of other cultures in an imagined past, and in places designated as far from the ‘modern’ world. MacCannell ([1999] 1976), drawing on Boorstin ([1973] 1961: 1), sees tourists, as ‘moderns’ dissatisfied with the lack of meaning and the perceived artificiality of modern life and its ‘pseudo-events’. He advances the idea that tourists seek out meaning and authenticity in non-modern societies, which are thought to embody real life in past ways of life: ‘For moderns, reality and authenticity are thought to be elsewhere: in other historical periods and other cultures, in purer, simpler life-styles’ (MacCannell [1999] 1976: 3). Mowforth and Munt (1998) also see tourists as constituting other cultures as authentic against a modern, developed world which is seen as superficial and devoid of meaning:

Other cultures and environments are everything that our cultures and environments are not. Thus western lifestyles can be denigrated as empty, culturally unfulfilling, materialistic, meaningless, while, on the contrary, Third World cultures can be bestowed with meaning, richness, simplicity and, of course, authenticity.
Drawing on Enlightenment and colonial imaginations and tourism theory, I conceptualise the constitution of authenticity in homestay tourism in the ‘past’ ways of life of local people as the imposition of Northern anxieties surrounding modernity ‘at home’ on ‘Other’ societies. Moreover, the constitution of homestay tourism within urban/rural, past/modernity binaries provides an imaginative framework through which tourists can reflect on their own perceived world. Tourism often is presented as a transformative, ‘life-changing’ experience, through which tourists are invited to reflect on their lives in opposition to their hosts who remain unchanged and ‘frozen in time’ (Bruner 1991: 238). This pre-conceived framework functions within the imagined differences between modern and past ways of life, so that rural ways of life in developing countries become models for sustainable and spiritual life, in opposition to the West. Thus homestay tourism functions within self/Other binaries proposed by Said ([2003] 1978), where the colonial Orient is an integral part of Western identity. Homestay tourism trades on this difference in order to sell an ‘authentic’ product.

Moreover, by placing authenticity in the past, against Western modernity, representations deployed in tourism function as the mourning of lost ways of life in the West. This conceptual framework reproduces imaginations of the power of modernity and of tourism (and tourists) and harbingers of modernity, to destroy authentic cultures. Rosaldo’s (1989: 69) concept of ‘imperialist nostalgia’ provides an apt lens through which to understand tourism as reproducing tropes both of tourism as a destructive force, which also functions through responding to tourists’ desires for past ways of life. Rosaldo describes the paradoxical feelings of longing for imagined times and places prior to the cultural destruction believed to be wrought by imperialism:
Imperialist nostalgia revolves around a paradox: a person kills somebody, and then mourns the victim. In a more attenuated form, somebody deliberately alters a form of life, and then regrets that things have not remained as they were prior to the intervention (...) imperialist nostalgia uses a pose of ‘innocent yearning’ both to capture people’s imaginations and to conceal its complicity with often brutal domination.

(Rosaldo 1989: 69)

Rosaldo’s paradox sheds light on representations of tourism destroying the authenticity of people and places, and yet seeking out authenticity that existed before the arrival of tourism. Homestay tourism constitutes authenticity in the past, defining indigenous cultures in terms of loss and evoking feelings of nostalgia. Within representations deployed in the promotion of homestay tourism, it is specifically mass tourism which is charged with ruining authentic destinations and encounters. I argue that seeing authenticity in terms of loss promotes development interventions based on projects of cultural revival and empowers Northern responsible tourists to carry out ‘enlightened’ agendas to revive ‘traditional’ cultures. Thus, the popular conceptualisations of authenticity deployed in alternative tourism contain the seeds of authenticity’s destruction, as discussed below.

**Staged authenticity and the destination lifecycle model**

Beliefs that authenticity is fixed to the past, degraded and destroyed by contact with tourists, are framed by a sense of fragility and inevitable loss. These notions also set up true/false dichotomies, which work through popular interpretations of authenticity as being spatially separated from tourists, described in MacCannell’s (1973: 589) concept of ‘staged authenticity’. Popular imaginations of the sustainability of cultural authenticity also function through Butler’s (1980: 5) ‘concept of a tourist area cycle of evolution’, more commonly referred to as the destination lifecycle model. Popular manifestations of these conceptual
frameworks have implications for the proposed sustainability of homestay tourism.

MacCannell (1973), referring to Goffman’s theory of ‘front’ and ‘back’ regions, claims that tourists, discontent with staged cultural performances, seek to push back into the more personal ‘back’ regions of culture. He claims that, to protect personal space, those involved in tourism employ ‘staged authenticity’ (MacCannell 1973: 589) by constructing spaces for tourists that seem ‘authentic’, but are in fact mediated for tourist consumption. I argue that MacCannell’s conceptualisation is founded on the assumption that there is an essential, ‘authentic’ culture. Moreover, this schema depends on imagining authentic culture to be fragile and needing to be protected from tourists’ corrupting influence by spaces that are not entirely authentic. The extent and frequency of local people’s contact with tourists, framed within binaries of alternative and mass tourism, are central to assumptions that local culture changes for the worse with increased tourism. So, while proponents of responsible tourism charge mass tourism with impacting negatively on authentic cultures, Butler (1990) proposes that alternative tourism can cause more cultural change because it centres on closer and more prolonged contact between tourists and locals, particularly when this contact takes place in local homes:

It is generally accepted that social change and impacts from tourism can occur because of contact between tourists and the hosts and residents. One can therefore argue that tourism which places tourists in local homes, even when they are culturally sympathetic, and not desiring a change in local behaviour, is much more likely to result in changes in local behaviour in the long run than is a larger number of tourists in more conventional tourist ghettos, where contact with locals is limited, if intensive, and in, what is to locals, and tourists, clearly artificial settings.

(Butler 1990: 49)
I suggest that Butler’s (1990) proposition that alternative tourism has more negative impacts than mass tourism, which contradicts popularly held views that mass tourism is more destructive than niche, illustrates the need to unpack the assumptions on which debates surrounding tourism are based.

Assumptions of tourists’ negative impacts on authenticity in MacCannell’s (1973: 589) spatial conceptualisations of ‘authenticity’ and ‘staged authenticity’ and in Butler’s (1990: 49) contrasting ‘tourist ghettos’ and ‘local homes’ popularly function over time, with culture in tourism moving from the ‘authentic’ to the ‘staged’. That is, popular conceptualisations of tourism argue that authenticity is diluted, or lost, in adapting local culture to tourists’ tastes and timescales and becomes folkloric (Boissevain 1992). These notions function within Butler’s (1980) destination lifecycle model of sustainability, which seems to be widely accepted by tourism practitioners and policy makers (see chapter 6) and reflected in the popular and promotional literature on tourism destinations (see chapter 4). This model sees the quality of a tourist destination as deteriorating, in terms of the environmental quality, cultural authenticity and relations between tourists and locals. The qualities that attracted tourists to the area are impacted negatively with increasing numbers of tourists, and changes in the kind of tourists, from individual travellers to mass tourists (Cohen 1972; Plogg 1994), over time. The final stage of the cycle is that tourists move on to the next ‘unspoilt’ destination.

Authentic of relations between tourists and hosts, which are defined as being motivated by friendship, rather than profit, following tropes of non-commodified exchange relations between colonial travellers and their ‘hosts’ (Hulme 1986; Pratt [2008] 1992), are central in the promotion of homestay tourism. Within the destination lifecycle model (Butler 1992), relations between tourists and hosts start as being genuinely friendly and then deteriorate to being cold and businesslike and finally become antagonistic and conflictive. Taking a postcolonial perspective, Nash (1989: 45) compares the deteriorating relations between guests and hosts to the coloniser/colonised relationship where each
treats the other as ‘objects’, and ‘are less likely to be controlled by the constraints of personal involvement and will feel freer to act in terms of their own self-interest.’ Furthermore, Pi-Sunyer (1977: 155) in his study of Catalan tourism, notes that the increase of tourism in the region has led to a deterioration in tourist/local relations. He argues that the objectification of tourists by locals manifests itself in hostility, in charging higher prices or cheating tourists:

Contacts between villagers and outsiders have never been greater, but the barriers to understanding have probably never been higher (…) If tourism commoditises cultures, natives categorise strangers as a resource or a nuisance rather than as people.

(Pi-Sunyer 1977: 155)

Tourists’ notions of prices feature in perceptions of declining relations between tourists and hosts, with tourists thinking that prices are rising or that they are being charged non-local prices and therefore being taken advantage of. The preoccupation with obtaining low, or local, prices is particularly relevant to alternative and backpacker tourism, where achieving these prices constitutes another aspect of an ‘authentic’ experience (Phillips 1999; Sorensen 2003). This conceptual framework of the decline in authenticity, which is extended to tourists’ perceptions of price and mistrust of hosts to offer a ‘genuine’ price, can lead to tourists, and tourism providers who play on tourists’ anxieties39, to move onto new destinations (see chapter 6).

I propose that, rather than representing an actual decline in tourist/host relations, these notions of an essentialised authenticity and cycles of

---

39 Zorn and Ypeij (2007) note that tour operators have moved their business from Taquile to the neighbouring island of Amantaní, which both offer homestays. They describe tour guides creating the impression among tourists that Taquileans have been corrupted by tourism, in that they are ‘greedy and overprice their weavings’ (Zorn 2007: 124). Prices may rise in tourist areas because of tourists being willing to pay more for goods and services than locals, and also because tourists demand higher standards of food and accommodation. Conversely, competition between tourism service providers drives prices down. Zorn and Ypeij (2007) note that prices charged for homestay tourism on Amantaní may not cover its costs.
sustainability are representational, based on imaginations from the colonial era and popularised tourism theories. Moreover, these conceptual frameworks intersect with ideas of exclusivity, set against mass tourism, in the promotion of homestay tourism. That is, indigenous culture is fixed to an imagined and idealised past which is fragile, easily corrupted and ultimately destroyed by a cycle of contact with ‘modernity’, embodied by mass tourists. The idea that there is a ‘real’ indigenous culture, as opposed to a ‘staged’ culture for (mass) tourists, and that this culture is constantly on the brink of disappearance increases the exclusive appeal of homestay tourism. Authentic culture is imagined to be hidden from (mass) tourists waiting to be discovered by alternative tourists willing to break off the beaten track, forego the comforts of mass tourism infrastructure and to stay with local people in their homes.

Moreover, these frameworks of authenticity and sustainability serve as yardsticks by which to judge tourism products (see chapter 4). This leaves communities involved in homestay tourism vulnerable to being left behind in the tourism destination lifecycle. That is, tourism professionals, such as travel agents and NGOs, and also tourists, can decide that a destination is no longer ‘authentic’, and move on to a ‘newer’ destination that is considered to be more ‘authentic’ (and cheaper).

**Challenging authenticity**

The conceptual structure of authenticity deployed in homestay tourism works through essentialist views of indigenous culture as fixed to the past and fragile in the face of the negative influences of ‘modernity’. These replicate colonial past/Modernity binaries and power relations within tourist/host relations, whereby tourists embody a powerful modernity which destroys past ways of life. However, within homestay tourism, tourists are imbued with the power to revive traditions. These temporal and power divisions deny other cultures as being hybrid, creative, changing and globalised (Sharp 2008). Rather, indigenous culture will be explored as flexible, with the capacity for creative change and
continuity, within the Peruvian context of colonisation and post-independence identity politics, nation building and modernisation. Moreover, commodified forms of cultural authenticity will be explored as actively produced by actors involved in homestay tourism, including communities.

Representations that dominate popular critiques of tourism focus on neo-colonial images of the destruction of authentic cultures by particularly mass tourists\(^{40}\). However, as Foucault ([1979] 1998: 95) suggests: ‘Where there is power, there is resistance (...)’ and there are alternative representations to those of the destruction wrought by colonisation, development and tourism. The strength and resistance of indigenous cultures, in the face of major, and ongoing, cultural changes within current processes of globalisation offer alternative ways of seeing the relationship of modernity, tourism and indigenous cultures.

Some historians of Latin America propose that indigenous populations employed strategies of pragmatic adaptation to the new cultural systems of the Spanish as a survival strategy to preserve their cultures in the post-Conquest period of colonisation. Stern (1993: xix) proposes that indigenous people in Peru resisted Spanish rule by ‘creative adaptations’. This strategy meant the adoption of certain cultural norms and practices that proved useful to indigenous people and the rejection, often through passive resistance, of others. For example, indigenous people complied with the conversion to new, Christian beliefs for political purposes while covertly conserving their old belief systems (Klarén 1999). Stern (1993: xl) comments that: ‘From indigenous vantage points, Christianisation implied not the substitution of one religious pantheon or framework by another, but a selective incorporation and redeployment of Christianity within a framework of indigenous understandings.’ These processes of cultural change took place under highly constrained conditions and unequal power relations. However, the hybrid cultures that have resulted from these

\(^{40}\) (Cohen 1972; Horne 1984; Crick 1996: 25; Kaplan 1996)
processes attest, not to the destruction of indigenous cultures, but to their survival, in living, changing forms.

Representations of indigenous culture in homestay tourism can be conceptualised as a series of pragmatic adaptations to tourists’ expectations of ‘authenticity’, in order to promote economic survival, and as demonstrating agency on the part of indigenous communities. Several studies of indigenous people and tourism note that indigenous people actively seek out and pursue self-representations to respond to tourists’ demands, learned through their interactions with tourists. Henrici (2002: 124), in her study of mestizo market vendors in the Peruvian town of Pisac, near Cusco, notes that female vendors are conscious of tourists’ representations of them as ‘exotic and indigenous’ and perform these identities to gain more trade. She also notes that indigenous villagers, who come to Pisac on Sundays, to the market and Mass, consciously dress in their most colourful traditional costumes and pose for photographs for tourists, for which they demand payment. Little (2004) also argues that Guatemalan Mayan traders of handicrafts are conscious of and perform their indigeneity specifically for economic objectives.

Studies of indigenous people and their relationships to tourism note flexibility on the part of indigenous people in moving in and out of ‘modern’ and ‘indigenous’ identities. A notable example of mobile identities is dressing in traditional clothes in the presence of tourists, and in ‘modern’ clothes when out of the tourist gaze. Zorn, (2004), in her work on community-based, homestay tourism on the Peruvian island of Taquile, on Lake Titicaca, reports that community members are aware of tourists expectations of them. They strive to fulfil tourists’ expectations of indigenous identity in the presence of tourists: wearing indigenous dress outside the home, and modern dress inside, using traditional

41 (Crain 1996; Henrici 2002; Martinez Novo 2003; Zorn 2004)
42 In terms of a racial category, ‘mestizo’ refers to a person of mixed indigenous/Spanish ‘white’ descent ‘mestizo’. However, ‘mestizo’ is also a social, class-based category applied to urban dwellers who speak Spanish and are literate. They are often shop owners and market traders (de la Cadena 2000).
ceramics to serve tourists, but plastic plates and bowls for themselves. Crain (1996), in her study of Quimseña women who work in the elite ‘Hotel Rey’ in Quito, Ecuador, notes that they are aware of the commodification of their gender and ethnic identities and the part this has played in the successful marketing of the hotel. They therefore trade on their exclusivity and fashionability in competing with women from other regions. She emphasises the women's flexibility in moving in and out of identities for consumption at the hotel and at home. ‘Onstage’ (Crain 1996: 148) they perform to the expectations of their elite prospective employers, warning them of ‘imposters’ (members of other ethnic groups posing as ‘Quimseños’), ‘offstage’ (Crain 1996: 150) they wear Western clothes and complain about their working conditions and social position.

Dwyer and Crang’s (2002) conceptualisation of current trends in the commodification of global ethnicities sheds light on the mediated, staged forms of ‘authentic’ culture actively produced by communities, taking cues from their interactions with consultants and tourists and interpreting their demands (see chapter 6). Dwyer and Crang (2002: 22) argue that, rather than there being some essential, unchanging authenticity, ethnicity is produced as cultural difference for the contingencies of the market: ‘ethnicity is (...) a form of cultural differentiation (...) reproduced through the production of commodities for the market.’ Moreover, they emphasise the agency displayed by the subjects of commodification in producing versions of cultural difference currently in demand: ‘(...) commodification is not something done to pre-existing ethnicities and ethnic subjects, but a process through which ethnicities are reproduced and in which ethnicised subjects actively engage with broader discourses and institutions’(Dwyer and Crang 2002: 23).

Crang, Dwyer and Jackson (2003: 440) propose that contemporary transnational commodity cultures create ‘new social space(s)’ which are hybrid. The concept of a constantly evolving cultural hybridity has been looked to explain the survival of local cultures within increasing processes of cultural homogenisation in the current era of globalisation. Romero (2001: 22) argues that local cultures have
continued to thrive through the fusion of tradition and ‘modernity’, producing hybrid cultures:

(...) notwithstanding the astounding development of capitalism, world markets, mass communications, and mass migration throughout the world, local cultures and ethnic differences continue to exist, struggle, and create novel lifestyles, which are, in turn, products of both ‘tradition’ and ‘modernity’.

(Romero 2001: 22)

Moreover, Clifford’s critique of the ‘salvage paradigm’ (2002: 160) challenges the binaries of urban/rural, past/modernity deployed in Western thought, specifically disputing the idea of the constant loss of traditional cultures to modernity and markets:

In Western taxonomy and memory the various non-Western ‘ethnographic presents’ are actually pasts, they represent culturally distinct times (‘tradition’) always about to undergo the impact of disruptive changes associated with the influence of trade, media, missionaries, commodities, the exotic art market, the ‘world system’.

(Clifford 2002: 161)

He describes the imaginations that framed the work of early twentieth century anthropology as seeing the cultures studied as sealed off from modernity, on the brink of disappearance, and the anthropologist’s role as being to record these cultures, and therefore save them at the point of loss:

Many ethnographies and travel accounts continue to be written in the style of après moi le déluge with the exotic culture in question inevitably undergoing ‘fatal’ changes. We still regularly encounter ‘the last traditional Indian beadworker’, or the last ‘stone age people’. The salvage paradigm, reflecting a desire to rescue some authenticity out of destructive historical changes, is alive and well.
Tourism, and particularly homestay tourism, can be seen as a continuation of anthropological imaginations and functioning within Eurocentric perspectives that define other cultures as dead or dying in order to rescue them from extinction. This imaginative schema allows homestay tourism to claim that it revives indigenous cultures.

The idea that ‘tradition’ and ‘modernity’ meld into one, to form a distinct cultural product draws on Bhabha’s (1994) concept of hybridity, and offers radical strategies for resisting colonial binary hierarchical impositions, of past/modernity, rural/urban, centre/periphery, First/Third Worlds. However uneven the power relations in colonial processes, Bhabha (1994: 5) argues that colonisation does not represent a simple imposition of one culture onto another, but a space ‘(...) between fixed identifications [which] open up the possibility of a cultural hybridity that entertains difference without an assumed or imposed hierarchy.’ Seeing indigenous culture as hybrid, a ‘Third Space’ (Bhabha 1994: 53) or a ‘contact zone’ between two cultures (Pratt [2008] 1992: 7) allows for the possibility of breaking down the hierarchical binaries of past/modernity, and of fragility/strength deployed within homestay tourism (Hollinshead 1998).

Dipesh Chakrabarty’s (Chakrabarty 2000: 243) concept of ‘entangled times’ or ‘timeknot’ takes a temporal approach to Bhabha’s (1994) notion of hybridity. Chakrabarty sees past and present as coexisting, which challenges historicist views of time as linear and that past and present are separate. Presenting time as fragmentary, as a mix of both past and present, also opposes prevalent views that the past is obsolete, having no value:

(...) the plurality that inheres in the “now”, the lack of totality, the constant fragmentariness that constitutes one’s present. Over against this stands 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.

(Chakrabarty 2000: 243)

Chakrabarty’s approach to time as hybrid helps to break down the binaries between past and present within homestay tourism’s modernist representations of time as a unidirectional flow. His view of time as non-linear provides a challenge to the uneven power relations implicit in homestay tourism’s division of past and present, authenticity and inauthenticity. While homestay tourism elevates ‘past’ aspects of indigenous culture, imbuing them with a superior value to present modernity, modernity remains the more powerful in the past/present binary. For example, modernity, in the form of tourism and tourists, has the power to destroy or revive authentic cultures. Chakrabarty’s (2000: 243) concept of ‘timeknots’, in common with Bhabha’s (1994) concept of hybridity, challenges the hierarchies implicit in cultural and developmental politics of difference, and more specifically those deployed in homestay tourism. By proposing that time is a mix of past and present, and indeed that past and present are not adequate labels for a continuous flow of time, does away with the hierarchies attached to this binaries.

I propose that viewing indigenous culture as hybrid, and time as ‘knotted’, frees homestay tourism from the binaries of authenticity and staged authenticity (MacCannell 1973) and from tourists’ perceptions of authenticity which function within notions of inevitable decline towards inauthenticity. I argue that viewing past/modernity binaries as false dichotomies and indigenous cultural authenticity being adaptive and dynamic means that it cannot be ‘lost’ or ‘destroyed’, but transformed into another form. This view of authenticity allows for representations of authenticity in homestay tourism to be de-essentialised in
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43 Chakrabarty’s, and other post-colonial critics’, proposition that time is not a unidirectional flow has implications for modernist conceptualisations of development as a linear path from developing to developed status, epitomised in Rostow’s (1960; 1978) five stages of economic growth. For critiques of unidirectional development discourses see, among others, Kothari and Minogue 2000 and Kothari 2005.
order to redress unequal power relations between tourists and hosts, which conceptualise tourists as both destroying and reviving authentic culture.

The colonial binaries and frameworks of cultural authenticity within which homestay tourism functions means that communities run the risk of being deemed corrupted by modernity at the slightest sign of modern adaptations, such as the use of non-traditional building materials or the wearing of Western dress (see chapter 6). Authenticity becomes an intrinsic ‘good’ and another ‘ethical’ yardstick by which to judge homestay products (see chapter 4), and by which the tourism industry and tourists are empowered to retract their custom from those communities it judges have ‘lost’ their authentic charm or if their culture seems staged (see chapter 6). However, seeing homestay tourism as actively produced by communities as a survival strategy of pragmatic adaptation with indigenous communities displaying agency in producing mediated versions of their culture to respond to tourists’ expectations redresses the imbalances of power between tourists and communities. This framework also counters the unsustainability inherent in the tourism destination lifecycle, where tourists move on when they think authenticity has been lost (according to their own received assumptions).

**Modernisation, development and identity politics**

Representations of indigenous peoples deployed in homestay tourism can be situated within the national, Peruvian context of post-independence identity politics, nation building and within modernisation paradigms (of both the post-independence/Enlightenment period and the post-Second World War era). Taking a national, historical approach highlights the tense political context within which homestay tourism’s agenda of reviving and re-valuing indigenous culture functions, and problematises the simplistic agendas of cultural revival proposed by homestay tourism. National genealogies of indigenous culture’s relationship to modernisation and development illuminate the similarities between former national projects and homestay tourism. This section focuses
firstly on the attempts in the post-independence period to solve what was seen as the ‘Indian Problem’ (Weismantel 2001: xxxiii) through the integration of indigenous people into the modern nation-state through racial ‘improvement’ and, later, the technical packages of the modernisation post-Second World War. Then it examines the status given to a glorified, specifically Inca, past, in post-independence nation-building, as an elite agenda to erase contemporary indigenous peoples from national identities. This movement towards ‘de-Indianisation’ culminated in the changing of the official racial category of ‘Indian’ to the class-based category of ‘campesino’ (peasant) at the time of Peru’s Land Reform in 1968 (Mallon 1992; Klarén 1999: 342). Essentialised, past forms of indigenous culture are staged in homestay tourism, which have been ‘improved’ and mediated by middle-class, non-indigenous experts for tourist consumption. These processes allow indigenous communities to be integrated into national development plans (see chapter 5) and global markets and work in a similar framework to modernisation approaches (see chapter 6). I argue that the selection and mediation of aspects of indigenous culture for homestay tourism confers the valuing of indigenous culture to non-indigenous ‘experts’, consumers and markets. I argue that staging mediated versions of indigenous culture for tourist consumption has the effect of de-politicising indigenous identity as a rallying point of resistance to modernisation and neo-liberal development.

Moreover, I propose that homestay tourism functions through a series of disjunctions that deny the radical possibilities of indigenous ways of life as viable alternatives to capitalism. Indigenous culture is simultaneously bounded to a glorious past and held up as a model for sustainable living in the twenty-first century. However, its temporal bounding within the past and packaging as a tourism product mean that indigenous culture can be experienced in homestay tourism through nostalgia and the enjoyment of a holiday, albeit a holiday that claims to combine fun with more serious social and educational purposes (see

Experts (NGO workers, consultants or travel agents) are highly educated (often abroad), metropolitan, white elites, who are placed above both mestizo merchants and indigenous communities in Peruvian racial and class-based hierarchies (Weismantel 2001).
chapter 4). I suggest that these boundings mean that ‘lessons learned’ become difficult to translate into a Northern context. Also, the revival of indigenous culture and the delivery of development are rendered possible through tourism, which signifies integration into global markets. Thus indigenous culture’s vital connection to the present, and possibilities as a viable alternative to capitalism, is thwarted by being a tourism product, placed in the past and dependent on markets.

Latin American post-independence nation building of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries stressed progress to modernity and a national identity based on ‘mestizaje’, or mixing between races, which erased the indigenous from national identity (de la Cadena 2000; Kaminsky 2008; McEwan 2008). At this time, Europe was adopting theories of biological racism and racial purity to justify their supposed racial superiority and right to rule over recently colonised peoples during the second wave of European imperial expansion. However, Latin American elites (who were of racially mixed descent) espoused theories of ‘constructive miscegenation’ (Stepan 1991: 138) to imagine their supremacy against ‘pure-blooded’ ‘indians’. Peru also adopted racial mixing as a strategy for national progress and modernisation. Peru’s economic ‘backwardness’ was blamed on the ‘purity’ of its Indian population. Racial miscegenation was thought to create a stronger breed of human, while ‘pure-blooded’ Indians were thought to be weaker and backward (de la Cadena 2000; Weismantel 2001; Fuller 2002). European livestock and crops were imported to Latin America on the assumption that they were of superior quality and would improve strains, which was an idea that was extended to people (Chasteen 2003). ‘Mejorar la sangre’ was a common expression in the post-independence period meaning ‘to improve the blood’. It refers to inter-marriage between indigenous Peruvians and Europeans, with the aim of ‘whitening’ and, therefore improving, the ‘race’. European immigration and racial mixing was encouraged to produce a ‘stronger’, mixed race (de la Cadena 2000: 12-16).
More recently, post-Second World War modernisation theory can be seen as functioning through Enlightenment and post-independence dichotomies of the traditional and modern and ideas of evolutionary social change (Klarén and Bossert 1986). Modernisation theory emanated from United States’ social scientists in the post-Second World War period in an attempt to explain Western development and lack of development in the non-Western world. It has been criticised for promoting US economic and political interests. When applied to a Latin American context, modernisation theory pointed to the traditional values and social institutions inherited from the 16th century colonial period, the Catholic Church and large Indian populations as obstacles to progress. Societies were thought to all pass through similar, linear stages of development from the traditional to the modern. This view of development was formalised in Rostow’s five stages of development from tradition to modernity, which assumed all societies would follow the industrialisation processes experienced in the British industrial revolution (Klarén and Bossert 1986). The way of achieving modern development was through the implementation of capitalist economic systems and technological inputs: ‘Modernisation occurred when economic and technological change made the traditional social and status structures obsolete’ (Klarén and Bossert 1986: 10).

While the imaginations deployed in homestay tourism represent indigenous communities as standing outside modernity and markets, its agenda for development depends on market integration and technical inputs, in the shape of training to provide communities with the skills to offer the necessary services, including cultural displays, to tourists. While communities demonstrate agency in their adoption of representations of indigenous culture, proposed cultural revival and re-valuing through homestay tourism privileges the perceptions of indigenous culture of ‘white’ urban Peruvians and international tourists. That is, communities rely on ‘experts’ in the form of non-indigenous consultants from NGOs and travel agents, as well as tourists themselves, from more educated, middle-class backgrounds who generally have a higher social status and more authority conveyed by this status (Nightingale 2005). It is these social groups
that provide training in order to ‘improve’ authentic culture and transform it into a mediated, sanitised product which is suitable for tourist consumption\(^45\) (see chapter 6). While claiming to revive the intrinsic value of indigenous culture, it does not have a value in its ‘authentic’, pre-mediated, pre-commodified form. It needs to be ‘improved’ in order to become a product with ‘added-value’ in niche market-places, evoking similarities with modernisation paradigms of improving Peru’s indigenous population. Moreover, homestay tourism suggests that indigenous culture needs to be integrated into markets, and into national projects for development, to attain a utilitarian value, in order to be valued intrinsically.

Essentialised indigenous identities have been evoked as a strategy for political resistance to neo-liberal regimes during Peru’s history. Klarén (1999: 229) describes the peasant revolts against the hacienda system in the Southern Andean region of Puno in the post-First World War period as employing ‘a millennial discourse that stressed ‘Indianess’ as a political identity tool, to campaign for greater autonomy and socio-economic rights. Indigenous identities are currently called on as a political rallying point throughout Latin America. For example, the Zapatista movement in Mexico evokes specifically indigenous historical resistance to neo-liberal reform (Wade 1997). Moreover, Evo Morales in Bolivia, Bolivia’s first indigenous president, evokes the indigenous leaders of uprisings against the colonial government (Dunkerley 2007) and pre-colonial communitarian social structures (Albro 2006) to offer resistance and alternatives to what he presents as US imperialism and a failing modernity.

However, Peru is often cited as an exception among Latin American countries with large indigenous populations for its absence of an indigenous political movement (de la Cadena 2000; García 2005). De la Cadena (2000) argues that one of the reasons for this absence was the appropriation of an indigenous past by elites, in the ‘indigenista’ intellectual movement of the 1920s and 30s.

\(^{45}\) (Mawdsley et al. 2002; Mitchell 2002; Kothari 2005; Laurie et al. 2005; Goldman 2006; Goldman 2007; Jenkins 2008)
Why these efforts [of promoting 'indigenous folklore', and the absence of advancing national identity based on mestizaje] did not result in indigenous movements of ‘ethnic pride’ in Peru is explained by the fact that these projects were led by elite intellectuals, who saw themselves as salvaging and uplifting a tradition encroached on by modernisation and despised by Hispanisation.

(de la Cadena 2000: 325)

In effect, intellectual elites separated indigenous people from their past, in order to bolster their own, elite identity. Méndez (1996:12) argues that the ‘indigenista’ project of glorifying a remote Inca past had the effect of ‘turning its back on the present’\(^46\) which she sums up in the title of her essay: ‘Incas sí, indios, no’, translated as ‘Incas, yes, Indians, no’. (1996:1): ‘(...) the idealization of the past, or the ‘Andean utopia’, is what has recently been replacing a history of negations (...) But if the past is idealized or exalted, in this case the most remote past, it is really to compensate for what is negated in the present’\(^47\) (Méndez 1996: 12). The separation of indigenous people from a glorified past blocks the political possibilities of indigenous organisation around ethnic identities to voice political demands for socio-economic inclusion and political representation offered by identification with the past (see chapters 5 and 6). An Incan past is valued within national identity and tourism more highly than an indigenous present\(^48\). Homestay tourism offers idealised representations of ‘past’ forms of indigenous culture mediated by national elite experts for discerning tourists.

The commodification of mediated forms of indigenous culture for tourist consumption allows communities access to global markets. Further integration into neoliberal systems, through the performance of mediated indigenous identities, is sought out by communities. However, I argue that the processes of commodification deny the political opportunities offered by indigenous

---

\(^{46}\) See appendix 3, note 2:1 for the original Spanish.

\(^{47}\) See appendix 3, note 2:2 for the original Spanish.

\(^{48}\) (Silverman 2002; Silverman 2005; Vich 2006; Vich 2007)
identities elsewhere in Latin America to be employed as a rallying point for
resistance to uneven integration into capitalist systems and to campaign against
social and economic exclusion (Wade 1997; Monge Salgado 2006) (see chapters
5 and 6). For example, recently indigenous groups in the Northern Peruvian
Amazon have protested against the selling of their land by the government to
national and international oil companies. They rallied around indigenous
identities, wearing traditional face paints and carrying spears to defend their
ancestral lands (Caroll 2009).

Homestay tourism is presented as an opportunity for Western tourists to reflect
on their own societies and learn from indigenous peoples in pre-defined ways.
Specifically, tourists are encouraged to view their societies as superficial,
materialistic and unsustainable and indigenous communities as models of
spirituality and sustainability. However, bounding indigenous culture temporally
in the past and geographically to remote regions negates indigenous people’s
agency within the present and the opportunities indigenous culture presents as a
viable alternative to modern capitalism (Apffel-Marglin and PRATEC (The
Andean Project for Peasant Technology) 1998). Designating indigenous culture
to the past also denies the historical and political structures which marginalize
indigenous people within Peruvian society. I propose that within homestay
tourism, indigenous people can only have value in the past and through markets,
which de-politicizes the radical opportunities offered by indigenous ways of life,
and evoked in homestay tourism promotion. Homestay tourism does not present
indigenous people as living in the present, nor does it propose how lessons
learned from indigenous people can be put into practice ‘back home’.

I propose that homestay tourism’s commodification of authenticity through ‘loss’
necessitates its agenda of revival. Too many of the wrong kinds of tourists (mass
tourists) are advanced as impacting negatively on authentic cultures, while
homestay tourism is represented as reviving and revaluing cultures to fulfil the
‘right’ kind of tourists’ demands for authenticity (reproducing class-based
distinctions between mass and niche tourists). This replicates colonial power
relations between the North and South, denying indigenous cultures the creativity to change. There is a further paradox here, that markets, which are constituted as bringing corrupting contact with ‘modernity’ are charged with reviving ‘authentic’ cultures to fulfil the ‘right’ kind of tourists’ constitution of, and demands for, ‘authenticity’ (see chapter 6). Conceptualisations of hybridity that centre on the fusing of the ‘traditional’ and ‘modern’, and the belief that indigenous people display agency in adapting and resisting certain cultural impositions, offer ways of redressing the power imbalances in the processes of colonialism, and tourism. I also claim that the notion of hybridity advances ways of avoiding the lack of sustainability in the sustainable destination lifecycle model. Moreover, I argue that homestay tourism’s agenda to revive and re-value indigenous culture through the staging of essentialised past forms of indigenous culture for tourism and integration into national development plans and global markets, de-politicises indigenous identity and strategies for demanding inclusion in the benefits of neo-liberal development regimes.

2:3 Sustainable Development?

Indigenous cultures, represented as spiritual and sustainable, provide the imaginative basis for homestay tourism’s agenda of cultural revival and development, this section will therefore explore sustainable development discourses along two genealogical strands: ideas surrounding sustainable development of the early to mid-1990s at the time of the Rio ‘Earth Summit’ and notions surrounding the limits to economic growth of the 1970s. It firstly explores homestay tourism as imaginatively embedded in the sustainable development discourses of the early to mid 1990s. These discourses display post-developmentalist sensibilities, which imaginatively situate sustainable development outside of modernity and markets. Critiques of these imaginations will also be explored.

It will then explore a second strand of imaginations that underpins the conceptualisation of sustainable development in homestay tourism: notions that
the earth has a finite capacity for economic growth of the 1970s. The influence, in particular, of Hardin’s (1968) ‘The Tragedy of the Commons’ on ideas surrounding the need to limit the use of the environmental commons will be examined.

Next, it examines claims that alternative models of sustainable development have been mainstreamed into neo-liberal development agendas, processes which were arguably formalised at the Rio ‘Earth Summit’ in 1992. That is, at this conference, market mechanisms were proposed to deliver environmental protection through the commodification of the environmental commons. The market mechanisms proposed by the Rio Summit will be extended to analyse homestay tourism’s transformation of indigenous culture as a ‘cultural commons’ into a limited, bounded resource that can be commodified.

Finally, it explores homestay tourism through views of development as a professional industry, where experts concentrate on getting the ‘models’ of development ‘right’. These perspectives see the emphasis on development as a technical exercise, conducted by experts, as denying the politics of approaches to development that privilege the market and modernity.

Alternative imaginations: the end of development?

The first strand in the imaginative underpinning of homestay tourism within sustainable development discourses is found in the post-development sensibilities of the early 1990s. The early 1990s are significant in popular conceptions of sustainable development and its relationship to indigenous ways of life. This period was marked by widespread concern at the environmental damage of the 1980s, caused by development through economic growth and industrialisation (Woodhouse 2000) and an increasing interest in how ancient civilisations managed their environmental resources sustainably (Oliart 2004). Also, 1992 marked the 500th anniversary of Columbus’s arrival in the Americas in 1492. Bi-millennial celebrations in Spain were matched by protests by
indigenous peoples’ rights groups against the environmental and cultural destruction heralded by the European invasion (Oliart 2004). Moreover, the concepts of sustainability and development were brought together formally in the United Nations Conference on the Environment and Development (the Earth Summit) in Rio de Janeiro, 1992 and the resulting Rio Declaration on Environment and Development and Agenda 21 (so named because its proposals were intended to guide policy on these issues into the 21st century). In 1995, the United Nations dedicated the next decade to indigenous peoples (Oliart 2004) as ‘The International Decade of the World’s Indigenous People’ (Yashar 2005; UN 2009). This decade (from 1995 to 2004) also saw the World Bank direct funding for development at groups who self-identified as indigenous, through many new NGOs, and the ratification of ILO (International Labour Organisation) Convention 169 on Indigenous and Tribal Peoples, which guarantees indigenous peoples’ human rights, by most Latin American countries, (Canessa 2006). The early 1990s, with their landmark commemorations and conferences, were therefore particularly significant in bringing together environmental concerns and conceptualisations of indigenous people as guardians of the environment. This period was also important in that it marked a backlash against development, which was charged with the destruction of indigenous communities and their environments, as the following section on the post-developmentalist school will discuss.

The post-development school49 emerged in this historically significant period of questioning development. While differing in their emphasis, the ‘post-developmentalists’ are united in their disillusionment with development through economic growth and integration into capitalist markets. They propose that, after four decades of ‘development’ (from the post-Second World War era to the 1990s), Western models of development, promoted through industrialisation, economic growth and integration into capitalist markets had not delivered widespread prosperity and higher living standards. The prevailing sentiment

that development had failed and is largely an empty discourse is famously proposed by Sachs (1992: 1): ‘The idea of development stands like a ruin in the intellectual landscape (...) It is time to dismantle this mental structure.’

Moreover, post-developmentalist claim that economic growth through capitalist markets creates poverty and renders societies that are independent of markets unsustainable, vulnerable to shifts in markets and natural disasters. Anthropological studies, such as Sahlins’ (1997) classic account of hunter-gatherer societies ‘The Original Affluent Society’ or Helena Norberg-Hodge’s (1991) ‘Learning from Ladakh’, emphasise the sustainability and spirituality of societies that they define as ‘pre-market’ and ‘pre-modern’. Sahlins (1997) believes that it is the introduction of civilization’s idea of development: ‘that can render agrarian peasants more susceptible to natural catastrophes than any winter camp of Alaskan Eskimo’ (1997: 19). Helena Norberg-Hodge (1991: 45) describes Ladakhis living in a state of co-operative, pre-industrial harmony, summed up in their often used phrase ‘we have to live with each other’. She then describes the break down of community ties and the arrival of poverty (both notional and objective) with the arrival of state-sponsored, Western-style development. In Peru, PRATEC (the Andean Project for Peasant Technology) (Apffel-Marglin and PRATEC (The Andean Project for Peasant Technology) 1998), a radical indigenous NGO from the Cusco region, proposes indigenous ways of life as sustainable and spiritual alternatives to modernity and markets.

However, the post-developmentalist are not without their critics. Nederveen Pieterse (2000: 177) points out that the post-developmentalist fail to conceptualise poverty as a material phenomena, ignoring statistical evidence, and instead concentrating on its representational and moral dimensions by: ‘stepping from a statistical universe to a moral universe’. Furthermore, he argues that this view of poverty elevates the lack of material resources to a superior moral position by: ‘romanticis(ing) poverty (...) equat(ing) it with purity’ (Pieterse 2000: 177). Following on from this critique, Thomas (2000: 20) comments that, although there have been some ‘rural idylls with co-operative
values’, many pre-industrial societies were also unequal and ‘objectively’ poor. He also observes that because of the globalisation of industrialization and capitalism most of the world’s poor cannot be described as living in pre-industrial societies, but ‘in some relation to global, industrial capitalism’ (Thomas 2000: 20). In a similar vein, contemporary Andean scholars refute previous romantic interpretations of pre-contact Incan society’s absence of trade, commerce and markets and emphasis on mechanisms of reciprocity and exchange. Murra (1984) argues that Peru’s Inca rulers collected goods, principally grain and cloth, as tribute from subjugated tribes and then redistributed these to the nobility and ruling elites throughout the empire in exchange for their loyalty. Such accounts present Inca society, not as an egalitarian socialist state, but as ‘an exploitative, hierarchical society in which a small, privileged ruling class benefited from the extraction of tribute, labour, and services from their subject peoples’ (Klarén 1999: 29). Moreover, in contrast to common representations of indigenous peoples standing outside of monetary relations and markets, current studies of Andean societies in the colonial period of ‘first transition’ (Larson 1995: 15) of economic restructuring from pre-market to market economies in the sixteenth century, show that Indian communities participated in colonial monetary-based markets systems. Far from being passively integrated into global trade systems as serfs and slave-labour on rural estates and in the mines, Assadourian (1995) argues that Indian communities played an integral role in supporting the colonial extractive economy, which centred on the silver mines of Potosí, by trading food and other essential supplies through emerging interregional markets. Murra (1995) and Stern (1995) paint a picture of Indian communities adapting actively in participating in the new market economy, while simultaneously preserving their traditional kinship-based systems of reciprocity, exchange and barter. Moreover, these communities preserved the pre-conquest vertical ‘ecological archipelagos’ (Murra 1995: 62) which were sustainable systems of agriculture. Each eco-system, from the highlands to the low-lying rainforests specialised in the sustainable cultivation of livestock and foodstuffs suitable to that
environment, which were then exchanged and traded between these different zones.

While markets did not dominate Indian communities, contemporary scholars agree that up until the mid-nineteenth century there was a strong Andean presence in regional and interregional markets (Larson 1995). The transition to the common Andean identification of Indians as ‘antimarket’ (Larson 1995: 36) came with the Republican establishment of a modernising, export-orientated nation-state, which restricted previous Andean autonomies in the legal, economic and cultural fields (Larson 1995). Olivia Harris (1995) argues that the philosophical framing of modernisation, liberalism and emerging scientific racism of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries reconfigured ethnic and class categories. She claims that at this time ‘Indian’ became either, in the Indigenista’s view, an impoverished victim of feudal exploitation, in shameful contrast to their illustrious Incan ancestors, or an obstacle to modernisation and development. This legacy continues in the present-day classification of Indian people as ‘poor, rural and antimarket’ (Larson 1995: 36).

Homestay tourism’s representations of indigenous peoples relationships to markets and modernity function within Rousseauian tropes of pre-Fall, egalitarian idylls and sustainable development paradigms and post-developmentalist’s idealisations of rural communities as pre-capitalist models of spirituality and sustainability. However, contemporary ethno-historical research gives us a different view of pre-contact societies as functioning through hierarchical, almost feudal relations. Moreover, this scholarship presents indigenous communities as having a long history of dynamic relationships with monetary markets, while preserving traditional systems of exchange based on kinship relationships and sustainable agricultural practices. These perspectives challenge the ways in which indigenous communities are viewed within the destination lifecycle, that is, communities are imagined as inevitably being corrupted by markets and modernity in the form of tourism and tourists. More realistic representations of communities as robust (although not participating
equally) within markets would allow rural communities to participate in a
growing tourism industry without the threat of the negative effects of the
destination lifecycle.

**Limits to growth**

The second strand in the imaginative underpinnings of sustainable development
discourses deployed in homestay tourism is found in the 1970s when the
popular consensus in the benefits of limitless economic growth and capitalist
markets began to be challenged. Landmark publications such as the Club of
Rome’s report ‘The Limits of Growth: A Report on the Predicament of Mankind’
1972 (Meadows, Meadows and Behrens 1972), Hardin’s (1968) ‘The Tragedy of
the Commons’ and Schumacher’s ‘Small is Beautiful: a Study of Economics as if
People Mattered’ ([1973] 1993) carried the message that the world’s capacity for
growth was finite, and economic growth should be limited to ensure
environmental sustainability and human survival. Both the ‘The Limits of
Growth’ and ‘The Tragedy of the Commons’ proposed that the world had a
limited ‘carrying capacity’, resources were finite and that if population and
economic growth continued at its current rate, these limits would be reached.
‘Small is Beautiful’ proposed that the world’s resources were limited, and that
economic growth and industrialisation were not viable models of development,
proposing instead small-scale models of sustainable development, based on
studies of ‘traditional’ village economics.

It is the key concepts of limited ‘carrying capacity’ and ‘small-scale’ that are
applied to the sustainability of both the environment and traditional cultures in
homestay tourism, as well as to the viability of tourism products. The
sustainability of a tourist destination is conceptualised through the notion of
‘carrying capacity’ advanced by Hardin (1968: 162) in ‘The Tragedy of the
Commons’. Butler's (1980) destination lifecycle model, adopted throughout
responsible tourism discourses, applies Hardin's concept of limited ‘carrying
capacity’ to tourism. Butler argues that environmental quality and cultural
authenticity (and friendly tourist/host relations) will decline over time, as increasing numbers tourists arrive, and the kind of tourist deteriorates from independent to mass. He proposes that tourist destinations eventually experience a decline in visitor numbers because tourists move on to new, uncorrupted destinations. Thus the ideas of sustainability that have influenced homestay tourism link the protection of environmental quality and cultural authenticity with continuing product viability. Limiting tourist numbers, the kind of tourist (those genuinely interested in and respectful of authentic cultures) and restricting tourist behaviour is proposed to halt this cycle.

**Mainstreaming markets**

Homestay tourism functions through post-developmental imaginations: mass tourism is represented as the harbinger of modernity and development, which fails to benefit local and indigenous people and indigenous communities are upheld as models of past ways of life and sustainability. However, it also works though the sustainable development principles and agendas specifically outlined at the Rio Earth Summit of 1992 (see chapter 4). That is, while homestay tourism rejects large-scale, ‘modern’ development and mass tourism, it adopts market mechanisms to carry out its agenda of including indigenous people directly in tourism to promote development and revive traditional cultures. I argue that homestay tourism integrates indigenous culture into global markets in two principle ways: by commoditisng the ‘cultural commons’ of indigenous culture and by using indigenous egalitarian social structures and mechanisms of reciprocity and exchange as ‘cultural capital’ by which dissent within communities is calmed and market integration is facilitated.

Goldman (1998: 23) pinpoints the Rio Summit as the event where, rather than turning away from capitalist systems, or imposing limits on economic growth, global powers set an agenda to integrate common, natural resources into market mechanisms:
(...) the objective of the [Rio] Summit's major power brokers was not to constrain or restructure capitalist economies and practices to help save the rapidly deteriorating ecological commons, but rather to restructure the commons (e.g. privatize, 'develop', 'make more efficient', valorize, 'get the price right') to accommodate crisis-ridden capitalisms.

(Goldman 1998: 23)

A range of 'alternative' and 'sustainable' tourisms have emerged from the Rio Summit (see chapter 4), applying market values to environmental and cultural resources as a means of environmental and cultural preservation. Eco-tourism proposes that tourists' demands to see natural environments enable market values to be applied to these, and thus advance their preservation. Similarly, homestay tourism applies market mechanisms to the 'revaluing' of 'traditional' cultures: tourists' demands to see and experience authentic, traditional cultures are proposed to convey a market value on indigenous cultures, and thus provide a financial incentive for their preservation. Moreover, appreciation by outsiders is proposed to foster pride in traditional identities. Thus homestay tourism functions within sustainable development discourses, which conceptualise indigenous culture as having interdependent intrinsic and utilitarian values. That is, while indigenous culture is situated imaginatively outside of modernity and markets, and as having the intrinsically superior values of sustainability and spirituality, sustainable development paradigms advance market mechanisms to promote its survival.

The constitution of homestay tourism within notions of limited, small-scale growth and the destination lifecycle model intersect with the formation of an exclusive product for a niche market of middle-class consumers. While this group is proposed to be willing to pay more and, therefore, represents 'added value' as consumers, they also to seek out products with 'added value', which is provided by indigenous peoples' cultural authenticity. Thus, indigenous people have been 'mainstreamed' into neo-liberal development processes, as an economic resource for urban, cosmopolitan markets who favour the 'niche' products that indigenous
people can offer, such as ‘alternative’ medicines, organically produced food and glimpses into spiritual, sustainable lifestyles in eco-tourism (Healy 2001; Oliart 2004; Radcliffe and Laurie 2005).

Indigenous people and their cultures also provide ‘added value’ in their assumed role of being guardians of both tradition and the environment. That is, they fulfil sustainable development projects’ (of which homestay tourism is one) requirements for environmental protection and cultural revival. As such, they represent a cost-efficient way of delivering sustainable development. Oliart (2004) proposes that, while market integration is prioritised, sustainable development’s environmental and cultural agendas depend on indigenous peoples to become viable. Radcliffe et al. (2005: 472) also argue that neo-liberal approaches to ‘development-with-identity’ have co-opted indigenous culture as a means of delivering development efficiently, proposing: ‘development-with-identity treats indigenous culture as a flexible and dynamic resource.’ Indigenous culture can thus be conceptualised as a ‘cultural commons’ which is bounded, and therefore commodifiable, by the processes of professionalisation in the formation of tourism associations and packaged cultural experiences, mediated through training provided by NGOs and travel agents (see chapter 6).

Moreover, the inclusion of traditional community structures in development is viewed as a way of disciplining dissent and minimising resistance to the socially divisive effects of market-led development. Radcliffe (2006: 7) argues that ‘the cultural capital of the poor’ offers ways of promoting development that is socially inclusive and culturally appropriate:

The promotion of social cohesion and rights to cultural expression has recently been at the heart of measures to recognise the cultural capital of the poor. Whereas impoverished people may have little more than cultural identities, this cultural capital is viewed in recent policy as the launch pad for transforming their relative position in multicultural societies.
Traditional indigenous systems of distributing the benefits of tourism in more equitable ways than purely capitalist, individualistic models facilitate market integration. That is, entrance into markets is enabled by pacifying dissent within communities on the part of those who protest at their lack of inclusion in tourism projects by sharing some of the benefits of tourism, for example increased income and employment. A more equitable distribution of benefits also fulfils homestay tourism’s charitable agenda (see chapter 6).

Strategies to build indigenous culture into development interventions can be seen as ways of reducing resistance to neo-liberal development strategies and dissipating dissent. Oliart (2004) notes that indigenous rights and the revival and protection of indigenous culture became a conditionality of World Bank and IDB (Inter-American Development Bank) loans in the early 1990s. She argues that the promotion of bilingual education and culturally sensitive health care, among other measures to promote cultural revival and respect, were introduced to counter the political and economic instability and unrest due to the negative social impacts and environmental degradation of the neo-liberal approaches of the 1980s. Thus, the World Bank insisted that developing countries put in place political and economic measures to guarantee political stability to render themselves governable and, therefore, suitable for foreign investment and loans, as well as prepared for development through neo-liberal markets (Burawoy 2000; Mitchell 2002) (see chapter 5). Fujimori’s government (1990-2000) significantly reinserted Peru into the international financial system at this time in order to benefit from these financial packages. He also instigated national campaigns to promote tourists’ safety, calling on a national spirit of co-operation in order to encourage a secure environment for development through tourism (see chapter 5).
Within homestay tourism, egalitarian indigenous community structures, that function through traditional mechanisms of reciprocity and exchange (Abercrombie 1998; Mayer 2002), provide ways to mitigate the often uneven and socially divisive effects of neo-liberal development. They can be seen as functioning as structural strategies to calm dissent and render communities safe for development projects, tourism and tourists (see chapter 6). Homestay tourism in Peru evokes the Andean family and community structures of the ‘ayullu’⁵⁰ and reciprocal or communal work arrangements of ‘ayni’⁵¹, both in its promotion of indigenous cultures as a tourist product distinct from Western cultures and also as ways of delivering its developmental agenda. Homestay projects are implemented through tourism associations who consist of interrelated family groups, who share tourists and work through traditional mechanisms of, for example, taking turns (see chapter 6). Community tourism associations function through community systems of reciprocity and exchange and serve as strategies, deployed by community elites, of calming dissent within communities.

The etching of homestay tourism onto community structures and mechanisms for the more equal distribution of the economic benefits of tourism can be seen as a strategy for pacifying dissent to uneven market integration. Communities’ insistence on following traditional egalitarian structures and mechanisms can also be seen as acts of resistance to the increased socio-economic differentiation that accompanies market-led development. Conflict within communities, caused by the uneven distribution of the benefits of homestay tourism, is often expressed by displays of what Scott (1985: xvi) refers to as ‘everyday forms of peasant resistance’. He proposes that most forms of peasant resistance to exploitative socio-economic structures do not involve open confrontation with powerful groups, which would run the risk of failure and even greater control and oppression. Rather, less powerful groups resist exploitation by employing small, individual acts of resistance, for example: ‘foot dragging, dissimulation,

⁵₀ Translated from Quechua by Mayer (2002: 333) as ‘a kinship and social unit’.
⁵¹ Translated from Quechua by Mayer (2002: 333) as ‘symmetrical reciprocal exchange’.
desertion, false compliance, pilfering, feigned ignorance, slander, arson, sabotage, and so on’ (Scott 1985: xvi). Those within communities who protest at not being directly included in homestay tourism projects can use the strategies of passive resistance described by Scott (1985) (for example, minor, anonymous acts of sabotage and slander) to insist on a share of the benefits of tourism, within traditional structures of communal sharing (see chapter 6). These acts can be viewed as resistance to the socio-economic differentiation triggered by neo-liberal development and the insistence on ‘traditional’ forms of more egalitarian distribution.

**Getting the model right—denying the politics**

Homestay tourism can be viewed through critiques of development as a professional industry, where experts concentrate on getting the ‘models’ of development ‘right’. These perspectives see the emphasis on development as a technical exercise, conducted by experts, as denying the politics of approaches to development that privilege the market. As a product of ‘rolling back the state’ (Johnson 1999: 49; Bondi and Laurie 2005) and the emergence of NGOs in the 1980s, development actors, including states, compete for funding from Northern development agencies, and comply with conditionalities attached to loans. Radical actors have often been integrated into neo-liberal agendas through their need of funding to survive. Moreover, for organisations to survive, to attract more funding, they need to deliver successful projects, which are judged through auditing systems (Mawdsley et al. 2002). I argue that, by focusing on getting the model of tourism ‘right’ (broadly, ‘responsible’ as opposed to ‘mass’ tourism) and implementing the ‘right’ project designs to produce this kind of tourism, denies the power relations between communities and ‘experts’ (including tourists) and the politics of development through integration into global markets.

The 1980s and 1990s saw the emergence of a plethora of NGOs in response to widening funding opportunities offered by Northern institutions (Mawdsley et al. 2002). Within the neo-liberal paradigm of ‘rolling back the state’ (Johnson 1999:}
Northern development agencies sought to bypass supposedly inefficient states by channelling funding for development through the ‘third sector’ (Mawdsley et al. 2002: 5), which was assumed to be more efficient. Bypassing the state’s role in development through NGOs has been criticised as a way of establishing the global governance of Northern governments and development agencies by the backdoor, in advancing neo-liberal agendas to subdue and integrate economically marginalized communities into global markets.

With the move from development being the state’s responsibility, what were once stable government jobs for development professionals became jobs reliant on project cycles and external funding (Mawdsley et al. 2002). Development professionals became freelance consultants, and NGO workers became dependant on generating their own employment through bidding for funding for projects. Therefore, the need to replicate the development discourses of funders, and the delivery of successful projects, to promote institutional and professional survival became paramount (Bondi and Laurie 2005; Goldman 2006). Mawdsley et al. (2002: 5) observe that many NGOs have been established to serve the neo-liberal agendas of their funders, and the need for relatively well paid employment of their staff, rather than the needs of their clients: ‘In recent years NGOs have been viewed as having an important role in the neo-liberal transformation, and in the process many have been established without any particular agenda other than the need to access funds and to survive.’

The concentration on models, implemented through experts, serves to depoliticise development and mask the North-South flows of funding, knowledge (and power) (Mitchell 2002; Kothari 2005; Goldman 2006). Debates on development are conducted within the vacuums of official discourses, and discussions centre on models and techniques. Popular and policy-oriented discussions of homestay tourism concentrate on the constitution of the ‘right’ models (responsible and sustainable as opposed to mass) and practices of tourism (small-scale, community-based and bounded by rules) rather than on
the political structures that create uneven development. Mawdsley et al. (2002), claim that the auditing culture stifles the asking of the wider questions of whether or not the work of a particular NGO has made a difference: ‘Many feel that a culture has developed in which the important thing is to measure and count ‘activities completed’ and ‘performance indicators met’, rather than to ask ‘what difference does it make?’’ (Mawdsley et al. 2002: 18).

Mawdsley et al. (2002) argue that the need to provide proof of efficient use of funds and successful projects has led to an auditing culture that discourages critical engagement with development. Rather, auditing promotes evaluations within pre-set discourses and parameters, with the aim of proving successful project delivery, in order to gain funding for more projects. They also suggest that the emergence of an auditing culture favours middle-class professionals who can speak the latest language of development and also who can fulfil the bureaucratic requirements of report writing and form filling. The privileging of these technical skills serves to exclude less professional and smaller NGOs (that is, those that are formed by less educated staff and who work more at the grassroots level) from gaining funding for projects. The emphasis on educational status both discriminates against less educated staff who work for NGOs at the local level (Jenkins 2008) and also against less educated members of communities who do not have the skills to take on managerial roles (see chapter 6).

The homestay tourism projects in this study were carried out through NGO tourism consultants, ‘responsible’ travel agents, and wholly or partially funded through international development agencies, state agencies and travel agents (see chapter 3). The people who work for these agencies consist of a transnational professional class who are highly skilled at negotiating funding, developing projects, speaking the right language of development and auditing projects according to the criteria set out by funders. However, their focus on fulfilling pre-determined models and envisioning development and tourism within, often seemingly enlightened and alternative agendas, can serve to blur
more critical perspectives. Moreover, their positionality as middle-class, highly educated urban professionals can lead to idealised views of rural life, which is seen in opposition to a corrupted, individualistic modernity.

Moreover, tourists are encouraged to play the role of expert and auditor. Within ethical modes of consumption it is the consumer who is empowered with the knowledge to choose products that meet their own ethical standards (see chapter 4). The responsible tourist is encouraged to take on the role of environmental auditor, monitoring performance according to responsible criteria:

How many of us have carefully put the towels back on the rack, only to come back to the room and find that freshly laundered towels have replaced them? The responsible traveller will have taken up that failure to deliver with the management. Who is ultimately more powerful – the demanding consumer or the expert auditing social and environmental performance?

(Goodwin 2005: 4)

Goodwin (2005) proposes that the responsible tourist take over the role of expert, judging and demanding responsible standards far more effectively than more traditional auditors. The move from ‘official’ auditing bodies (either state or NGO) represents a shift in power to consumers, and also a cost-free way of monitoring responsible standards. For example, the web-based responsible travel company responsibletravel.com relies on its customers to evaluate products and provide feedback, rather than employing its own auditors. Other internet sites such as tripadvisor.com and expedia.com invite tourists to share their views of various tourism products. Also, the Virgin Holidays Responsible Tourism Awards, organised by responsibletravel.com (2009) and sponsored by the Daily Telegraph, the World Travel Market (a professional organisation), Geographical Magazine and BBC World News, relies on nominations from tourists.
2:4 Conclusions

This chapter has explored the imaginative constitution of homestay tourism from both the ‘demand’ and ‘supply’ sides of the equation. Critical genealogies of alternative travel and tourism, notions of authenticity and sustainable development have been examined in order to challenge homestay tourism’s agenda for the revival and revaluing of indigenous culture and the promotion of sustainable development within indigenous communities. It proposes that the privileging of experts to create mediated versions of ‘authentic’ indigenous culture for elite tourist consumption depoliticises the radical possibilities for resistance to neo-liberal development offered by indigenous identities and ways of life. Moreover, the focus on ‘getting the model right’ (for example, sustainable, as opposed to mass tourism) depoliticises the centrality of homestay tourism’s neo-liberal agenda of delivering development through market integration.
Chapter 3  Methodology: multiple sites, multiple actors

3:1  Introduction

This chapter will explore the methodologies and methods that have guided the collection of and have inspired the theoretical approaches (chapter 2) and analysis of empirical data (chapters 4, 5 and 6) that form the basis of this thesis. First I will outline my positionality and how my background and experiences led to the adoption of the principle methodological approaches of multi-sited and interface analysis, critical discourse and genealogical analysis, and also how grounded theory inspired a data-led approach. These methodological influences will then be taken up and expanded upon throughout this chapter. Second, I will move to the field and describe the multiple sites and actors engaged with during this research and specifically during periods of fieldwork in Peru. Third, ethical issues encountered and methods employed during fieldwork will be explored. I will make links between the methodologies and methods across these sections, showing how my methodologies informed my methods. The fourth part moves to the analysis of the empirical data, through: transcription and coding of the interviews, as well as critical reviews of the policy and promotional literature. Although this chapter has been primarily divided into data collection during fieldwork and analysis on return, the case is that the research process has been a iterative one, with collection and analysis of data occurring simultaneously, and continuing beyond the periods of fieldwork in Peru. Similar cyclical processes inspired the pursuit of the theoretical perspectives that cut through the analysis of the empirical data. Finally, conclusions will be drawn that link this discussion of methodology and methods to the following empirical chapters.

3:2  Methodological approaches

This section will initially explore my personal background and motivation for undertaking this research and the extent to which these aspects of my positionality have influenced the pursuit of the major themes of this research.
Further issues of positionality will be taken up in subsequent sections. The methodologies of grounded theory, multi-sited and interface analysis, as well as critical discourse analysis, will then be discussed in relation to the data collection and analysis of the empirical material of this thesis.

**Positionality**

I came to this research with a background of Teaching English as a Foreign Language in international contexts, which led me to begin to think about the complexities and tensions between distinct, culturally-based pedagogies and of cross-cultural exchange. I spent a year in Bulgaria as a volunteer for VSO (the UK government’s Voluntary Service Overseas) some years ago and the programme, and myself, were motivated by developmental aims. The major rationale behind VSO’s programme in the recently post-communist Eastern Europe was educating secondary level students in the English language and cultural skills they would need for economic development and eventual integration with Western Europe. Reflecting on this and my wider experiences as an English language teacher abroad, I can see that this form of teaching can be likened to development interventions, where opposing views on pedagogy can be seen to stem from distinct world views and conceptualisations of development can differ according to different cultures. Within the English language classroom, Northern pedagogies and teaching methods often clash with the more ‘traditional’ approaches of national teachers and students. These tensions have been theorised by critical linguistics as forms of linguistic and cultural imperialism (Pennycook 2001; Widdowson 2003), which find parallels with the postcolonial perspectives on development and tourism explored in chapter 2. It was these experiences and reflections on teaching abroad that have led me to be attracted to critical perspectives on development.

As well as working for VSO, a charity which is linked to the British government’s overseas development agenda I also worked for another government sponsored educational programme, the JET (Japan Exchange and Teaching) programme.
This is run by the Japanese Ministry of Education and promotes English as part of its policy of internationalisation, which is intended to open up Japan culturally to global influences to further its already advanced economic development. This has led me to reflect on the state’s role in adopting culturally specific forms of development, in this case the teaching of English language and Western cultural norms, and the ways in which it interacts with these culturally distinct paradigms (taken up in chapter 5).

A second strand of my experiences consists of spending time travelling as a backpacker during holidays while teaching abroad. Much of these travels took place in ‘developing’ countries, including South America, where I travelled solo during my year abroad as part of my Spanish degree. (My experience of Latin America and Spanish language skills, for practical reasons, informed the choice of location for this research.) The discussions I had with other backpackers on the merits of this form of travel, as opposed to the ills of mass tourism, and on the potential for development through tourism inspired the eventual pursuit of some of the themes in this thesis. I found that my experiences of longer lasting and deeper cultural exchange that I had had when teaching abroad, for periods, of 1 to 3 years, contrasted with the fleeting and sometimes fraught contacts during my travels. Moreover, I had participated in homestays in Thailand and found them to be similarly unsatisfactory in terms of the cultural and personal contact I had expected. I had also spent some time trekking in environmentally sensitive areas and took a great personal interest in the issues of responsibility and sustainability, both culturally and environmentally, that affected these regions. The processes of reflection on my professional life and personal travels led me to study for an MA in Development Studies with the Open University and then onto the research topics embraced in this thesis: the relationship of tourism to culture and development, issues of responsibility and sustainability, as well as the home as a space for cultural exchange and cross-cultural contact.
Through my experiences as an English language teacher and independent traveller, my approach had been questioning but largely uncritical of the assumptions on which alternative tourism was based. Namely, I was concerned with tourism’s potential for development, and often uneven development and its negative impacts on local cultures. My background as a teacher, where the identification and development of strategies to solve students’ language problems is an integral part of our training and practice, and MA modules on the project-based approaches to development interventions led me to conceptualise tourism in terms of models and getting the approach right. However, I developed more critical perspectives as the research progressed, which led to a shift in my world view from finding the right model, within prescribed paradigms, to considering the assumptions behind these models and approaches. These critical approaches are reflected in the methodologies discussed below.

**Grounded Theory**

First, I will outline my adoption of Grounded Theory that led me to approach the research as an iterative process, and above all, to develop a theoretical framework during and after the principle periods of data collection of fieldwork in Peru, rather than before. Glaser and Strauss published ‘The Discovery of Grounded Theory’ in 1967 as a challenge to the dominant ‘Scientific Method’ and its associated quantitative methods. The main departure from the assumptions of the ‘scientific method’ was their advocacy of ‘developing theories from research grounded in data rather than deducing testable hypotheses from existing theories’ (Charmaz 2006: 4). Grounded Theory seeks to generate theory from data, rather than using data to prove or disprove existing theories by ‘letting the data speak’ (Charmaz 2006: 5). ‘Grounded Theory’ proposes that research ‘start(s) with data’ (Charmaz 2006: 3) and therefore suggests ‘conducting the literature review after developing an independent analysis’ (Charmaz 2006: 5). Following the principles of Grounded Theory, my adoption of the theoretical framework explored in the previous chapter (2) and the
methodological approaches described here came out of my reflections on the data collected during fieldwork.

Inspired by the principles of Grounded Theory my ‘sampling (was) aimed toward theory construction, not for population representatives’ (Charmaz 2006: 5). My claims that the sites studied and actors interviewed are ‘representative’ are based on the ‘the constant comparative method’, ‘using the constant comparative method, which involves making comparisons during each stage of the analysis’ (Charmaz 2006: 5). While I was engaged in data collection, I reviewed my data and compared it to what I had gathered before. For example, I listened to each interview afterwards, transcribed, summarised and started to analyse it. By constantly comparing the promotional and policy material I was collecting and what people told me in and outside of interviews, I found patterns emerging, which I have gone on to analysis as ‘discourses’. What I found most striking were the similarities within groups of actors, and differences between them. It seemed as though different groups of actors were ‘telling the same story’, and that the points of contention could be glimpsed by ‘reading between the lines’. The fact that so many ‘key’ actors, and so many different sources, told me similar stories gives me confidence that I am presenting ‘representative’ data. Studying three different sites of homestay tourism, whose actors express similar views, also supports my claims to have collected representative data. Cook and Crang (Cook and Crang 1995: 11) describe this as the ‘point of theoretical saturation’, where further interviews can be predicted to reflect representations and attitudes already explored in previous interviews.

**Multi-scalar approaches, multi-sited and interface analysis**

Tourism and development are multi-sited phenomena, evidenced by previous studies of tourism as part of the processes of globalisation and development. These studies often reflect on the highly unequal relationships between the tourist-sending countries of the North and the tourist-receiving countries of the South (Urry 1996), guests and hosts (Smith and Brent 2001). Moreover, recent
landmark works on globalisation and development reveal neo-liberalism to be played out over different scales, through interactions between multiple actors. These include Michael Burawoy’s pursuit of ‘global ethnographies’, which aim to ‘assemble a picture of the whole by recognising diverse perspectives from the parts’ (Burawoy 2000: 5), and Goldman’s (2006) multi-sited ethnography of the World Bank. Marcus (1995: 95) notes that there is an emerging methodological shift in anthropological research from single-sited to ‘multi-sited ethnography’, where ‘multiple sites of observation and participation (…) cross-cut dichotomies such as the “local” and the “global” (…)’. As Marcus indicates, sites and scales merge and interact within current processes of globalisation, as the investigation of the multiple sites and actors involved in homestay tourism in this study gradually revealed. Furthermore, as Sharp (2008: 7) notes: ‘Postcolonial writers tend to challenge the presentation of singular narratives and instead seek to include multiple voices in their works.’ These methodological approaches, and the postcolonial critical perspective of representing multiple voices, has inspired the exploration the multiple scales, sites and actors involved in homestay tourism as a development intervention in this study.

Development studies also have a tradition of actor-oriented and stakeholder approaches to the analysis of the multiple viewpoints of actors in development interventions. For example, RRA (Rapid Rural Appraisal) was developed in response to the vertical, homogenous interventions of the Green Revolution of the 1970s, and pioneered by Robert Chambers (1983; 1997) and embodies the principle that people have different perceptions of problems (Theis and Grady 1991). These methods aim to uncover differences in the agendas of diverse actors, which often reveal unequal power relations, and to provide channels of negotiation between different groups. However, these approaches have been criticised for overly representing elite, powerful views. Brugha and Varvasovszky (2000: 245) note that stakeholder analysis approaches can be limited in their usefulness in: ‘cultural contexts where respondents are not familiar with this approach, or have unspoken agendas which can deter them from making
forthright responses.’ Bad practice of PRA (Participatory Rural Appraisal) has been criticised for replicating the views of elites within communities not least from Chambers himself\textsuperscript{52}. While RRA and PRA methods, such as community focus groups and mapping exercises, were not pursued in this study, their underlying principles of the inclusion of diverse actors, particularly communities, and their recognition of the power relations inherent in participation in research have informed the approaches taken here.

Reflecting my realisation of differing views among actors, I followed an actor-oriented approach of ‘interface analysis’, proposed by Long (1999: 1), which ‘counterpoises the voices, experiences and practices of all the relevant social actors involved’ in development interventions. He notes actors’ perspectives often differ and clash, reflecting distinct cultural world views, power relations and interests. He emphasises that views within groups of actors may also vary, and that each group does not represent a monolithic view point. The analysis of the data has been led by Long’s schema of interface analysis, dividing sites and actors into distinct scales (international, national and local) and groups (international development agencies, state development agencies, consultants, community leaders and tourists) allows for contrasting agendas and genealogical trajectories to be explored. However, these sites and actors merge and interact. As Long (1999: 2) notes, the positions of those who negotiate at the interface are: ‘inevitably ambivalent since they must respond to the demands of their own groups as well as to the expectations of those with whom they must negotiate.’ Views within groups also differ, and I have attempted to reflect both views that are representative of groups as well as critiques and tensions.

\textsuperscript{52} (Chambers 1998; Cornwall 1998; Guijt and Shah 1998a; Guijt and Shah 1998b; Chambers 1997; Guijt and Cornwall 1995)
Critical discourse and genealogical analysis

As the research process progressed my awareness of the uneven power embedded in relations between actors and differences in their employment of the discourses of sustainable tourism development grew. Foucault's ([1977] 1975: 27) concept of ‘power-knowledge’, that ‘power produces knowledge’ teaches us that knowledge about the world is produced by powerful social groups. Moreover, Foucault's (1980: 131) concept of ‘regimes of truth’, that operate through ‘discourses’ are created and maintained by powerful groups whose world views come to be assumed to be ‘true’: ‘Each society has its regime of truth, its “general politics” of truth: that is, the types of discourse which it accepts and makes function as true; the status of those who are charged with saying what is true’. I adopted Foucauldian approaches of critical discourse and genealogical analysis (Foucault [1969] 1972; Said [2003] 1978) in order to trace the differing reactions to cultural revival and socio-economic development from the perspectives of elites and non-elites back to their colonial and developmental origins. This enabled the critical unpacking of assumptions and also the uncovering of the sources of power on which these assumptions are based.

Foucauldian conceptualisations of power as functioning through networks and discourses also informed the analysis of the ways in which responsible, homestay tourism discourses interact and are distributed, and interpreted over multiple geographical scales (international, national, local). Foucault’s vision is compPELLINGLY expressed by Said’s ([2003] 1978: 3) description of the power of Orientalist colonial discourse, not as produced by a central source, but emanating from and maintained through networks:

This is not to say that Orientalism unilaterally determines what can be said about the Orient, but that it is the whole network of interests inevitably brought to bear on (and therefore always involved in) any occasion when that particular entity ‘the Orient’ is in question.
The idea of networks is also employed by critics of development as a powerful industry (Escobar 1992a; Crush 1995) (see chapter 5). This approach allows development to be analysed as being formed through discourses that are produced through interconnected sources and over multiple scales, which interact. These theoretical approaches intersected with the methods I employed to access sites and actors, which reflected these scales, and were found through their connections to one another through the method of ‘snowballing’. Valentine (1997: 116) describes snowballing as ‘using one contact to help you recruit another contact, who in turn can put you in touch with someone else.’

3:3 The field: multiple sites, multiple actors

The field of responsible, homestay tourism is multi-sited and involves many and diverse actors. This section will explore the sites in this research: the promotional and policy literature that forms the basis of the empirical analysis of chapters 4 and 5, and the sites of homestay tourism in Peru that are explored in chapter 6. Next, the various actors involved in this study will be explored.

Promotional and policy data

Inspired by critical genealogical approaches, the sites explored in chapter 4 consist predominantly of the international institutional policy documents on sustainable development and responsible tourism that I traced back to the Rio ‘Earth Summit’ of 1992. I did this through web based searches, taking the lead from one source and then moving to another, linking sources through the snowballing method. Thus I built up a picture of a network of connected discourses. I examined this field post-field work, and thus my analysis focused on the key themes identified in my conversations with key actors in Peru, namely sustainable tourism development and its connection to indigenous cultural revival.
The sources of promotional materials were also explored through snowballing. I started with the analysis of the websites of those companies working with the sites studied in Peru, a process started during fieldwork there, and then worked outwards. I went to the Times Travel Fair, at Earl’s Court, London, and concentrated on investigating the stands in the responsible travel and Latin American sections and collected promotional material from them. This, together with web-based searches and regular scanning of the travel supplements in the UK Sunday newspapers, gave me a very concrete idea of the main companies specialising in responsible travel. I also searched through bookshops for the most current literature on green travel and ethical travel. As more general background to inform myself of imaginations of travel I collected guide books on Latin America, and autobiographical travel literature on Peru, as well as following popular UK TV shows on travel, such as the BBC’s ‘Tribe’ and ‘Amazon’.

While in Peru, I collected institutional policy data on responsible, homestay tourism from the NGOs and state agencies involved in establishing the projects studied, which I studied while in the field and which initiated my discussions with actors and subsequent analysis. I focus on Pentur (Mincetur 2004; Mincetur 2005; Sariego López and García Santillán 2008), the Peruvian government’s 10 year plan for tourism development, which was launched at the time of fieldwork, in chapter 5 because of its status as a major policy document. I also interviewed key actors in the Peruvian Ministry of Tourism and consultants who worked for state agencies about current policy. I also regularly reviewed the Peruvian newspapers and specialist travel magazines while in Peru, and on return to the UK via web sources, in order to keep up to date with the latest debates on sustainable tourism in Peru.

These sources, both international and national, were selected to show how popular representations of responsible tourism are produced and reproduced over different scales. This literature is available in the public domain, although not all actors can be assumed to access all of the sources presented. For example, international tourism development professionals may directly access, discuss
and contribute to UN documents on sustainable and responsible tourism, while community tourism leaders will most probably not, due to lack of internet access, appropriate levels of literacy and need. Consumers of travel products may read the travel pages in the Sunday newspapers, such as the Guardian and Observer, which have a middle-class readership, buy guide books and access travel company websites. Particularly concerned consumers may buy ethical and ‘green’ travel guides and read travel company web pages on responsible tourism policies. National sources, especially those written in Spanish, are less accessible to international audiences, but are available to Peruvians who have access to the internet and national press, which most community members I encountered did not.

**Homestay tourism projects**

I initially set out to study the homestay tourism projects on the islands of Taquile and Amantaní on Lake Titicaca, which I visited during my first period of fieldwork in January 2005 and participated in packaged tours and homestays on both islands. Homestay tourism appeared on these islands in the mid-1970s and early 1980s in response to visits by backpackers looking for ‘authentic’, ‘off the beaten track’ destinations. Tourism began on Taquile in 1976, after the publication of a brief account recommending Taquile to independent travellers in a popular traveller’s guide (Zorn 2004) and the neighbouring island of Amantaní started to receive visitors in the early 1980s (Gascón 2005). Homestay tourism on Taquile started off as giving tourists the key to a room in an outlying house and progressed to becoming a model for community-led, homestay tourism, with a community travel agency, accommodation with local families, local guides and cultural programmes for tourists.

---

53 Interview with Miranda Toledo, Tourism and Protected Areas Specialist, Mountain Foundation, Huaraz
I found that both were the subject of extensive studies of homestay tourism, Taquile had been the focus of long term anthropological study for over 30 years by Elayne Zorn (2004; 2007; 2007), and homestay tourism and socio-economic differentiation were studied on Amantaní by Jorge Gascón (2005). From this first trip, I decided to draw on the experiences of and literature on homestay tourism of these islands as points of reference to other, more recently established projects. I did this because these islands had already been well studied and were regarded as ‘models’ of community-based tourism, to the extent to which they are used as ‘training grounds’ for newer tourism projects. Members of the projects I studied had visited these islands to learn about homestay tourism. They also lie at the heart of debates in Peru on sustainability and the tourism life cycle and authenticity and were referred to in interviews when actors talked about these issues. I also wanted to extend the study of homestay tourism to other regions and communities.

In addition, I thought the points of comparison of newer and well-established sites might prove to be beneficial in studying the discourses of sustainability in homestay tourism, within Butler’s (1980) destination life-cycle model. Within this schema, the natural environment, and cultural authenticity, exemplified in friendly tourist/host relation are conceptualised as deteriorating over time, and with increasing numbers of mass tourists, as opposed to responsible, tourists, who are thought to be more culturally aware and sensitive. Zorn’s (2007; 2007) recent observations of tourism on Taquile are that the community is losing control of tourism to external travel agents and guides and the island has become the site of what she calls ‘mass day tourism’ (Zorn and Farthing 2007: 681), which is less profitable than tourists staying over night.

The three sites of Amistad, Bienvenido and Encuentro had been recently established as providers of homestay tourism at the time of field work in 2005.

---

54 These are pseudonyms, according to the agreed conditions of anonymity. I have chosen names in Spanish that reflect relations of friendly contact: Amistad, means friendship, Bienvenido, welcome and Encuentro means meeting.
Amistad had been in operation for 3 years, Bienvenido for 5 and Encuentro for 7 years. As the research progressed, I discovered that this temporal context meant that they were ideally placed to study the structures and processes of professionalisation involved in the creation of homestay tourism. That is, consultants and state agents were still involved in the cycle of project development.

Another advantage of choosing these sites was that the three communities in this study were geographically located in Peru's Andean region (rather than, for example, the coastal or Amazon regions which have other cultural influences). This opened up opportunities to study the processes at play in the commodification of indigenous culture as part of a specifically Andean, Incan (and pre-Incan) heritage. Although all the sites studied had diverse pre-Inca roots and specific cultural practices (for example, there were marked differences in dress), all were formerly part of the Inca Empire and all shared a common Andean culture: Amistad included tours of pre-Inca ruins, and the nearby Inca Road project specifically aims to revive and rebuild Inca heritage in the form of a tourism product; Bienvenido was established next to an Inca archaeological site; and Encuentro traded on its Andean cultural practices.

**Geographical situations of sites and funding models**

The sites studied each have a specific relation to sites of mass tourism. What is more, they each reflect different models of tourism development, set within the parameters of the neo-liberal agenda of hybrid state, third sector (NGO) and private funding. By tracing each site to their funders, the contingencies of the philosophy of development are revealed. The process of tracing projects' approaches to development through funding flows also reveals the personal, embodied web of contacts and power (Crush 1995) that lead to funding and project enactment. Connections are often deeply embedded in the histories of the particular sites, and the policy and wider institutional frameworks influencing regional development. The following will outline each site's geographical
location and genealogy of funding. The following map (3:1) shows the geographical locations of the sites studied.

Map 3:1 Sites of responsible, homestay tourism in Peru

Amistad

The town of Huaraz receives high numbers of international trekkers and mountaineers in the dry season, which is May to September, and national tourists during the Easter festivals and July for the festival of the town's patron saint. Foreigners started to visit Huaraz and its surrounding mountains in the 1950s to climb in the Huascaran range (now a National Park and an UNESCO World Heritage Site) and international tourism revolves around trekking and climbing. The recent climbing documentary film, recounting Joe Simpson's (a now famous British climber) near-death adventure on the mountain Siula Grande in the neighbouring Cordillera Huayhuash range has also added to this
area’s popularity. Certainly, ‘Touching the Void’ (Macdonald 2003) is played regularly at the local cinema. Both international and national tourists make day trips to the Llanganuco Lakes, making areas also sites of mass day tourism.

The Mountain Foundation, the NGO that instigated the homestay tourism project in Amistad, is particularly interested in reviving pride in indigenous culture. This can be seen as a rejection of what workers from this NGO view as the harm done by a US and Peruvian agricultural university experiment in the early 1950s, within the post-war modernisation and development paradigm of the ‘Green Revolution’. This project introduced new ‘improved’ strains of potatoes, the use of chemical fertilisers and pesticides to commercialise agriculture, funded by providing micro-credit to farmers, which then was funded by the profits from increased yields. After initial successes, where potato yields grew and provided profitable commercial crops, the new strains of potatoes failed to survive new diseases, and by 1970 commercial potato production failed because of disease and the decline in soil quality. Peruvian government extension workers were expelled from the community in 1973-4. It is in this context of the failure of technology-based, ‘modernisation’ approaches to development that sustainable development approaches have emerged. The Mountain Foundation’s approach of reviving traditional culture and pride in traditional culture can be interpreted as an attempt to make amends for the failures of past development paradigms and projects. The NGO’s director was educated at the same US University that conducted the experiment, and funding comes from one of the former members of the experiment’s team.

Amistad was funded by a US-based NGO, which gained funding from USAID, and then the Dutch government for a community museum. The Dutch Embassy funded the museum at Amistad because of a connection with Dutch interns working for the Mountain Foundation at Huaraz. Travel agents also became involved in supporting the development of homestay tourism, both as income-

---

55 See 3:1 anonymised sources, p. 4.
generating businesses and as development projects. For example, Winding Roads travel agency is involved with Amistad, establishing a hostel and educational centre in Huaraz which is managed by Amistad community members.

**Bienvenido and Encuentro**

Bienvenido and Encuentro are near to centres of mass tourism: Cusco and Machu Picchu are undoubtedly the top tourist destinations in Peru: about 98% of visitors to Peru visit Machu Picchu\(^56\). Puno, on Lake Titicaca, and the islands of the Urus, Taquile and Amantaní, form part of a popular circuit which goes to/from Lima-Cusco-Puno-Arequipa-Nazca-Lima. They are also on an overland route to/from La Paz in Bolivia to Lima (and beyond to Ecuador).

Therefore, the rationale behind either NGO or community initiation of homestay tourism projects lies within the theoretical framework of ‘trickle down’ economic development. According to theories of ‘trickle down’ economic growth, the benefits from a core economic activity (in this case, centres of mass tourism) emanate out to the periphery of economy (in this case, people might migrate to tourist centres to work in this sector.) These homestay projects are created near to sites of mass tourism, and along already established tourist circuits. The idea is that the economic benefits of mass tourism will spread out from centres to these communities. This reflects national and regional tourism development plans of developing circuits between tourist centres and networks between them. Homestay tourism also provides an alternative to mass tourism, which for many tourists contributes to an added value to an otherwise conventional tour. Tourists are offered the opportunity of staying with a family for a night or two without ‘missing out’ on seeing in the major sights or doing the ‘classic’ treks.

Bienvenido was funded by the Peruvian State agencies FONCODES (Fondo de Cooperación para el Desarrollo Social, Social Development Fund) and MIMDES (Ministerio de la Mujer y Desarrollo Social, Women's and Social Development Ministry) and the Regional development agency Corredor Cusco-Puno, as well as through investment by the families involved in the tourism project. The Peruvian Women's Ministry funding focused on its agenda to develop women's leadership and training, which explains why the leadership of this project was female. When contextualised in critiques of previous development projects which primarily focused on male heads of households, this project's focus on female leadership can be interpreted as seeking to counter-balance this focus. Travel agents were also involved in consultancy and training at Bienvenido.

Encuentro was funded by an individual indigenous leader/entrepreneur, who used his contacts with regional state agencies and international development agencies to gain funding for community development projects. Two examples of this are its water sanitation scheme, funded by the Italian government and a library which was built by All Paths Travel agency. Also, he forged an alliance with a major Peruvian travel agent to develop adventure and homestay tourism.

The following table, Table 3:1 provides a summary of site descriptions.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Geographic location (and reason for visitors)</th>
<th>No. of visitors 2005 (or nearest available data)</th>
<th>Increase in visitors</th>
<th>No. of visitors to home stay site 2005</th>
<th>Increase in visitors</th>
<th>No. of families in project</th>
<th>Charge per person per night</th>
<th>Length of stay</th>
<th>Year started and length of project in 2005</th>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Funding</th>
<th>Other actors</th>
<th>Other sites studied in area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Near town of Huaraz and Huascarán National Park (UNESCO World Heritage Site) Trekking and mountaineering in the Andes</td>
<td>2005: 119,342 international and national visitors to Huascarán National Park</td>
<td>2004: 109,302 international and national visitors to Huascarán National Park</td>
<td>2005: 45 visitors</td>
<td>2008: 163 visitors</td>
<td>2-4 visits per family</td>
<td>SIS 25, including all meals, guided tours and cultural activities</td>
<td>1-2 nights, 2-3 days</td>
<td>Started in 2001, 4 years</td>
<td>NGO-led</td>
<td>Northern State funded</td>
<td>Northern Responsible Travel agency and tourists</td>
<td>Inca Road, an alternative trekking route in Ancash, opened by the Mountain Foundation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Source: Interviews with project participants.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Geographic location (and reason for visitors)</th>
<th>No. of visitors 2005 (or nearest available data)</th>
<th>Increase in visitors</th>
<th>No. of visitors to home stay site 2005</th>
<th>Increase in visitors</th>
<th>No. of families in project</th>
<th>Charge per person per night</th>
<th>Length of stay</th>
<th>Year started and length of project in 2005</th>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Funding</th>
<th>Other actors</th>
<th>Other sites studied in area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Between the major tourist centres of Cuzco and Puno</td>
<td>2004 546,928 national &amp; international visitors to Cuzco&lt;sup&gt;61&lt;/sup&gt; 2005 679,953 International and national visitors to Machu Picchu&lt;sup&gt;62&lt;/sup&gt; 2005 32,899 International and national visitors to archaeological site&lt;sup&gt;63&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>2086 691,623 2007 737,766&lt;sup&gt;4&lt;/sup&gt; International and national visitors to Machu Picchu&lt;sup&gt;62&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>2 visits per family  10-15 visitors per group</td>
<td>2 visits per family  2-4 visitors per group</td>
<td>13 families offering accommodation and meals, guided tours, pottery demonstrations  Musicians are sometimes employed for dances</td>
<td>USD15 including all meals, guided tours and cultural activities</td>
<td>1 night, 2 days</td>
<td>Started in 2000, 5 years</td>
<td>Community-led</td>
<td>Peruvian State funded and self funded</td>
<td>Northern and Peruvian Responsible Travel agencies and tourists</td>
<td>Alternative Routes in the Sacred Valley Project, a project developing alternative trekking&lt;sup&gt;64&lt;/sup&gt; routes in the Sacred Valley, Cusco, sponsored by Swissaid/Japanaid Cusco Centre for Andean Studies sponsored Lares trek, an alternative to the Inca Trail, near Cusco</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

<sup>62</sup> (Mincetur 2007)  
<sup>63</sup> (Mincetur 2005)  
<sup>64</sup> There is a limit of 500 people per day on the world famous Inca Trail (BBC 2000). Travel Agencies are developing alternative trekking routes so that tourists who do not have a place on the Inca Trail can be offered a trek nearby. This also follows in the idea of spreading the economic benefits of tourism out from the tourist centres.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Geographic location (and reason for visitors)</th>
<th>No. of visitors 2005 (or nearest available data)</th>
<th>Increase in visitors</th>
<th>No. of visitors to home stay site 2005</th>
<th>Increase in visitors</th>
<th>No. of families in project</th>
<th>Charge per person per night</th>
<th>Length of stay</th>
<th>Year started and length of project in 2005</th>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Funding</th>
<th>Other actors</th>
<th>Other sites studied in area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Near the major tourist centres of Puno, Lake Titicaca and the islands of Urus, Taquile and Amantaní.</td>
<td>125,000 visitors to the Urus, Taquile and Amantaní islands Jan-Oct 2005</td>
<td>125,000 visitors to the Urus, Taquile and Amantaní islands Jan-Oct 2005</td>
<td>1581 visitors from Jan-Nov 1998-2005</td>
<td>70 (approx) visitors per family in 2005</td>
<td>5 families who provide accommodation</td>
<td>$US15 incl all meals, guided tour and 'rituals'</td>
<td>1-3 nights, 2-4 days</td>
<td>Started in 1997, 8 years</td>
<td>Led by one community leader</td>
<td>Peruvian and Northern State funded and self funded</td>
<td>Taquile and Amantaní</td>
<td>Another island on Lake Titicaca</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{a}\) Regional Director of Tourism in Puno, Gamaliel de Amat (T. News Bolivia 2005 in Zorn and Ypeij 2007).

\(^{b}\) Regional Director of Tourism in Puno, Gamaliel de Amat (T. News Bolivia 2005 in Zorn and Ypeij 2007).

\(^{c}\) (Zorn and Ypeij 2007: 123) (Zorn, 2007 #27: 123), approx = approximate and est = estimate

\(^{d}\) (Mincetur 2007)

\(^{e}\) (Mincetur 2007)
Notes on data and categories

1. Sites have been made anonymous by giving them the names: Amistad, Bienvenido and Encuentro.

2. Geographic location (and reason for visitors). Each site is near a tourist centre with high tourist numbers.

3. Number of visitors to the region and/or tourist centre in 2005 (or nearest available data) (2005 was the year fieldwork was conducted)

4. Increase in visitors to the region and/or tourist centre

5. Number of visitors to the homestay site in 2005

6. Increase in visitors

7. Number of visitors per family

Columns 4, 5 and 6 show increases in visitor numbers to mass sites, and also for all the homestay sites.

Column 7 shows how visitors are distributed between families. All sites used a ‘turn’ or ‘rotation’ system of sharing tourists between families.

8. Number of families in the homestay tourist project/business in 2005

It should be noted that the data for mass sites was taken from different official sources and it can only be as accurate as those sources. I have used the data available to piece together a picture of visitor numbers. Data for visitor numbers at homestay sites was taken from interviews with project participants. In the case of Encuentro, the project leader had kept written records of visitor numbers, but in the other two sites there was no centralized source of information. Therefore, these numbers are approximate and discrepancies are inevitable.

9. Charge per person per night

10. Length of stay

11. Year started and length of the project/business in 2005

12. Model: NGO-led, state-agency-led, travel agency-led, community-led. This describes the predominant initiator of the project/business. However, projects/businesses may be involved with a range of funding agencies and actors. These alliances may change over time.
Principle funding agency: There may be multiple funding agencies and these may change over time.

Other actors

Other nearby sites studied in the area, but not in the same depth as the sites focused on in this thesis: Inca Road, an alternative trekking route in Ancash, opened by the Mountain Foundation; Alternative Routes in the Sacred Valley Project, a project developing alternative trekking routes in the Sacred Valley, Cusco, sponsored by Swissaid/Japanaid; Cusco Centre for Andean Studies sponsored Lares trek, an alternative to the Inca Trail, near Cusco.

Actors

Because of the multi-scaled structure of tourism, I interviewed a wide range of actors from across different geographical and institutional scales, international, national and local. I interviewed representatives from: international development agencies working in Peru, state agencies; NGOs (both international and national); travel agents (international and national); indigenous tourism association leaders, both male and female; and also homestay tourists. See appendix 5 of a full list of actors, which have been anonymised.

Illustration 3:1 Dividing and grouping actors
The dividing up of actors is somewhat problematic because their roles overlap and merge, as Selwyn (1996: 9) notes:

The triad of tourist/local/observer is clearly no simple one, for the roles may be exchanged. Local residents of tourist destinations and observers may become tourists, tourist observers and so on. Post-modernity is certainly dissolving visa controls between these terms.

For example, the director of an NGO may self-identify as an indigenous woman or a community leader may be seen by others as an entrepreneur, working to a greater or lesser extent in his community’s and/or his own interests (one such individual is labelled a ‘shark’ by certain NGO consultants). Scales can be multiple: NGOs can be at once international, national and local. Travel agents, even if they are ‘locally’ based, for example, in Cusco, work with international or national companies and international tourists. It should also be noted that NGO, travel agents and ministers of tourism can themselves take on the role of tourist in their professional capacities (for example, trying out a new tourism product or giving advice from the point of view of a tourist during a consultancy) or be tourists in their leisure time, and thus form opinions based on their personal experiences.

Despite the blurring of boundaries, power is unevenly distributed across these different groups. NGOs have the power to choose which communities and which members of a community to fund and work with. Community leaders have the power to include, or exclude, other community members; inclusion often follows family ties, causing conflict between those in, and those out of, the ‘project’. It is important to note that indigenous community leaders can be seen to constitute an elite74 as they are often richer than other community members and have access to more or better land, employment, educational and political opportunities. They therefore find it easier to access NGO, state or travel agency funded tourism development projects. Consequently, their views are not

74 (Abercrombie 1998; Harris 2000; Mayer 2002; Zorn 2004; Gascón 2005)
intended to be seen as representative of ‘the community’ as a whole, even though the term, ‘community’ might give the (false) impression of a homogenous, and harmonious whole. Tourists have the power to demand certain tourist products, thus ‘homestay’ packages are produced to fulfil this perceived demand.

However, despite tourists’ role in the formation of homestay tourism and although I interviewed homestay tourists, I have not included material from these interviews in this thesis. I have chosen to do this for two main reasons. Firstly, there are issues surrounding the extent to which the tourists I interviewed were representative of homestay tourists more generally. The tourists I interviewed were North American university students from the same university and all in their early twenties. They were all studying tourism and were travelling as a group on an educational tour of Peru, which had been tailor-made to allow them to experience different kinds of tourism in Peru, and to discuss and reflect on these experiences. For example, the tour company had organised a meeting with one of the tourism ministers in Lima and discussions with community leaders at Amistad (where they did a homestay, and on which I accompanied them). They also had to write a reflective journal on their experiences, which would be assessed for credit at their university. This group was therefore especially well prepared and versed in the issues surrounding sustainable and responsible tourism. This may have made them less representative than other tourists visiting homestays. I had intended to interview more tourists at Amistad, Bienvenido and Encuentro, and although I tried to organise my visits to these communities to coincide with visits from groups of tourists, I discovered that these sites had low tourist numbers and highly intermittent visits. This lack and infrequency of tourist visits meant that I was not able to interview any other international tourists apart from the group of North Americans. I visited Bienvenido with a group of Peruvian tourism experts who were participating in a state-funded study visit. I did not interview them because they were domestic, as opposed to international, tourists, and moreover, the purpose of their visit was educational, rather than specifically for
tourism. As with the group of tourists at Amistad, I am not convinced at the extent to which they are representative of domestic homestay tourists.

Secondly, an established trend in geographical tourism scholarship is the focus on tourists’ experiences, representations and perceptions. As the thesis progressed, I realised I wanted to redress this imbalance by focusing on actors within the industry and on communities. While not discounting the importance of tourists’ experiences, views and demands in forming homestay tourism, I have instead focused on representing communities’ perceptions of and reactions to tourists’ demands. This focus is also due to length constraints, in that to have included tourists’ views directly in the form of interview data would have either considerably lengthened the existing empirical chapters, or would have led to the creation of a further empirical chapter.

Dividing community tourism leaders along gender lines may not be entirely appropriate to the Andean context, where gender roles are viewed as being complementary (Fuller 2002), rather than in conflict. The gender of community leaders is significant, however, in who I could talk to and their command of Spanish. Leaders tended to be male, and with a better command of Spanish, than their wives. However, I interviewed female leaders at Bienvenido and also at Amistad who had good Spanish.

3:4 Ethical issues and methods during fieldwork

This section will address the principle methods employed during fieldwork, describe the times and duration of fieldwork and will discuss the major ethical issues arising from my positionality in relation to those I researched.

**Times and duration of fieldwork**

I spent an initial period of fieldwork in Peru in January 2005, when I stayed for 4 weeks. I made contacts with NGOs and travel agents, conducted preliminary interviews with 3 key actors and visited libraries and bookshops to collect material on themes related to the thesis. I participated in a conference organized by the Red de Turismo Sostenible ‘KUSKALLA’ (The ‘KUSKALLA’ Sustainable Tourism Network): Turismo Sostenible: Funciona y es Negocio (Sustainable Tourism: It works and it is a Business) in Cusco. I also visited Cusco and the Sacred Valley where I participated in and observed mass tourism, and the islands of Taquile and Amantaní, where I experienced homestay tourism on a package tour of 3 days. The data I collected and subsequently analysed and the observations I made during this trip lead me to refine my research questions and the focus of the thesis.

I spent the second and main period of fieldwork in Peru from September to mid-December 2005. I also spent the month of August travelling in Northern Peru and trekking in the mountains near Huaraz prior to starting the actual fieldwork. This enabled me to establish an idea of the kinds of tourism available in the Northern region of Peru, and specifically near Huaraz. I also gained some contacts for my fieldwork during this time. I then spent 6 weeks from the beginning of September to mid-October in 2005 in Huaraz. I conducted interviews with a range of actors there and visited Amistad to experience homestay tourism with a group of tourists. The homestay package I participated in lasted 3 days and 4 nights, and activities also included meetings with community leaders in Huaraz. I visited the community individually on another two occasions to conduct interviews and I also interviewed community leaders in Huaraz. Moreover, I participated in the Mountain Foundation’s Inca Road project as an ‘experimental tourist’, trying out and providing feedback on, their recently established trekking route which included communities on a section of the Inca Road near Huaraz.
After this, I spent two weeks in Lima, from mid-to the end of October, gaining access to key actors and conducting interviews at Mincetur and Promperú.

Next, I spent a 6 weeks from the beginning of November to mid-December in Cusco, interviewing a range of actors. From Cusco I visited Bienvenido as a homestay tourist with a group of Peruvian tourism experts who were visiting on a state funded study visit (this lasted 2 days and 1 night), where I also conducted interviews with community members. I visited the community individually on a further occasion to conduct more interviews. From Cusco I visited Puno and Encuentro, interviewing actors there. Unfortunately, there was no group of tourists at the time I visited Encuentro (for 3 days and 2 nights), so I was not able to experience a complete homestay package, but I interviewed the community tourism leader and some of the community involved with homestay tourism. The data I collected and analysed during this period of fieldwork makes up the main body of this thesis. I spent a final week in Lima, collecting information at the ministries and from travel agents.

Positionality

Undertaking fieldwork in other cultures brings with it the recognition of the discipline of geography’s colonial legacy of exploration and investigation in order to subjugate other territories and cultures (Stoddart 1986; Driver 2001). The challenge and responsibility for today’s researcher is to acknowledge this history and to attempt to carry out fieldwork in ethical ways. As Smith (2003) points out, working in other cultures and languages requires sensitivity to ‘different’ cultures. She argues that researcher’s have an obligation to break with imperial paradigms of regarding ‘other’ cultures as distinct from our assumed norms, often taking an Orientalist stance (Said [2003] 1978) in seeing those studied as exotic and primitive. One of the principle ethical challenges in postcolonial settings is the unequal relationships between Western researchers and non-elite communities. While Smith (2003) and Rose (1997) note that the researcher cannot guess which parts of their identity a participant might find significant,
reflecting on the possible implications of our own position in relation to participants, and its potential impact on the research is important. As Herod (1999: 320) comments ‘(...) it is apparent that the positionality of the researcher can shift depending upon a number of considerations, in the process disrupting the supposedly stable dualism of “insider”/“outsider”.’

In this research, the most salient aspect of my positionality was my shifting insider/outsider status among the diverse groups of actors I researched. To the consultants and travel agents, I could be constructed as both an ‘insider’, in that we shared similar levels of education and comparable academic knowledge on theories of tourism, development, culture and sustainability. I was also an ‘outsider’ in that I did not share their grounded knowledge and experiences of the ways in which these issues played out in the projects and communities they were involved with. My position as a tourist, who participated in and experienced their homestay tourism packages and, on their requests, gave feedback on these products, made me both insider and outsider, and expert like themselves (see chapter 2 and 6 on the tourist as expert and auditor) and also a consumer. For communities I was a tourist and researcher/consultant, all positions they were familiar with. The ethical questions for me were how to negotiate these fluctuating roles and how to make clear my position to these groups of actors. For example, I communicated to community leaders that as a tourist I could advise them on their product, if they asked, but that I as a researcher the photographs I took, interviews I recorded and notes I took would be used for research purposes. On reflection, these research purposes evolved with the analysis and the writing of the thesis. Although I could provide the immediate feedback on homestay products’ quality requested of me by both NGO consultants and community leaders, explaining the purpose of the research at the time was more problematic. When the thesis is complete I will send electronic copies, together with a policy-oriented report to the NGOs involved in this research, in order to provide feedback on the wider structural implications of this study. The issues of language, informed consent and anonymity became particularly significant in this research, which are explored in the next sections.
Informed consent

As Skelton (2001) notes, informed consent involves giving actors the genuine choice to participate in the research process or not and also giving them sufficient information to allow them to make an informed decision. Before conducting an interview I explained the purpose of my research and asked if I could conduct an interview, making it clear that participants could refuse to be interviewed. I also asked if I could record the interview, and also explained that participants could refuse to be recorded (which some did). I explained that I would not identify them in my research. I also asked for consent on whether or not I could take photographs, explaining that they might be published. I have only included photographs where people consented to being photographed. Also, having changed the names of the homestay projects makes identification less likely. However, my positionality raises ethical issues over informed consent. I started the research from the perspective of accepting the assumptions of responsible, homestay tourism promoting sustainable development and cultural preservation, as undeconstructed ‘goods’. During interviews I was mostly positive and friendly, although I did challenge some ideas. I think the people I interviewed regarded me as a ‘friend’, someone who sympathised and supported their work, which I mostly did. They also regarded me as an ‘expert’, I was an ‘experimental tourist’ on two occasions, which means I took part in newly set up tourist packages and gave my feedback (these were the Inca Road, an alternative trekking route in Ancash, opened by the Mountain Foundation and the Cusco Centre for Andean Studies sponsored Lares trek, an alternative to the Inca Trail, near Cusco). I could not predict that my writing would be so critical of this kind of tourism, and I am sure their ‘informed consent’ did not extend to criticism. Therefore, I have anonymised sites, organisations and people. I am critical of discourses, not of individuals, who act out of good intentions, and are often self reflexive and critical themselves.
Anonymity

Due to ethical concerns I do not name the organisations, sites or actors involved in this research. Instead I have given them Spanish pseudonyms. The decision to make organisations, sites and actors anonymous is because the focus of this study is to critically analyse responsible tourism through its representations and material impacts, rather than to criticise the way individual organisations and actors work. I also stated to actors that I would make them anonymous, although they did not request this. I am anxious that criticism of general discourses might be interpreted as criticism of the management of individual projects. I am concerned with deconstructing the discourses and practices of responsible, homestay tourism, which are taken for granted as assumed ‘goods’, rather than the actions of individuals or individual organisations. However, I do name the sites of Taquile and Amantaní because they are well established and receive high numbers of visitors. I feel any perceived criticism on my part should not affect these sites adversely. Also, they are not part of my primary data set, although I use them as points of reference, and I visited the islands as part of my preliminary fieldwork.

It should be noted that actors may be aware of some of the issues raised in this thesis to varying degrees. Some may be more reflexive than others and some may ‘believe’ in the claims of responsible tourism more or less than others. Critical perspectives were sometimes explored in the course of interviews and informal conversations. However, the success of development projects in general, and those connected with the tourism business in particular, rely on projecting a positive image to attract funding, travel agents and tourists. NGOs need ‘successful’ projects to perpetuate successful bids for funding in the international and national arenas. It is not my intention that this thesis, and its connected conference papers and articles, be (mis) interpreted as labelling individual projects and products as being badly managed, which may have the unintended consequence of jeopardizing funding and tourist flows. My intention is certainly
not to create the impression that an individual project or company is ‘bad’, thereby directing potential consumers to others that are constructed on similar assumptions and structures.

**Semi-structured interviews**

Interviews can be described as being on scale from structured to semi-structured and unstructured (Dunn 2000; Fontana and Frey 2000). Interviews with all actors were conducted in a semi-structured, rather than structured or totally unstructured formats using questions to prompt ideas but following the flow of the interviewees’ responses. As Dunn (2000: 52) explains: ‘This form of interviewing has some degree of predetermined order but still ensures flexibility in the way issues are addressed by the informant.’ Semi-structured interviews allowed actors to raise issues that were important to them, and perhaps not covered in my list of themes and questions (see appendix 6). Longhurst (2003: 117) describes the processes involved in semi-structured interviews as follows: ‘Although the interviewer prepares a list of predetermined questions, semi-structured interviews unfold in a conversational manner offering participants the chance to explore issues they feel are important.’ I used a list of themes and questions in order to prompt a discussion of key topics to my research and to ensure these topics were addressed by all actors. As Lindsey (1997: 58) notes: ‘The interactive nature of qualitative interviewing means that interviewing is itself part of the learning process for the researcher’. This allowed for learning about the ways in which different actors approached the themes and I ensured that, as I conducted more interviews with more actors, that I included themes raised in initial interviews. In this way, interviews were both guided by the actors interviewed and also standardised across actors. The questions vary slightly between actors grouped as NGOs and travel agents, communities and tourists, reflecting their different positions, experiences and the language they used. I also recorded the interviews using a digital recorder, in order to capture actors’ responses word for word. This also allowed me to focus on the flow of the
interview (Valentine 1997). However, I made notes during the interview and reviewed them towards the end to ensure I had not missed or misunderstood any points.

I formed my initial questions through reviewing the theoretical literature and my first period of fieldwork. In accordance with Grounded Theory’s call for the ‘simultaneous involvement in data collection and analysis’ (Charmaz, 2006: 5), I found that as I started data collection in the field, new issues emerged and my focus changed. An example of a change in emphasis can be seen in an initial question on authenticity: How do different actors envisage an ‘authentic’ experience? This question is refined into questions about the ‘loss’ and ‘revival’ of indigenous culture, because this is how, particularly development and tourism professionals, were talking about ‘authenticity’. I therefore fed these terms into subsequent interviews.

As I spent time with the various actors involved with the tourism projects, I would socialise with them, go to their offices, and go on trips with them as an ‘experimental tourist’. I heard other stories that struck me as contradicting the popular representations of responsible, homestay tourism, most notably those focusing on community conflict, so I developed and incorporated questions about these issues in my interviews questions. My focus of analysis also shifted, for example, my initial question on sustainability came from the approaches to literature that were heavily influenced by Butler’s destination lifecycle model and the need to limit tourist numbers. However, I began to discover problems of lack of financial viability due to low tourist numbers and also communities’ desires for greater numbers of tourists. Therefore, I began include questions on these topics into my interviews. I kept to my battery of interview themes and questions, but was flexible in responding to what my respondents were saying and pursued lines of enquiry that opened up during the course of the interview, and wider research context, what people told me in phone conversations, or informally over coffee.
3:5  Limitations of research

Any research has its limitations and contains the possibilities of being carried out in entirely different ways, which would also raise other advantages and disadvantages. Here I reflect on the particular restrictions of the approaches I took and the alternative approaches I had considered. I focus on issues surrounding the language in which I conducted interviews during fieldwork and the implications of my choice of language on my access to certain actors. Then I look at issues of access to actors, particularly the limitations of depending on access to communities through gatekeepers. I also discuss the gains and potential losses of having presented multiple case-studies as opposed to a single case study. I then examine my choices of sources of promotional and press material.

Language

I am a fluent Spanish speaker, but as the fieldwork progressed it became apparent that I was learning the cadences and formalities of Peruvian Spanish and the formal niceties of approaching social situations. These proved to be central to contacting interviewees, establishing relationships with them and conducting interviews. I also learnt the particular language of responsible, homestay tourism, which, by the end of my second period of fieldwork I could operate better in Spanish than in English, so ‘valor agregado’ came to my mind more naturally than ‘value added’. I also realised, as I conducted interviews, it seemed to be enough to say a key word and immediately my respondent would seem to know what to say. This led me to begin to analyse my data in terms of discourses.

My high level of fluency in Spanish enabled me to access a wide range of actors, instead of limiting the research to elite English speakers (ministers of tourism, some NGO workers, travel agents and consultants) and most notably to tourists. I have found a bias in studies of tourism towards tourists’ experiences and perceptions and I suspect that one of the reasons for this is (Northern) researchers’ proficiency in English and lack of skills in other languages.
Conducting my research in Spanish meant that I could access all groups of actors, including NGO workers, travel agents and consultants and community leaders who could not speak English. I always approached actors in Spanish, and did not assume that they could, or should, speak English, although three interviewees preferred to speak to me in English. Moreover, my use of Spanish allowed me to make and establish contacts and relationships with actors directly and without the need for an interpreter. I could also appreciate informal conversations taking place between other actors outside of the boundaries of interviews, and this added to my knowledge of the research context. I could transcribe and analyse my data without the interface of translation which furthermore allowed me to get a feel for the nuances of the particular discourses by these actors.

Although my command of Spanish represents a strength in my research, relying solely on Spanish also limited my access to certain groups. A person’s proficiency in Spanish, as opposed to the predominant indigenous languages of Quechua and Aymara, reflects the power relations inherent in Peru’s postcolonial situation. While white, middle-class, urban elites (NGO consultants, travel agents) speak Spanish as a first language, those in rural communities, especially women, speak Spanish as a second language, with their mother-tongue being Quechua or Aymara. I also found that those with Spanish as a first language were more fluent in the theoretical and technical concepts of sustainability, responsibility and tourism. I compensated for these differences in the command of Spanish and the language of tourism by adapting the language used in my questions for non-community and community groups, using the terminology that they themselves were familiar with (see appendix 7 semi-structured interview questions). Some questions, however, such as asking community leaders about the relationship between homestay tourism and the revival of pride in indigenous culture seemed to sound strange to them. Their reactions made me begin to analyse the interview data from the point of view of contrasting consultants’ and communities’ discourses and agendas (see chapter 6).

Quechua is spoken in the Andean regions of Peru, and Aymara is more common in the Southern Andean region of Puno, which borders on Bolivia.
Other ways of dealing with differences in fluency in Spanish would have been to have learnt Quechua or Aymara myself. As this would have added another year or more onto the research project, and it would have produced uncertain results regarding my fluency in these languages, I decided against this option due to time and funding constraints. I could also have tried to employ a Quechua or Aymara speaking interpreter on my visits to communities, although none of my contacts presented this as a possibility to me. I did not pursue this possibility due to my wish to communicate as directly with actors as possible and also due to the need to be flexible in when I could visit communities. I had previously discovered that relying on third parties to accompany me on visits to communities was often unreliable.

**Gatekeepers and access**

Conducting my research in Spanish was one of the factors that had implications for who I was able to contact and communicate with within communities. Spanish limited my access to actors who were reasonably proficient in this language, who were more than often male community leaders. I also interviewed female community leaders who spoke Spanish. I compensated for the lack of proficiency in Spanish of other community members involved in ‘official’ homestay tourism projects by asking one of their family members to translate my questions for them into their native language. I realise that this was not ideal, in that it might have influenced their ability to speak openly about homestay tourism. While embracing the call of postcolonial approaches to embrace excluded voices, I recognise my bias towards the representation of elite groups within communities and do not assume that these groups speak for the community as a whole. I have also attempted to include conflicting views within communities, although I did not access rival groups. I would also argue that my research attempts to access and reflect community views where other studies of tourism have not.
In fact, my discovery of elites within communities led me to a major strand in my analysis, which was to think of responsible, homestay tourism in terms of ‘official’ and ‘unofficial’ discourses. That is, all actors are involved in reproducing ‘official’ discourses, while contradictions and dissent surface occasionally in the form of comments made to me and acts of sabotage by rival groups within communities. The idea of communities as socially and economically differentiated power structures, and that tourism contributes to existing uneven development and power relations, also became a major theme in the analysis of the empirical material (see chapter 6).

I accessed community groups through consultants who worked with official tourism associations and, therefore, approaching partially formed associations would have been much more difficult. I used gatekeepers to access communities for two reasons. One was because I was employing snowballing methods to access sites and actors, and this lead to a chain of contacts which resulted in access to certain, prominent tourism associations who had established links to funding agencies and travel agents. The other reason was that rival groups were not easily identifiable: communities are formed by geographically disparate households, making identification and contact more problematic. Issues of internal, sometimes violent, conflict (for example, some rival groups were suspected of acts of sabotage against ‘official’ tourism associations) as well as suspicion of outsiders also increased the barriers to contacting those outside tourism associations. I also had to consider issues of my personal safety, especially when visiting communities alone as a highly visible foreign woman. I avoided lone visits where possible, and stayed with families trusted by gatekeepers to minimise the risks to my personal safety. There were also ethical issues to consider, such as if I had contacted rival groups, this might have caused further conflict within the community. By this I mean that rival groups might have sought my support against other groups, which would have put me in an awkward position in relation to actors that had helped me gain access to communities.
Multiple case-studies vs a single case study

There are advantages and disadvantages of basing the research on three case studies of responsible, homestay tourism as opposed to the more usual approach of researching a single, more detailed, case study of one site. Following the method of snowballing, I pursued lines of enquiry that led me to more than one site of homestay tourism. I followed this methodological approach in the belief that I could arrive at a more representative analysis of responsible, homestay tourism in Peru if I studied more than one site of homestay tourism. I believed that if, by researching different sites, I arrived at similar findings, my results would be more reliable, and generalisable, to other situations in Peru. This would also provide a more robust foundation for any policy suggestions I proposed. That is, findings would be more likely to be attributable to the presence of homestay tourism within communities, rather than on specific, local conditions.

However, where I gained a more general, and generalisable, vision of homestay tourism in Peru, I also lost the potential for rich detail and analytical insights that focusing on one case study, perhaps through conducting a longer-term ethnographic study might have yielded. Instead, I have relied on existing long-term ethnographic studies of Peruvian communities to explain the reasons behind community power structures, dynamics and conflicts. I have also provided short histories of the sites’ involvement with development agencies and homestay tourism in order to convey some of the differences in individual contexts and cases. These histories attest to the often personal chains of contingencies that lead certain communities to have contacts with funding agencies and to benefit from opportunities to be involved in homestay tourism.

Sources of promotional and press material

About half of international tourists to Peru are from Latin American countries and Peru has also a domestic tourism market (Sariego López and García Santillán 2008) (see chapter 1). However, the other half of international arrivals are from
the higher spending world markets of the Western Europe and the US (UNWTO 2008), most notably, the US, the UK, Japan, France, Germany and Spain (Sariego López and García Santillán 2008) (see chapter 1). I chose to analyse discussions on sustainable and responsible tourism from Northern sources on the assumption that these markets offer greater potential gains from tourism than either Latin American or domestic markets, and are therefore prioritised in Peruvian plans for economic development through tourism. Moreover, it is these international markets that have been identified by Peruvian State agencies as seeking authentic experiences and niche products, of which responsible, homestay tourism is one (Sariego López and García Santillán 2008) (see chapter 1). What is more, my empirical work with communities indicated that homestay tourism providers preferred international to domestic tourists because they could charge them more for their services. Also, community tourism association members actively sought out alliances with Northern and Peruvian travel agencies whose clients were from the North (rather than Latin America) for the same reason.

I decided to concentrate on analysing Northern institutional sources because of their prominence in policy debates. I focus on UK/US English-language promotional and press material to examine the discourses contained in representations and discussions surrounding sustainability and responsibility in tourism (see chapter 4). I chose these geographical regions because of the predominance of tourists’ from these countries in Peru’s tourism markets. I subsequently found that the UK press and promotional materials lent themselves to a critical genealogical analysis that traced the imaginations on which concepts of responsibility and tourism are built to their historical and geographical foundations in British imperialism.

77 For example the UNWTO, United Nations World Tourism Organisation, is based in Madrid.
If I had analysed similar materials from separate Latin American sources and more specifically US (although some US sources are referred to), as well as Japanese, French, German and Spanish sources this would have opened up the lines of enquiry into the similarities and differences in representational discourses from distinct geographical sources. This is due to the fact that these markets represent very diverse cultures, based on different histories, geographies and economies which could influence the ways in which tourism and issues of sustainability and responsibility are discussed and represented in the promotional and press materials of these countries. These historical and geographical differences would also present the possibilities of tracing distinct genealogies, perhaps to a variety of colonial legacies. Spain has an earlier imperial period, and a direct colonial legacy in Peru and Latin America in contrast to the British, French and German imperial eras which were later and had a distinct geographical focus. Moreover, the US colonial legacy departs from that of its former coloniser, Britain. Japan, on the other hand, has a colonial past in its imperial expansion in Asia.

The extent to which representations from these diverse countries could be traced to colonial or entirely different roots could have contributed to a fascinating analysis of the reach of the colonial legacies on tourism imaginations. This approach could also have perhaps added to more nuanced understandings of tourism’s conceptualisations of authenticity, and more widely to understandings of multiple postcolonial perspectives. An analysis of Spanish material in particular would have presented an interesting case because of Spain’s direct colonial legacy and linguistic and cultural links with Peru. (Although this country represents the lowest numbers of international tourist arrivals). However, these lines of enquiry were not pursued in this thesis due to space constraints, the unity of the thesis and language problems. While perhaps gaining subtlety, the thesis’ arguments may also have become fragmented. There were also language issues to consider, in that, although I am fluent in English,
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Spanish and French and would be able to analyse sources in these languages without difficulty, I do not read German or Japanese to a high enough level to make an in-depth discourse analysis of sources in these languages feasible.

I did, however, purposefully include an analysis of Peruvian press and promotional materials (see chapter 5) in order to draw out the ways in which the dominant discourses of sustainability and responsibility from the demand-side are interpreted from the perspective of the supply-side of the equation.

3:6 Analysis: Coding and Atlas-ti

I left ‘the field’ with the challenges of having collected a lot of very rich, qualitative data. I also had quite strong feelings about the material and I felt the need to truly represent the voices of those who had given me their time. I needed to find a way of avoiding being swayed by my own feelings and opinions about my data. I therefore needed to organise my material, systematise it and find ways to dealing with it in a ‘more objective’ way. I needed to ‘let the data speak’ (Charmaz, 2006: 5) rather than select the most striking quotes because they supported my arguments. In order to take up these challenges, I transferred my interview transcripts into Atlas ti, which is a software package that is based on Grounded Theory and helps in the coding of qualitative data. This enabled me to ‘Construct codes and categories from data, not from preconceived logically deduced hypothesises’ (Charmaz, 2006: 5). I then coded my data along themes that had emerged from the interviews themselves. For example, when an interviewee talked about ‘culture’, I used the code ‘CUL’, when they specified ‘cultural authenticity’ I used the code ‘CULAUT’. (See appendix 6 for a full list of codes).

Atlas ti allows the researcher to code large amounts of data and then to ‘cut through’ it according to groups of actors and codes. It allowed me to compare what various actors said on various themes (codes) at the press of a computer
key. It helped me to engage more deeply with my data, to see points of agreement and contrast, and build up discourses of different groups of actors. This created a solid empirical basis on which to draw out my arguments, rather than the other way around. I used a less formal method of analysing the institutional and promotional literature, highlighting codes manually on paper versions of policy documents and travel agency websites.

As I was coding my data, I wrote ‘memos’ or comments on the data to develop my ideas and arguments. In many ways, this process started in my field diaries, and in the notes wrote while reviewing my interviews and other materials. I used memos to compare and contrast what different actors said about themes (codes). I used them to point out contradictions in arguments and gaps in what they were saying. Memo writing became a ‘step’ towards writing in a more ‘formal’ way.

3.7 Conclusions

The methodologies explored and the data produced by the methods discussed in this chapter will now be examined in the following empirical chapters, 4, 5 and 6.
Chapter 4  

Homestay tourism in international sustainable development discourses

4: 1  

Introduction

This chapter will critically examine the emergence of responsible tourism from the sustainable development discourses of the early 1990s. The ways in which sustainable development principles are constituted and deployed at the international level will be explored in order to represent the ‘demand-side’ of the responsible tourism equation. Views of sustainability and tourism from the ‘supply-side’ will be examined in subsequent chapters. The ‘demand-side’ includes both institutional bodies which fund and, therefore, influence the direction of tourism projects and consumer demands, reflected in, and formed by, commercial organisations which promote responsible tourism. This chapter has adopted a critical genealogical approach (Foucault [1969] 1972; Said [2003] 1978) in order to reveal the power relations that lie within sustainable development and tourism discourses. Power runs disproportionately from North to South, with Northern institutions funding homestay tourism projects and Northern travel agents sending tourists from predominantly Europe, North America, Australia, New Zealand and Japan.

The chapter is divided into two parts. The first creates a genealogy of responsible tourism and traces its institutional foundations in the land-mark Rio Earth Summit of 1992 and will discuss the emergence of auditing mechanisms. It will analyse international institutional policy documents from a series of major United Nations summits and declarations to reveal the linking of sustainable development discourses to market mechanisms. The second explores the constitution of responsible tourism in popular publications, including the UK travel press, guide books as well as the promotional materials of UK and US-based responsible travel agents, NGOs and campaign groups who advance responsible tourism. It situates responsible tourism in colonial imaginations of authenticity, class-based concerns over mass and niche travel and notions of sustainability as imposing limits on development.
Homestay tourism can be placed within a genealogy of sustainable tourisms which have emerged from the Rio Earth Summit of 1992. This landmark conference on sustainability formalised the principles which form the foundation of the current principles of homestay tourism. A series of groundbreaking agendas, discussed and agreed on by diverse stakeholders (principally NGOs and business groups) at key international conferences, from the Rio Earth Summit onwards, reveal the same sustainable development principles throughout different kinds of alternative tourism: sustainable, eco-tourism, community-based, homestay, ethical, responsible and Fair-Trade tourism. The following genealogy will explore the ways in which the sustainable development principles of limiting economic growth and concentration on small scale development became attached to market mechanisms at the Rio Earth Summit. This in effect privatised the environmental and cultural commons. It will analyse how diverse institutions, from the public and private sector, have been subsumed into privileging the market in conservation and cultural revival (Goldman 1998). It will also examine how indigenous people have been ‘mainstreamed’ into neo-liberal development and indigenous culture has been co-opted as resource through which to deliver development (Oliart 2004; Laurie et al. 2005: 472).

**Rio Earth Summit, 1992**

Tourism has been seen by international development agencies as offering the potential for development since the 1970s onwards, especially as international tourism increased rapidly between 1950 and 1970 (Harrison 2008). The World Bank was one of the first lending institutions to recognise tourism’s potential for poverty alleviation, providing finance for the development of infrastructure and credit for foreign investment in the 1970s (Harrison 2008). Concerns over the environmental and social impacts of particularly mass tourism were formally discussed at the Rio Earth Summit of 1992 and laid out in the Rio Declaration on...
the Environment and Development and in Agenda 21 which was adopted by the United Nations in 1999. This led international funding agencies to curb their funding of large-scale development projects to support tourism (Harrison 2008). Instead, funding bodies started to concentrate on small-scale, sustainable projects which focused on including local people in tourism businesses.

The Rio Declaration brought together concerns surrounding environmental preservation and poverty alleviation in the term sustainable development. However, economic growth, delivered through open international markets, was proposed as being compatible with these goals, and promoted through efforts to cement international legal frameworks and a global consensus on free markets. Goldman (2006) argues that it is this landmark summit that saw the mainstreaming of neo-liberal markets to deliver environmental protection and economic and social development. Principle 12 states that: ‘States should co-operate to promote a supportive and open international economic system that would lead to economic growth and sustainable development in all countries, to better address the problems of environmental degradation’ (UN 1992a).

Furthermore, Principle 22 of the Declaration highlights indigenous peoples’ and local communities’ perceived role as guardians of the environment because of their supposedly unique knowledge and ways of life. It calls on states to acknowledge indigenous peoples’ culture and integrate them in sustainable development processes:

Principle 22

Indigenous people and their communities and other local communities have a vital role in environmental management and development because of their knowledge and traditional practices. States should recognise and duly support their identity, culture and interests and enable their effective participation in the achievement of sustainable development.

(UN 1992a)
However, while this acknowledgement of indigenous people’s role in environmental protection seems sympathetic to the needs of indigenous people, critics see this statement as the co-option of indigenous knowledge into market-led development, and an invitation for often antagonistic state intervention (Oliart 2004; Laurie et al. 2005; Goldman 2006).

Agenda 21 stresses the need for international co-operation through partnerships with multiple actors, both state and non-governmental, and across multiple scales:

> International co-operation should support and supplement such national efforts. In this context, the United Nations system has a key role to play. Other international, regional and subregional organisations are also called upon to contribute to this effort. The broadest public participation and the active involvement of the non-governmental organisations and other groups should also be encouraged.

(UN 1992b)

The proposed delivery of sustainable development through a wide range of state and public actors in ‘a new global partnership for sustainable development’ (UN 1992b) advances neo-liberal hybrid models of public-private support for development agendas. The presence of multiple stakeholders from the public and private sectors at subsequent key conferences leads to what seems to be a global consensus on what constitutes sustainable tourism development. It is notable that, the declarations resulting from conferences after Rio echo the principles laid out there, and there is no record of opposing ideas within the publically available official sources.

Furthermore, with funding opportunities being opened up to small-scale projects and a wide range of NGOs and non-state actors, the principle of partnership has been criticised for co-opting, or excluding, groups critical of neo-liberal
development approaches (Mawdsley et al. 2002; Goldman 2006). The contingencies of acquiring funding for tourism initiatives, particularly in the state and NGO sectors, can be seen as one of the factors in the widespread dissemination of sustainable development principles throughout alternative tourism. The following sections will show how the principles established at Rio echo through subsequent world summits, and through a range of different ‘alternative’ tourisms (from eco-tourism to Fair-Trade tourism).

The World Eco-Tourism Summit and the Quebec Declaration, 2002

Specific principles for eco-tourism were agreed on in the Quebec Declaration at the World Eco-tourism Summit in 2002 which followed on from the Rio Summit. The Quebec Declaration was disseminated at the World Summit on Sustainable Development in Johannesburg (UN 2002) later in the same year. The Quebec summit was held as part of the UN International Year of Ecotourism, 2002, and was sponsored by the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) and the World Tourism Organization (WTO). The meeting included multiple actors from the public, private and non-governmental sectors, amounting to 1,000 representatives from 132 countries. Prior preparatory meetings had involved over 3,000 representatives from: ‘national and local governments including the tourism, environment and other administrations, private ecotourism businesses and their trade associations, non-governmental organisations, academic institutions and consultants, intergovernmental organisations, and indigenous and local communities’ (UNEP and WTO 2002). The Declaration claims to be: ‘the result of a multi-stakeholder dialogue, although it is not a negotiated document’ (UNEP and WTO 2002) and admits that smaller NGOs and representatives from some indigenous communities were not included in the process. The Declaration, therefore, makes claims for wide stakeholder participation in discussions, but is ambivalent about the extent of their participation in the final document. This ambiguity over stakeholder representation could suggest that if there were opposing views to those expressed in the Declaration, they were not included.
Moreover, the Declaration is embedded in the sustainable development principles of the Rio Summit, which suggests that its conceptual foundations were established prior to the Quebec Summit. Echoing the Rio principles, the Declaration is concerned with the negative environmental and social impacts of mainstream tourism and stresses the need for controls on tourism development. The following extract from the declaration defines eco-tourism in terms of established sustainable tourism principles, but claims to have refined these:

Recognize that eco-tourism embraces the principles of sustainable tourism, concerning the economic, social and environmental impacts of tourism. It also embraces the following specific principles which distinguish it from the wider concept of sustainable tourism:

- Contributes actively to the conservation of natural and cultural heritage,
- Includes local and indigenous communities in its planning, development and operation, and contributing to their well-being,
- Interprets the natural and cultural heritage of the destination to visitors,
- Lends itself better to independent travellers, as well as to organized tours for small size groups.

(UNEP and WTO 2002)

As can be seen in the above extract, the Declaration proposes that eco-tourism has the potential to preserve natural environments and cultural heritage through visitors’ demands to experience these. This conceptualisation of eco-tourism thus converts the environment and culture into commodified resources in a controlled market for more enlightened, educated visitors. The market is controlled by targeting independent travellers and small-sized groups and emphasising visitor education. It also insists on the integration of indigenous and local communities from planning to implementation of tourism projects, although this assumes indigenous groups’ support of eco-tourism.
Community-based, homestay tourism

Community-based tourism emerged in the 1970s (Mitchell and Muckosy 2008), and was established on the islands of Taquile (Zorn 2004) and on the neighbouring island of Amantaní (Gascón 2005) in the form of homestay tourism in the same period. However, the current ideological influences on community-based, homestay tourism come from the Rio Summit. So, while the ideals behind community-based tourism of the 1970s were based on communal ownership (Mitchell and Muckosy 2008), now the emphasis is on sectors of the community developing individually owned tourism enterprises. For example, the UNWTO’s ‘World Ecotourism Summit’s Final Report’ from the Quebec Summit, emphasises the need to encourage ‘individual entrepreneurship and community enterprise and employment opportunities for local people’ (UNWTO 2002: 97). Moreover, following the trend for hybrid public-private models of development funding, the delivery of community-based tourism is proposed through multi-stakeholder alliances of the public and private sectors.

Furthermore, indigenous people can be seen to be included in tourism development as cost-free guardians of the environment (Laurie et al. 2005), which reflects Rio’s shift to delivering sustainable development objectives through more overt market mechanisms (Goldman 1998; Goldman 2006). In community-based, homestay tourism market values are applied to previously non-commodified phenomena, the environment and culture. Tourists’ demands for these resources are proposed to create financial incentives for their preservation by indigenous people whose work in their conservation can be added-in to tourism development projects at no cost to funders (Laurie et al. 2005). The UNWTO’s ‘World Ecotourism Summit’s Final Report’ from the Quebec Summit, establishes a relationship between tourists’ demands for authentic experiences and the potential for communities to benefit economically and from
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the preservation of their culture, encouraging: ‘(...) community involvement in social and cultural programming, to provide direct economic and cultural benefits, and well as to enhance visitor experiences and authenticity’ (UNWTO 2002: 84). The report also calls on community involvement in tourism in order to be able to decide which aspects of traditional culture are valuable to communities and tourists, and thus which will be preserved, emphasising the need to: ‘Obtain community input about traditional and cultural activities of value (...) and to preserve critical elements of a culture.’ Communities are, therefore, integrated into market-based valuing of otherwise non-commodified resources.

**Ethical tourism**

The Global Code of Ethics for Tourism was proposed in a resolution of the UNWTO General Assembly meeting in Istanbul in 1997. The Code was developed and gained official status in 2001 as UN resolution A/RES/56/212 Global Code of Ethics for Tourism (WTO 2002). In common with previous international declarations, a multi-actor approach was taken in its development and dissemination whereby actors from the private sector, NGOs and labour organisations were consulted during its formation. It also built on existing declarations and industry codes which are embedded in the sustainable development paradigms of the Rio Summit and the Quebec Declaration. Its conceptualisation of cultural conservation through tourism is embedded in notions of tourism as destructive and degrading of authentic culture (MacCannell 1973; Butler 1980; MacCannell [1999] 1976). It takes a utilitarian approach to ethics, applying market notions of minimising losses and maximising profits to ways of delivering the ‘goods’ of environmental and cultural preservation and economic and social benefits to local people. This approach pragmatically accepts market integration through tourism, and its negative impacts, but proposes controls, limits and planning in order to restrain tourism development.
The Code consists of ten articles. Article 3 focuses on tourism as contributing to sustainable development by protecting the environment and ensuring sustainable economic growth. Following Hardin's (1968: 162) conceptualisation of environmental ‘carrying capacity’, it proposes that tourism stakeholders limit their activities in ecologically sensitive areas and respect the carrying capacity of sites (WTO 2001b). Limits are proposed to convey respect for the natural heritage and local people of sites. Article 4 conceptualises tourism as existing in a mutually beneficial relationship with cultural heritage, in that tourism uses heritage as a resource, which provides a reason for its conservation. It suggests the planning of tourism activities to encourage the survival of traditional cultural products, such as crafts and folklore, and in order to work against their deterioration and standardisation (WTO 2001a).

The Global Code of Ethics for Tourism (WTO 2002) does not propose ways of enforcing its approach to sustainable tourism development, other than encouraging public and private stakeholders to co-operate in their implementation and to refer to the UNWTO in cases of disputes over their interpretation. However, its principles form the basis for current developments of auditing systems for sustainable tourism, for example Fair-Trade tourism, which is discussed below.

**Responsible tourism**

Following the Code of Ethics for Tourism, which focused on stakeholders within the tourism industry, the UNWTO published Responsible Traveller and Tourist guidelines in 2005 (UNWTO 2005) which are addressed directly at tourists. These principles and rules are intended to guide tourists’ decisions and actions, and emphasise the importance of visitor education to promote the sustainable use of the natural environment and interactions with local people and cultures. Moreover, tourism is presented as a means of self-fulfilment and self education on the part of tourists. Bruner (1991) comments on popular representations of tourism in advertising materials as disseminating notions that travel is a life-
changing experience for tourists. These notions of travel as a transformative experience follow in a trajectory of imaginations of travel as spiritual quest (Urry [2002] 1990) and as part of elite education in the era of the eighteenth century Grand Tour (Turner and Ash 1975; Butcher 2003; Urry [2002] 1990). As the following quote from the UNWTO's Responsible Traveller and Tourist guidelines shows, responsible tourism is advanced as a means of personal realization and education:

Travel and tourism should be planned and practiced as a means of individual and collective fulfilment. When practiced with an open mind, it is an irreplaceable factor of self education, mutual tolerance and for learning about the legitimate differences between peoples and cultures and their diversity.

(UNWTO 2005)

Responsible tourism and tourists are placed within a line of imaginations of travel for a higher purpose, for spiritual fulfilment or as an elite, educational experience. Evoking this genealogy situates responsible tourism and tourists in a morally superior niche which can be set against mass tourism. Barnett et al. (2005) comment on the middle-class bias in ethical consumption and responsible tourism follows this slant: it is proposed as an exclusive product, which is limited to those who occupy suitable levels of education and cultural sensitivity.

Responsible tourists' desire for educational experiences, through approaching other cultures with an open attitude, is advanced as minimising tourists' potential to impact negatively on traditional cultures. Tourists are encouraged to respect cultural difference and diversity. Following local customs is suggested as enhancing the tourist experience, by setting the terms of interactions between tourists and locals as those of respectful friendships. Again, a utilitarian approach to ethics is employed, with both tourists and locals presented as benefitting from
mutually respectful interactions, as can be seen in the next extract from the UNWTO’s Responsible Traveller and Tourist guidelines:

Open your mind to other cultures and traditions – it will transform your experience, you will earn respect and be more readily welcomed by local people. Be tolerant and respect diversity – observe social and cultural traditions and practices.

(UNWTO 2005: 1)

Moreover, by making educated choices over consumption, tourists are presented as having the potential to contribute to local economic and social development, as illustrated in the UNWTO Responsible Traveller and Tourist guidelines:

Your trip can contribute to economic and social development. Purchase local handicrafts and products to support the local economy using the principles of fair trade. Bargaining for goods should reflect an understanding of a fair wage.

(UNWTO 2005: 1)

However, tourists are assumed to have the knowledge to decide the constitution of a fair price or wage, when they often have little knowledge of local economies. I argue that emphasising tourists’ knowledge and responsibility in decisions over the value of local goods and services reproduces unequal power relations between tourists and locals (Nash 1989). This focus on tourists’ responsibility over choices as a consumer reflects post-Fordist economic shifts, where power has moved from the producer to the consumer. Tourists are, therefore, empowered to facilitate economic and social development through paying what they believe to be a fair price.

Although the UN General Assembly recommended the dissemination of these guidelines, in the form of a letter and a brochure (both available on the UNWTO
website) to tourists worldwide, it is unclear how they were distributed. However, many more accessible sources, such as travel agents websites, brochures and the travel press reflect the spirit of these guidelines, as we shall see below. Moreover, the UNWTO, with the World Travel Market, an annual business to business event staged in London (WTM (World Travel Market) 2008) designated the 14 November World Responsible Tourism Day for the first time in 2007 (Goodwin 2007). This shows how the UNWTO works through the structures of the tourism industry to disseminate its principles and raise the profile of responsible tourism. This event also pinpoints the establishment of the term responsible tourism both within the formal structures of the tourism industry as an umbrella term for alternative tourisms.

**Auditing, global partnerships and Fair-Trade tourism**

Consumer demands for higher environmental and socially responsible standards came to the fore in the 1990s, with certification systems being developed for primary agricultural commodities, such as coffee, tea, chocolate and bananas (Honey and Stewart 2002). The concept of certification to ensure consumer confidence in the environmental sustainability and social responsibility of these agricultural products has spread to tourism. While responsible tourism principles have been discussed and agreed within UN institutions, in conjunction with stakeholders from the public and private spheres, systems for ensuring their implementation have emerged in different forms in diverse global contexts. These auditing systems reflect the basic principles set out in the UN Declarations, of promoting environmental and cultural preservation and economic and social development through responsible market mechanisms. For example, the Costa Rica Sustainability Programme Department of the Costa Rica Tourist Board and the Costa Rica National Accreditation Commission has developed its own state-led system of certification of eco-tourism products, CST (Certification for Sustainable Tourism) which grades service providers according to environmental and social standards (Costa Rican Tourism Institute 2009). The Rainforest Alliance, an international conservation NGO has developed a
Sustainable Tourism Certification Network of the Americas (Rainforest Alliance 2009), promoting the sharing of best practice in environmental and social management of small to medium-scale tourism enterprises. Currently, UK-based institutions are developing a ‘Fair Trade’ mark for tourism (Tourism Concern 2007). The creation and implementation of these certification systems are carried out through multi-stakeholder involvement from public, private and third sector organisations (Honey and Stewart 2002).

A Fair Trade tourism certification and labelling process is currently being discussed by Tourism Concern (a UK-based charity), the Fair Trade Labelling Organisation (FLO), an independent Fair Trade certification company, based in Germany (Tourism Concern 2007; FLO-CERT 2009), and government development agencies, such as the UK’s DFID, the Department for International Development. Tourism Concern set out their ‘Principles and Criteria of Fair Trade in Tourism’ in 2002, after a three year consultation process with organisations in the North and South. Fair Trade tourism aims to promote sustainability through maximising the benefits from tourism to all stakeholders, and by encouraging more equal relationships between actors.

Fair Trade in Tourism is a key aspect of sustainable tourism. It aims to maximise the benefits from tourism for local destination stakeholders through mutually beneficial and equitable partnerships between national and international tourism stakeholders in the destination. It also supports the right of indigenous host communities, whether involved in tourism or not, to participate as equal stakeholders and beneficiaries in the tourism development process.

(Tourism Concern 2007: 3)

Fair Trade tourism focuses on those without the power or money to have a stake in mass or mainstream tourism, for example indigenous communities and fledgling, small tourism businesses and paying a fair price, consumers pay a premium for Fairly Traded goods, which is invested in community development.
projects (Tourism Concern 2007). Fair Trade tourism emphasises the need to redress structural inequalities within trading relationships, and applies these principles to tourism. Tourism Concern proposes that company and international legal structures can lead to sustainable and eco-tourism being inequitable: ‘If the trade practices of a company or the legislation covering international trade create inequalities and an imbalance of power, then even sustainable tourism and eco-tourism can be exploitative’ (Tourism Concern 2007). Fair Trade tourism thus proposes to go further than confining notions of fairness to individual transactions between tourists and hosts.

One example of the Fair Trade mark being applied to tourism is in South Africa, where DFID, in collaboration with the Business Linkages Challenge Fund, is establishing a brand which recognises the application of fair and responsible tourism values. These principles focus on including communities in tourism in a fairer way, with regard to wages, working conditions and sharing the benefits of tourism throughout communities, as well as promoting human rights and protecting local cultures and the natural environment:

The trademark is awarded to tourism businesses in South Africa that adhere to criteria such as fair wages and working conditions, fairness in operations, purchasing and distribution of benefits, ethical business practice and respect for human rights, culture and environment.

(DFID 2008)

Fair Trade principles place a strong emphasis the regulation of trading terms in order to advance more equal relationships between consumers and producers, in an otherwise highly unequal global market (Raynolds 2002a). However, tourism is criticised for being built on global inequalities, particularly as the costs of goods, services and labour are lower in developing countries, which enables tourists to benefit from cheap holidays and companies to maximise profits (Crick 1996; Kaplan 1996). Critics of charitable forms of tourism such as Hutnyk (1996) see the idea of offering a fair price as masking the global inequalities in which
tourism works. There is also inequality of knowledge within the tourism industry. Travel companies, NGOs and consultants are familiar with tourist expectations of what constitutes a tourist product and acceptable standards for tourists which enable them to assume managerial roles, while indigenous people often work at the lower levels of the tourism industry (Pattullo 1996; Henrici 2002; Barnett 2008). According to Fair Trade in Tourism principles, to counter this inequality in knowledge and division of labour travel agencies, NGOs and consultants should train people at community level for managerial positions (Kalisch 2000).

Certification itself is not without its problems. Studies of the Fair Trade coffee sector show that auditing by outside consultants can be prohibitively expensive for small projects. Raynolds (2002a) finds that high certification charges can exclude more marginal growers. Calo and Wise (2005), in their report on Fair Trade and organic coffee in Mexico find that there are barriers to certification and the accompanying entrance into these niche markets for the majority of producers. These obstacles include: the need to be an organised producers’ association or co-operative; the costs of the attainment of the higher standards required for particularly organic certification and of certification itself. The same study finds that accessing more highly compensated markets have balanced out certification charges for well organised co-operatives. This suggests that Fair Trade Certification favours more prominent producers. One suggestion to promote the inclusion of more marginal producers in Fair Trade is that the costs of certification are borne by buyers (Raynolds 2002a; Raynolds 2002b). The cost constraints may be one of the reasons that, in the absence of a Fair Trade mark, auditing within tourism has relied on cost-free ways of ascertaining standards. For example, the Costa Rican CST awards rely on the grading of an on-line questionnaire that tourism providers complete themselves. Other grading systems depend on tourists’ views to decide whether or not a destination or product is responsible (Honey and Stewart 2002). For example, the UK-based travel company, Responsibletravel.com, seeks their clients’ feedback on products, and displays comments on their website. This places the power to
decide on the environmental and social standards outside of the hands of producers, and into the hands of consumers. Reflecting the neo-liberal ‘rolling back of the state’ (Johnson 1999: 49) of the 1980s, these processes also circumvent the state’s role in setting and ensuring standards, for example of minimum wage (Honey and Stewart 2002).

Moreover, the auditing of responsible tourism according to principles of environmental and social sustainability established in the UN Declarations leaves very little space for dissenting voices to be heard. Best practice is based on these assumptions, and alternative approaches (such as mass tourism) do not fall within these parameters. One point of tension is sustainable tourism’s ambivalent attitude to market integration. That is, environmental and cultural sustainability can be achieved through creating a market for these goods through tourism, but that this market must be limited. However, the long-term financial viability of sustainable tourism projects could be jeopardised if a sustainable level of tourist volume is not achieved, which will be discussed in the following section.

4:3 Imaginative genealogies of responsible tourism in popular publications and the UK Press

Having examined the development and dissemination of sustainable tourism development principles at the institutional level, the following section will examine conceptualisations of responsible tourism in promotional and popular publications, such as travel magazines, guide books, travel company brochures and websites and the UK travel press. These are all sources accessed by tourists, and are examined to show how ideas on responsible tourism are disseminated among consumers, based on the assumption that these sources both form and reflect consumer preferences. This review will show how principles established at international conferences are reflected in popular sources, building a consensus on the constitution of responsible tourism. However, I am not suggesting that there is a linear, top-down process of decisions made by
international institutions, which are then disseminated through popular sources. As seen above, international institutions consulted multiple stakeholders in the formation of responsible tourism principles, and travel companies, charities and travel journalists are also stakeholders in their development and dissemination.

It could be argued that representations in promotional material should be viewed as functioning through stereotypes that fulfil tourists’ assumed expectations in order to create a successful product, and therefore need not be taken too seriously or as material reflections of indigenous people or of developing countries. However, as Bruner (1991: 3) argues: ‘It would be too easy to dismiss the language of tourism as mere advertising, as characterized by extravagant promises and exaggerated claims that no one takes seriously, as just purple prose for the purpose of selling the tour.’ Drawing on Foucault’s ([1969] 1972) and Said’s ([2003] 1978) revelation of the power of discourse, particularly in the context of colonial and postcolonial power relations81, I argue that the representations deployed in the promotion of responsible tourism are not innocent, but replicate both imaginative and material power relations between North and South, tourists and their hosts.

I claim that responsible tourism’s developmental agenda means that the imaginative schema within which it functions and which it produces has political implications on how development is envisioned and impacts how development is delivered. As Crush (1995: 6) argues, development as a discourse has the power to implement actual measures, which have real, if unintended, results: ‘Development discourse promotes and justifies very real interventions and practices with very real (though invariably unintended) consequences.’ Moreover McEwan (2008: 28) argues the representational is implicit in the material, that the way in which the world is imagined, and therefore created, spatially influences material development policies: ‘Development has always been about spatial imaginaries that operate at local, national and international

---

scales; underpinning many development interventions are the ways in which the South is perceived and represented in the North.’

Notions of responsibility and sustainability in tourism will be traced through: intersecting imaginative genealogies of colonial imaginations of non-commodified contact and the civilising mission; class-based markers of social distinction in travel preferences deployed through binaries of mass and responsible tourism and ideas on sustainability from the 1970s that focus on limiting growth of tourism and small-scale businesses.

**Authentic experiences, colonial imaginations**

Responsibility and sustainability can be seen to be conceptualised through the maintenance of authenticity of travel experiences and benefitting local communities. Both concepts of authenticity and bringing the benefits of development to local communities through personal exchanges can be traced to the era of imperial travel. This period justified the highly unequal terms on which colonised peoples were integrated into global markets through the imaginations of the civilising mission\(^2\). This represented the colonial project as being motivated by the desire to benefit colonised ‘Others’. Moreover, accounts of early colonial encounters represent global trade relations through individual contact and exchanges which are built on notions of pre-commodified reciprocity (Hulme 1986; Pratt [2008] 1992). Homestay tourism replicates these imaginations of authentic travel experiences by conceptualising market integration through fair exchange and friendly contact. All Paths Travel, one of the travel agents involved with the homestay at Encuentro evokes imaginations of pre-market reciprocity through its advertising strap-line: ‘Experience the magic of giving and receiving with tourism’\(^3\). This company specifically locates reciprocity temporally in pre-Conquest, pre-market Quechua traditions of

---

\(^2\) (Blunt and McEwan 2002; McEwan 2008; Sharp 2008; Pratt [2008] 1992: 149)

\(^3\) See anonymised source 4:1. These are not included in the final thesis, but were presented to the examiners.
‘ayni’\textsuperscript{84}, which is called on in representations of tourist/host relations: ‘Our goal is to invigorate the ancient Quechua principle of "ayni" so that our travellers along with local people can experience giving and receiving, exchanging, sharing, and helping each other.’\textsuperscript{85}

Authenticity in responsible, homestay tourism is constituted through deeper contact with local families and by experiencing their everyday lives, as illustrated in the following extract from the Winding Roads’ (a travel company which works with Amistad) website: ‘We stay with indigenous villagers who live simply but well and whose day to day activities you will be a part of’ (Winding Roads website)\textsuperscript{86}. This experience of closer encounters with local people is presented with suggested binaries of mass and niche tourism where ‘mass’ tourist experiences are constituted through tourists’ separation from locals: ‘We dissolve the lines that typically separate travellers from locals so your trip is richer and more rewarding, not only for you, but for your host family, too’ (Winding Roads website)\textsuperscript{87}. Here contact is presented as being mutually beneficial for tourists and their hosts, thus operating within notions of reciprocal exchange. Moreover, the rewards of contact are imagined as being personal and cultural for both parties and the financial advantages of the exchange for the hosts is not mentioned. Thus transactions are represented within tropes of non-commodified contact.

Moreover, the sustainability of guest/host relations is contextualised within notions of the destination life cycle (Butler 1980) where mass tourism is represented as eroding friendly encounters by commoditising and professionalising exchanges. The Ethical Travel Guide (Pattullo 2006) makes the distinction between the ideal of the genuine, uncommodified smile and the false, trained smile of the service provider. What are represented as genuine smiles are

\textsuperscript{84} See glossary of terms for a more detailed translation.
\textsuperscript{85} See anonymised source 4:2.
\textsuperscript{86} See anonymised source 4:3.
\textsuperscript{87} See anonymised source 4:4.
conceptualised as becoming the less authentic as human contact becomes professionalised over time.

Smile please, we’re tourists

Tourists have a good idea of what could be called the sliding scale of the smile. When we book a holiday abroad we delight in hearing that the people of that place are friendly, smiling and welcoming. But this is not a commodity that anyone gets paid for. It is a human response to a human encounter; it is best when it comes unexpectedly and unsolicited.

The manufactured smile, however, when tourist ‘providers’ have been trained to smile for the tourists, has a different context.

(Pattullo 2006: 14)

Small groups are advanced as promoting equality in cultural exchanges and cross-cultural learning, as the following statement from the UK-based adventure travel company, Intrepid, claims: ‘Small groups allow travellers to experience cultures first hand, offering greater opportunity for cross-cultural understanding’ (Intrepid 2008). Moreover, Intrepid (an Australian/UK adventure travel company) sees small group travel as facilitating non-commodified contact and exchanges with local people through the shared use of local space, streets and homes, and transport:

We think the smaller the group, the better the experience. That’s why we limit the numbers on every Intrepid trip. Travelling in a small group (an average of 10 travellers) makes it feel more like you’re travelling with a bunch of friends than on an organised tour. It means you can get to experience more of the local culture, too. As a small group, we don’t dominate; we can actually get to know the people we meet and do the things they do. Sharing their buses, their streets, and their homes, we’re more likely to be asked to join in, not just buy stuff.

(Intrepid 2007: 1)
The maintenance of authentically friendly relationships between tourists and their hosts are also advanced in the responsible tourism literature through the promotion of guidelines governing inter-cultural contact. Most travel companies that have responsible tourism policies, and also ethically-aware guidebooks, have developed similar sets of rules, which focus on following local etiquette, dress codes and adopting sensitive approaches to photography and bartering. It is unclear whether local communities are consulted in the formation of these guidelines, as most do not refer to specific cultures. However, as most are generic suggestions on promoting cultural sensitivity on the part of tourists in most points of contact with local people and also reflect sustainable and ethical

Box 4:1 Cultural Rules, Culture Shock vs Cultural Connection

One of the best things about travelling is making connections with people from different cultures, in an authentic and mutually enjoyable way. 'Cultural sensitivity' is simply a matter of respect: take your behavioural cues from the locals and, if in doubt, try to see things from the locals’ point of view.

Go with the flow. Other cultures have very different concepts of time, personal space and socially acceptable behaviour. You’ll find it a lot less stressful - and a lot more enlightening - if you just chill out. You might even reassess your own ideas.

Dress appropriately. Looking at the locals is a good way to gauge what to wear. Particularly in conservative cultures, don’t flaunt your flesh and try to be neat and clean - it’s only respectful.

Try to be conservative with resources such as water, food and energy - you may be depriving local people or making a negative impact on their environs.

Buying locally made crafts and curios means your money goes directly to the community.

Enjoy the ancient art of bargaining: part pas-de-deux, part drama, part chess-game, bargaining is a skill and an art form. It’s as much about the social interaction as the final outcome. Make sure you know when bargaining is appropriate - and when it’s not. Have fun with it and keep things in perspective - does haggling over that last dollar really make a difference to you, compared to the vendor?

It’s when you make those cross-cultural connections - even though initially you may have thought you had nothing in common - that it hits you again: people are the same wherever they’re from; we all have the same needs and desires, aspirations and affections. Revelling in that realisation is the holy grail of travelling.

(Lonely Planet 2009)
tourism principles from the institutional sources above, it is fair to assume that these rules have evolved from institutional and industry sources.

Winding Roads Travel on their website recommends tourists: ‘Be careful to avoid offensive behaviour, particularly in regard to dress, photography, and religion’. The Lonely Planet website (see box 4:1 above) also lists suggestions to guide intercultural interactions between tourists and locals. These guidelines focus on the enhancement of the experience for the tourist, and the benefits that can be gained by local people. Following rules of cultural contact are presented as promoting the mutual enjoyment of cultural exchange, echoing colonial tropes of friendly contact, and also as directly benefiting local people by choosing to buy local goods and being generous in bartering.

Moreover, behaviour that is respectful of cultural differences among tourists is advanced to promote the sustainability of the tourist experience, as ensuring good relationships for future tourists. Dealing fairly with local hosts also carries with it utilitarian approaches to sustainability: treating local communities well is seen as guaranteeing good hospitality for current tourists and those that follow. The following definition of responsible travel, from the web-based travel company responsibletravel.com, illustrates these points:

Responsible travel is about bringing you closer to local cultures and environments by involving local people in tourism. It’s about doing this in a fair way that helps ensure that they will give you an even warmer welcome.

(Responsible Travel 2007a)

Intrepid on their website advances the idea that responsible travel guidelines for tourists contribute to the maintenance of long-term friendly relationships between tourists and hosts.

---

88 See anonymised source 4:5.
Why do we have these guidelines? We are guests and are privileged to be able to visit these communities, homes and places of worship. As responsible travellers, we want our type of tourism to be sustainable for the areas we visit, so future travellers can enjoy similar wonderful experiences. Intrepid group leaders and travellers have made many special friends around the world and we treasure the ongoing relationships we have with them.

(Intrepid 2008)

Appropriate behaviour is advanced within notions that relationships between tourists and locals inevitably deteriorate over time as the type of tourists change from individual travellers, who are characterised as being interested and sensitive to local cultures, to mass tourists who are seen as being unconcerned about the host culture (Cohen 1972; Plogg 1994). Within the destination lifecycle model (Butler 1992), relations between tourists and hosts start as being genuinely friendly and then deteriorate as relationships become more about service and financial gain and finally become antagonistic and conflictive. Relations between tourists and locals become characterised by mistrust, especially surrounding tourists being overcharged for goods and services, and the fear of crime (Pi-Sunyer 1977; Nash 1989).

Conceptualisations of sustainability of guest/host relations can also be seen as functioning within past/modernity binaries where tourism is represented as a destructive modernity and host communities as pre-modern, spiritual and sustainable idylls. Tourists are represented as harbingers of modernity, destroying these admirable qualities on contact with previously untouched communities. These representations are constituted within Romantic and colonial representations of ‘pre-Fall’, idyllic societies (Hanke 1973; Hulme 1986). Within the responsible tourism popular and promotional literature, tourists are represented as embodying the power to impact negatively on local cultures and to constitute the terms of interactions with local people. The Ethical Travel guide refers to one tourist’s description of paying for a photograph, where the tourist believes she has turned her subject into a ‘beggar’ by ‘overpaying’ her. The
tourist is imagined as having the power to determine the terms of the interaction and to impact negatively on her host:

There was a lady cutting rice with a little implement so I thought this was a good photograph and I took her photograph. She was very sweet and I gave her some cigarettes for it and I overpaid her and it changed her instantly into a beggar.

(Pattullo 2006: 29)

Authenticity in specifically homestay tourism is conveyed through communities’ temporal bounding in the past, through their remoteness from centres of modernity. Moreover, contact with tourists is situated within imaginations of colonial contact with exotic ‘Others’ (Said [2003] 1978) and MacCannell’s ([1999] 1976) conceptualisation of tourism as a quest for a purer past. Winding Roads promises: ‘a cross-cultural journey into the lives of another people and another time’ (Winding Roads Website)89. In this piece of advertising, tourists are presented as modern and mobile, able to cross geographical and temporal boundaries and travel into a distinct cultural landscape which exists in the past. Thus indigenous communities are defined by their temporal and spatial difference from a powerful modernity (Harvey 1996; Massey 2005). Bruner (1991) comments on the disparities in power that characterise representations of indigenous communities in developing countries. He proposes that while tourists are represented as transforming themselves through travel, host communities are envisioned as standing still in time, in the past, in spite of undergoing a whole set of material changes throughout recent history. He argues that these imaginative schemas have wider implications which impact on how indigenous people are viewed in the context of development. That is, while tourists learn and change native people in developing countries are represented as lacking the capacity to develop.

89 See anonymised source 4:6.
In contrast to the promise of a complete change occurring within the tourist self, in a brief 3-week period, the native self remains unchanged, despite the industrial revolution, colonialism, wars of independence, nationalism, the rise of new nations, economic development, tourism, and the entire production of modern technology, including automobiles, television, Sony radios, and Casio watches. Nothing changes the native self, which is frozen in time, immobile, and apparently incapable of learning and changing.

(Bruner 1991: 239-40)

The community of Amistad is described as bounded by its isolation from the modern, outside world and its lack of contact with ‘outsiders’: ‘The people of Amistad have had little to no interaction with outsiders and have maintained their traditional customs as well as their language, Quechua’ (Winding Roads Website)\(^90\). The idea the community has been able to preserve its traditions and language because of lack of contact with the modern, ‘outside’ world both reproduces tropes of a temporally and geographically distinct and authentic ‘Other’ and follows notions of the destructive impact of modernity. Tourism is imbued with the power to change cultures, and its impact on communities is described as though communities and tourists existed within a vacuum. That is, representing encounters between indigenous peoples and modernity solely through encounters with tourism and tourists ignores the national context of a history of contact with ‘modernity’ and the ‘outside world’.

However, the particular region described by Winding Roads is a site where foreign mining companies operate, and have done so for decades, and therefore contacts with ‘modernity’ are not solely due to the encroachment of tourism in the area. Adventure travel has also been established in the area since the 1970s, although tourist numbers are increasing. The region is described in the following extract from Winding Roads website as changing due to the increase in adventure tourism. The subtext to this description of change is one of exclusivity:

\(^90\) See anonymised source 4:7.
if tourists visit now they will be privileged to participate in friendly contact that could deteriorate in the future.

(...) the Quechua (...) people have had little to no interaction with outsiders and have maintained their traditional customs. However, the popularity of both regions for adventure tourism is bringing change to the areas.

(Winding Roads website)\textsuperscript{91}

Communities’ communal ways of living are associated with pre-modern purity and harmony and ‘ancient’ ways of life. These are contrasted with tourists’ individualistic, artificial and unnatural lives as evinced in the following extract from the UK-based responsible travel agency, Responsibletravel.com. In a piece on ‘tribal cultures and communities’ on the UK-based responsible travel agency website, Responsibletravel.com, the writer describes ‘tribal’ communities in opposition to ‘our’ modern lives. He privileges Western tourists’ idealised notions of communities living ‘simply’, in harmony with each other and with nature, through ways of life that have not broken with the past:

We find ancient ways of life fascinating, and often of great romantic appeal. In today’s world of concrete; supermarkets; urban life; fashions; celebrity culture; stressful jobs; and lack of community the ideal of people living simply together close to nature in the same way that they have for 1000s of years is extremely appealing.

(Francis 2008)

Communities’ lack of material wealth is interpreted as spiritual richness, set against an empty and materialistic modernity, echoing the popular idealisation of the sustainability of traditional societies. Ideas of sustainability, which oppose economic growth and transitions to modernity, can be traced to the promotion of alternative development of the 1970s\textsuperscript{92} and the post-developmentalists of the

\textsuperscript{91} See anonymised source 4:8.

\textsuperscript{92} (Hardin 1968; Meadows et al. 1972; Schumacher [1973] 1993)
1990s (Norberg-Hodge 1991; Sahlins 1997). The following tourist's account of trekking through communities on the alternative Inca trails\(^{93}\) near Cusco, Peru, published in the r:travel (Responsible Travel) ezine (a magazine distributed by e-mail), defines the people he sees in terms of their lack of material goods, yet their ‘abundance’ of spirituality, gratitude and friendship. They are contrasted favourably with urban Westerners who are defined by their lack of these admirable qualities.

The people here are amazing, they have so little but have so much to offer. I learned a lot from them about gratitude and friendship, changing my perception of poverty; we who live in big cities lack so much in spirituality which they, in return, have in abundance.

(Vega 2007)

Madadventurer.com, a travel company that specialises in gap-year and volunteer tourism, describes the host communities with whom they work as friendly and welcoming, despite their poverty:

Based around the historic town of Cusco, the ancient capital of the Inca Empire, Madventurer have been working in Peru for many years. Located high among the spectacular Andes Mountains our projects focus on assisting children and impoverished communities who, despite their harsh living conditions, will always have a big smile for you.

(Madadventurer.com 2009)

Notions of authenticity in tourism can be seen to function through Rosaldo’s (1989: 69) concept of ‘imperialist nostalgia’. Tourists are seen as ruining the authenticity that first drew them to destinations, while ironically desiring the qualities they damage. This is illustrated by the following definition of Sustainable Tourism from the US-based National Geographic Center for

\(^{93}\) A number of alternative trails have been established in order to cater for tourists who are not able to obtain a place on the ‘Classic’ Inca trail that ends at Machu Picchu or for those who want a less touristed option. Places on the classic trail are currently restricted to 400 people a day.
Sustainable Destinations, a branch of the magazine's Research, Conservation, and Exploration Division, which works with associated organisations internationally to develop and disseminate information on sustainable tourism: ‘Sustainable tourism does not abuse its product—the destination. It seeks to avoid the "loved to death" syndrome’ (National Geographic 2007a).

Tourism is seen to accelerate the loss of cultural authenticity, which becomes staged for tourists (MacCannell 1973). The ‘Ethical Travel Guide’ describes loss of authenticity through the commodification of cultural displays for tourists, community members wear clothes that are usually kept for festivals to pose for paid photographs for tourists, and performing traditional dances and rituals for tourists that are not part of the usual festival cycle.

Cultural loss

Our interest in other people's cultures is not always sensitively approached. What are the implications, for example, of tourists photographing tribal peoples who now demand payment in exchange for a quick bit of modelling in their festivals’ finery?

Performing for tourists has become an income earner for tribal groups all over the world. But the income comes with a price. In Peru, for example, a representative of the Yagua tribe writes that one community is made to ‘perform dances no matter what day, which is contrary to our customs, since with us each dance would be performed at a particular time of the year, times which are festivals for us. Our brothers are exhibited to the tourists like animals, and have to be at their disposal, so that they can take photos’.

(Pattullo 2006: 27)

Responsible tourists are defined in the responsible tourism literature as valuing authentic culture, rather than culture packaged for mass tourist consumption. This desire to experience ‘authentic’ culture is seen as an indicator of superior taste and discernment within a context of class-based distain for mass tourism,
as evinced in the following reference to Greek resorts in the UK-based travel company Responsibletravel.com’s definition of ‘the responsible traveller’:

The responsible traveller wants to get a little bit more out of their travels, and to give a little bit back to the special people and places that they encounter. They want deeper and more real travel experiences. The responsible traveller values authenticity-experiences integral to local people’s traditions, cultures and rituals—rather than those created for tourism, or those whose existing meanings and uses have become lost as they have been packaged up for tourism. No more ‘Greek nights’ in resorts with the only Greek people there to serve the food please!

(Responsible Travel 2007a)

Sustainable tourism discourses present tourism as a means of reviving lost traditional cultures through giving them a utilitarian value in that they are commodified for tourist consumption. Indigenous communities’ pride in the intrinsic value of their culture is proposed to be rediscovered through the external recognition of their culture, for example, tourists admire traditional cultures. Responsible tourism’s demands for authenticity, defined as traditional forms of culture, are proposed as being the impetus behind cultural revival. Therefore, responsible tourism is seen as saving culture through its commodification, rather than de-valuing and destroying it. Income from tourism is advanced as providing an incentive for local people to conserve their environment and culture, as evinced in this statement on the role of the ‘responsible traveller’ on the travel agency website, Responsibletravel.com:

The responsible traveller understands local peoples’ relationship with environments, and that income from tourism can be a powerful incentive for conservation. The responsible traveller values diversity – diversity of people, cultures and environments.

(Responsible Travel 2007a)
Community-based tourism is promoted in the same website as promoting the community’s conservation of natural and cultural resources, by giving them both intrinsic and utilitarian values:

Community based tourism enables the tourist to discover local habitats and wildlife, and celebrates and respects traditional cultures, rituals and wisdom. The community will be aware of the commercial and social value placed on their natural and cultural heritage through tourism, and this will foster community based conservation of these resources.
(Responsible Travel 2007b)

The National Geographic describes its own form of responsible tourism, ‘Geotourism’ as reviving pride in local cultures, through outside appreciation, in a relationship that is beneficial to both tourists and hosts:

Residents discover their own heritage and how the ordinary and familiar may be of interest to outsiders. As local people develop pride and skill in showing off their locale, tourists get more out of their visit.

(National Geographic 2007b)

Similarly, Winding Roads94 claims that homestay tourism has revived pride in the community’s traditions.

Project members have re-gained pride in their culture. Through tourism they realise that their language, clothes, music, and traditions are special and should be respected and conserved. Previously they were embarrassed by their ancestry.

However, the company omits to explain why this community is ashamed of their identity, failing to recognise the national or local contexts. Tourists and tourism are thus presented in a vacuum in their relations with local communities and are credited with the power to change the local level positively.

94 See anonymised source 4:9.
Changing the world one holiday at a time

Tourism and tourists are imbued with power, as the following quote from the Green Travel Guide attests: 'The travel industry is the largest in the world, which means that tourists wield enormous power' (Jenner, Smith and Jay 2008: 81). Responsible tourism claims that the ‘right’ kind of tourism can be a positive force for environmental protection. The Green Travel Guide embeds this quote in a piece envisioning the beginning of environmental damage on the Galapagos Islands, which were imagined as a ‘paradise’ by Charles Darwin’s scientific expedition. Darwin is represented as paving the way for the destruction of this idyll: ‘They had paradise in their grasp, and they all—even a scientist like Darwin—destroyed it’. (Jenner et al. 2008: 81). Tourism is, therefore, situated within colonial tropes of pre-contact Paradise versus post-contact destruction. However, the Guide claims that individual tourists can use their power for good, conveying the message that the ‘tragedy’ of environmental destruction can be avoided by the actions of ‘green travellers’: ‘It’s a tragedy in so many ways, but a tragedy that you, as a tourist, could put an end to. Tourists have enormous power. Just think about it. Tourism is the biggest industry in the world. Which means that green travellers have the power to do a lot of good.’ (Jenner et al. 2008: 82). This seemingly contradictory proposition is carried out through encouraging tourists to make informed choices as consumers.

Tourists’ choices as individual consumers are privileged with the power to bring about sustainable tourism development. Within the post-Fordist shift to increased consumer choice from a plethora of niche markets, ethical consumption places the power to define and demand ethical standards on the consumer (Jackson 1999; Klein 2000; Gregson and Crewe 2002; Barnett et al. 2005; Powelson [1998] 2000; Urry [2002] 1990). In an article on eco-tourism in Costa Rica in the UK-based specialist travel magazine ‘Wanderlust’, the author emphasises his use of local services, pitched in a dichotomous relationship against a notional ‘American chain’. The author goes onto examine his choice of hotel, lunch and purchases, emphasising the inclusion of local people in the
tourism services and products he selects. He also considers the terms of inclusion of local people, which he judges to be fair: he chooses to have lunch at a co-operative and to buy fair-trade coffee beans. Ideas of sustainability are interwoven in his purchases, he emphasises that the coffee beans are organic and purchased at source. By carefully weighing up his options as a concerned and informed consumer, the tourist/journalist reproduces his power as a Western consumer:

I chose my hotel carefully too: Fonda Vela employs only local people (...) After checking in, I lunched at the local coffee co-operative and bought several bags of organically grown fair-trade beans (at source).

(Robinson 2007: 43)

The Lonely Planet encourages responsible tourists to quiz tourism service providers on their responsible credentials, and, according to their response, make a decision as to whether they are responsible. The power to decide whether or not a product meets the tourists’ demands is put in the hands of the tourist:

Tour operators, hotels and lodges that are genuine in their approach to responsible tourism will generally have a written policy covering their environmental impact, employment and cultural policy. If they don’t, ask them why -- by their response, you’ll be able to make the judgement call.

(Lonely Planet 2009)

The Lonely Planet follows this statement by listing the correct questions to ask, and by which to judge, a service provider. The questions are embedded in sustainable tourism discourses: minimising the negative environmental and social impacts of tourism through limiting the size of tourist groups; and involving the local community in the socio-economic benefits of tourism.
Ask some specifics about how they implement their policy:

How are they dealing with the main environmental issues facing them?
Do they employ local guides, leaders and staff and provide training opportunities?
Do they limit the size of their groups to minimise environmental and social impact?
Do they have a 'green' purchasing policy?
Do they work with the local community? If so, what proportion of their revenue is redirected to that community?
What information do they offer their clients on responsible travel?

(Lonely Planet 2009)

Thus responsible tourists are encouraged to use their power as consumers to assume the role of policing service providers and products. This is indicative of the post-Fordist context of producer/consumer relationships which has seen power shifting from the producers to the consumers (Klein 2000; Butcher 2003; Urry [2002] 1990). This move can also be contextualised by the neo-liberal legacy of ‘rolling back the state’ (Johnson 1999: 49; Bondi and Laurie 2005), in that the role of auditing and controlling of industry standards that was formally the state’s responsibility, now lies with consumers.

Consumer power is translated into the power to develop, as evinced by the title of the Observer article on responsible travel: ‘You may not be St. Bob\(^{95}\) ...but you can help fight poverty in Africa by simply choosing the right holiday’ (The Observer 2005: 1). The VSO WorldWise campaign also points out that ‘Your choice of holiday and the way that you visit can make a difference’ (Goodwin 2005: 2). Power lies in the hands of Western tourists to debate and make the ‘right’ choices as consumers and, in doing so, confer development by their individual choices as consumers.

\(^{95}\) St. Bob refers to Bob Geldof (KBE), the Irish singer who raised aid to relieve the Ethiopian famine of 1984 with his song ‘Do they know its Christmas?’ and ‘Live Aid’ concerts in the UK and US. He has subsequently campaigned for increased aid and debt relief for Africa.
On the one hand, responsible tourism empowers tourists to change the world through the choices they make as consumers, while simultaneously limiting development to personal interactions between tourists and their hosts and the small-scale. Addressing global inequalities through personal exchanges, rather than, for example, demanding fairer market conditions or terms of trade, follows in colonial erasures of integration into the world economy. That is, the highly unequal terms of trade were omitted from imperial travel accounts, where colonial trading relations were represented through ‘reciprocal’ exchanges between individual travellers and their hosts (Hulme 1986; Pratt [2008] 1992).

Moreover, by operating within the sustainable development discourses of small-scale projects, responsible tourism avoids making grand claims about its power to alleviate poverty and bring development (Butcher 2003). So the responsible tourist need not aspire to the beatitude of the comically rendered ‘St. Bob’ of the above Observer article and is described as someone who gives ‘a little bit back’. Moreover, development is reduced to relations of personal exchange, whereby tourists maximise their benefits, by enjoying the enhanced experience of personal contact, while in return helping local people to develop: ‘The responsible traveller wants to get a little bit more out of their travels, and to give a little bit back to the special places and people that they encounter’ (Responsible Travel 2007a). The UK-based adventure travel company Dragoman which visits Bienvenido, uses almost exactly the same phrasing when describing the motivation behind its responsible tourism policies: ‘Dragoman Overland (...) decided it wanted to give a little bit back to the countries and people we met on our journeys’ (Dragoman 2008).

**Sustainability as an exclusive product**

Proponents of views on sustainability that propose setting limits on development argue that fewer, higher paying visitors can provide the same revenue from tourism, but with fewer negative impacts on the environment and cultures as many, lower paying mass tourists. Furthermore, visitor education is emphasised
as a means of ensuring appropriate behaviour towards the environment and traditional cultures. Both of these practical concerns favour the promotion of responsible tourism to more wealthy and educated middle-class consumers. However, I argue that discourses of sustainability and responsibility go beyond mere pragmatic marketing. These are deeply influenced by class-based prejudice against the lower class leisure pursuits, which are constituted as less worthy and educational, and moreover, morally inferior (Butcher 2003). Thus the promotion of responsible tourism reinforces middle-class social and moral superiority and offers increased cultural capital (Bourdieu 1984) gained through the consumption of niche as opposed to mass products (Butcher 2003; Barnett et al. 2005; MacCannell [1999] 1976; Urry [2002] 1990).

Responsibletravel.com advertises under the strap-lines: ‘Hand-picked holidays from the world’s specialist operators’, which carries connotations of exclusivity and emphasises the ‘niche’ value of the products on offer. It continues with the line: ‘holidays that give the world a break’ (Responsibletravel.com 2008), which evokes the benign nature of this kind of tourism in an imaginative binary with its destructive mass counterpart. Responsibletravel.com has also run a ‘campaign against mass tourism’, which featured the slogan ‘Had enough? Thousands of holidays to hundreds of places that haven’t been ravaged by mass tourism’ (Responsibletravel.com 2008). Illustration 4:1 below formed an integral part of the campaign. It shows a hyper-realistic depiction of mass tourism, which evokes a series of class-based anxieties about the ills of mass tourism, and also about the possibility of middle-class tourists having to mix with lower class people on holiday. Moreover, taking a campaigning role merges with the promotion of the company’s products, reflects the move to markets and consumers deciding ethics in ethical consumption (Klein 2000; Powelson [1998] 2000).

A further illustration of the promotion of niche holidays to middle-class consumers, which play on their concerns over contact with lower-class holiday makers, is an incident which reached the UK national press and was reported on the BBC News. Alistair McLean, the owner of a small UK-based adventure travel company, Adventures Abroad, caused a furore by posting a list of presumed lower-class names in an e-mail-based newsletter to past and prospective customers. He stated that his clients would not encounter people with these names on one of his trips. The UK press announced that he was promoting ‘Chav-free holidays’ (Allen 2009), and there was considerable discussion on newspapers’ discussion boards either protesting or supporting McLean’s provocation. The fact that McLean’s comments reached the national press is an indication of the deeply embedded class-based notions of distinction in travel preferences in the UK.

Linking class-based prejudice to notions of moral superiority follows in anxieties of social distinction that can be traced to elite concerns over Thomas Cook’s package holidays for the working classes of the British industrial era (Butcher 2003). The above image (illustration 4:1), from responsibletravel.com’s campaign against mass tourism, can be seen to be following in established binaries of tourists and travellers (Boorstin [1973] 1961). The way in which mass tourists are depicted here and elsewhere in the promotional literature reflects popular imaginations of tourists as passive consumers of superficial, inauthentic experiences, who moreover are happy in their ignorance. This image can be contrasted with depictions from responsible travel promotional materials which deploy representations of the lone traveller, who is young, active and interacting in a friendly way with local people. Photographs of tourists with children abound in this literature, particularly in relation to making a contribution to their education. Tourists’ often visit or donate materials to local schools as part of a homestays, especially when these are undertaken as part of educational or gap year programmes. These images reproduce imaginations of
imperial travel through tropes of contact and parent-child relationships with hosts\textsuperscript{96}.

The following pictures from the All Paths Travel website\textsuperscript{97}, which specialises in homestays in Encuentro, show tourists involved in visiting and donating materials to the local school:

![Illustration 4:2: A tourist photographing children at a school funded by All Paths Travel, Encuentro](image-url)

\textsuperscript{96} (McEwan 2000; Ashcroft 2001; Manzo 2008; Pratt [2008] 1992)

\textsuperscript{97} See anonymised source 4:9.
Perceptions of tensions between holidays as being spaces for enjoyment and comfort as opposed to having a deeper motivation, which for responsible tourism is development work, also reflect classed-based distinctions between mass versus niche travel. Mass tourism for pleasure is designated as the preserve of the lower classes and individual travel for a ‘higher’ purpose of exploration and education, being the preserve of social elites (Turner and Ash 1975; Butcher 2003; Urry [2002] 1990).

Representations of responsible tourists are celebratory of responsible tourists’ psychological make-up, which is presented as being superior to that of mass tourists. These descriptions of responsible tourists echo Plogg’s (1994: 214) psychological classification of outward going ‘allocentrics’ and Cohen’s (1972: 167-168) typology of ‘organised’, ‘individual mass tourists’, ‘explorers’ and ‘drifters’, placing responsible tourists in the latter two categories. Responsibletravel.com (2007a) claims that: ‘Responsible travel suits life’s curious adventurers and enthusiasts’. In the following extract from Responsibletravel.com, responsible tourists are defined by their preferences for more individual travel and the desire for authentic contact with local cultures, against representations of mass tourists’ unwillingness to break from a familiar group of people (from ‘back home’) and passivity of experience (‘being herded’).

The responsible traveller prefers smaller groups, and to meet some local people (as well as fellow travellers) rather than be surrounded by 1000s of people from back home. They don’t like being herded about in a large crowd like nameless faces and understand that travelling in smaller groups makes local people and cultures more accessible.

(Responsible Travel 2007a)
Other descriptions of ethical travellers emphasise their superior educational, economic and class positions and ability to engage with ethical issues. The Ethical Travel Guide, which is widely available in bookshops in the UK, and also sold by the charity Oxfam in its stores, notes that the most ‘ethically aware’ (Ethical Consumer in Pattullo, 2006: 30) group in the UK tend to be middle-aged, affluent and well-educated and are estimated to form a niche market of some six million people. ‘Ethically aware’ does not mean that they always purchase ethical products, but are: ‘potentially important as an engaged consumer group, more likely to act on ethical considerations in purchasing and in other relationships with companies they become potential advocates of those they consider ethical’ and ‘potential critics of those companies they perceive to be unethical’ (Ethical Consumer in Pattullo, 2006: 30).

Representations of responsible tourism respond to conflicting, class-based notions of travel. Elite travel is imagined to be a challenging, purposeful undertaking, which reflects imperial travel accounts of arduous travel (Pratt [2008] 1992). Within responsible tourism the aim of travel is developmental and educational: the US-based responsible tourism company, Winding Roads Travel98 has ‘Travel with a Purpose’ as its strap-line. However, this form of travel is also conceived of as a holiday, which is imagined as a time and space for pleasure, and elite notions of pleasure include luxury consumption. Responsible tourism plays to these imaginations of travel choice inspired by deeper, ethical motivations, while calming anxieties surrounding lack of pleasure and comfort. Adopting an approach which stresses pleasure as well as ethics, echoes Krippendorf’s ([1984] 1987: 109) mantra of ‘positive responsibility’, which promotes more sensitive tourism as enhancing tourists’ experiences. He advances the idea that tourists need to be encouraged to act responsibly out of positive motivations and experiences, rather than compulsion: ‘Orders and prohibitions will not do the job—because it is not a bad conscience that we need to make progress, but

98 See anonymised source 4:11.
positive experience, not the feeling of compulsion, but of responsibility’ (Krippendorf [1984] 1987: 109).

The Observer, whose readership is considered by many to be middle-class and ‘educated’, promotes ‘ethical’ holidays in its travel supplement, ‘Escape’, as giving pleasure to the tourist through doing good, as well as being comfortable and luxurious: ‘The good life: ‘Ethical’ tourism doesn’t have to mean volunteering on an eco-project in the jungle. We’ve found 10 fabulous trips which will give you the feel-good factor without having to forfeit your luxuries.’ (The Observer 2006: 1). The Sunday Times’ (which also has a middle-class, ‘educated’ readership) travel supplement, ‘Travel’, ran a cover story on high quality ethical and eco-tourism destinations and products, under the front page headline, which joins notions of pleasure and ethics in the phrase tourists use when they take holiday snaps: ‘Smile (You’re Saving the Planet): Ten top eco-destinations and how to make the most of them.’ (Ryan 2008: 1) A sense of exclusivity is conveyed in the ‘top-ten’ and also in the title of the actual article: ‘Ethical. Ecological. Excellent: It’s rare to get all three in one holiday. Now you can, courtesy of the latest hotlist of eco-destinations.’ (Ryan 2008: 14). The bringing together of high ethical and ecological standards in an excellent product is described as being a scarce commodity, and the destinations described in terms of being the latest fashion, a ‘hotlist’ (Ryan 2008: 14).

Responsibletravel.com advertises a range of ‘eco-chic’ luxury holidays, contrasting popular ideas that to be environmentally friendly is to suffer with the promotion of luxury accommodation:

Eco chic holidays

No sack cloth environmentalism here – if you are craving a little eco-friendly luxury then look no further. Here you will find stunning lodges and small hotels made from local materials, in sympathy with the environment, and with the support of local communities. Eco chic holidays, stylish AND sensible!
Similarly, the Ethical Travel Guide (Pattullo 2006: 3) counters possible perceptions of responsible tourism as sacrificing pleasurable holidays by representing critics of responsible tourism as: ‘Those (...) who like to sneer at the terms ‘ethical’ or ‘responsible tourism’ and think that ‘the holiday makers who try to be a bit ethical are holier than thou and that their holidays are not really holidays at all but some sort of wearisome social work project disguised as pleasure.’ The Guide stresses that responsible tourism is as pleasurable as any other holiday: ‘This could not be further from the truth. Holidays such as those at Tumani Tenda (a community-based tourism project in the Gambia) are as much fun and can provide as much excitement as any other sort of holiday.’ (Pattullo 2006: 3).

Small is beautiful

Tourism controlled by transnational companies is criticised by proponents of responsible tourism for causing the leakage of benefits away from host countries. Pattullo (2006: 17) in the ‘Ethical Travel Guide’ claims that most tourist money is spent before tourists arrive at their destination: on a package with flights: ‘leakage (...) can be as high as four-fifths the cost of a holiday’. Responsible tourism, therefore, emphasises the importance of dealing directly with local people and the use of locally sourced goods to counter leakage. The following article in The Observer Escape Travel Supplement (2005) blames transnational companies and foreign owned hotels for the exclusion of local people from the developmental benefits of tourism. Community-based tourism is presented as an alternative approach to development, small scale projects, directly benefitting local people countering large-scale, international companies:

With many hotels and tour companies foreign-owned, much of the tourists’ money never reaches the poorest people. But the new phenomenon of so-called ‘community-based tourism’ provides an
alternative. Growing numbers of these projects are being set up across the continent, run by small communities which profit directly and use the funds for essential development work.

(The Observer 2005: 1)

The marketing of responsible tourism products as exclusive brings together the aim of reducing leakage, benefitting local people and the sustainable development goals of limiting tourist numbers. Responsibletravel.com links the concept of responsible holidays reducing leakage from the destination with sustainable tourism development. They claim that with responsible tourism, more money remains in the host country and local communities can gain the same level of benefits with fewer tourists. This in turn limits the negative effects on the environment:

We are often asked how ‘responsible’ holidays stand apart from normal holidays (...). A higher percentage of the income remains in country of destination. In conventional or ‘package’ tourism, up to 90 percent of the cost of your holiday may leave the destination. With responsible tourism, up to 70% of the cost of your holiday excluding flights (and 100% from community based tourism initiatives) remains in the destination. This means that local communities can achieve the same economic and social benefits with far fewer visitors and therefore environmental impact on their resources.

(Responsible Travel 2008)

Dragoman promotes reducing economic leakage as part of their responsible tourism policies. Ideas of sustainability are conceptualised both as avoiding harm to the environments and people visited. Leaving a higher percentage of tourists’ money in the destinations than mass tourism is advanced as a way of benefitting local people. Sharing passengers’ skills with local people is also proposed as a way of benefitting hosts and is another example of how monetary transactions
are hidden by representations of non-commodified exchange. Moreover this places tourists in a position of educators of local people:

Tourism is now the biggest industry around the world. So we must ensure that our pleasure does not have an adverse effect on the lands and people we meet. As little as 10% of worldwide tourist spending ends up in the host country. Dragoman Overland passengers can expect that at least 55% of their money end up in the destination country. It's our aim to benefit our hosts and share the skills that our passengers have, in a positive and rewarding way.

(Dragoman 2008)

The following definition of community-based tourism from the UK-based responsible travel company Responsibletravel.com's website emphasises the inclusion of groups that are geographically and socially excluded from mainstream development and mass tourism (the rural and the poor) in this kind of tourism. The benefits of tourism are generated at community level through job creation and are further spread to the wider community by reserving part of the revenue from tourism for community projects, as shown in the following extract:

Community based tourism is tourism in which local residents (often rural, poor and economically marginalized) invite tourists to visit their communities with the provision of overnight accommodation.

The residents earn income as land managers, entrepreneurs, service and produce providers, and employees. At least part of the tourist income is set aside for projects which provide benefits to the community as a whole.

(Responsible Travel 2007b)

However, calculations of leakage can be widely inaccurate. ODI (the UK Overseas Development Institute) research estimates that the amount of money that reaches the poor could be anything as low as one tenth to as high as one quarter
of tourist spending, derived from wages, tips, sales of small items and employment in local tourism businesses (Mitchell and Muckosy 2008). Mitchell and Ashley (2007) criticise calculations of leakage for being inaccurate and pessimistic. They propose that the cost of flights and services outside of the tourism destination should not be claimed as leakage, and neither should the price of a package holiday, which is also paid for before arrival at the destination. They claim that using these figures distorts leakage claims, emphasising that tourists’ spending money (outside of the cost of a package) can be up to one third of the cost of the holiday. It is this money that is spent locally on, for example food, drinks, excursions and souvenirs and which stays in the local economy. By focusing on money spent locally, they estimate leakage rates of 50% of tourists’ spending, rather than the 90% and 70% quoted above. What is more, they propose that the concentration on leakage detracts from efforts to encourage linkages between local people and the tourism economy. This argument, when applied to responsible tourism, means that, instead of focusing on claims of being more beneficial to local people than mainstream tourism, linkages between all forms of tourism projects and the wider economy should be forged in order to generate income for local people.

Lack of tourists

In order for a tourism project to be self-sustaining, there needs to be sufficient tourists for a business to make a profit, and to share among the families of an association. However, the predominant definition of sustainability in homestay tourism is that of ‘carrying capacity’ (Hardin 1968: 162). That is, the number of tourists that a destination could sustain without negatively affecting the environmental integrity or cultural authenticity of the destination. ‘Carrying capacity’ in terms of numbers of tourists in homestay tourism is often not researched, quantified or enforced within projects but referred to in the abstract. There are difficulties in defining the optimum number of tourists before environmental and cultural change occurs. While it is feasible to measure the environmental impacts of increasing numbers of tourists, (although this may not
be finite, with environmental management mechanisms enabling increased carrying capacity (Butcher 2003) ways of measuring the impact of tourists on cultural authenticity seem to be less obvious and reliable. For example, how can the friendliness of a host community be measured before and after tourists arrive, and with increasing numbers of tourists? Also, how can ‘negative’ changes, such as the adoption of Western clothing, be attributed solely to tourism? I argue that, while concerns over tourism’s impacts on environmental and cultural sustainability are justified, the way in which carrying capacity is applied to homestay tourism is very much notional, based on imaginations of the inevitable deterioration of tourist destinations within the tourism destination lifecycle model (Butler 1980). Moreover, Butcher (Butcher 2003) suggests that increased income from tourism can be invested in improving the environmental carrying capacity of destinations.

Mitchell and Muckosy (2008) note that many community-based tourism enterprises have failed due to lack of financial viability. They quote a recent Rainforest Alliance/Conservation International (both international NGOs concerned with environmental protection) survey of 200 community based tourism projects across Latin America which showed that many projects which provide accommodation have only 5% occupancy. Harrison (2008) also points to the fact that sustainable tourism projects have often failed to recognise the importance of commercial viability and access to markets. Institutional and popular sources also attest to the common failure of community-based tourism products, due to lack of tourists and, therefore, failure to make a profit, as discussed in the Final Report of the UNWTO’s World Ecotourism Summit in 2002:

Too many products fail

There are examples in most regions of ecotourism products which have failed through lack of profitability, or are likely to do so when donor support is no longer available. Often these are community-based and perhaps started primarily for
A common problem is lack of market response and poor feasibility assessment and planning.

(UNWTO 2002: 95)

Responsibletravel.com, based on research they conducted via questionnaires distributed to projects that they promote on their website, point to low levels of occupancy in community-based tourism projects (see also Box 4:1 below):

The jury is still out on whether community based tourism can actually be profitable enough to create sustainable lifestyles, and so support conservation and local economic development. The big problem for these small scale and often remote community tourism ventures is marketing. Too often it is simply the case that they are so small and so remote that nobody knows about them. This means that booking levels and occupancy are low and they have to rely on support from donors or go out of business.

(Responsible Travel 2007c)

Box 4:2 Occupancy levels and length of stay in community-based tourism projects surveyed by Responsibletravel.com, from ‘Community-based tourism Progress Report-September 2006’

**Occupancy levels**

The majority of the community based tourism projects that responded to the questionnaire were already working with existing tour operators or tourism organisations. Only 13 were not. However, even those that were doing so were not showing strong evidence of success. Although the highest occupancy* was 95%, the lowest was 1% (excluding those that were just starting up and had not yet received any bookings) and for the majority it was around 5%. Figures were not always clear due to some community based tourism projects being based around homestays in a number of different villages.

**Staying power**

Over half the projects that returned questionnaires had started in the last 5 years and 79% in the last 10 years. The oldest project that fitted the community based tourism definition started in 1992. This finding may be an indication that many older projects have already closed due to lack of bookings.

*Occupancy calculated on an assumed stay of 5 nights per person, accommodation available 365 days a year.
However, while there is recognition of the commercial unsustainability of eco-tourism and community-based products at both institutional and popular levels, sustainable tourism continues to be conceptualised in terms of limiting tourism to a notional carrying capacity. The idealisation of the small-scale may override concerns over the lack of commercial viability of homestay tourism enterprises. Goodwin (2008) notes that, despite a lack of empirical data to support small scale community-based approaches to sustainable tourism development, funders continue to support eco-tourism and community-based tourism projects. He blames international funders as much as international and national NGOs for not investigating the financial viability and access to markets of potential projects. This may point to the strength of the imaginative genealogies of cultural authenticity being destroyed through contact with markets and the tourism destination lifecycle model and also the power of sustainable development discourses that seem impermeable to criticism and change.

**Linkage**

Critiques of mass tourism of the early 1990s of its environmental and cultural damage have led funders away from supporting mainstream tourism (Harrison 2008). Prejudice against mass tourism remains, and perhaps this contributes to the persistence of sustainable tourism models that function through opposition to mainstream tourism. While institutional sustainable tourism discourses are imaginatively situated outside of capitalist systems, they still privilege the market to deliver development and environmental and cultural preservation. However, these discourses stress limited development and shy away from fully embracing tourism as a capitalist industry. This may account the lack of commercial success of many projects. They are caught between the need to be commercially viable and imaginations that resist market integration, and especially mass tourism.
However, critiques of community-based and eco-tourism stress the importance of forging linkages with mainstream tourism in order for alternative tourism projects to be economically viable. Goodwin (2008: 869) urges the adoption of a ‘pro-poor tourism’ approach which: ‘pragmatically accept[s] that tourism is a private sector capitalist activity and [...] that tourism operations need to be profitable in a competitive world market if they are to be sustainable.’ This approach stresses linkages between local businesses and mainstream tourism, advancing the idea that even mass tourism can alleviate poverty if it includes local people. It also accepts that tourism can have negative environmental and cultural impacts and seeks to minimise these. Mitchell and Muckosy (2008) note that Taquile’s community-based, homestay tourism enterprises have been successful since the 1970s by linking their community to a major tourism route.

The dependency of NGOs on external funding in order to finance the establishment of homestay tourism projects means that there is very little room for questioning current conceptualisations of sustainability or for more critical evaluation of the success of projects. That is, NGOs tend to reproduce the discourses of funding bodies and to claim success, to secure funding for further projects (Mawdsley et al. 2002). Success is often limited to the establishment of a homestay project, within a relatively short time span, the funding cycles of the projects studied here lasted on average 3 years). This means that the implementation of a project is assessed, rather than its sustainability in terms of attracting adequate tourist numbers to achieve commercial viability. Many travel agents and tourism consultants interviewed in this study attest to the need for more than 5 years for new tourism products to become established, and for flows of tourists to reach sustainable levels. Moreover, by defining sustainability in terms small-scale projects, with limited numbers of tourists, or abstract, and therefore unquantifiable, aims such as reviving pride in indigenous culture means that projects’ can be termed successful within the parameters of the projects limited aims and timescales.
However, representations of mass tourism as being controlled by transnational companies, and by implication responsible tourism being in the hands of local businesses, need to be challenged. Larger, more mainstream companies are starting to make moves into the ethical market: the ‘big (British) four’, Thomas Cook, Airtours, First Choice and Thomson (Butcher 2003) have bought smaller, niche operators in order to benefit as these markets expand, for example, the volunteer travel company i-to-i was recently sold to First Choice Holidays (Gapyearresearch 2007). Mainstream travel agents are also included in the promotion of responsible tourism principles and awards. The Travel Foundation, a UK charity which promotes sustainable outbound tourism, includes major mainstream travel agents such as First Choice, Thomas Cook and Thomson-TUI, as well as adventure companies such as Exodus, and charities such as Tourism Concern, as members of its discussion forum (thetravelfoundation 2007). Mainstream companies feature in the ‘Responsible Travel Awards’, with Hyatt Hotels and Resorts sponsoring the ‘Best Large Hotel/Accommodation (more than 50 rooms) category, and the Radisson SAS Hotel in Edinburgh, UK won highly commended in 2007 (Francis 2007). While responsible tourism is marketed within notions of sustainability as small-scale development and within niche tastes, the wider adoption of responsible tourism principles could be seen as a positive development.

4:4 Conclusions

This chapter’s exploration of genealogies of responsible, homestay tourism has revealed uneasy imaginations of indigenous communities’ relationships to markets. On the one hand, tourism markets are represented as impacting negatively on natural environments and cultures. On the other, market integration, subject to controls in limiting tourist numbers and restricting tourist behaviour, is proposed to provide incentives to revive traditional cultures, through responsible tourists’ demands to experience authentic culture. It has further proposed that, while any product needs to take into account the tastes
and preferences of its consumers, situating responsibility, sustainability and authenticity imaginatively against mass tourism could be harmful to the sustainability of homestay tourism products. That is, within popular conceptualisations of the destination lifecycle model, sustainability is defined in terms of being small-scale and, as tourism increases, the qualities that once drew in tourists begin to be lost, and tourists move on to a less touristed destination. While this may be the case, there is evidence to show that many homestay projects receive very low visitor numbers and, therefore, struggle to be financially viable without donor funding. I propose that a change in the conceptualisation of sustainability is needed in order to allow for the growth of homestay tourism enterprises.

This chapter has also explored representations of responsible tourism at the international level as privileging the development paradigms of international funding bodies and the colonial and class-based prejudices of middle-class Northern consumers. Moreover, these representations influence how development is conceptualised and have material implications for how development is carried out. While multiple stakeholders were consulted in the formation of UN declarations, the presentation of such a coherent discourse throughout representations, deployed at institutional and popular levels indicate little space for dissent or less powerful actors. I argue that representations of responsible, homestay tourism replicate unequal power relations between North and South, agents of tourism (for example NGOs and travel agencies) and communities as well as between tourists and their hosts. The next chapter, chapter 5, focuses on national debates on sustainable tourism, from national institutional and popular sources. It aims to explore the similarities and tensions between international and national conceptualisations of responsible, homestay tourism.
Chapter 5 Homestay tourism in national sustainable development discourses

5:1 Introduction

This chapter will examine discussions of sustainability and tourism at the national level. It will draw on Peruvian State plans for sustainable tourism, Promperú’s (the Peruvian Ministry of Tourism Promotion), branding of the country as ‘the Land of the Incas’ and concerns and debates on the sustainability of tourism in the Peruvian press. It will also include interviews of representatives from the Peruvian State Tourism agencies, Mincetur (Ministerio de Comercio Exterior y Turismo, the Trade and Tourism Ministry) and Promperú.

It will link national plans and concerns for the sustainable development of tourism to international institutional discourses, discussed in the previous chapter (chapter 4). Setting international and national policy frameworks and popular concerns over sustainable tourism development side by side will reveal the Peruvian State’s echoing of international conceptualisations, to meet the contingencies of outside consultants and funding bodies. Also, attention to Peru’s specific history and geography of development will show the ways in which national political approaches to development are worked through tourism policies and national elite attitudes permeate discussions on sustainable tourism development. This examination of national voices emphasises the agency with which neo-liberal approaches to tourism development are taken up by elites, and the resulting heterogeneity of neo-liberalisms. It will follow two major strands of sustainable tourism principles: the inclusion of local people in tourism development and the preservation of natural and cultural phenomena through their conversion into economic resources.
Tourism started in Peru in the 1920s and was largely promoted and organised by the private ‘Touring y Automovil Club del Perú’ (Touring and Automobile Club of Peru) (Desforges 2000: 178). This organisation came to be supported and subsidised by the state which also established state-owned hotels. However, this chapter will outline approaches to tourism and development starting with the state-led focus of the 1960s to the early 1990s, and then examining President Fujimori’s neo-liberal stance throughout the 1990s, finally looking at President Toledo’s continued neo-liberal policies and his emphasis on Peru’s indigenous identity in tourism promotion. Not only is this period more recent, it also reflects the post World War Two period of increasing international tourism (Harrison 2008) and focuses on the economic development of ‘developing’ countries within the international community (Esteva 1992; Sachs 1992; Escobar 1995).

From the 1960s to 1990s tourism development was predominantly led by the state. The state created institutions for the development and promotion of tourism; established tourism development zones and sought foreign loans in order to invest in infrastructure, concentrating on the Cusco-Puno regions (Desforges 2000). The turn from a ‘small-state’ model of the 1950s (Desforges 2000: 181) to the state assuming the role as an engine of development came with increasing disillusionment with export-led growth. Reliance on outside markets, where prices for primary commodities were subject to erratic rises and falls led proponents of import-substitution industrialisation to argue that development needed to be placed in the hands of the state. They reasoned that the state could raise finance on a large enough scale to promote development, which would bring greater returns than those from the export of agricultural and mineral products (Desforges 2000). The state attempted to lead tourism development to promote economic growth and the redistribution of wealth through foreign loans. For example, the development of the Cusco-Puno region, which focused on the construction of transport infrastructure and the development of tourist sites, including the UNESCO-supported restoration of Machu Picchu in 1965, was
funded by the Peruvian State, the InterAmerica Development Bank and other foreign loans (Desforges 2000). This investment came to an end in the debt crisis of the 1980s, when President Alan García refused to pay back international debts, leading the international financial community to cut off its support.

When Fujimori became president in 1990 he implemented a series of neo-liberal measures designed to restructure a collapsing economy, dubbed ‘el fujishock’ (Klarén 1999: 408) because of its particularly harsh social impacts. Fujimori’s policies focussed on drastically reducing the role of the state in the economy and liberalising trade. In particular he sought to renew the confidence of the international financial community and reintegrate Peru into the world economy by making regular and substantial monthly debt repayments to international financial institutions (Klarén 1999).

Fujimori’s ten-year reign was immediately marked by authoritarianism, he staged an ‘autogolpe’ (autocoup) (Carrión 2006: 2) in 1992 that shelved the constitution and shut down congress. In order to maintain control, the press was subject to repression, and human rights abuses committed by the military against the political opposition and the Maoist guerrilla group, the Sendero Luminoso (Shining Path), were ignored (Carrión 2006). Fujimori also put an end to the ten-year insurgency of Sendero Luminoso: in 1992 its leader Abimael Guzmán was captured and sentenced to life imprisonment.

During the 1980s, the negative social impacts of neo-liberal approaches to economic development led the World Bank to put in place political and economic measures to guarantee political stability. Critics, such as Oliart (2004), argue that these measures were implemented in order to render developing countries governable to ease the transition to neo-liberal economic systems. By implementing measures of financial austerity and regaining national security, Fujimori paved the way for Peru’s reintegration into the global economy by appeasing the international financial community. These strategies, including the political repression of opposition groups, can be seen as typical of neo-liberal
hegemony globally. That is, foreign investment and integration into global markets depend on national governments ensuring political stability and national security. This is what Goldman (1998: 23) sees as the institutionalisation of domination and imperialism in ‘(...) new forms of social control that can lead to intensified exploitation of all forms of nature, human and non-human.’ For example, neo-liberal reforms carried out in Egypt under the auspices of the IMF were given a smooth passage by the government’s repression of dissent either through political fraud or widespread human rights abuses (Mitchell 2002). An example of the pacifying of dissent in order to allow the neo-liberal development of the tourism industry in Peru is Fujimori’s establishment of security which resulted in tourists returning to Peru. The Sendero Luminoso had prompted the government to call a state of emergency and targeted tourists, causing tourist arrivals to drop dramatically. After Fujimori’s suppression of this terrorist group, international arrivals nearly trebled from 1992 to 1996 from 200,000 to 700,000 (Desforges 2000).

Fujimori emphasised the role of a privatised tourism industry, making major cut-backs in state tourism departments and encouraging private investment (Desforges 2000). However, he retained the state’s role in the promotion of tourism, through FOPTUR, Fondo de Promoción Turística (Fund for the Promotion of Tourism, or Tourist Board). This was responsible for the promotion of Peru as a tourist destination, through maintaining a presence at international trade fairs and relationships with international travel agents (Desforges 2000). FOPTUR also was responsible for advancing positive attitudes to tourism domestically. In 1995, it launched a public campaign under the slogan ‘El turista es su amigo’ (tourists are your friends), which aimed to increase Peru’s ‘conciencia turística’ (tourist conscience or awareness) (Desforges 2000: 187). Fujimori’s use of state apparatus in an attempt to call on national unity in tourism promotion reflects the neo-liberal casting of the state’s role in calming dissent in order to facilitate market integration. Calls for a national spirit in the face of hardship, in order to develop Peru, also reveal Fujimori’s popularist style of governance. Another strategy by which Fujimori encouraged a positive public
attitude to tourism development was his promises of the industry's widespread job creation. He is famously quoted as saying that for every two tourists, one job would be created: 'We have to always remember the fact that 2 tourists generate 1 job' \(^99\) (Fujimori 2000: 7).

President Alejandro Toledo (2001-2006) followed Fujimori as president in 2001. He presents perhaps a contradictory background as both a Peruvian of indigenous descent and as a US Stanford educated elite World Bank consultant (García 2005). He made much of his indigenous identity during his presidential campaign, and celebrated his inauguration at Machu Picchu, where he addressed his audience in Spanish and Quechua thus affirming his position as Peru's first indigenous president (Silverman 2002). He pledged to defend indigenous rights with the presidents of neighbouring Latin American countries in The Declaration of Machu Picchu (García 2005). However, his background of US education and work for the World Bank were reflected in his pursuit of neo-liberal policies of further privatisation of state enterprises, including electricity suppliers and his focus on attracting foreign investment, against which there were anti-free market protests (McClintock and Vallas 2003). He gained funds from the World Bank in 2002 for development projects directed at Amazonian, Andean and Afro-Peruvian peoples, which have been criticised for co-opting indigenous organisations into neo-liberal economic structures (García 2005). Toledo has played on his own indigenous identity in order to promote Peru as tourism product in the world economy. Vich (2007) describes the joint Promperú production and US Discovery Channel of a documentary on Peru, where Toledo himself plays tour guide. The programme emphasises Peru’s indigenous heritage as a point of difference in the marketing of the country and Vich argues that the commodification of indigenous culture de-politicises indigenous identities:

> We already know that before it homogenizes cultures, the contemporary market encourages and promotes ‘cultural difference’ as part of a strategy over whose control powerful actors

\(^99\) See appendix 3, note 5:1 for the original Spanish.
compete. Gradually, the political power of ‘cultural difference’ (...) no longer scares the hegemonic centres and instead is being systematically used as a way to create greater flexibility in supplying products in a highly competitive market. In other words: the world is no longer presented as a place of political struggle or of identities that seek more social rights and greater access to resources, but simply as a place where diversity is celebrated as a kind of postcard aesthetics and emptied of all political content.

(Vich 2007: 3)

Peru has experienced power struggles between central control and regionalism from the post-independence period onwards. In the post-colonial period, modernisation of the economy, society and politics emanated from the colonial capital, Lima, which was pitted against conservative regional elites (Klarén 1973; Klarén 1999; Monge Salgado 2006). Toledo’s presidency marked a renewed movement towards decentralisation, with its emphasis on the participation of civil society in development. His government proposed the decentralisation of political representation and social institutions, such as the provision of education services and health care, together with the participation of civil society, in order to combat economic, social and political exclusion (Monge Salgado 2006).

Tourism development in Peru reflects changing approaches to the role of the state and markets as agents of development and tensions between central state control of development and regional autonomy. These themes, which have been outlined in this brief history, will be explored below through the most recent Peruvian Institutional frameworks for sustainable tourism development.

### 5:3 Peruvian institutional frameworks for sustainable tourism development

Peruvian institutional frameworks for sustainable tourism reflect both the contingencies of international discourses and national geographically and historically embedded concerns surrounding development. The following will
examine the Peruvian political approaches to development outlined above by focusing on Pentur, the Peruvian State’s plan for tourism development.

**Pentur**

The Peruvian State launched its 10 year plan for tourism development, Pentur (Plan Estratégico Nacional de Turismo, National Strategic Plan for Tourism) in 2005. This is intended to guide tourism development from 2005-2015 (Mincetur 2005) and a revised plan from 2008-2018 (Sariego López and García Santillán 2008). It is important to note the involvement of USAID in funding institutional restructuring in Peru, and its influence on approaches to economic development. It provides financial and technical support to Mincetur in order to further integrate Peru into the world economy, based on the principles of free trade, as stated in the following extract from a USAID country report:

In order to improve coordination and transparency among regulatory bodies in Peru, USAID provided assistance to the Ministry of Foreign Trade and Tourism (MINCETUR) to inventory all technical regulations to meet World Trade Organization (WTO) requirements and pre-implementation of the PTPA (Peru Trade Promotion Agreement).

(USAID/Peru 2008a: 2)

Furthermore, USAID states in its country profile on Peru that:

USAID works with the national, regional and local governments in areas such as customs reform, business registration reform, regional export plans, and infrastructure concessions. Work with the private sector includes an extensive business development services program and support for an open dialogue on free trade, including the recent entry-into-force of the Peru Trade Promotion Agreement (PTPA) between the US and Peru.

(USAID/Peru 2009b: 1)
USAID also states in its country profile on Peru that its mission is to fund: ‘Activities [that] are focused on poverty reduction by expanding opportunities for low-income Peruvians to participate in the international economy’ (USAID/Peru 2009b: 1).

Concerns for the sustainability of tourism focus on visitor security and official documents call on the fostering of a national spirit to protect tourists and to avoid disruptions to the tourism industry. Pentur sets out policies to decentralise the geographical range of tourism circuits in order to generate employment out from established centres of tourism and to increase the participation of civil society. It also promotes DMOs to devolve the management and funding of tourism to regional public and private partnerships. It outlines plans to diversify Peru’s tourism products to respond to a wide range of niche markets, while preserving its traditional tourism demand-base, which centres on visiting the major tourist centres of Cusco, Machu Picchu and Puno. Tourism markets are also proposed as the means of preserving environmental and cultural resources.

In the following extract from his preface to Pentur (2005-2010), Toledo endorses this plan. He promotes a vision of sustainable tourism that will deliver decentralised development through the participation of civil society. Toledo’s approach to tourism follows Fujimori’s idea of tourism as a means of generating more equitable economic growth and addressing economic and social exclusion (Monge Salgado 2006). Toledo proposes to do this by advancing an agenda for participatory decentralisation (Monge Salgado 2006), through promising widespread employment, the inclusion of small businesses in tourism and calling on the participation of civil society. He evokes international sustainable development principles to support this agenda, which emphasise the need to respect the environment and traditional cultures:

Tourism can be an important way to achieve diverse development goals, such as the generation of decentralised employment, the conservation of our cultural and natural
heritage through, among other things, the participation of civil society and the strengthening of small businesses.

(...)

These actions will be realised within the philosophy of sustainable development, caring for the environment, respecting traditional cultures and the active participation of society. 100

(Mincetur 2004: 5)

Toledo emphasises the importance of the participation of wider civil society in the preservation of cultural and natural assets and in the support of the tourism industry. The following extract from Pentur directly links sustainable tourism with socio-economic development, and advances the promotion of ‘a culture of tourism’ (Sariego López and García Santillán 2008: 14), through the support of civil society to ensure visitor security:

General Objective: To develop sustainable tourism in Peru as a tool for socio-economic development.
Strategic objectives:
Objective 1: promote a culture of tourism and visitor security. 101

(Sariego López and García Santillán 2008: 14)

The emphasis on civil society’s support (whether or not they are directly involved in tourism or its benefits) as crucial for the success of Peru as a tourist destination echoes Fujimori’s insistence on a ‘tourist conscience’ (Desforges 2000: 187). Concerns for security issues and their effect on the sustainability of tourism hark back to the period of Peru’s civil war, which caused tourism to decline rapidly in the late 1980s and early 1990s (Desforges 2000). Pentur not only advances visitor security as being the duty of civil society, but also as the

100 See appendix 3, note 5:2 for the original Spanish.
101 See appendix 3, note 5:3 for the original Spanish.
role of the state. It suggests that state agencies implement a security programme in order to restore the public’s, and tourists’, confidence in the state’s authority, as seen in the following extract:

The perception of insecurity is not only related to the increase in crime or the number of road accidents, but also to the lack of confidence society has in the capacity of the state agencies responsible for ensuring order in the country. It is evident that a security programme is fundamental to deal with this situation, and the national and regional authorities must start imposing control on tourist destinations in the country.102

(Sariego López and García Santillán 2008: 60)

The promotion of the state as responsible for guaranteeing tourists’ security is in line with the neo-liberal conceptualisation of the role of the state as enabling the safe passage of private enterprise. The next section, on the decentralisation of tourism destinations and diversification of tourism products in Peru, also reflects neo-liberal approaches to extending and increasing market integration.

**Decentralisation and diversification**

Decentralisation of tourism is proposed in Pentur by supporting the development of new tourism routes that are emerging, as well as identifying potential tourism circuits. These new circuits break from the previous concentration of tourism development and promotion of the Cusco/Puno circuit, which was heavily invested in during the 1960s (Desforges 2000). Most tourism in Peru remains concentrated in Lima and in the south of the country, along the Cusco-Puno corridor which links the iconic, World Heritage sites of Machu Picchu and Cusco to the world’s highest navigable lake, Lake Titicaca. The most established and heavily touristed circuit takes in Lima, the Nazca Lines, Arequipa, Lake Titicaca, and Cusco and Machu Picchu (Desforges 2000). The figures are indicative of the concentration of tourism in this region: there were

---

102 See appendix 3, note 5:4 for the original Spanish.
over half a million visitors to Cusco and Machu Picchu in 2006 (Mincetur 2007) and 98% of visitors to Peru visit Machu Picchu (Desforges 2000:178).

A parallel strategy to decentralise tourism, with the aim of achieving a more equitable distribution of the benefits of tourism, is to diversify the range of tourism products, beyond the traditional sites of tourism and to focus on niche markets, of which community-based homestay tourism is one. This transition from traditional tourist circuits and limited products (mainly the iconic sites of Cusco, Machu Picchu and Puno) represents a break from prior national tourism policies. It also reflects post-Fordist trends in the diversification of tourism products which are taking place globally. The following extract from Pentur 2008-2018 shows the Ministry of Tourism’s intention to branch out into niche markets in order to benefit local people more directly:

> It should be a priority for the state to develop tourism that appeals to specialised travel interests, such as community-based rural tourism, birdwatching, gastronomy, surfing, opening up non-traditional tourism spaces and assuring a better distribution of the revenue from tourism towards the local population. 103

(Sariego López and García Santillán 2008: 18)

Other reasons for the advancement of niche tourism are that, according to research carried out by Promperú (Sariego López and García Santillán 2008: 21), although 61% of tourists visit iconic sites on the traditional circuits, specialised tourists are claimed to spend more on average, and be more adaptable in the services they demand. They also look for real life experiences and see levels of convenience and comfort as less of a priority. For these two reasons, niche tourists provide added value in that they spend more and need less investment in terms of, for example, transport infrastructure and hotels, which are two of Peru’s weaknesses in the tourism sector, according to Pentur (Sariego López and García Santillán 2008). This reasoning, of niche tourists providing high degrees

---

103 See appendix 3, note 5:5 for the original Spanish.
of added value, is reflected in the promotion of responsible tourism at the international level (chapter 4). As the following extract from Pentur 2008-2018 shows:

In accordance with the market segmentation researched by Promperú, 39% of tourists look for activities related to specific niches or diverse interests linked to real-life experiences, while the rest are interested in visiting iconic sites on traditional circuits. In this way, niche and multi-themed activities tend to be more specialised. Moreover, they attract tourists with higher average spending who are more adaptable to services.104

(Sariego López and García Santillán 2008: 21)

The profile of niche tourists, researched by Promperú, below, echoes profiles of responsible tourists promoted at the international level. The identification of niche tourists’ priorities of discovering new experiences, contact with nature, personal development and education, supports the creation of new products to meet their demands.

In researching the profile of the new international tourist, Promperú found that he is looking for new experiences and personal growth. Moreover, he needs to feel that he is discovering ancient civilizations and having a high degree of contact with nature. These explorers, who generate trends in their group, have open and positive minds, consider travel as an important activity and have a high level of education. That is to say, today’s tourist is looking for experiences.105

(Sariego López and García Santillán 2008: 22)

Community-based, homestay tourism fits Pentur’s (Sariego López and García Santillán 2008) proposals of developing niche tourism products, for a tourist market that is looking for real-life experiences, particularly through visiting and learning about rural communities. Homestay tourism also requires little start up

104 See appendix 3, note 5:6 for the original Spanish.
105 See appendix 3, note 5:7 for the original Spanish.
investment compared to that of traditional, mass tourism, which demands high standards of accommodation and services. Moreover, homestay tourism is advanced by the Peruvian Ministry of Tourism as delivering development in a more equitable way. The following statement from Minister Aráoz (Minister for Tourism Development), quoted in a news report on 'The First National Meeting of Rural Tourism in Puno' (Mincetur 2007), indicates the state's commitment to rural tourism as being at the forefront of development in marginalized areas, because of its potential to directly benefit local people: 'Mincetur has decided to use rural tourism as being at the forefront [of development], we believe that this directly benefits local people.' The statement uses the term ‘frontier’ in the original Spanish, translated as ‘forefront’, which evokes imaginations of rural areas as being at the edges of developed Peru. The following extract from Mincetur's (2008) working document on the development of community-based, rural tourism emphasises the participation of local people in tourism for the benefit of the community: ‘Community-based, rural tourism in Peru is all tourism activities that are developed in rural areas, in a planned and sustainable way, based on the participation of local people and organised for the benefit of the community’ (Mincetur 2008: 4).

Despite Pentur’s proposal that niche markets do not require a great deal of investment in infrastructure, international access to Peru, and internal access to tourist destinations within Peru, are a priority in its national tourism policy.

The National Strategic Plan for Tourism is a tool for our country on the path to greater economic competitiveness, a better balance and sustainable development in an accessible and well connected territory. (Sariego López and García Santillán 2008: 14)

---
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Peru’s establishment of new, diversified tourism circuits attests to the recognition that the commercial viability of new tourism products is connected to pre-existing tourism infrastructure and established routes. Dolores Takahashi, Director of Domestic Tourism at Promperú, whom I interviewed, emphasises that tourism becomes established around certain ‘points’, or centres, and along ‘corridors’. Tourism in rural communities also depends on ease of access, that is, good roads and proximity to tourist centres. She is arguing that there needs to be a pre-existing tourist infrastructure in terms of access and services for rural homestay tourism to become established. Very remote, rural communities are not ear-marked for homestay projects because of difficulty of access.

I tell you from my own point of view that, tourism isn’t the fairy godmother that can change peoples’ lives, and, oh, suddenly it will change them into something that they’ve never imagined. Tourism, like any other productive activity is established in points, and along routes, where you can carry out this activity. A rural village, a community, no matter how beautiful it is, if it’s at 5,000 metres above sea level, behind the whole of the Andes without a road, there’s no way of getting there, is there? So, it’s a matter of establishing tourism where there are the most favourable conditions, so that the tourists can arrive, where there are facilities.\footnote{See appendix 3, note 5:12 for the original Spanish.}

Echoing this idea of ‘points’, centres, and ‘corridors’, state agencies and international development agencies are working within the vision of ‘circuits’ and ‘alternative routes’ between established tourist centres. Instead of travelling directly from tourist centre to tourist centre, tourists/travellers are encouraged to stop en route and do a homestay, or take an alternative route from a well-established tourist centre. This is reflected in the geographical location of the sites in this study. Amistad is near Huaraz, which is a major trekking centre. The Peruvian State agency FONCODES/MIMDES (FONCODES, Fondo de Cooperación para el Desarrollo Social, Social Development Fund and MIMDES, Ministerio de la Mujer y Desarrollo Social, Women’s and Social Development Ministry) is
establishing the ‘Corredor Cusco-Puno’ as a route between these two major
tourist centres. Bienvenido finds itself on this route: the village is located next to
an archaeological site where tourist buses stop for an hour and then move onto
Cusco or Puno. It has established a homestay tourism project with state support.
Encuentro is near the tourist centre of Puno, and is promoting itself as an
alternative to the perceived over-touristed Puno and islands of the Uros, Taquile
and Amantaní.

DMOs

Direct control of tourism by the state has been devolved to hybrid public-private
models of management and funding from 1990 onwards when Fujimori adopted
neo-liberal approaches to cutting back the state’s role in tourism (Desforges
2000). Pentur’s proposed decentralisation and diversification of tourism will be
delivered through DMOs (Destination Management Organisations), which are
promoted by the WTO, and international tourism consultants, as models of
public-private partnerships (established through networks) and public-private
funding.

DMOs are public-private, not for profit associations which
implement tourism development plans. They are financed
through periodic quotas from their members and through other
sources of financial support, such as international co-
operation.111

(Sariego López and García Santillán 2008: 37)

The idea of DMOs has been transferred into Peruvian State policy for tourism
management through a network of international consultants. Rather than
demonstrating a direct line of command from the World Bank to the Peruvian
government, consultants from diverse institutional backgrounds (for example,
from academic institutions and government development agencies) build a

111 See appendix 3, note 5:13 for the original Spanish.
Development discourse is constituted and reproduced within a set of material relationships, activities and power-social, cultural and geo-political. To comprehend the real power of development we cannot ignore either the immediate institutional or the broader historical and geographical context within which its texts are produced. The immediate context is provided by ‘the development machine’. This machine is global in its reach, encompassing departments and bureaucracies in colonial and post-colonial states throughout the world, Western aid agencies, multilateral organisations, the sprawling global network of NGOs, experts and private sector organisations such as banks and companies that marshal the rhetoric of development, and the plethora of Development Studies programmes and institutions of learning worldwide.

(Crush 1995: 6)

The geographical flows of DMO models for the development and management of tourism is important. Pentur was developed in conjunction with the World Tourism Organisation (based in Madrid), which provided training in the establishment of DMOs to the Peruvian Ministry of Tourism. A Spanish private consultancy firm was hired to develop Pentur, funded by the InterAmerican Development Bank (which is based in Washington, DC) (Sariego López and García Santillán 2008). DMOs were also promoted by a British academic, who gave a presentation on this model of tourism organisation to the Peruvian
Ministry of Tourism and a consultant for the Swiss government’s development agency worked on plans for DMOs in the Cusco-Puno. Northern models of tourism development and management come to be normalised as the best way to deliver tourism development through a series of outside (US and European) experts (Mitchell 2002; Goldman 2006).

The direction of flows of ideas surrounding tourism management attest to postcolonial continuities of power from US and European centres to ‘developing’ peripheries. The post-development view, that ‘development’ is a continuation of colonialism: according to Rajni Kothari (1988: 143), ‘where colonialism left off, development took over’ in the post-World War II period highlights the coloniality of current power relations regarding the Peruvian State’s adoption of Northern models of tourism development. The post-development school sees the colonial world view of modernity/coloniality as being taken up in the dichotomies of the development era: core/periphery, First/Third World, developed/under-developed or developing countries. Esteva (1992) and Sachs (1992) highlight development as being defined in terms of Southern countries, which are seen as ‘under-developed’ against Northern models, which are defined by their Northern inhabitants as ‘developed’. Escobar argues that, once countries began to see themselves as ‘underdeveloped’ ‘how “to develop” became for them a fundamental problem’ (Escobar 1995: 25). He proposes that Southern countries were faced with following Western scientific, industrial, cultural and political models as the sole way of becoming ‘developed’, which it was assumed to be a universally desired state.

However, involvement of the Peruvian State in struggles over control of regions peripheral to the European capital, Lima, and the country's integration into

112 Interview with Ernesto Valencia, Technical Secretary of PENTUR, Ministry of Foreign Trade and Tourism (Mincetur), Lima
113 Interview with Martin Reichmann, Senior Economist/partner, Strategy and Enterprise Development Agency (formerly) Consultant for Swissaid tourism projects in the Cusco/Puno region, Lima
global markets has a longer history. Moreover, elites display agency in adopting neo-liberal approaches as part of this historical trajectory (Colás 2005; Harvey 2005). The integration of remote regions into national networks that facilitated global trade was seen as a major challenge by the modernising Limeño elites of the post-independence period. For example, in the post-independence geographies the Andes were represented as a barrier to the flow of goods from the Amazon region to trading centres on the coast (Orlove 1993). The role of the state in integrating peripheral regions into global markets has changed from struggling over control of resources in the provinces (Monge Salgado 2006) to supporting structures that enable markets to function. Scott (1998: 8) notes that while states have attempted to establish control through grand schemes to restructure the societies they govern, capitalist markets simplify and standardise social practices in order to extract a profit: ‘(...) large-scale capitalism is just as much an agency of homogenisation, uniformity, grids, and heroic simplification as the state is, with the difference being that, for capitalists, simplification must pay. A market necessarily reduces quality to quantity via the price mechanism and promotes standardisation (...).’ In establishing DMOs, the state maps out simplified and standardised regions as tourist destinations, each with their own attractions, and proposes models of public-private management of these sectors.

The environment and culture as economic goods

Peruvian discourses of tourism as a means of delivering development through accessing world markets can be contextualised in post-independence modernisation paradigms. In the post-independence period of modernisation of the economy, society and politics emanated from the once colonial capital, Lima, whose elite saw itself as struggling against a physical geography, regional conservatism and racial backwardness that hindered progress. These environments and cultures are now assets in neoliberal development. Tourism can be seen as a form of modernisation, in that it integrates Peruvian regions into the world economy through offering environmental and cultural resources. Making these resources accessible to global markets is seen by the state as a
challenge, contingent on investing in infrastructure for tourism services, such as transport and accommodation, as well as the promotion of tourism products and national economic restructuring.

Peruvian post-independence geographical imaginations of race and place saw rural areas and their indigenous inhabitants as hindering national progress and aspirations to modernity. Orlove (1993: 321) describes post-independence geography’s tripartite division into coast, highland and jungle, with the highlands impeding progress through presenting a physical barrier to the flow of goods throughout the Republic. The highlands are presented as: ‘an obstacle to national integration, most immediately because they impede the movement of goods and people from other regions to the coast. These tropes of “obstacle”, “integration” and “progress” are central to the hegemonic impulse of republican geography’ (Orlove 1993: 321). He then describes how physical geography becomes racialised through environmental determinism: ‘Precisely like the highlands, the Indians became an “obstacle” which impeded “integration” and thus retarded national “progress”’ (Orlove 1993: 328). De la Cadena (2000) also describes Peruvian racial geographies of the early twentieth century as relying on environmental determinism to explain regional economic inequalities through environmental differences impacting on racial traits. Lima and the coast were placed above highland areas in terms of temporal evolution, progress and modernisation. The highlands and its people were seen as conservative and as obstructing progress.

Post-independence modernisation paradigms and racialised geographies continued in the post-Second World War period and are still prevalent today. Radcliffe and Westwood (1996), in their study of contemporary national identity in Latin America, argue that ‘race is regionalised, and regions racialised’ (Radcliffe and Westwood 1996: 111) and that rural life is uniformly represented: ‘in a “commonsense” way as backwards, uneducated and poor’ (Radcliffe and Westwood 1996:110). These racial geographies can be identified in current Peruvian discourses on development as the following quote from an opinion
piece by the current Peruvian President, Alan García, published in the Peruvian press, shows. Commenting on Amazonian indigenous communities’ refusal to sell their communal land to foreign mining companies, a dispute that has recently caused violent clashes between the Peruvian army and indigenous groups (Caroll 2009), García argues: ‘(...) there are many resources going unused that cannot be sold, that are not receiving investment, and that are not generating work. And all this because of the taboo of obsolete ways of thinking, and because of idleness and laziness’ (Salazar 2007). Thus, Alan García sees indigenous communities as blocking progress through their out-dated attitudes and laziness, which reflect post-independence modernisation paradigms and racism.

While attitudes to indigenous people as hindering progress remain, the Peruvian State now sees the environment and indigenous cultures, the rural places and the people that live there, as being valuable resources in tourism. Pentur 2005-2015 sees its mission as making the country’s environmental and cultural resources accessible, both representationally and materially to global tourist markets:

> The challenge lies in making our natural resources and rich local culture attractive and accessible to global tourist markets.

Dr. Alfredo Ferrero Diez Canseco, Trade and Tourism Minister

(Mincetur 2004: 6)

While treating nature and culture as economic resources, Pentur 2008-2018 also echoes international sustainable development proposals that the commodification of these promotes their conservation:

> The increase in the participation of the tourism sector of the country’s economy is a quantifiable goal that must be considered with benefitting from and conserving the socio-cultural and environmental values that represent Peru’s competitive advantage in tourism.\footnote{See appendix 3, note 5:14 for the original Spanish.}
Moreover, Pentur 2008-2018, in the above quote, suggests that the distinctiveness of Peru’s social, cultural and environmental values represents a way of differentiating the country among its competitors. Peru is constituted as a tourism product through cultural difference for a global tourism market that trades on distinctiveness from Western norms. As Vich (2006: 93) points out, tourism markets function within ‘(...) a system which needs to produce difference in order to establish itself with its consumers.’ Cultural difference is conveyed through notions of authenticity and Otherness, found in the past, primitive ways of life (MacCannell 1973; Selwyn 1996; Mowforth and Munt 1998; Vich 2006; Vich 2007). Peruvian branding of temporal and cultural difference is found in a specific historic and ethnic identity, that of the Incas, which will be examined in the next section.

5:4 Peru--the Land of the Incas

Promperú has adopted the strap-line ‘Peru--Land of the Incas’ (Promperú 2008) in its promotional website (see illustration 5:1 below). This slogan creates Peru as an ‘authentic’ destination through evoking the past in the Incan archaeological site of Machu Picchu, which also features on the home page of the website. Moreover, authenticity as cultural difference is suggested through encounters with Peru’s indigenous people, presented as the present-day descendents of the Incas, evoked by images of colourfully dressed locals.

116 See appendix 3, note 5:15 for the original Spanish.
Dolores Takahashi, Director of Domestic Tourism at Promperú, describes the slogan, Peru-Land of the Incas, which started to be used in 2000, as a strategy to differentiate Peru as a tourist product on the global market of countries with high profile archaeological sites:

Peru-Land of the Incas is more than anything a strategy of differentiation, its not a country brand, but a tourist brand, which we have to help us differentiate ourselves from the competition, through offering a unique product that is different from all the other countries which can compete with us in terms of history and archaeology, but no other country apart from Peru can say it's the land of the Incas (...) for us it's a powerful tool of differentiation in markets where we compete with different destinations, like Petra, Angkor Wat, Tical, the pyramids and so on.  

---

117 See appendix 3, note 5:16 for the original Spanish.
She counters critics of the branding who point out that Peru has a more diverse cultural heritage of civilizations that pre-date the Incas, saying that consumers need a simple, strong brand:

We still have a lot of conflict because of this, because some people think the brand can be seen as a flag, but the brand is what we have to help us enter into the consumer's mind and access markets. Now you can criticise this, by saying we have mochica, wari, wancas, aymaras, we have these native peoples. But I think it has been proved that people get confused if there are too many things. It's like when you go to a big shopping mall to buy a pair of sandals and the shop has thousands of sandals, you end up leaving without buying any.118

While Dolores Takahashi is careful to separate Peru the brand from Peru the country, critics of tourism’s commodification of culture argue that representations in tourism cannot be separated from the political messages they convey. Vich (2007: 2), in his discussions of Promperú’s promotion of the country’s ‘exotic’ and ‘magical’ past, argues that the production of simplified and standardised images to fulfil tourists’ expectations de-politicises developmental difference. He maintains that the deployment of such images have political impacts by creating and normalising temporal and developmental differences between hegemonic centres of modernity, which send tourists, and Peru, which receives tourists.

(... tourism [is] a discursive machinery that produces representations of the nation that have important consequences on the ways in which history and cultural identity are conceptualised ...) We would be mistaken if we considered it as an innocent process that had no direct effects on the geopolitical division of the world and on development programmes.

(Vich 2007: 2)

118 See appendix 3, note 5:17 for the original Spanish.
While Vich (2007) argues that representations in tourism promotion have wider political impacts on development, Roberto López contests Promperú’s advertising campaign on the grounds that it continues to promote the concentration of tourism in the hands of elite travel agents and in the Cusco-Machu Picchu area. Roberto López is a former tourism consultant for Promperú, writer, journalist and TV presenter of a Peruvian travel programme which educates Peruvians about alternative tourism circuits in their country. He disputes the branding of Peru as the land of the Incas, arguing that Peru offers far more diversity and living cultures, rather than simply historical ruins and that these resources should be promoted in order to decentralise and diversify tourism. He argues that branding the country as the Land of the Incas continues to privilege the traditional Cusco-Machu Picchu tourist centre. He explains elsewhere in the interview that FOPTUR, the state-owned agency that Fujimori disbanded to create Promperú, was run by 6 or 7 powerful travel agents who used their influence to sell their own products at international tourism fairs. He explains the continued predominance of Cusco-Machu Picchu and traditional lack of investment in new products and tourist routes is due to the continuation of vested interests. He describes how his own team worked in Fujimori’s Promperú to diversify Peru’s tourism image and products, but that when Fujimori fell and Toledo took over, the branding of the country reverted to the traditional Cusco-Machu-Picchu tourism image.

We began to question, to raise doubts over the positioning of Peru as only Cusco-Machu Picchu (…) We were about to discover that Peru was much more than Inca stones, and that living cultures were much more interesting. And so we started to do all the work of rethinking and that was a really hard fight with the traditional agencies who wanted to continue selling Cusco-Machu Picchu. Finally Fujimori fell, and Toledo’s government came and suddenly our country’s brand was Land of the Incas, and now we’re the Land of the Incas.\footnote{See appendix 3, note 5:18 for the original Spanish.}
López sees the branding of the Land of the Incas as running contrary to the decentralisation and diversification of tourism products. Moreover, further on in the interview he expresses the opinion that, despite Pentur’s plans to decentralise and diversify tourism routes, and develop new niche products and circuits, state tourism agencies continue to be in the grip of powerful travel agents who work to maintain the concentration of tourism in traditional products and destinations. He argues that there is a lack of investment in new routes and products, reporting that Promperú allocates 60% of its funding to promotion and 40% on developing new products.

López reveals the politics behind the branding of Peru as the Land of the Incas, in terms of the interests at play in the continued emphasis on traditional images and tourism centres. However, in a postcolonial reading of Promperú’s campaign, Vich (2006) argues that the images produced for tourism promotion have the effect of depoliticising lack of development. He argues that the images of especially traditional, indigenous people deployed in Promperú’s promotional materials homogenise Peru’s ethnic diversity and multi-cultural society, denies their experience of historical changes, poverty and connection to the present. These images erase the historical and political realities that indigenous people have experienced and continue to experience. Moreover, by co-opting a sanitised version of indigenous culture for its own gain, tourism depoliticises the structural inequalities that promote developmental inequalities. Said ([2003] 1978) argues that colonial representations of the Orient render it as timeless and unchanging and, therefore, stagnant and incapable of change. Vich (2006:93) in the following quote, argues that representations of indigenous people in Promperú’s campaigns are rendered timeless, and happily unaffected by modernity or poverty.

Promperú has spent some hundreds of thousands of dollars promoting an image where it seems that the great changes of the twentieth century (migrations, urban poverty, new aesthetics) have had little impact on the so called traditional world. Its leaflets and participation in international exhibitions always present Peru as a country where its indigenous groups are
Promperú’s promotion of an image of Peru that is rooted in the past, and specifically the glorious past of a lost civilisation can be seen from the postcolonial perspective of rendering colonised territories and peoples as impermeable to modernity. It can also be contextualised in the post-independence search for a national identity that broke away from Eurocentric superiority. While national identities were being forged based on ideologies of ‘mestizaje’ (racial mixing) and modernisation, there were also ‘indigenista’ (indigenous revival) movements that revived and glorified Latin America’s pre-Columbian past. However, while the pre-conquest past was revived as a source of national pride, those marked as contemporary ‘Indians’ remained a source of national shame. Kaminsky (2008: 120) notes that within Mexico’s project of national identity building, its ‘ideal ancestor’ was imagined as the Indian, yet contemporary Indians were to be integrated (and de-racialised) into its ‘ideal citizenry as mestizo’.

Peru saw the emergence of a particularly regional form of indigenismo, ‘Indigenismo Cusqueño’ (Arellano 2008: 39), at the turn of the twentieth century in Cusco. Indigenismo (indigenous revival) and Cuzqueñismo (pride in being from Cusco) was an elite, middle-class, urban revival of an imagined Inca past. Traditions were invented (Hobsbawm 1983) for middle-class and, later, tourist consumption. This movement was stimulated by prominent Cuzqueños who actively sought to promote their city (and themselves) politically, by claiming that they represented authentic nationalism as opposed to Lima’s hispanophilia. This movement gained support from the archaeological and ethnographic research into the city’s glorious past, as well as the revival of episodes from Inca history and regional music and dances through popular performances (de la Cadena 2000; Arellano 2008).

---
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Indigenismo and Cuzqueñismo intersected with an emerging tourism industry in 1944, when the first official Cusco Day on 24 June 1944 was organised to coincide with what was formerly known as the 'Día del Indio' (Day of the Indian), the pre-Hispanic Incaic solstice ritual, Inti Raymi, Corpus Christi, celebrations of the fourth centennial of the Spanish founding of Cusco and, crucially, the tourist season (de la Cadena 2000). Thus, the creation of a regional identity based on a joint Inca/Spanish past, replaced the more recent ‘Day of the Indian’ is telling of the conscious erasure of the contemporary indigenous from Cusco’s regional identity. The date of the celebrations was also specifically chosen to coincide with the tourist season, and performances of Inca heritage were purposefully viewed by local officials as ways to promote economic development through tourism (de la Cadena 2000; Arellano 2008).

Promperú’s promotion of a tourism identity centres on the celebration of an ethnic past and indigenous cultures which provide a living link to that past. Silverman (2002: 882) notes that: ‘The Peruvian nation-state, in existence since 1821, has often looked to the ancient past in framing transcendental questions and policies about its present and future’. The Peruvian State, in promoting tourism as a development strategy, employs past/future binaries, seeing its indigenous heritage as providing the promise of future development, bypassing the present conditions of indigenous peoples, as the following extract from the Promperú website shows:

Heir to ancient cultures and a rich colonial tradition, Perú is a magical spot which involves one of the richest biodiversities of the Earth, and is a melting pot of different cultures, who together are forging the promise of a better future.

(Promperú 2008)

The appropriation of Inca heritage by the state in order to promote neo-liberal market integration in tourism, however, denies the present day inequalities within Peruvian society, and suffered by indigenous people. National elites can be viewed as deploying sanitised forms of indigenous culture within neo-liberal
development models in order to further their economic positions (Harvey 2005) and social identities. By focusing on identities from an imagined past, rather than indigenous identities and concerns in the present, identity as a political rallying point is denied, as the following section will explore.

5:5 Concerns surrounding the sustainability of tourism in the Peruvian Press

The revival of pre-Colombian indigenous identities has been deployed by different political actors to support their agendas throughout the Peruvian post-colonial period. Peruvian presidents have evoked the pre-Hispanic past to bolster the legitimacy of their leadership. Fujimori promoted himself as a new Túpac Amaru II, the Indian nobleman who led a rebellion against Spanish rule in the early 1780s, and Toledo emphasised his indigenous roots, playing the part of the returning Inca, Pachacutec, in his inauguration ceremony at Machu Picchu in 2001 (Silverman 2002; García 2005). Radical political parties have used pre-Colombian symbols as a rallying point for resistance to highly uneven integration into global markets. For example, in the 1920s, which were marked by widespread urban working class and rural indigenous unrest, APRA (Alianza Popular Revolucionaria Americana, American Revolutionary Popular Alliance (Klarén 1973)) adopted the pre-Columbian eagle of the Chavín civilisation to symbolise reaching back into the beginnings of Peruvian culture to create: ‘a new Peruvian society, free from the trappings of imperialism and dedicated to helping the popular classes and promoting indigenismo’ (Silverman 2002: 882). In the late 1960s, the revolutionary military regime of Velasco adopted Túpac Amaru II as the symbol of its social revolution (Klarén 1999). In neighbouring Bolivia, Evo Morales evokes his indigenous heritage as a rallying cry against the new imperialism of foreign companies.

However, the adoption of indigenous symbols in tourism promotion denies the political potency of these symbols and indigenous identity is depoliticised in its integration into markets. The commodification of a mythical indigenous past
follows in the national post-independence national identity formation, which preserved a glorious, distant past while erasing contemporary indigenous people from national discourses (Méndez 1996). Market integration for local and indigenous people remains uneven, with high degrees of social and economic inequalities (Monge Salgado 2006). The uneven development engendered by tourism is often contested by local people, through social protests, such as roadblocks. Silverman (2005) notes that on 22 September 2001 residents established roadblocks to stop tourists gaining access to the archaeological sites at Sipán, in the North of Peru, in order to draw attention to the discrepancies between the national and international attention that the archaeological sites have received, and the lack of basic infrastructure such as running water, sewerage and paved roads of local communities. The local people in the protests described here are not calling on an indigenous identity, but instead on a campesino, or peasant, identity and targeting tourism and tourists in order to gain attention for their cause. The lack of political use of indigeneity attests to Peru’s historical change of emphasis from Indian to peasant categories. The Velasco government replaced the racial category ‘Indian’ with the class-based one ‘campesino’ in its decrees and laws in the late 1960s because they framed the historical marginalization of Peru’s indigenous people as a socio-economic, rather than a racial or cultural problem (Klarén 1999).

This chapter will now turn to a discussion of concerns surrounding the sustainability of tourism in the Peruvian press, focusing on articles that appeared in El Comercio, a major national newspaper, and Viajeros, a specialist travel magazine, in 2005 (which coincides with the period of fieldwork of this study). These articles discuss protests by local people against a lack of inclusion in the benefits of tourism. Crimes against tourists will also be considered. The articles’ concentration on tourist security and concerns for Peru’s image as a safe country for tourists will be contextualised within a history of unrest due to uneven integration into global markets and Peru’s recent history of political violence and its effect on tourism. The views expressed in these articles are those of journalists, tourism ministers and travel agents and reflect the attitudes of
middle-class, Lima-based elites. There is a generally scornful tone in the articles’ attitudes to local people’s concerns and actions. Local people are represented as failing to understand that tourism benefits everyone, reflecting Fujimori’s popularist assertions that tourism development was a national project that would have widespread benefits.

**Sustainability as national reputation**

The following analysis takes an article from the national newspaper ‘El Comercio’ (2005) and the editor’s letter and an article on sustainable tourism from the Peruvian specialist travel magazine ‘Viajeros’ (Silvera and Cartagena 2005). El Comercio is a centre-right newspaper with the second highest circulation in Peru. Its editorial team are based in Lima, but it is distributed to major cities throughout Peru. Tourism is presented as the key to Peru’s future development and, therefore, the reason to preserve its natural and cultural resources. Blockades of infrastructure are a common form of social protest in Peru against uneven neo-liberal development and its resulting conditions of poverty. What comes out strongly in the discussion of these incidents is the hindering of tourists’ mobility, which is seen as threatening the sustainability of this development opportunity. The tone of these articles is scornful of the protestors, expressing the feeling that local people are damaging a valuable source of economic development and are, in their ignorance, harming the nation and themselves. However, there are also voices that express these problems in terms of the failure to create linkages between tourism and the wider economy, and of the benefits of tourism to reach local people, and that local people need to be included in tourism development.

El Comercio of 8th December 2005 reports a blockade of the rail line to Machu Picchu, with some local people chaining themselves to the railway tracks to stop the tourist trains (see illustration 5:2 below). A group called ‘Frente de Defensa de los Intereses de Machu Picchu’ (Front for the Defence of Machu Picchu’s interests) was lobbying for the local authorities to allow a bus to run along part
of the route to Machu Picchu. The route is currently monopolised by Peru Rail, the transnational company that runs the trains and buses from Cusco and Aguas Calientes to Machu Picchu. Peru Rail co-runs the trains and buses to Machu Picchu with Orient Express, which owns the hotel and café outside the site. The Orient Express company, with its Anglo-French colonial heritage, evokes the imperial era of elite travel, is an iconic example of the contrast between exclusive, luxury travel and the conditions of local people who are not benefiting to the same extent as these transnational companies from tourism. The protest shows the lack of linkages between prime tourist resources and local people.

Illustration 5:2 Blockade of rail line to Machu Picchu, Peru, 2005 (El Comercio 2005)
However the report does not consider the structural causes of this incident, which are presented as local disputes between the local authorities and the protestors. Instead, it focuses on the negative effects on Peru’s reputation as a tourist destination. The article emphasises the financial costs of the incident to tourists and the damage done to Peru’s image as a tourist destination. The headline states: ‘Tourists affected by blockade of the train lose US $ 432, 000’ and the subtitle runs: ‘there were some 250 who damaged Peru’s image’ (El Comercio 2005: 15). While the article features quotes from tourists affected by the blockade, there is no interview with the locals who were involved: to give their side of the story. The tone of this article is scornful of the local people involved, they are criticised for, above all, negatively affecting tourism and tourists, who are described as innocently ‘bringing development to Cusco’: ‘The authorities lament this type of action, that is due to internal problems with the local council, ended up affecting thousands of people who were only bringing development to Cusco’ (El Comercio 2005: 15). Rather than engage in an analysis of the complex processes of uneven development initiated by tourism, this presents tourism as a simple ‘good’. This finds parallels with the responsible tourism literature that presents tourists as promoting development simply by their choice of holiday. Blockades of the train line to Machu Picchu continue to be a frequent occurrence, as do those targeting roads and airports, as reported in the editorial of El Comercio of 28th October 2007 (Editor El Comercio 2007). The editor takes a similar attitude to the above article, emphasising the need to foster a greater public awareness of the economic importance of maintaining a positive tourism image.

These accounts, taken with others that appeared in the Peruvian press at the time and since, focus on disputes as internal, domestic matters, that should be taken up at a local level and dealt with out of the international, tourist gaze.

---

121 See appendix 3, note 5:20 for the original Spanish.
122 See appendix 3, note 5:21 for the original Spanish.
Following in the tradition of Fujimori's 'el turista es tu amigo' (tourists are your friends) (Desforges 2000: 187), accounts of unrest call on the national spirit of those excluded from tourism development to put their problems to one side for the greater good of the country's reputation and development, rather than addressing the causes of economic exclusion.

We will now turn to a discussion of an article that appeared in Viajeros (Silvera and Cartagena 2005) in September 2005 on the road blocks that paralysed Peru's transport system earlier that year. These blockades were undertaken as a national protest against widespread social exclusion and poverty and are illustrated in the photograph below (illustration 5:3), which accompanies the article.

Illustration 5:3 Road blocks on the Pan American Highway, Peru, 2005
(Silvera and Cartagena 2005: 35)

The photograph is presented with the following caption, which links the free mobility of people (and tourists) to economic benefits, and associates the blocking of this mobility as obstructing economic growth:

Social Protest

Blocking the highways is a radical action by those who, in the name of the people, are preventing the free transit of people. Without doubt, a fatal blow to tourism and the country's economy.

(Silvera and Cartagena 2005: 35)123

Although these blockades were not directed specifically against tourism, the discussion of the incident by Peruvian tourism experts in the article that follows focuses on the impacts of the blockades on tourism as a key sector of the economy and driver of economic growth. Moreover, the above reference to the 'free transit of people' has resonance with Article 8 of the WTO Global Code of

123 See appendix 3, note 5:22, for the original Spanish.
Ethics (WTO 2002), which evokes international and national law, and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, which insists on tourists’ free mobility:

Tourists and visitors should benefit, in compliance with international law and national legislation, from the liberty to move within their countries and from one state to another, in accordance with Article 13 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights; they should have access to places of transit and to tourism and cultural sites without being subject to excessive formalities or discrimination.

(WTO 2002)

The discussion between Peruvian tourism experts focuses on the effects of road blocks on the sustainable development of tourism. The general consensus is these disruptions are very harmful to tourism in that they represent a huge financial loss: CANATUR, (La Cámara Nacional de Turismo del Perú, the Peruvian National Chamber of Commerce for Tourism), quoted in the article, estimated that the incidents of road blocks from January to June 2005 affected 25,000 tourists and represented an estimated loss of $22 million. The road blocks are also represented as harmful to the country's image as a tourist destination. Luis Verneau, a leading tour operator and tourism consultant, comments: ‘I worry about the impression of our country that tourists will take away with them’ (Silvera and Cartagena 2005: 38).124

The panel comes to the consensus that, as a form of social protest the road blocks harm the very people who are protesting, which is based on the belief, promoted by Fujimori, that everyone benefits in some way from tourism. This is echoed in the following remarks from Dolores Takahashi, director of Domestic Tourism at Promperú (Peru's Ministry of Tourism), who comments that poor people are not conscious of the wider implications of their actions, which reflects both Fujimori's and Pentur's mission of creating and encouraging a 'conciencia turística' (Desforges 2000: 187) (tourist conscience or awareness):

124 See appendix 3, note 5:23 for the original Spanish.
These poor people may think that the ones who have lost out in their blockade of the highway are the Romero and Hayduk companies transportation companies\textsuperscript{125}, they’re not conscious that they will all lose out. Them as well.\textsuperscript{126}

(Silvera and Cartagena 2005: 38)

Sustainability is defined in terms of tourists’ perceptions of Peru as a safe country for tourists to visit and is expressed through concerns over visitor security and ease of travel. These discourses privilege the defence of Peru’s national reputation as a secure tourist destination in the international market over directly addressing marginalization at the local level. Those who resort to disrupting the functioning of the tourism industry to protest against their exclusion are represented as being ignorant of the damage they are doing at the national and international scales. Dissenters are called on to suppress their protests for their own, and the greater, national good. The tone of discussions surrounding dissent and unrest is scornful of the dissenters, and who are portrayed as ignorant and uneducated, of lacking in awareness of the wider impacts of their actions. This tone reflects racist and classist attitudes to local and indigenous people on the part of middle-class, white, Lima-based elites who are the journalists, tourism ministers and travel agents who form the sole voices in these discussions and who have vested interests in the tourism industry.

Strikes and blockades of transportation networks continue to cause disruption to the Peruvian economy, as reported in El Comercio on 13\textsuperscript{th} July 2009 (Gamarra and Limache 2009). The report claims that Peru lost US\$ 295 million in June 2009. It also notes an increase in these forms of social protest from 2005, when there were 33 incidents of this kind, to 2009, when there were 273 incidents, which had moreover become more aggressive. The journalists propose that, while Peru has become richer, GDP has grown and employment has also

\textsuperscript{125} These are two large Peruvian companies that rely on road transport to distribute their goods, and which suffered financial losses in the blockade.

\textsuperscript{126} See appendix 3, note 5:24 for the original Spanish.
increased, the distribution of wealth has also become more unequal, which they see as being the cause behind these social protests.

**Security**

The sustainability of Peru’s tourism industry is discussed through concerns over visitor security, in reports on attacks on tourists and their property, evinced in the title of following extract from the editorial of El Comercio of October 2005: ‘Let’s end attacks on tourists and tourism once and for all’ (Editor El Comercio 2005: a4). The editorial comments on an attack on 16 tourists, who were physically assaulted and robbed of all their money and belongings while trekking on the Inca Trail in the Sacred Valley, Cusco. In common with the above commentary on the blockade of the rail line to Machu Picchu, this account reflects representations of the innocent intentions of the tourists and the damage that these criminal actions have done not only to them as individuals, but to the reputation of the country as a tourism destination. This incident is seen in terms of the loss of both potential return visitors and (later in the piece) ambassadors to promote Peru. It is described as follows:

This week 16 tourists were cowardly assaulted and beaten up on the Inca Trail, in the middle of the Sacred Valley. The delinquents took everything—the visitors’ money and other belongings—but also the expectations of a group of foreign citizens who wanted to discover Peru and who now, probably will never come back to the country.

(Editor El Comercio 2005: a4)

The author goes on to directly link the harm done to individual tourists to the industry as a whole, and its potential for economic growth, which is expressed in

---

127 See appendix 3, note 5:25, for the original Spanish.
128 The emphasis on return visits may be misplaced as Peru as a destination is often promoted through adventure travel companies as a ‘once in a lifetime journey[s]’ (Adventurecentur.com, 2009). This is supported by Butler’s (1992) claims that alternative tourism is characterised by its lack of repeat visitation.
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terms of GDP and influx of foreign currency. So the incident is described as a ‘double blow’ for both the tourists involved and for the nation:

This incident has been a double blow. The tourists have lost out and so has Peru, whose tourism continues to be mistreated and attacked, in spite of being the seventh most important economic activity in the country, contributing 3.3 % to GDP and generating more than $ 600 million in foreign currency.  

(Editor El Comercio 2005: a4)

In the following extract, the editor evokes Fujimori’s discourse of ‘a tourist conscience’ and suggests that all that is needed is to ensure the sustainability of the industry is to provide tourists with a pleasant stay. As in the above extract on the blockade of the rail line to Machu Picchu, this can be interpreted as oversimplifying the relationship that those not directly benefiting from tourism may have with tourists. Moreover, it can be seen as avoiding a discussion of the national and international structures of inequality and mechanisms of socio-economic differentiation in which tourism functions, and which results in many people being excluded from its benefits:

Neighbouring countries, with fewer tourist attractions and resources, attract a larger volume of visitors who (and this is the best part!) come back or become the top tourism promoters of countries which simply offered them a pleasant stay. Here we have Machu Picchu, World Heritage Site, among other beautiful attractions, but we lack a tourist conscience.  

(Editor El Comercio 2005: a4)

Directly after this comment, the editor calls on the state to mount a national campaign much like Fujimori’s promotion of tourism as a popular, national project in his ‘el turista es tu amigo’ campaign, to convince Peruvians to realise the economic and cultural value of tourist resources, to: ‘appreciate the value of

130 See appendix 3, note 5:27 for the original Spanish.
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what we have.'132 He proposes that such a campaign could teach Peruvians the value of hospitality and: ‘to be good hosts and to attract tourists instead of sending them packing’133. If this state-led strategy fails to protect tourists, the editor suggests that the state should warn prospective visitors to Peru of the potential dangers that they might encounter. In attributing the role of warning tourists’ of the dangers of visiting the country to the state, the editor’s comments are in line with the WTO’s Global Code of Ethics (WTO 2002), which proposes that states have a duty highlight the risks of travelling to their countries.

A national project

Throughout these articles, wider civil society is called on to show a national spirit of unity to support tourism as a universally beneficial road to economic development. As Silverman, states, tourism is promoted throughout all levels of Peruvian society as a driving force of development:

The discourse of modernity in Peru is phrased in terms of economic development, and international tourism is proclaimed at all levels of Peruvian society—from traditional highland villages to cities—as one of the most important catalysts for prosperity.

(Silverman 2002: 883)

This popular discourse equates the support of tourism to a national project, whereby everyone has a duty to unite to protect and promote tourism. In the editorial of the Peruvian travel magazine ‘Viajeros’, there is a strong sense that tourism will provide a future for Peru. The editor describes the many ‘positive voices’ that are joining what is described as a ‘national project’, full of ‘promise

132 See appendix 3, note 5:29 for the original Spanish.
133 See appendix 3, note 5:30 for the original Spanish.
and possibility: ‘...a cause that can bring new proposals that will build the foundations of a national project which Peru can take up with promise and possibility’\(^{134}\) (Reaño 2005: 5).

**Lack of inclusion of local people in tourism development**

However, within discourses that see local people as ignorantly blocking economic progress and threatening Peru’s image as a tourist destination, and within the same ‘Viajeros’ (Silvera and Cartagena 2005) article (above), there are voices that advance ideas from international sustainable tourism discourses, that the benefits of tourism have failed to ‘trickle down’ to ‘local’ communities and that these need to be included in tourism development. Luis Verneau, a leading tour operator and tourism consultant, suggests that the tourism industry should include local communities: ‘We haven’t included local communities in our vision of the future. Tourism in the future should include these fundamental actors in all decisions. If not, we'll continue feeding the farce.’ \(^{135}\) (Silvera and Cartagena 2005: 38).

Tourism companies’ appropriation of local and indigenous culture for their own economic benefits, while failing to compensate communities adequately for the commodification of their cultural assets is also highlighted as causing social unrest. Luis Verneau comments: ‘Travel agents trade on culture while leaving little money in communities. So we can’t complain when there are unfortunate incidents and protests because people can’t identify with tourism’\(^{136}\) (Silvera and Cartagena 2005: 37). Dolores Takahashi, from Promperú, is also of the opinion that tourism depends on local people and cultures and that these need to be integrated into the industry: ‘People and cultures are at the heart of the tourism industry and we need to find a way of integrating them into this economic activity’ \(^{137}\) (Silvera and Cartagena 2005: 36).

---

\(^{134}\) See appendix 3, note 5:31 for the original Spanish.

\(^{135}\) See appendix 3, note 5:32 for the original Spanish.

\(^{136}\) See appendix 3, note 5:33 for the original Spanish.
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This chapter has examined discussions of sustainability and tourism at the national level. It has analysed Peruvian State plans for sustainable tourism, Promperú’s (the Peruvian Ministry of Tourism Promotion), branding of the country as the Land of the Incas and concerns and debates on the sustainability of tourism in the Peruvian press. It has situated contemporary national discourses on tourism within historical concerns with development through market integration, decentralisation, national identity and unrest due to the failure of market-led development to bring widespread benefits. It has concentrated on examining debates in Peru within this country’s historical processes in order to explore the specificities of the national level, and the ways in which these interact with international discourses. The next chapter, chapter 6, will turn to discussions of homestay tourism at the local level, focusing on interviews with tourism consultants and NGOs working with community-based homestay projects, and on interviews with community leaders.
Chapter 6  Constructing culture and development in homestay tourism: consultants, tourists and communities

6:1  Introduction

Having explored the constitution of homestay tourism through international and national discourses and policies, this chapter turns to the local level to examine the interplay between tourism consultants (working for internationally and nationally funded NGOs and travel agencies) and community leaders in the construction of indigenous culture and development in homestay tourism. The chapter will examine the principle ways in which indigenous culture is used as a resource to fulfill homestay tourism’s agendas for cultural revival and socio-economic development by these actors. First, it will contextualise homestay tourism’s agenda for cultural revival within contemporary indigenous movements. Second, it will look at homestay tourism’s agenda for the revival of indigenous culture through processes of commodification, mediation and training. Third, it will study the deployment of homestay tourism’s developmental agenda, employing communities’ traditional structures and mechanisms of reciprocity as the cultural capital by which the socio-economic benefits of tourism are distributed throughout a community. It will also examine the interdependent processes of professionalisation and product and socio-economic differentiation. The implications of conceptualisations of authenticity and tourist numbers on perceptions of sustainability will also be explored.

6:2  Indigenous cultural revival and Latin American social movements

Homestay tourism’s agenda of indigenous cultural revival is set within the wider context of the deployment of indigenous identities in contemporary social and indigenous movements throughout Latin America, which also evoke pre-Columbian civilizations. Contrasting grassroots political movements and the commodification of culture in tourism raises questions over the origins of the agenda for cultural revival in homestay tourism. This chapter will discuss
homestay tourism’s agenda for cultural revival from the point of view of international sustainable development discourses and Peruvian elite concerns with national identity (expressed in the views of middle-class, white consultants) and also from the grassroots level of communities. It will also question the extent to which homestay tourism’s agenda to revive indigenous culture is connected to attitudes towards indigenous culture in wider Peruvian society.

As proposed in chapters 2 and 4, homestay tourism functions through ‘alternative’ imaginations, which operate through binaries of travel, as opposed to tourism, non-market exchange, rather than market integration and sustainable and culturally appropriate development, as opposed to destructive, mass tourism. Escobar (1992b: 84) highlights the tensions between ‘development alternatives’ and ‘alternatives to development’, which he sees as ‘the rejection of the entire paradigm’. Following Escobar’s conceptualisation, I argue that homestay tourism presents a development alternative which integrates communities further into global markets in ways that are conceptualised as environmentally, culturally and developmentally responsible by international development agencies and national consultants. However, this form of tourism is promoted by the international responsible tourism industry and development agencies as offering alternatives to mass development.

Escobar (1992b), in common with a prominent group of Third World intellectuals and activists of the early 1990s (Esteva 1987; Sheth 1987; Nandy 1989), sees alternatives to development as coming from grassroots movements. Escobar and Alvarez (1992) argue that prior to the 1970s, social protest on the part of marginalized groups had reflected stable class-based identifications and oppositions, for example the rural peasantry against landowners and oligarchs and the urban proletariat against industrialists. However, the ‘new’ social movements that have emerged from the 1970s onwards reflect more fragmented identities (Wade 1997). Escobar and Alvarez (1992) argue that stable society-state relations started to break down with the failure of the post-Second World War projects of modernisation and development, which culminated in the debt
crisis of the 1980s and harsh neo-liberal structural adjustment interventions. They argue that ‘new ways of doing politics’ (Escobar and Alvarez 1992: 2), reflecting diverse identities and political agendas, emerged in this period in response to widespread social and economic hardship and the failure of traditional mechanisms of political representation (Escobar 1992b). Grassroots indigenous social and political movements, rallying under the banners of indigenous identity, have emerged in Latin America since the 1970s and reached an apex in the early 1990s, as protests gathered around the quincentenary of Columbus’s landing in the Americas in 1992 (Wade 1997).

The new indigenous social and political movements of the 1980s and 1990s have united around ‘millenarian orientations’ (Calderón, Piscitelli and Reyna 1992: 21), exalting ancestral connections to a glorious past, deploying self-essentialising identities as a political strategy to campaign for greater rights. Examples include the Zapatista movement in Mexico (Calderón et al. 1992; Mawdsley et al. 2002) and the Katarista movement in the Bolivian altiplano (Calderón et al. 1992; Yashar 2005). The Zapatistas took their name from the Mexican Revolutionary leader, Emiliano Zapata, and their philosophy from Mayan political thought in their struggle against the Mexican State and its neoliberal policies. The Kataristas adopted the name of Túpac Katari, an indigenous rebel leader in the late colonial period and their vision of society reflects traditional indigenous values. Indigenous movements also propose alternative, communitarian ways of structuring social life, evoking relations of reciprocity, co-operation and solidarity in the face of social exclusion (Calderón et al. 1992). Examples include CONAIE in Ecuador (Radcliffe and Westwood 1996; Laurie et al. 2005; Yashar 2005), the Indigenous Authorities Movement in Colombia (Findji 1992) and the Pan-Maya movement in Guatemala (Warren 1998). Grassroots indigenous movements have emerged most recently and strongly from neighbouring Bolivia. Here, under the nation’s first indigenous president,
Evo Morales, indigenous groups propose pre-colonial indigenous communitarian social structures as viable alternatives to capitalist development\textsuperscript{138}.

Although Peru has a history of indigenous resistance to colonial rule, in the uprisings of Túpac Amaru II in the latter half of the eighteenth century and frequent unrest among rural populations against an elite, creole state (Klarén 1999), many commentators see Peru as lacking a contemporary indigenous political movement (García 2005). (Notable exceptions to Peru's absence of a national indigenous movement are the campesino-indigenous organisation, the National Coordination of Peruvian Communities Affected by Mining (CONACAMI) (Zibechi 2006), and the recent protest movement against the national government and national and international oil companies in the Northern Peruvian Amazon, which has rallied around indigenous identities (Caroll 2009).) There are various theories put forward for what has been termed ‘the Peruvian anomaly’ (Yashar 2005: 240). One is the appropriation of indigenous symbols of rebellion by state and counter-state groups, and another is the blocking of solidarity and networking within and between indigenous communities by both these groups.

The Velasco Revolution of 1968 (President Velasco stayed in power until 1975) appropriated the indigenous rebel leader Túpac Amaru II as its symbol and sought to incorporate indigenous people into the nation state through land reform and ‘an alternative discourse of “indigenous nationalism”’ (Klarén 1999: 121). This discourse incorporated indigenous rebel leaders into Peruvian history alongside creole heroes of Independence. Leading Peruvian anthropologist Rodrigo Montoya (in Zibechi 2006) considers this appropriation of indigenous figureheads by the Peruvian State as robbing a potential indigenous movement of strategic symbols. Yashar (2005) argues that Velasco's land reform of 1968 resulted in competition and conflict within and between communities due to the uneven distribution of land. She contrasts this with the effects of similar

\textsuperscript{138}(Laurie 2002; Albro 2006; Canessa 2006; Dunkerley 2007)
corporatist policies in Ecuador and Bolivia which strengthened inter-community ties and solidarity. Thus indigenous communities in Peru lost potential grounds for building a movement based on common interests and solidarity.

While the state appropriated indigenous figures of resistance, so did groups engaged in violent struggle with the state. Both the Sendero Luminoso and the Túpac Amaru Revolutionary Movement (MRTA) deployed millenarian symbols of indigenous revolt and the communitarian principles of indigenous life in their promotion of Maoist communism. However, Yashar (2005) argues that neither group were committed to advancing indigenous identities or community interests, and were principally Marxist, class-based organisations. She also proposes that the Sendero Luminoso’s lack of tolerance towards alternative forms of organisation led to the destruction of indigenous leadership and possible networks.

Montoya (in Zibechi 2006) argues that both the Peruvian State and the World Bank appropriate indigenous concerns and organisations and integrate them into neo-liberal agendas. He proposes that President Toledo, despite claiming indigenous descent, sought to prevent the emergence of indigenous movements. He claims that one of the ways Toledo did this was through the creation of the National Coordination of Andean, Amazon and Afro-Peruvian Communities (CONAPA) funded by the World Bank and managed by his wife, Belgian, Quechua-speaking anthropologist Elaine Karp. CONAPA was generally condemned for being run in a top-down, authoritarian style, with Karp choosing the principle leaders, distributing funds and raising herself to president of the institution. Karp’s leadership of CONAPA has also been widely criticised in Peruvian society for harking back to popularist, paternalistic relationships between the state and indigenous people and for co-opting indigenous causes (García 2005). She resigned in 2003 in an attempt to put an end to these charges of paternalism and conflicts of interest between state and indigenous organisations, and CONAPA and her own indigenous NGO, Fundación Pacha (García 2005).
The World Bank’s role in funding the organisation - it received US $5 million from the World Bank in 2002 (Garcia 2005) - is also contentious and attests to the networks of power\(^{139}\) that run through individuals from the international to the national levels. Toledo worked for the World Bank before campaigning for the presidency. Montoya (in Zibechi 2006: 1) sees the funding of CONAPA as an attempt by the World Bank to block the development of an indigenous movement in Peru, stating that its objective is ‘to prevent culture and power from joining together.’ In this statement, Montoya is echoing widespread critiques of the World Bank’s appropriation of grassroots movements in order to disseminate its neo-liberal programme (Goldman 2006). As part of this agenda, the UN, the World Bank and the ILO (International Labour Organisation) have targeted groups who self-identify as indigenous for development projects since the beginning of the UN’s dedicated decade to indigenous people in 1995 (Canessa 2006).

In the following sections I argue that homestay tourism appropriates indigenous cultural identity and social and political structures to further integrate communities into global markets. Moreover, homestay tourism can exacerbate the competition within and between communities that have resulted from the Land Reform in 1968, which built on inequalities that date to the colonial period.

6:3 Cultural revival and the commodification of indigenous culture

One of homestay tourism’s agendas is the revival of indigenous culture. The popular and policy related literature on homestay tourism (see chapters 4 and 5) claims that authentic culture is revived through the conversion of indigenous culture into a marketable resource to fulfil responsible tourists’ demands for authenticity. The processes of mediation of indigenous culture through training

\(^{139}\) (Goldman 2006; Crush 1995; Escobar 1992; Ferguson 1990)
by experts (consultants and tourists) and communities’ views on cultural revival in homestay tourism will be explored below.

**Cultural revival: consultants and tourists**

While homestay tourism’s agenda of cultural revival purports to restore the intrinsic value of indigenous cultures, value is conveyed by external consumers and markets, whereas national attitudes to indigenous culture remain ambivalent. There seems to be a disconnection between an appreciation of indigenous culture at the international level, evinced in policy pronouncements from international sustainable development conferences and responsible tourism’s promotional material (see chapter 4), and attitudes to indigenous culture at the national level (see chapter 5). National tourists are viewed as being less appreciative of communities’ efforts at both cultural revival and product formation. Tania Morales, a tourism consultant in gastronomy at Bienvenido, comments that national tourists do not appreciate homestay tourism because they do not realise the work that has gone into adapting aspects of traditional culture to create a tourist product.

[Morales’ comments indicate that the project of cultural revival in homestay tourism is limited to certain mediated versions of indigenous culture, which are valued by outside consumers and markets, while the national context remains less appreciative of indigenous cultural products. As Canessa (2006: 243) points](#)
out, many Latin American countries have experienced dramatic reversals in national attitudes to indigenous cultures, however these remain contradictory and ambivalent:

After decades and centuries of contemporary indigenous culture being represented as anachronistic, backward and retarding the progress of the nation, ‘the indigenous’ is now increasingly seen as being iconically national. At its most trivial level, tourists can buy indigenous handicrafts as souvenirs in every Andean international airport as ‘typical’ and ‘authentic’ national souvenirs. There is, however, some ambivalence to this celebration of indigenous culture: the particularity of indigenous culture and language can be presented as marking the genuinely national even as it serves as the marker of social and racial inferiority.

Morales’ comments reflect opposing national attitudes to indigenous culture and indicate that homestay tourism’s project of cultural revival may not go beyond being valued according to the contingencies of external markets and the tastes of international tourists. As such, indigenous cultural revival can be seen as a middle-class agenda to fulfil middle-class concerns and tastes at both the international and national levels. Weisman (2001: xxxviii) points out the racialised differentiation between international (foreign) and national experts, and local mestizo elites and indigenous communities:

(...) if social scientists have been quick to describe local elites as mestizos, it is surely in the conviction that the authors of the study are the real whites. After all, unlike the small-town petty-bourgeoisie they call mestizos, these professionals are members of an international metropolitan class who can claim symbolic whiteness not only among the rural poor, but anywhere on the continent. Local elites agree, readily ceding their own claims to whiteness in the presence of a university student or professor, whether Latin American or foreign.

Many of the consultants and travel agents in this study were North American, European or highly educated white Peruvians, some of whom had lived or been educated abroad. For example, Miranda Toledo, the NGO consultant for Amistad
had studied for a Masters in the US and Martin Alonso, one of the consultants for Bienvenido is a trained economist who studied models of rural tourism in Spain while living there. Jenkins (2008) examines a Peruvian NGO involved in the training of grassroots female health workers in working class communities in Lima. She notes the frequent use of professional titles, such as ‘ingeniero’ and ‘doctor’ (used both for medical doctors and professionals with or without PhDs) when the health workers address the NGO consultants. The use of professional titles marks both the professional status of the consultants, as well as their middle-class, white status, which differentiates them from the lower social and ethnic status of the health workers. She argues that the NGO she studied trains health workers to a certain level, while they remain formally unqualified and unpaid. She sees the differential status given to trainers and trainees as reinforcing class and ethnic hierarchies, which operate to limit social mobility. I will argue that similar processes can be observed in homestay tourism, where white consultants train communities to produce representations of indigenous culture that fulfil their own, and tourists’ conceptualisations. This in turn emphasises professional and ethnic difference, although communities become involved in tourism to enhance their social mobility. Homestay tourism can therefore be conceptualised as being actively pursued by elites at both the national and community levels in order to maintain, and elevate, their economic and social status through the promotion of neo-liberal agendas (Colás 2005; Harvey 2005).

Authenticity as added value

The revival of cultural authenticity is promoted by consultants as providing ‘added-value’ in the tourism market. Tania Morales combines cultural revival with creating a ‘value-added’ product that commands a higher price in the market. Authenticity is mediated through processes of training and adaptation so that indigenous communities can produce a product that has been refined for the
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141 While on fieldwork in Peru, I was sometimes addressed as ‘ingeniera’ or ‘doctora’ by indigenous leaders.
tourist market. Morales describes the conversion of a local product, potatoes, into a ‘value-added’ product of a traditional dish of locally produced potatoes, that includes an element of visitor education to teach tourists to appreciate the intrinsic value of the product. Morales’ suggestion that tourists be taught that indigenous people eat natural, nutritious, locally produced food, can be set within sensibilities of sustainable development discourses, and middle-class consumer tastes which emphasise the environmental and moral superiority of local, organic produce in the North:

So we’ve seen that if you train people in communities, trying to revive what they’ve got, not change, it’s not about changing their food but just the opposite, it’s about teaching tourists about how they [indigenous people] eat natural food, with local, Andean products, and that they know, so they’re trying to adapt their cooking, using typical, regional products, produced by themselves to give them an added value, something that is not just about selling a kilo of potatoes but selling a dish made with potatoes, grown in their fields, that has a higher value.  

Lily Iglesias, the Cusco office manager for Exploración, a company that works with Encuentro, describes both the local dishes and the contact that tourists have with local people in the homestay as providing an added value to the product:

For tourists its an added value because they don’t stay in a hotel, which is a very cold experience, where they don’t have very much contact with local people, they stay, they eat the food that they prepare for them, and this is the best part, isn’t it? I think this is the new trend in tourism and its something quite positive.

While the revival of indigenous culture in homestay tourism centres on the mediation of cultural authenticity by outside consultants to fulfil tourists’ expectations and the contingencies of niche markets of offering products with added value, authenticity is also constituted through imaginations of loss.

---

142 See appendix 3, note 6:2 for the original Spanish.
143 See appendix 3, note 6:3 for the original Spanish.
Authenticity as loss

Authenticity is situated in a disappearing past, which is represented in opposition to European modernity. This schema of authenticity can be placed in Clifford’s ‘salvage paradigm’ (2002: 160), whereby indigenous cultures are represented as being constantly on the brink of disappearance in the face of modernity. Moreover, MacCannell’s ([1999] 1976) view of tourism as a quest by tourists for the lack of authenticity in their modern lives in what they perceive to be past ways of life illuminates the past/modernity, inauthentic/authentic binaries present in homestay tourism’s conceptualisation of authenticity and cultural revival. This constitution of authenticity in terms of loss can be seen in Tania Morales’ following comments. She echoes international responsible tourism discourses (see chapter 4) when she claims that participating in homestay tourism has made the community realise that it has a valuable culture to share with tourists, which has helped them to lose their shame of being indigenous:

Before we intervened and gave these training sessions, and carried out the consultancy explaining what homestay tourism is, they had lost their (traditional) costumes and cultural identity (...) And they wore modern clothes, and really, all of a sudden when we explained to them that tourists really come to see the original, what it was like, the real culture, they have returned to choosing their culture of before, the one that was being lost (...) so they understood that what is valuable doesn’t lie in dressing as they do in Europe.144

While European cultural forms, in Tania’s example of ‘modern’ dress, are derided for causing loss of indigenous culture, Northern markets are imbued with the moral purpose of reviving disappearing cultures. It is tourists’ demands for authenticity that Morales claims have revived and given a value to indigenous culture. Representations of indigenous culture emanate from the North and

144 See appendix 3, note 6:4 for the original Spanish.

Thus the schema of authenticity as cultural loss enables consultants to revive indigenous culture. Consultants provide training to create versions of indigenous culture that are acceptable to tourists’ perceptions of cultural authenticity and standards of accommodation and food hygiene, as well as timescales. Particular attention is paid to the revival of indigenous dress and traditional, locally produced dishes which have been modified to tourists’ tastes. As can be seen in the photographs below, taken during fieldwork at Bienvenido, members of the homestay tourism association wear local dress when involved in demonstrations of traditional crafts, such as pottery, and when catering for tourists.
Illustration 6:1a A pottery demonstration at Bienvenido

Illustration 6:1b Cooking for a tourist group at Bienvenido

Illustration 6:2 a
A party for tourists at Bienvenido

Illustration 6:2 b
A party for tourists at Bienvenido
Community tourism association members also wear traditional dress when hosting ‘despedida’ (farewell) parties for tourists. Parties feature folk music and dancing and involve tourists’ participation in dressing in traditional clothes and dancing with community members. This event is a common feature of homestay tourism, Amistad and Encuentro included similar parties in their homestay tourism packages, as do Taquile and Amantaní. The idea of hosting a farewell party, where tourists participate by being dressed in traditional clothes and dancing with their hosts seems to have originated in Taquile and Amantaní. Community association members from Amistad visited Taquile and members from Bienvenido visited Amantaní on NGO and state-funded training trips, and the association at Encuentro is located close enough to these islands to be familiar with their tourism packages. Thus conceptualisations of authenticity and the constitution of homestay packages are replicated throughout projects in distinct geographical areas. The use of the homestay packages at Taquile and Amantaní by consultants and communities as models for the formation and reproduction of homestay tourism in other sites in Peru indicates the emphasis within the development community on identifying and disseminating successful project formats (Mawdsley et al. 2002). Homestay tourism on Taquile and Amantaní has been in operation for nearly 40 years and both islands are successful in receiving high numbers of tourists (Gascón 2005; Zorn and Ypeij 2007). Moreover, Taquile has been considered a model of community-based tourism because of the organisational structures its tourism association employs to distribute the benefits of tourism (Zorn 2004; Zorn and Ypeij 2007). This focus on reproducing successful models of development makes development consultants and communities into technicians of development, dulls critical perspectives and facilitates the building and maintenance of a consensus on the constitution of authenticity in homestay tourism (Goldman 2006).
**Tourists**

Tourists’ constructions of authenticity are conveyed through consultants, and also by tourists’ themselves. Tourists also play the role of outside expert, defining authenticity and standards of accommodation, food and service. NGO funded projects often include tours with ‘experimental’ tourists, where tourists volunteer to try out and offer feedback on the product before it becomes more widely marketed. I participated as an experimental tourist on two occasions during fieldwork, on one trip in the North on a section of the Great Inca Road (which stretched from Quito to Cusco) and another on the 'Lares trek', near Cusco, a proposed alternative to the ‘classic’ Inca Trail which ends at Machu Picchu.

Valeriano Quispe, the community tourism association leader at Encuentro, actively sought tourists’ opinions on his homestay tourism package. He recounts that they advanced authenticity as the reason they had travelled to his community, which they defined in terms of external markers of difference with modernity, in this case the use of traditional building materials. He had built rooms for tourists using ‘modern’ building materials such as corrugated iron, cement and plastic. However, when tourists commented that they preferred traditional, locally sourced materials he built his new tourist accommodation with adobe and stone bricks and wooden window frames:

> So the tourists told me ‘we don’t want corrugated iron, cement, plastic, we want to see authenticity, this is why we want to come here’, so because of this one of my objectives was to recuperate and re-value our cultural identity.\(^{145}\)

Quispe relates that tourists’ demands for specific, external markers of authenticity led him to prioritise the revival of cultural identity as one of his objectives in his homestay tourism project. His equation of the production of

---

\(^{145}\) See appendix 3, note 6:5 for original Spanish.
mediated versions of ‘authentic’ housing to fulfil tourists’ conceptualisations of authenticity to the revaluing of cultural identity indicates the priority given to markets in cultural revival.

Quispe’s realisation and response to tourists’ conceptualisations of authenticity is reflected in Yu Wang’s (2007) study of homestays in Naxi, China. She describes successful homestay accommodation as achieving a ‘customised authenticity’, which she argues that ‘(...) even in an overtly staged or constructed context, can be highly pursued and embraced by tourists’ (Wang 2007: 789).

The photographs below show the tourist accommodation at Encuentro, the buildings are made with adobe bricks. The corrugated iron roofs in illustration 6:3a will be covered with thatch in order to look more authentic.
However, in responding to tourists’ conceptualisations of authenticity, Quispe should not be seen as simply accepting the impositions of outside representations of indigenous culture, but as displaying agency in seeking out and responding to tourists' demands. As Mato (1998) concludes in his study of self-representations of indigenous peoples’ organisations at the Smithsonian Institution’s Festival of American Folklife, various indigenous groups learn that to gain an audience for their cause or a market for their products they must look indigenous in terms already coded by their western allies. For example, they must wear 'exotic', traditional dress or relate organic farming practices to those of their ancestors. He insists these representations are not responses to 'imperialist impositions', but come about through 'informal and mutating complexes of intermediation of resources and representations constituted by “global” and “local” agents’ (Mato 1998: 205).

**Communities**

Indigenous community leaders relate the revival of particularly the external markers of indigenous culture within the contingencies of tourism, to fulfil tourists’ demands for authenticity, and emphasise the role of outside experts in the processes of the commodification of indigenous culture. While homestay tourism’s agenda for cultural revival depends on paradigms of cultural loss and lack of appreciation, communities do not necessarily view their culture in this way. Community leaders talk about approaching their culture in an unconscious, unconsidered way, until training by NGOs and consultants raised their awareness of conceptualising culture in terms of loss and the revival of pride. Alvaro Medina, an indigenous community leader at Amistad notes that, while the members of the community homestay project have received training to revive aspects of traditional culture for tourists, they have always unconsciously maintained their culture: ‘Before, we didn’t think of anything [but] we’ve always
maintained our culture'. Raúl Rodrigo, the Tourism Association Guide at Bienvenido also reports the continuation of cultural forms, which are more intrinsic, such as belief systems, while the more visual (and in demand by tourists) aspects of traditional culture may have changed. When I asked Rodrigo if traditions were being lost, which Morales had previously raised as an issue, he replied that traditions such as offerings to mother earth were still practiced, but that dress had been lost:

**Interviewer:** These customs were being lost before [the tourism project]

**Raúl Rodrigo:** Offerings to the earth, no, we've always maintained that.

**I:** But what about [traditional] dress?

**R.R.:** Dress was lost, yes that was

His view of non-visual culture as continuous, as neither past nor modern, reflects Bhabha's (1994) idea of hybridity Chakrabarty's (2000: 243) notion of 'entangled times' or 'timeknot' and postcolonial conceptualisations of non-linear time (Kothari and Minogue 2000 and Kothari 2005).

Rodrigo, in common with Medina, reported a recent awareness of the value of traditional dress as a marker of cultural identity, for both tourism and as in order to restore Andean cultural identity:

**Interviewer:** What was your cultural identity like?

**Raúl Rodrigo:** Cultural identity? Before we didn’t wear our typical dress that you can see now, it was already being lost, for years it was being lost and now we’re recuperating it.

**I:** Why?

**R.R.:** Because we are revaluing our Andean culture, yes we're revaluing it.

**I:** And why now, for tourism?

**R.R.:** For tourism and also for our cultural identity, our identity.

**I:** And what is your cultural identity?

**R.R.:** I’m proud to be of Quechua ancestry, a Quechua speaker, a campesino, we wear our traditional dress with pride.\(^{148}\)

---

\(^{146}\) See appendix 3, note 6:6 for the original Spanish.

\(^{147}\) See appendix 3, note 6:7 for the original Spanish.
Rodrigo’s self-identification can be seen to reflect national conceptualisations of indigenous heritage. He states his pride in a Quechua identity, which he describes through a connection to the past, through his ancestry and speaking the pre-Columbian language, Quechua. In his self-identification he thus avoids the stigma of racialised label ‘indigenous’ or ‘Indian’\textsuperscript{149}. This follows the historical trends of simultaneously seeking pride in past, pre-Conquest identities, resurrected by the indigenismo movement of the early twentieth century (Méndez 1996) while deriding contemporary indigenous identities. He also uses the identifier ‘campesino’ (a farmer or peasant), which reflects more recent class-based, rather than racial classifications (Klarén 1999). The term indigenous is deployed in international discourses, but is not one considered by community members when describing their culture because of its negative connotations. When he uses ‘we’ it is not clear whether he is referring to only the tourism association or if he is speaking for the community as a whole. As we will see below, the revival of traditional dress by the tourism association was a contentious issue for non-association members, so if he is assuming that everyone takes pride in a Quechua identity, then this might be misplaced.

De la Cadena (2000) argues that the philosophical rejection of scientific racism by Peru’s mixed race elite in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries meant that race became culturally defined. She proposes that this legacy of the cultural categorisation of race offers a degree of social mobility within present-day Peruvian society, while maintaining hierarchical and racist categories of mestizo and indigenous. To be mestizo means being an urban dweller, having a certain degree of education and literacy, speaking Spanish and not wearing indigenous dress. She argues that it is possible for rural residents to cast off the social stigma of being indigenous through migration, education and adopting more urban, Western styles of dress, while still identifying with indigenous culture:

\textsuperscript{148} See appendix 3, note 6:8 for the original Spanish.
\textsuperscript{149} (de la Cadena 2000; Weismantel 2001; Fuller 2002; García 2005)
Working-class indigenous cuzqueños [inhabitants of Cusco] (...) use “mestizo” to identify literate and economically successful people who share indigenous cultural practices yet do not perceive themselves as miserable, a condition that they consider “Indian”. Far from equating “indigenous culture” with “being Indian”—a label that carries a historical stigma of colonized inferiority—they perceive Indianess as a social condition that reflects an individual’s failure to achieve educational improvement. As a result (...) “indigenous culture” – or Andean culture to be more specific–exceeds the scope of Indianess; it broadly includes cuzqueño commoners who are proud of their rural origins and claim indigenous cultural heritage, yet refuse to be labelled Indians. They proudly call themselves “mestizo”.

(de la Cadena 2000: 5-6)

It is also possible for members of rural communities to engage in folkloric performances of ‘indigenous’ culture without identifying as indigenous, as Rodrigo’s self-identification as campesino shows. Furthermore, in each of the sites studied, the tourism association leaders had levels of educational attainment that meant that they had good Spanish and literacy skills and had migrated to major Peruvian cities before returning to their communities. These experiences mean that, although urban dwellers may look down on these rural communities as indigenous, the identities of tourism association leaders are more flexible, and take on many of the characteristics of being mestizo.

The revival of traditional dress for homestay tourism can become a focus for conflict within indigenous communities because of its highly contentious status as an external marker of indigeneity, which is derided as inferior by modern, urban Peruvian society, and within rural communities themselves. Colloredo-Mansfeld (1998) notes that in Otavalo, in Northern Ecuador, the international trade in indigenous handicrafts, which is linked to tourism, has brought prosperity and social mobility to indigenous traders. However, racial categories and stereotypes remain within white-mestizo society, and have also spread to
indigenous society. Racist language is used by native merchants to differentiate themselves from the poorer, less socially mobile members of their community:

The rising class of native merchants insult poorer, rural Otavaleños as being dirty, borrowing racist terms to increase social gaps. For their part, some poorer peasants use pejorative vocabulary self-referentially. They speak of themselves as indios who must farm and stick with their own traditions.

(Colloredo-Mansfeld 1998: 186)

Because of the contentious nature of contemporary identity politics, homestay tourism’s agenda to revive indigenous culture and foster pride in indigenous identities is by no means shared by everyone in a community. Raúl Rodrigo, an indigenous tourism guide at Bienvenido, describes how those involved in the homestay project were criticised for reviving the wearing of traditional dress by other members of the community not involved in tourism or those members who refused to wear traditional dress. He describes how the women involved in the project were mockingly called ‘little grandmothers’ and ‘little old women’, because they wore the traditional dress of their grandmothers.

Interviewer: They say that it cost a lot to revive your (traditional) dress?
Raúl Rodrigo: A lot, a lot, criticisms from here, from there.
I: Criticisms?
R.R.: Yes, (they called us) little grandmothers, little old women.150

There is a national context of racism which de-values indigenous culture as past and feminine, even within rural communities, which explains the jibes made against those wearing traditional dress for the tourism project. It is indigenous women who are more likely to stay at home, speak traditional languages and preserve traditional dress (de la Cadena 1996; Radcliffe, Laurie and Andolina 2003). Radcliffe et. al. (2003) note that indigenous women are commonly represented in national and development imaginations as embodying local

150 See appendix 3, note 6:9 for the original Spanish.
culture and are seen as being responsible for the social reproduction of this culture through the teaching of indigenous language and values in the home. They argue that men, on the other hand, are represented as stepping outside the local and indigenous, for example many more indigenous men than women speak Spanish and are literate, giving them access to jobs outside the local domain. It is mostly men who take on the leadership of homestay tourism projects because they have these skills which are necessary for communicating with consultants and dealing with bureaucratic matters such as funding and licensing. (The exception here is Bienvenido where the leadership of the homestay project is female, which is due to the fact that it was funded by MIMDES, Ministerio de la Mujer y Desarrollo Social, Women’s and Social Development Ministry) and that the development of female leadership was one of the project’s funding criteria. Indigenous men, however, can be subject to ‘feminised’ representations, as being poor and lacking in agency. Moreover, because women are more closely connected to traditional culture, women’s indigenous identities are often deployed in the representative work in tourism. In Bienvenido, it is the women who wear traditional dress in the presence of tourists, with their male partners only donning traditional clothes at the end of trip parties.

Given the contentious nature of indigenous identities within Peruvian society and rural communities, the agenda for the revival of certain cultural traditions can be interpreted as being promoted by middle-class, white tourism consultants. Furthermore, it can be inferred that cultural revival is employed pragmatically by certain community members, rather than coming from the grassroots level. The role of middle-class experts in cultural revival has a wider history in the indigenismo movement throughout Latin American countries with an indigenous heritage in the early twentieth century. Canessa (2006) argues that in Mexico and Bolivia the indigenismo movement assimilated aspects of indigenous heritage into a national, mestizo identity, particularly through the
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151 (Swain 1993; Crain 1996; Henrici 2002; Martinez Novo 2003)
interpretation of pre-Columbian traditions in folkloric performance. He argues that in this way contemporary indigenous identities were erased from the national project of identity building:

By mid-century in Bolivia the mestizo was part of the national project of creating an urban, Spanish-speaking middle-class as well as a rural proletariat, and consequently the indian was erased in favour of a mestizo identity in the 1952 revolution. As part of this process indigenous culture was glorified, but as folklore rather than contemporary culture: in order to create a new national identity the state sponsored folklore festivals, encouraged folkloric dances in schools and enabled folklore troupes to tour Latin America. In many of these instances the troupes were exclusively or primarily composed of mestizo-creoles. Indigenous culture as it became national culture was folkloric and the principal nation building project was to assimilate indians into a national mestizo Spanish-speaking culture.

(Canessa 2006: 244-5)

In Cusco, in a similar period, middle-class, urban intellectuals revived Inca cultural heritage in the form of folkloric performances of plays and dances. By so doing they defined a form of high Inca culture against contemporary indigenous culture, identifying themselves with the former and reinforcing hierarchical social and cultural distinctions (Méndez 1996; de la Cadena 2000; Arellano 2008). Mendoza (1998) also notes that in staging contemporary folkloric dance performances in Cusco, non-Indian experts teach both mestizo and indigenous performers institutionalised forms of representing indigenous culture. Similar processes can be observed in homestay tourism, where mestizo consultants train communities to produce representations of indigenous culture that fulfil their own, and tourists’ expectations.

The role of outside experts and training in the recuperation of certain external markers of indigenous identity is strikingly alluded to in the comments of one of the female leaders of the tourism association at Bienvenido, Abelen Inca. She describes herself and the other members of the tourism association as being
‘improved’ by wearing her traditional dress for tourists. She describes the revival of traditional dress in order to fulfil tourists’ demands to see traditional clothing. She explains that if it were not for tourism, she would be dressed like me, meaning in ‘modern’ dress (I was wearing trousers and a t-shirt).

**Interviewer:** Did you wear your traditional dress before the cultural programmes [for the homestay tourism project]?

**Abelena Inca:** No, before we didn’t, but now we do, since we’re working with tourists, because of this we’ve also recuperated our [traditional] dress.

**I:** For tourism?

**A.I.:** Yes.

**I:** Because [tourists] like it?

**A.I.:** They like these clothes, otherwise I’d be like you, something like that, I’d wear the same clothes as you with these clothes we’re more, improved.152

In describing herself in traditional dress as ‘improved’, Inca can be seen to be conceptualising the processes of the recuperation of indigenous dress within modernisation approaches to development of the post-Second World War period. Andean farmers continue to describe new strains of potatoes or grain as ‘improved’, which particularly evokes the Green Revolution, where traditional farming methods and products were ‘improved’ by the application of technical packages through the guidance of outside experts (Healy 2001). Inca’s use of the term ‘mejorar/mejorada’, improve/improved evokes the role of the expert in improving original cultural forms from modernisation approaches to development. She also uses the passive, ‘we’re improved’, or ‘we have been improved’ suggests the involvement of outside actors in this process.

The valuing of past forms of cultural identity over the contemporary, evinced in the devaluing of ‘modern’ clothes indicates the prioritisation of past, folkloric heritage over present forms of indigenous culture. Thus indigenous identity deployed in homestay tourism continues to work within colonial schema that fix indigenous culture in a timeless past, set against a central, normal modernity
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152 See appendix 3, note 6:10 for the original Spanish.
Indigenous culture may be assigned the positive values of spirituality and sustainability, but it can only be valued through folkloric versions that have been created by middle-class, white experts for middle-class, white consumers. Therefore, middle-class experts and tourists reconfirm their difference from indigenous communities through reproducing distinctions between urban and rural, modernity and the past. Moreover, participation in performances of indigenous culture for tourist consumption allows for social mobility of elites within communities while reconfirming hierarchical categories.

Furthermore, the continuation of binary identifications, defined by outside actors, opens communities up to the dangers of the destination lifecycle model (Butler 1980). Within popular interpretations of this cycle, the appearance of signs of modernity, popularly attributed to too much tourism and economic development, are equated to the corruption and loss of cultural authenticity. The external signs of cultural difference, such as dress, may also be considered as being ‘staged’ for tourists and, therefore, inauthentic (MacCannell 1973). Silvio Moreno, the project leader of alternative routes in the Sacred Valley (between Cusco and Machu Picchu) project, cites Taquile as an example of too much economic development causing the loss of essentialised, intrinsic cultural values, which has led people to believe that it is ‘fake’:

> It’s very interesting because [tourism] has generated a lot of development, economic development had above all caused [Taquile] to lose its essence now everyone knows its fake, don’t they?\(^{153}\)

Taquile, and other sites of homestay tourism run the risk of falling out of favour with tour operators and tourists if they do not conform to pre-conceived notions of authenticity and become considered to be staged or ‘modern’.

\[^{153}\text{See appendix 3, note 6:11 for the original Spanish.}\]
Distributing development through community structures

Another principle aim of homestay tourism is to include local communities in the socio-economic benefits of tourism (see chapter 4). Communities’ traditions of exchange and reciprocity will be explored as the ‘cultural capital of the poor’ (Radcliffe 2006: 7) that enables the peaceful functioning of homestay tourism. Communal traditions become channels through which to deploy the developmental benefits of tourism throughout communities and to simultaneously pacify dissent and render communities safe for tourists and market integration. Conversely, communities’ insistence on sharing some of the benefits of tourism, often through the low-level disruption of homestay products, such as acts of vandalism against homestay associations’ property, is conceptualised through Scott’s (1985) ‘weapons of the weak’. Processes of training lead to the professionalisation of tourism associations, which creates greater product and socio-economic differentiation. I argue that, while homestay tourism is deployed within imaginations of alternative, harmonious communal structures in opposition to a corrupt, individualistic modernity, this form of tourism further integrates communities into market mechanisms which engender socio-economic differentiation. However, communal mechanisms of reciprocity and exchange counter monolithic accounts of neo-liberalism (Bondi and Laurie 2005; England and Ward 2007; Larner et al. 2007) and open up spaces for alternatives within neo-liberal projects (Larner 2003).

Elites

Homestay tourism functions within Rousseauian imaginations of harmonious, egalitarian pre-capitalist societies, set against a corrupted, individualistic modernity (Hanke 1973; Hulme 1986; Widdowson and Howard 2008). Moreover, proponents of homestay tourism propose that bringing tourism to rural communities includes those marginalized in mainstream development in the socio-economic and developmental benefits of this economic activity.
However, the idea that rural communities can be treated as homogenous units through which to deliver development by policy makers and practitioners has been criticised in the academic literature on community-based and grassroots development interventions in general and specifically community-based, eco- and homestay tourism. Evidence that elites within communities benefit disproportionately from community-based and eco-tourism initiatives is provided by many studies in this field.\textsuperscript{154} Scheyvens (2002: 9) notes that communities are often divided by:

(...) a complex interplay of class, gender and ethnic factors, and certain families or individuals are likely to lay claim to privileges because of their apparent status. In such circumstances it is unlikely that community members will have equitable access to involvement in tourism development and the benefits this can bring.

Community participation in development projects often becomes eclipsed by the appropriation of the benefits of development by local elites (Cornwall 1998; Cooke and Kothari 2001), as de Kadt (1990: 30) comments: ‘(...) calls for community participation gloss over the well-known tendency for local elites to “appropriate” the organs of participation for their own benefit.’ Scheyvens (2002: 58) sees elites benefitting more from tourism because of their superior abilities to contact and communicate with development practitioners from outside the community:

Elites within communities often become wealthier than others simply because they have the power and confidence to deal with outsiders and ensure that development opportunities offer particular gains for themselves and their families.

Gascón (2005), in his study of homestay tourism on the island of Amantaní, sees participation in the tourist industry as the domain of the community’s elite, which leads to further socio-economic differentiation and conflict. He traces the

history of this differentiation to the land reform of 1968, when former ‘gamonales’ (Indian over-seers for absentee land-owners) were in a privileged position during the reform which enabled them to gain more, and better, land than their ‘peon’ (tied labourer) neighbours. The former ‘gamonales’, therefore, had more disposable income to invest in fishing boats when the economy shifted from agriculture to fishing. This in turn enabled investments in motor boats to transport tourists and home improvements to provide accommodation for tourists when the economy shifted once again. Also, those families who had members who had migrated to work in urban centres were able to use this increased income to invest in tourist facilities. While Yashar (2005) argues that Velasco’s land reform of 1968 resulted in competition and conflict within and between communities due to the uneven distribution of land, Gascón (2005) argues that involvement in tourism has now taken on the same power of socio-economic differentiation and conflict that land once had. Zorn, (2004), reports a similar history of differential benefits of the 1968 land reform, of migration and investment in homestay tourism in her study of the business on neighbouring Taquile island.

The histories and backgrounds of the community members involved in the homestay tourism projects of the sites in this study reflect similar trends to those reported on Amantaní and Taquile. All sites indicate that those involved in homestay tourism occupy elite positions within these communities. The community of Amistad was the subject of a high profile North American development intervention in the early 1950s and 60s\textsuperscript{155}. The experiment, in common with other projects in the period of the ‘Green Revolution’, was later criticised for working with male heads of households who were politically well connected, excluding women and the very poor, thus widening the gender gap and between the relatively well off and the poor\textsuperscript{156}. This group of male leaders derived their status as community leaders through hierarchies of power, based on family ties, that had their roots in the colonial period and functioned through

\textsuperscript{155} See anonymised sources, 6:1.
\textsuperscript{156} See anonymised sources, 6:2.
allegiances with the hacienda’s ‘gamonales’ (or overseers)\textsuperscript{157}. One of the older members of the tourism association at Amistad had experienced the experiment, and maintained contact with one of the North American professors involved at the time, who was sponsoring his son’s education. This connection indicates that power and prestige continue to be maintained from the colonial period and are present in current development interventions. The leaders of the homestay tourism project at Amistad are all prominent male community leaders who have more recent experience with working with another NGO. The Mountain Foundation chose to work with the community leaders who had previously worked with another NGO on reviving their traditions and reaffirming pride in their culture. Therefore, prior success in accessing NGO support and funding, by fulfilling the NGO’s criteria of being committed to cultural revival enabled the group to access further funding.

In Bienvenido, the tourism association leaders were women because of the funding criteria of the project (it was partly funded by MIMDES, Ministerio de la Mujer y Desarrollo Social, the Women’s and Social Development Ministry). This group and their husbands were community leaders, some were teachers and others also had market stalls in the nearby tourist market. Having the positions of teachers and tradespeople both indicate the status of being a ‘mestizo’ (Henrici 2002) and thus having a higher status than poorer members of the community. This status also means that they have the Spanish language and literacy skills to communicate with NGOs and other mediators of funding and training.

In Encuentro, Valeriano Quispe, the community leader who initiated homestay tourism in Encuentro, left his community to join the army, which he was in for one and a half years, then he worked as a carpenter making furniture in Lima for five years. He then spent another five years in the government offices in Puno as a promoter of various development projects, focusing on agriculture and

\textsuperscript{157} See anonymised sources, 6:3.
tourism. This background of migration and positions in the army and regional government explain why he had the financial resources to start his own tourism business, and why he has the knowledge, skills and contacts (and the ability to make further contacts) to access state funding and do business with travel agents. His personal history of migration and self-education also define him as ‘mestizo’ (Colloredo-Mansfeld 1998; de la Cadena 2000).

Consultants

The consultants at Amistad, Bienvenido and Encuentro comment on the need to work with community members who display confidence in their culture, leadership and higher levels of education than others in the community. These criteria function as cultural capital which contributes to the success of a homestay tourism project. They also coincide with higher levels of material wealth. Success is defined within the parameters of sustainable development principles of the negative impacts that tourism can have on fragile cultures and the contingencies of tourism, the ability to give good service and not to offend tourists with unacceptable levels of poverty.

Miranda Toledo, the NGO tourism consultant at Amistad, defends choosing the group of related families that make up the tourism association by making the case that the NGO needed a group of people who had a strong sense of pride in their culture. She highlights sustainable tourism development paradigms of tourism impacting negatively on weakened cultures: the idea being that the introduction of tourism in the community could impact harshly on those who already suffered from low self-esteem:

We started the project with families. Why these families? For various reasons, one because Amistad seemed enormous to us and we didn’t know where to start, how to promote people, and on the other hand we were certain that tourism could impact negatively on country people whose values and self-esteem were weakened, so this NGO came to work a while ago with, I don’t know, 100 families, on cultural affirmation, on the understanding
of their cultural richness, and we said we wanted to work with this group of people who had demonstrated that they could work and who were confident in their culture, so the risk would be less with tourism.\footnote{158}

Thus displaying pride in an ‘authentic’ culture becomes cultural capital by which community elites gain access to NGO funding. Neumann (2000: 221), in his study of conservation NGOs in several African countries, describes NGOs as representing communities in terms of “good-natives” (traditional, nature conserving)’ and “bad-natives” (modernised, nature destroying)’. Those ‘good natives’ who display the right criteria, set by NGOs, receive support and funding, while those who fail to meet their standards are excluded from conservation projects.

Roberto López, former tourism consultant for Promperú, writer, journalist and TV presenter of a Peruvian travel programme, cites the educational level of community members as an important criterion in their selection for homestay tourism projects. He says that more educated families give better service to tourists, they speak Spanish better, and they have more capacity for understanding business. They will therefore be less dependent on the funding agency, be it an NGO or the state, and the project will be more viable commercially:

Which criteria should be used to select a community? I think for example that one of the variables to take into account is the educational level. The educational level makes a big difference in the standard of service (...) the language level, for example, and well, educated people are more capable of having business sense than those who are less educated. Less educated people are more dependent in the NGO or the state. Look, this sounds simple, but it’s true, the level of education determines a project’s viability.\footnote{159}

\footnote{158}{See appendix 3, note 6:12 for the original Spanish.}  
\footnote{159}{See appendix 3, note 6:13 for the original Spanish.}
Economic status is also an important criterion. Families need to be able to dedicate time to receive training in tourism, time which represents an opportunity cost, because during this time they could have been economically active. They also need a surplus of income to invest in the building of tourist facilities and buying traditional clothing. The cost of buying hand-made, woollen traditional clothing, as opposed to cheap and practical mass produced 'Western' clothing is a common complaint in communities involved in homestay tourism. Weismantel (2001) notes that female market traders in the Andes don traditional dress as a symbol of their economic status because of its high cost. However, the wearing of clothing as an ethnic identification provokes ambivalent responses in Andean society and is contentious for both mestizo traders and 'indigenous' communities.

Jean Veron, hotelier and director of Vida Travel, based in Cusco, and who works with the community at Encuentro, highlights the problems of working with very poor families. He says that tourists do not want to see poverty or experience another person's poverty:

The problem is that if the family is really miserable, tourists don't want to see misery. They want to feel a little or understand a little how things are, but they're not there to live another's poverty.  

His comments also reflect the notions of limits within representations of responsible and homestay tourism (see chapter 4). That is, responsible tourism is promoted within notions of visitor education and ethical motivations of facilitating development and environmental and cultural protection while simultaneously advancing imaginations of holidays as times and spaces for fun and relaxation. Therefore, while having a serious agenda, responsible tourism need not take this too far. He thus limits tourists' feeling and understanding to 'a little'.

\(^{160}\) See appendix 3, note 6:14 for the original Spanish.
Toledo, in describing the families the Mountain Foundation chose to work with at Amistad, depicts an established male leadership within the community which had gained further status in its work for cultural revival, instigated by a previous NGO. This fulfils a pragmatic need for NGOs to work with community members that have already been ‘professionalised’ to a certain extent and thus have more of a chance of making it a success:

So these families (...) were already promoters of their culture in their community, for example, Mr. Alvaro Medina is a leader in the recuperation of native varieties of potato, Manolo Medina was the one who started to recuperate traditional dress, Mr. Manolo Medina is a former tailor, he’s one of the few who make traditional clothing in Amistad. So they are the people we chose, we got those people together who we already knew valued themselves without being influenced from the outside, because we thought that this would avoid some of the negative impacts on their culture, because they already had high self esteem and a certain amount of standing within their community.  

Previous contact and experience with working with an NGO, therefore, puts community members in a stronger position when being approached by, or approaching, subsequent NGOs for support and funding. Therefore, prior success in accessing NGO support and funding enables groups to access further funding. Higher social status facilitates greater access to establishing personal contacts with funding bodies, which in turn creates more opportunities for further funding and establishing more development projects. Thus, following Escobar’s (1992a: 25) description of the power of development discourses functioning through ‘a vast institutional network’ and Crush’s (1995: 6) analogy of development with an ‘industry’ and also as a ‘machine’, following Ferguson’s (1990: xv) conceptualisation (see chapter 5), development funding runs through established networks of power at international, national and local levels.

161 See appendix 3, note 6:15 for the original Spanish.
Professionalisation and experts

The transition to neo-liberal funding regimes, which allocate resources on a project by project basis, with various NGOs competing for ‘contracts’, and in which funding is often limited to 3-5 year project cycles, have replaced more stable flows of state funding. Concurrently, steady government jobs in development have been replaced by a mobile sector of consultants who either compete for jobs as funding for projects appears, or whose jobs at NGOs depend on their success in gaining funding for projects (Mawdsley et al. 2002). Thus consultants emphasise the delivery of successful homestay tourism projects, within the parameters set by funders, which can lead to more funding, rather than considering the politics behind these development interventions. As Mitchell (2002), Goldman (2006) and Escobar (1992b) argue, the rendering of development to a set of technical problems that can be solved by the intervention of outside experts and the application of the correct models, denies the politics behind development as a force of neo-liberal market integration. Escobar (1992b: 65) sees what he describes as ‘the discourse of development’ as creating a lack of development at the level of the imagination, which has enabled Western experts to provide technical solutions to problems of development:

The discourse of development portrayed Third World societies as imperfect, abnormal, or diseased entities in relation to the “developed” societies; the cure for this condition would be, of course, the development prescriptions handed down by Western experts and very often willingly adopted by Third World elites.

Kothari (2005) proposes that processes of professionalisation and technicalisation in the UK development industry have been ongoing since the period of decolonisation when former colonial administrators often became development consultants. She argues that these continuities between the colonial and development eras highlight the unremitting project of progress and modernisation, and sees ‘the development “expert” as an agent in involved in consolidating unilinear notions of modernising progress’ (Kothari 2005: 393).
She proposes that these underlying power relations are eclipsed by the development industry's emphasis on expertise and techniques, which serve to depoliticise and detheorise development discourses and interventions. Moreover, Bondi and Laurie (2005: 394: 1) argue that processes of professionalisation appropriate alternative agendas and activism, facilitating ‘the production of the globalised spaces of neo-liberal governance.’

Processes of professionalisation extend beyond white, educated consultants and travel agents to community tourism association leaders who gain not only training in tourism service provision, but also managerial skills and the contacts to gain further development funding. Pablo Toledo, President of the Amistad homestay tourism association hopes to build on the contacts and skills he has gained from working on this and previously NGO funded projects to gain funding to build a large tourist lodge for his sector of the community. He differentiates between the wider community of Amistad, which the current project encompasses, and his own sector and hamlet. He also uses his experience and training with the Amistad project to differentiate himself as the leader of this next project, which he presents in terms of need, the project will need a trained person and he will employ his immediate community as hotel staff:

Apart from the partners (of the Amistad project) with my hamlet, with my sector, more people would benefit, about 100 people in one lodge, then it would be managed by a trained person to improve it and open up more jobs, to have another source of income for the community, but not for the community of Amistad, for [my] hamlet. 162

The community’s idea of constructing a tourist lodge was originally opposed by the Mountain Foundation, the NGO funding the homestay project at Amistad, on the grounds that, by concentrating tourists in one place, it did not fulfil their principles of sustainability and spreading the benefits of tourism widely throughout the community. Pablo Toledo hopes to use his position to further the interests of his immediate community.

162 See appendix 3, note 6:16 for the original Spanish.
Critiques of the professionalisation of development illuminate the focus of consultants, travel agents and community leaders on implementing successful models of homestay tourism, and gaining funding for further projects rather than considering the political implications of this development intervention. While homestay tourism consultants and community leaders do not view their interventions in a political way, Tina Ramirez, General and International Relations Secretary of CCIP, Centre for Indigenous Cultures, Lima, an NGO which campaigns for indigenous people’s rights, and who is not involved in homestay tourism, takes a political perspective. She sees entrance into neo-liberal markets as increasing socio-economic differentiation in Taquile, causing the community to lose its communal structures and spirit:

And so neo-liberalism also arrived at Taquile because the families that have been able to leave (migrate) and can set up handicraft businesses, restaurants and accommodation, these are growing and there is another sector of the community that is only carrying water for these restaurants and they are cleaning the tourists’ rooms and so it’s as though they’ve lost what it was before. Because of economic development, because of the commodification of culture, and this is why I see socio-economic inequality.\(^\text{163}\)

She goes onto identify having higher levels of financial capital and education as contributing factors that differentiate participation in homestay tourism. She is critical of what she proposes as elites’ appropriation of communities’ collective cultural capital, becoming entrepreneurs while other community members provide services supporting tourism activities:

In communities cultural capital is collective, and proposals should be designed that benefit the community collectively and not because I have capital or because I have more education or I don’t know what, I can become the great entrepreneur of the community where everyone else gives me only services.\(^\text{164}\)

\(^\text{163}\) See appendix 3, note 6:17 for the original Spanish.
\(^\text{164}\) See appendix 3, note 6:18 for the original Spanish.
Ramirez thus defines cultural capital as communities’ traditions of collective work for the overall benefit of the community through egalitarian structures. It is these structures that she sees as being broken down through entrance into neoliberal markets through homestay tourism which favours wealthier and more educated community members.

**Community structures**

Rural communities involved in homestay tourism are imaginatively conceptualised through Rousseauian tropes of lost egalitarian, harmonious pre-modern societies (Hanke 1973; Hulme 1986; Widdowson and Howard 2008). Homestay tourism’s agenda to revive indigenous culture includes recreating community structures, which are imagined to have been lost in the face of modernity and individualism.

Martin Alonso, a tourism consultant working with the Cusco-Puno Corridor/Rural Tourism Network and with Bienvenido, also evokes an idealised past when speaking of communities in terms of their interrelated worldview, which sees communities as functioning in harmony with nature and with each other. He describes these traditions of community cohesion and communal work as being lost to present day individualism:

Traditionally, Andean culture was structured around a lived world view and all the stars and the astrological cycles were in harmony with the cycles of the harvest, the cycles of raising animals, with human activities and this was all interrelated and relied on communal labour to manage the environment better (...) in these times it was the ‘all’, which has been translated legally into communities (...) and now there’s an individualisation which substitutes the legal heads of the community, with their communal lands and with some characteristics of the ‘ayni’ or the ‘mink’ which are communal work, or las faenas (communal work groups), work together
with individual values. A lot of people have thrown this to one side.\textsuperscript{165}

Martin Alonso contextualises this loss in terms of communities’ geographical proximity to modernity and markets: the closer a community is to a market, the more individualistic community members become. He describes the process of being integrated into an individualistic, capitalist system through the dividing up of communal lands into individually owned plots and the resulting processes of socio-economic differentiation and individualisation (see Gascón 2005, Zorn 2004 and Doughty 1965 for more details on these processes).

It’s the same in all cases, the more far away you are, the more cohesion there is in the community (...) Many communities are fully in a process of transition, because of this you have communities which are no longer communities, but individuals. You have the dividing up of land into individual plots in a lot of cases (...) and you have some who are in the process, that is to say, they no longer believe in communal structures and that they are effectively in a process of transition where some are coming out better than others, and so in this struggle, there are some who say, why go ahead alone, when we’re a community?\textsuperscript{166}

Raúl Vega, Managing Director of Apu Travel, a Cusco-based adventure and cultural travel company, in the following interview extract, states how his company has built a community tourism association with Bienvenido, basing the community’s dealings in tourism on old community structures. This revival of traditional community structures and decision making processes in Bienvenido’s homestay project intersects with responsible tourism’s wider agenda to revive and revalue indigenous culture. However, it should be noted that the community association does not include everyone in the community.

We’ve looked to create an organisation based on communal strengths, going further than organisations based only on the family. Communities have their own, very old, social

\textsuperscript{165} See appendix 3, note 6:19 for the original Spanish.
\textsuperscript{166} See appendix 3, note 6:20 for the original Spanish.
organisation so we’ve adapted this social organisation into various specialised associations within the community: there is an association of potters, of cooks, of tourism, that are adaptations of traditional forms of organisation. The management of the association has been made in the most traditional way, through taking advice, everyone has a voice, everyone has a vote, and the vast majority of decisions are approved, not by majority but through coming to agreements.¹⁶⁷

Traditional community structures are utilised by both consultants and communities as a model for the more even distribution of the socio-economic benefits of tourism. Communal mechanisms of exchange and reciprocity are employed as strategies to pacify dissent and unrest through meeting communities’ demands for a share of these benefits, which helps to ensure tourists’ security. By building homestay tourism on communal structures and mechanisms, consultants, travel agents and community leaders render communities safe for market integration, a role undertaken by states at the national level (Goldman 1998; Goldman 2006).

Strategies for spreading the socio-economic benefits of tourism function both within the tourism association and outside the tourism association. Within tourism associations, leaders divide tourists up equally among families and take turns to be hosts. They also divide work among specialised associations, for example, cooks, musicians and artisans. These mechanisms of turn-taking build on traditional structures of shared, communal work (Mayer 2002). Alvaro Medina, a tourism association leader at Amistad, explains how this system works: ‘We work according to lists, by turn, and if others are lucky to have a group for two or three days, or have more tourists, I even the numbers out’¹⁶⁸. Leonora Mamani, the treasurer for the homestay tourism association at Bienvenido also describes dividing tourists among its members using a turn system: ‘We have to share [the tourists] out by the list, we have a note book, and according to the book, the list, we have to attend [to tourists].”¹⁶⁹

¹⁶⁷ See appendix 3, note 6:21 for the original Spanish.
¹⁶⁸ See appendix 3, note 6:22 for the original Spanish.
¹⁶⁹ See appendix 3, note 6:23 for the original Spanish.
Outside of homestay tourism associations, strategies to share some of the benefits of tourism include offering work to other community members and making donations to community funds and development projects. Alvaro Medina, a community leader at Amistad, describes distributing the support work within tourism to other people in his close community (his relatives and neighbours). This also reinforces power structures within the community, with community leaders, who are also leaders of the tourism association, acting as gatekeepers to employment through tourism. Alvaro Medina expresses feelings of pride in being able to distribute work and pay wages:

We can feel even prouder because we can give work to other people, like, making the pachamanca and they can work, and they can teach other people and we can pay their wages and buy products from other neighbours and they can have an income for themselves too, and in this way the quality of life can be improved for other people too.

Community tourism associations often make donations to a community fund, to provide the wider community with educational materials or communal facilities. In this way, homestay tourism’s agenda to spread the benefits of tourism is etched onto the traditional obligations of elites who are responsible for funding community works, such as repairing roads and bridges and also community celebrations (Holmberg 1964). Moreover, the ability to fulfil traditional obligations both reinforces the social positions of community elites (Abercrombie 1998) and the community spirit of group solidarity (Nash 1993).

Alvaro Medina, a tourism association leader at Amistad describes keeping a communal fund, from which they can share some of the gains made from tourism, to pay guides and provide parties for the community: ‘The communal fund also gains, we share it among, for example, the guided tour, and also we

---

170 A traditional celebratory meal of meat and vegetables that is cooked by burying the food in the ground and covering it with hot stones. The tourism association at Amistad cooks this and organises a party with dancing and traditional musicians for the last day of a homestay package.
171 See appendix 3, note 6:24 for the original Spanish.
save a little for a party, to do pachamanca or other things.”

They also make donations of educational materials to local schools. Moreover, members of tourism association projects use their connections with external funding agencies, principally the state, NGOs or travel agencies, to gain funding for community projects. The leaders at Amistad gained funding for a community museum and Valeriano Quispe, the leader at Encuentro, uses his contacts to gain state and international funding for development projects, such as a clean water system, and has received help from travel agencies to establish a community library.

Generating work and fulfilling obligations are also strategies employed by tourism association leaders to avoid conflict and ensure the smooth functioning of tourism businesses. As Taussig (1997: 197) notes the Andean mechanisms of ‘reciprocity aim [ ] to buy peace’. Valeriano Quispe states that it his tourism association’s policy to share work ‘equally’ throughout his immediate community, both as a matter of principle and as a strategy to avoid conflict:

"In principle it’s our policy to generate work fairly, so that there’s work for everyone, that’s our policy, that work should be equal for everyone, so, for example, I can’t have boats to transport people, or boats to rent, all I can have is a restaurant and accommodation, because if I do everything I’ll have social problems. Why him? Why (not) us? They might say, and I want to avoid this."  

While Quispe stresses the fairness and equality in distributing this work, he maintains control of the most profitable aspects of the business, in having a greater proportion of the accommodation and the restaurant that serves all visitors.

Placido Escobar, a guide at the homestay tourism project at Amistad, describes how the community was going to appropriate the tourist lodges owned by the tourism association, until the NGO, the Mountain Foundation intervened and

---

172 See appendix 3, note 6:25 for the original Spanish.
173 See appendix 3, note 6:26 for the original Spanish.
suggested building a museum for the community, ‘The House of the Grandparents’ (funded by the Dutch Embassy through the NGOs contacts with Dutch interns), which recorded traditional ways of life in the community. The construction of a museum for the community seems to have served to calm conflict within the community:

Once we had built our lodges and they were functioning as accommodation, the community decided to take them for the community, but they didn’t and the Mountain Foundation had a different idea, if building the ‘House of the Grandparents’ and once it was built they more or less calmed down.\(^{174}\)

The absence of participation in homestay tourism does not go uncontested by some of those not involved in tourism businesses. Dissent often surfaces in acts of sabotage of tourism association property, as the following accounts illustrate. The acts of vandalism and protest against the differential gains from operating homestay tourism can be seen as what Scott (1985: xvi) refers to as ‘everyday forms of peasant resistance’. These acts can be interpreted as communities’ insistence on the fulfilment of traditional obligations to share some of the benefits across the community and as such represent resistance to the socio-economic differentiation resulting from uneven market integration.

Taussig (1997: 22) sees the persistence of precapitalist forms of reciprocity and exchange as resisting capitalist systems, at the same time as traditional communities are being integrated into global markets: ‘it is important for us to take note of the critique offered us by the neophyte proletarians of the Third World today, whose labor and products are relentlessly absorbed by the world market but whose culture resists such rationalisation.’ Thus the minor forms of unrest that occur when individuals within communities are seen by other community members to be gaining more from tourism can be seen as resistance to the uneven effects of capitalist integration. Moreover, these acts can viewed as strategies employed by the wider community to insist that the traditional

\(^{174}\) See appendix 3, note 6:27 for the original Spanish.
mechanisms of reciprocity and exchange are fulfilled. As Nash (1993: 315) describes, ‘communal sharing [ ] overcomes the envy and divisiveness’ that mark the entrance into national, market systems. Unrest within communities can also be seen as strategies to protest against lack of inclusion in markets, and thus can be viewed as reflecting social demonstrations at the national level (see chapter 5).

Valeriano Quispe describes the conflicts that arose with community authorities when he initiated a community-based tourism project. His account throws light on the conflicts that erupt from what he describes as envy, particularly when an individual is perceived to be making more money than other members of the community. Taussig (1997) describes the persistence of envy in Andean communities towards members who gain more from their engagement with capitalist systems as reflecting an egalitarian social ethic that takes a negative attitude towards the pursuit of individual gain and success. Echoing this attitude, Martin Alonso, a tourism consultant working with Bienvenido, describes Quispe as ‘a shark’.175

Quispe explains how he had started out with the idea of establishing community-based tourism, with each family having its own tourist accommodation, and a community tourism office, dining room and handicraft shop in the main square. He says, ‘the authorities’, by which he means the local heads of the community, threw him out when they saw that he was making money. Later in the interview he describes acts of sabotage committed against tourism association property. He accuses the community authorities of changing the locks to the communal dining room and cutting the tourist office’s telephone line. Similar acts of vandalism were reported in Amistad where the windows of tourist lodges were broken by jealous neighbours. He goes onto accuse the authorities of acting out of envy and of wanting to make money for themselves.

175 See appendix 3, note 6:28 for the original Spanish.
Valeriano Quispe: Well, I’ll tell you that at first I wanted to establish community tourism, communal, and I thought about working with the community, and that all the families should do up their houses and that tourists could stay with the whole community (...) but this didn’t really happen.

Interviewer: No?
VQ: It didn’t happen.
I: How? Why not?
VQ: Well, at first we had a business in the square, we had a dining room, a kitchen, a handcraft shop and a tourism office (...) But this didn’t work out because the envy of the authorities came, the authorities supported us in 96 but in 98 they no longer did, they told us to get out. You’re making money and you can get out. So they kicked us out. They cut our telephone line, they changed the locks, but this blow taught me [a lesson]. Even though they had taken the communal telephone away from me, and the keys I bought myself a mobile phone and now instead of the (communal) dining room, I’ve done up my house, but I didn’t plan to have a dining room here (in my house), it was going to be in the square.

Interviewer: But why (did the authorities do this, was it because) they weren’t making any money?
VQ: Because of envy.
I: Envy?
VQ: Yes, because they wanted the benefits for themselves.176

He concluded that it was better for him to work separately from the authorities, as an association, with his close neighbours (who are often his relatives). His decision to work at group, or association, level, with his nearby family and neighbours reveals the tensions and alliances that exist along family and sector lines.

Valeriano Quispe: But for me it was a good thing that they told me to leave because it’s better now, because it’s a problem working in a community. It’s better to work in an association or group, so I do up my house and my neighbours do up their rooms (for guests).

Interviewer: So that’s how you’re working?
VQ: In group.
I: A small group of 6 families?
VQ: Yes.

176 See appendix 3, note 6:29 for the original Spanish.
I: Do you sort things out among yourselves?
VQ: Yes, it's quiet and we're not a problem to anyone, no one bothers us and we're working peacefully.\textsuperscript{177}

Quispe has chosen to circumvent the community authorities and to separate himself from wider community by establishing his own tourism association. However, a more common course of action is to share some of the work and profits from the tourism project with the rest of the community, as seen above.

**Sustainability**

There are tensions between the principles of sustainability through limiting tourist numbers (see chapter 4), and community tourism associations’ desire to attract increasing numbers of tourists. Butler (1992: 41) notes this contrast in perspectives between middle-class, urban notions of environmental and cultural preservation and rural communities’ desires for development through increasing numbers of tourists:

Rural and indigenous peoples’ environmental ethics often differ from those of their urban counterparts, and they see the imposition of environmental controls and protection as contradictory, limiting their development in order to satisfy the desires of urban sophisticates.

Community tourism associations argue that, in order to spread the benefits of the increased employment of tourism, donating money to a communal fund or to community projects depends on increasing tourist numbers. However, the three sites studied here had started homestay tourism businesses in the last 3-5 years, and numbers of tourists were relatively low (see chapter 3). Raúl Rodrigo, the tourism association guide at Bienvenido, when asked if there were enough tourists to share with the rest of the community replied: 'No, as we've just been working for two years, we are receiving few tourists, not yet'.\textsuperscript{178} Manolo Medina, one of the tourism association leaders at Amistad, reasons that as more tourists

\textsuperscript{177} See appendix 3, note 6:30 for the original Spanish.
\textsuperscript{178} See appendix 3, note 6:31 for original Spanish.
arrive, the association will be able to give work, in supporting roles in the homestay tourism product, to other members of the community:

The idea is that when more tourists arrive, we will give more work to the others (...) to the musicians and the weavers, then there will be more work for others as well, not just for us.\textsuperscript{179}

He also comments that the ability of the tourism association to make donations to the local school is dependent on tourist numbers:

We’re supporting schools with small donations, books, coloured pencils, but up ‘til now we haven’t had enough tourism to give a lot, we haven’t been able to give tables or chairs yet, only small presents, pencils, little things like that.\textsuperscript{180}

Thus homestay tourism’s agenda to spread the developmental benefits of tourism, as interpreted by community tourism leaders, depends on market growth rather than limits.

**Professionalisation, product and socio-economic differentiation**

Blunt and Varley (2004) and Blunt (2005) outline new academic approaches to conceptualising the ways in which the previously non-commodified personal space of the home is being integrated into neo-liberal economies. Smith and Stenning (2006) describe the alternative economies of the domestic sphere, which support post-Socialist economies’ development of capitalist systems. They explore activities such as selling or exchanging home-grown produce from vegetable gardens and allotments and selling possessions from the home as survival strategies for those excluded from the formal economy, which is dominated by unemployment. Moreover, Peck and Tickell (2002) comment on the encroachment of neo-liberalism into previously non-commodified spaces,

\textsuperscript{179} See appendix 3, note 6:32 for original Spanish.

\textsuperscript{180} See appendix 3, note 6:33 for original Spanish.
such as the community. By extension, neo-liberalism brings the home into the market place in homestay tourism. Lynch (2005: 533) studies ‘CHEs’ or ‘Commercial Home Enterprises’ in the UK context, which are small-scale tourist accommodation where the host family is present and which include, small hotels, guest houses, B and Bs and homestay (usually involving families hosting language students). He differentiates the CHE sector from other accommodation provision by the importance attached by tourists/guests to interactions between guests and hosts and the sharing of private, family space, which becomes public. He contextualises the demand for this kind of accommodation in both the post-Fordist move to niche markets (Urry [2002] 1990) and the demand for more authentic holiday experiences (Poon 1993; Poon 1994). Homestay tourism in Peru has similar characteristics in that tourists involved in homestays are searching for authentic experiences through contact with their hosts, carried out in spaces of mediated authenticity, for example tourist accommodation is close to, and sometimes part of, but separate from the family's accommodation.

The home is commodified through processes of professionalisation carried out through training that produces ‘authentic’ indigenous culture as a mediated product and leads to product differentiation. Training enables the provision of delineated standards of comfort, hygiene and service which, enables groups within communities and from different communities to offer differentiated products and compete within the market. This in turn furthers processes of socio-economic differentiation within and between communities.

A common pattern is that a group within a community establishes a homestay project, with the initial support of an NGO, state agency and/or consultants in the form of funding and training. When the business is starting to operate, and tourists begin to arrive, other groups within the community employ strategies to claim some of the benefits of tourism. These strategies can include attempts to appropriate the initial project, which happened in Amistad, where the community authorities made moves to take over the homestay accommodation for the community. They can also involve the formation of rival tourism
associations, which sometimes demand training from the original association, which has been the case in Amistad and Bienvenido.

Leonora Mamani, the treasurer at Bienvenido, explains how initially most people in the community were not interested in joining the homestay tourism project proposed by the Cusco-Puno Project of Business Networks, who offered technical assistance, but did not fund the costs of setting up the project. These included the costs of building tourist accommodation, buying beds and other furniture as well as buying traditional dress. The wider community was not interested in getting involved because of these costs, and also because of the paperwork involved in setting up the project. She describes how this group originally were not interested in being involved in homestay tourism and then formed a rival group when they saw tourists arriving:

Now seeing us, there is a group that’s appearing, the one that tricked us [by taking the group of tourists away] there are 80 communities here, so the office of the Corridor [the state agency] asked who wanted to participate, so that they could sign up, but they didn’t want to, in the first days there were 20 participants, and they got together, but we had to do the [official] paperwork so we had to go to the office, so they left because it was difficult to invest in beds, which we had to buy. So they left, from 20 now we’re 13 and now seeing us, the whole community wants to do [homestays] and so there’s a group, I don’t know, I’ve only heard, they say there are 10 of them, are receiving tourists.\(^{181}\)

Dominga Quispe, a member of the original association at Bienvenido, describes how this rival group ‘stole’ a group of Italian tourists, destined for her association, from the main square: ‘Once they took a group of tourists away from us in the square (…) they were coming for our group, for us, and they waited for them in the square.’\(^{182}\)

\(^{181}\) See appendix 3, note 6:34 for original Spanish.

\(^{182}\) See appendix 3, note 6:35 for the original Spanish.
Rival groups’ lack of training is cited by members of original tourism associations as a way to differentiate their product as inferior to the original. Raúl Rodrigo, Tourism Association Guide, also at Bienvenido, complains that his association has invested a lot of time in training and that an untrained group from the community is copying their programme and offering an inferior product.

The other groups have just started, as we’ve started to work, we have spent a lot of time getting trained, it looks like they are also getting organised, they want to cater for tourists too but without training, they’re copying what we’re doing, a copy, but it’s not worth anything because they’re not trained, they’re improvising, it’s a bit bad.¹⁸³

The lower standards accommodation and service offered by rival tourism associations are viewed by members of the original, or ‘official’, tourism association as a slight on their reputation. Higher standards of service and facilities become markers to differentiate associations’ products, in their competition for tourists. Dominga Quispe, referring to the rival group who ‘stole’ their Italian tourists as making a bad impression on tourists and damaging their own association’s reputation: ‘The tourists look down on them too, the way they approach them in the street, tourists want toilets, we were worried, we wondered what we were going to do.’¹⁸⁴

Quispe also uses standards of accommodation to differentiate between her product and that of rival, sometimes distant, communities. When I commented that her toilets were good, compared to those at other homestay sites I had visited in Peru, she responded by saying that they were planning on putting in flush toilets: ‘But they’re not flush toilets, you have to flush with a bucket, but we want to improve our toilets’.¹⁸⁵ She uses toilet facilities again to differentiate between her association and the tourism association at Amantaní, which they visited on a training trip, organised by the state-agency which had funded the homestay project: the guest’s toilets were far away from the bedrooms, whereas

¹⁸³ See appendix 3, note 6:36 for original Spanish.
¹⁸⁴ See appendix 3, note 6:37 for original Spanish.
¹⁸⁵ See appendix 3, note 6:38 for original Spanish.
their is inside the tourists’ accommodation. They are imitating the tourism product at Amantaní, but claiming to improve it with higher standards of accommodation:

**Interviewer:** What did you think about Amantaní? Did you like it?
**DQ:** Yes, I liked it, but the toilets were far away.
**I:** They’re separate.
**DQ:** They’re far away. But we’ve got our toilets inside.¹⁸⁶

Standards are constituted through the interaction of various scales, actors and processes. Standards are defined by state-agencies, NGOs, travel agents and tourists, and ‘model’ homestay projects, such as those of Amantaní and Taquile, where the homestay tourism associations of both Amistad and Bienvenido were sponsored to go on a training visit by an NGO and the state respectively. Raúl Vega, one of the travel agents who works with Bienvenido, sums up the need for minimal standards acceptable to the tourist market, these standards are achieved through developing a product that has been mediated through processes of consultancy and training:

We’ve looked to reach a minimum standard of service in terms of food quality and hygiene, they cook well, everything’s very tasty, so the only thing we’ve done is to improve their cooking so that it’s at a more acceptable standard for the tourism market.¹⁸⁷

Federico Navarro, a travel agent who works with Encuentro also describes the criteria for a marketable homestay as being both authentic and comfortable: ‘the criteria to be authentic, to be rustic, but to be comfortable’.

Community members also become professionalised trainers, who nascent tourism associations come to for help in starting their own businesses. However, the capacity to train others can be withheld, and as such professionalisation becomes a bounded resource. Miranda Toledo, the tourism consultant at Amistad

¹⁸⁶ See appendix 3, note 6:39 for original Spanish.
¹⁸⁷ See appendix 3, note 6:40 for original Spanish.
describes other community members wanting advice to establish their own projects, the members of the original project denying them help:

But what happens, other people in their community are asking them for help in the form of advice and training so that they can set up other businesses and the project members want to help them, but not so much. (...) For example, a group of young people from Amistad who are studying tourism want to set up a tourism project (...) and I’m sure that the project members know this, but they’re not helping them, but I’m sure that they want to.  

**Awards**

International systems of auditing and awards also serve to differentiate travel agents involved in selling homestay products and homestays themselves. Verification of standards, therefore, comes from outside agencies (Henrici 2002). Federico Navarro, who worked to develop homestay tourism with Quispe at Encuentro, describes how, while he was the director for Exploración, Cusco, a Lima-based adventure travel company, his company gained ISO 14001 in 2002, an environmental management system certification which emerged from the UN Rio Earth Summit in 1992. In tourism products, this award applies to minimising impacts on the environment, for example, using filtered water instead of water in plastic bottles. The company also won the Responsible Travel Awards 2007 for Best in a Mountain Environment. Moreover, Valeriano Quispe won an international prize for eco-tourism in Quebec in 2002.

Markers of differentiation between ‘official’ and ‘unofficial’, trained and untrained homestay tourism providers are emerging and in the initial stages of being formalised. A homestay tourism network ‘the Cusco-Puno Corridor/Rural Tourism Network’ along the Cusco-Puno circuit is being established by the tourism consultant, Martin Alonso, echoing state plans for tourism networks (see chapter 4). This network brings trained associations together, in order to
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188 See appendix 3, note 6:41 for original Spanish.
differentiate their products in the market, as Martin Alonso explains: ‘One of the aims of the network is to build a differentiated image (...) in effect, the network allows us to differentiate the quality of service.’\(^\text{189}\) The criteria for membership to the network are uniform standards of service, food hygiene and comfort, and also authenticity, seen in terms of 'local colour', as he goes onto outline:

The idea is that they (the community association) will manage it themselves and through the criteria for quality that all the members of this network can offer as a minimum standard of service. Standardising the quality of service, if we're talking about food, everyone has to offer healthy (clean) food, everyone has to offer hygiene, everyone has to offer a certain local flavour.\(^\text{190}\)

Tania Morales, who works as a consultant for the same network builds on this idea of product differentiation, by suggesting that families within community tourism associations can be graded according to the standards of accommodation and service they offer. She explains that at Bienvenido some families have done up their houses more than others: for example, the Amaru family have invested more money in their kitchen, dining room and bedrooms. She has the idea that once community association members have reached a basic standard for all the tourist rooms people can improve further, resulting in a star grading system, from 1 to 5 stars. However, at the time of this study, this idea had not been implemented.

**Price and service**

Offering a higher quality product is also seen by consultants as a way of attaining higher prices. Martin Alonso, consultant for the Cusco-Puno Corridor and founder of the Rural Tourism Network comments that for community tourism associations to be able to charge higher prices, they need to continually 'improve the quality and differentiate themselves' in the market.\(^\text{191}\) He also notes that the
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\(^{189}\) See appendix 3, note 6:42 for original Spanish.

\(^{190}\) See appendix 3, note 6:43 for original Spanish.

\(^{191}\) See appendix 3, note 6:44 for original Spanish.
market is getting more demanding, and that community associations can charge
more if they respond to this: ‘The market's getting more and more demanding,
so if you offer a standard of service that the others don't, I won't mind paying a
little more for a good shower.’

Diana Palma, Manager of Exploración’s Puno Office, who works with Encuentro,
notes that training is a factor in differentiating the quality of a homestay, and also
enables charging higher prices. She explains that agencies that charge low prices
often are not trained, whereas they train families themselves:

In agencies that are very cheap the family isn't very well trained
to look after tourists, because in our accommodation on
Amantaní and Taquile they are trained, they have experience,
Exploración has designated families because they are trained, t
ty they have gone to Cusco for cooking courses with their products
and so they cook cleanly, healthily, in a suitable way for
foreigners.

Tourists’ perceptions of standards of service, expectations of hospitality and
authenticity and price also function within the tourism destination lifecycle
(Butler 1980). Relations between tourists and hosts are popularly thought to
deteriorate in terms of hosts’ good treatment of their guest and genuinely
friendly relations between tourists and locals (Pi-Sunyer 1977). Moreover,
especially alternative and backpacker tourists see being charged local (and low)
prices as a sign of authenticity (Phillips 1999; Sorensen 2003) and see being
charged what they think are 'high' prices as evidence of locals taking advantage
of tourists by over-charging. Higher prices are, therefore, interpreted as a sign of
a destination being corrupted by tourism.

Linda Davies from Andean Travel, a Cusco-based travel company specialising in
trekking and adventure travel, works with Bienvenido, Amantaní and Taquile.
She describes the bad reports she's had from clients who have stayed on the
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islands of Amantaní and Taquile. They felt, ‘they were being ripped off by the families’, in that the families did not provide the experience of cultural exchange that they had expected. They felt that the experience that they had imagined, of non-commodified reciprocal cultural exchange, coupled with friendly hospitality, was marred by their hosts’ more overt expressions of commercial motives. Also, the conditions and the standards of accommodation were harsh (which could actually be more ‘authentic’ as these are the standards experienced by the community):

Yeah, I’ve had a lot of dissatisfied clients with those two islands, with their home stays. They felt that they were being ripped off by the families, they felt that their experience, and I’d heard this before (…) The people, well, they just wanted their money, kind of and um they weren’t really interested in sharing with them, they just wanted to, really wanted to sell them things. And they had fleas and they were cold and it was just, yeah, I’ve had really bad reports.

Thus standards, authenticity and prices are prone to tourists’ perceptions of the destination lifecycle and could contribute to the longer term unsustainability of homestay tourism products.

6:5 Conclusions

While deploying alternative imaginations, homestay tourism does not offer alternatives to development, but further integration into neo-liberal regimes. Indigenous culture’s formation as a product, to fulfil the perceived demands of tourists, and facilitated through training by outside experts may diminish the political possibilities offered by the deployment of indigenous culture by grassroots social movements. That is, indigenous social movements evoke indigenous cultural identity and social and political structures to protest against indigenous peoples’ unfair integration into global markets, and also to offer alternatives to capitalist systems.
However, past, commodifiable, forms of indigenous culture are appropriated for the purposes of homestay tourism by white, middle-class consultants and community elites, while markers of indigeneity (dress, language, lack of formal education) still remain stigmatised within communities and national society. The construction of indigenous culture in homestay tourism as past, folkloric heritage fulfils imaginations of the loss of indigenous culture engaged in by middle-class consultants and tourists and the market contingencies of creating a ‘value-added’ product. This means that middle-class, professional ‘experts’ (including tourists) define indigenous culture against their own positions of modernity, which reconfirms hierarchical distinctions between past and modernity.

Moreover, engaging in performances of mediated indigenous culture by elites within communities offers opportunities for greater social mobility, while the category of indigenous remains stigmatised. Such is the consensus surrounding the constitution of authenticity in homestay tourism as lying in the past, that communities run the risk of being judged inauthentic if they display any signs of modernity, which has implications for the sustainability of a destination. Development consultants’ emphasis on producing successful homestay project, rather than challenging assumptions, contributes to the further depolitisation of the use of indigenous culture for development. Communities’ own view of the intrinsic (and less visual) forms of indigenous culture as continuing, as blurring the boundaries between past and present, supported by postcolonial perspectives on non-linear time, could open up possibilities for a less hierarchical conceptualisation of authenticity.

Homestay tourism also builds on traditional community structures and mechanisms of reciprocity and exchange in order to deliver development and to facilitate market integration. While homestay tourism largely benefits community elites, the wider community’s insistence on the honouring of traditional mechanisms of reciprocity and exchange can be interpreted as resistance to purely capitalist development. Moreover, these more equal
distribution strategies can be seen as possibilities for the opening up of alternative spaces of socio-economic development within neo-liberal regimes. Furthermore, neo-liberal projects cannot be viewed as monolithic due to the existence of alternatives in their midst. Processes of professionalisation, training and auditing can lead to greater product differentiation and result in greater socio-economic differentiation and competition between and within communities. Greater product differentiation can also be a source of ‘adding-value’ to homestay products and, therefore, offers the possibility of charging higher prices. Moreover, the emphasis of sustainable development discourses on the need to limit tourist numbers runs against communities’ desires for increasing numbers of tourists in order to spread the benefits of tourism more widely throughout the community. Furthermore, limits go against the wider community’s aspirations to be included in tourism. However, both tourist numbers and prices are prone to the destination lifecycle model, and could be a source of unsustainability for homestay tourism.
Chapter 7  Conclusions

7:1  Introduction

This thesis has explored the emerging phenomenon of responsible, homestay tourism through the lenses of the professionalisation of development, postcolonial critiques of tourism, post-development perspectives as well as nationally and historically grounded debates on modernisation, development and identity politics. It has explored empirical data, in the form of critical reviews of key literature in the policy and popular arenas as well as interviews with key actors, through these perspectives in order to unpack the assumptions on which current debates on the relationship between tourism, development and culture are based. I argued that current conceptualisations of responsible, homestay tourism are founded on established dichotomies between mass and niche tourism, as well as assumptions of cultural authenticity and sustainable development.

Multi-scalar approaches to analysing the discourses and views of the multiple institutions and actors whose interactions produce responsible, homestay tourism have revealed the uneven flows of power that run through these levels. They have also uncovered differences in the approaches of various actors, exposing distinct agendas on the part of consultants, tourists and communities. Genealogical approaches have supported the analysis of these differing reactions to cultural revival and socio-economic development from the perspectives of elites (consultants and community elites) and non-elites (within communities).

In drawing this thesis to a conclusion, this final chapter will firstly advance this thesis’s contribution to current debates in development geography, on neo-liberalism and responsibility, and in tourism studies, on authenticity and sustainability. Then, it will present summaries of each of the empirical chapters, 4, 5 and 6, linking them to the theoretical and methodological approaches
explored in chapters 2 and 3. It will also outline the principle arguments put forward in these chapters. Next, it will explore the arguments made across chapters, highlighting the policy implications for responsible, homestay tourism policy makers and practitioners that arise from these perspectives. Finally, I will suggest ways in which some of the paradoxes of homestay tourism may be resolved.

7:2 The contribution of this research to current debates in development geography and tourism studies

This research has contributed to current debates in development geography and tourism studies. In development geography, it has explored recent debates on neo-liberalism and responsibility to distant others. It has also investigated postcolonial discussions of culture in order to further debates in tourism studies on authenticity and sustainability.

This thesis has worked within definitions of neo-liberalism that resist its conceptualisation as a North-South imposition, but as having multiple sources and being produced over multiple scales. This challenge to uni-directional conceptualisations of neo-liberalism both reveals Southern elites’ agency in the adoption of neo-liberal projects and also offers strategies for change.

Harvey’s (2005) class-based analysis of neo-liberalism as being willingly pursued by Southern elites to further their superior socio-economic position has shed light on discourses deployed by elites at the national level and the behaviour of community leaders in homestay tourism in Peru. While Peruvian State tourism policy and national popular discourses claim that tourism brings widespread benefits across society, Harvey’s stance illuminates the socio-economic differentiation that ensues from neo-liberal economic approaches, which reinforce elite power. Elites benefit economically from the folkloric representations of indigenous culture deployed in homestay tourism and also in terms of identity. For example, elites in the form of urban, educated travel agents
gain economically from homestay tourism and in terms of identity, they maintain a superior racialised identity in relation to the indigenous communities involved in folkloric displays. In turn, indigenous elites benefit economically from these performances, and also in terms of identity, whereby they perform their connection to a glorious past, rather than the marginalised present of those not involved in these displays. Moreover, at the local, or community, level development through integration into neo-liberal market mechanisms is actively sought out by community elites in order to increase opportunities for social mobility. Socio-economic differentiation is tempered within elite groups and the wider community by employing traditional strategies of reciprocity and exchange.

Accounts of neo-liberalism as emerging through difference provide a strategy for deconstructing neo-liberalism as a monolithic, and immutable, project (in the singular) and therefore opens up opportunities for change. Larner et al. (2007: 246) stress that neo-liberalism is: ‘a diverse series of projects which have not and may not coalesce into an integrated political settlement’. Alternative development and activism have been analysed as being co-opted and mainstreamed into neo-liberal approaches through processes of professionalization and auditing cultures, particularly through Southern governments’ and NGOs’ need for funding, which is tied to neo-liberal agendas. However, spaces for alternatives are present within the mechanisms of reciprocity and exchange employed by communities involved in homestay tourism.

This thesis has also explored recent debates within development geography on Northern actors’ responsibility to distant others. I have argued motivations for homestay tourism are conceptualised through colonial tropes of imperial/development interventions as a moral response to lack and need (for

\[194\] See Wendy Larner's comments on the dangers of naturalising neo-liberalism by generating singular, and powerful, accounts of its propagation in England and Ward 2007).

\[195\] (Mawdsley et al. 2002; Bondi and Laurie 2005; Simpson 2005; Jenkins 2008)
development and cultural revival) on the part of host communities. This conceptualisation of lack implies responsibility on the part of Northern agents, including tourists, for distant others, in an unequal relationship of responsible agent and beneficiary. However, unequal power relations are tempered by notions of reciprocity and exchange, with responsible tourism being promoted as a way of ‘giving back’ to the places and peoples that tourists enjoy and gain positive experiences from. Moreover, while communities involved in homestay tourism are presented as lacking in material wealth, they are imagined as being rich in cultural authenticity and spirituality. I suggest that these conflicting imaginations of lack and wealth simultaneously justify homestay tourism as a development intervention, while limiting its scope to the fulfilment of basic needs. A more radical, moral agenda to tackle the underlying structural issue of material inequality between North and South, tourists and hosts, from which tourism, and also homestay tourism, benefits, is evaded by arguments for limiting development in order to preserve a morally superior cultural difference.

Furthermore, it is responsible, homestay tourism’s emphasis on imaginations of difference between North and South, tourists and hosts that limits a more radical agenda of social justice and equality. Indigenous communities are presented as geographically and temporally remote from the developed, ‘modern’ world which I propose, following Massey (2004; 2005), erases the North’s role in the creation of structures of inequality, and its responsibility to redress the imbalances that it is integral in creating. Moreover, representing responsible tourism against a mass counterpart distances, if not denies its involvement, and reproduction of, the same market structures that produce inequality as mass tourism. Also, responsible tourism’s focus on the power of individual consumers to impact on global inequality, through making ethical choices in their consumption, diminishes the potential for collective responsibility and action. I suggest that a re-conceptualisation of imaginations of communities of the North and South which emphasises their universal similarities (Corbridge 1993; Harvey 1996; Smith 2000a) and spatial and temporal co-existence (Massey
would encourage a more politicised approach to responsibility based on solidarity (Harvey 1996).

Moreover, breaking away from the notions of linear time implicit in binaries of past/present could open up possibilities of viable alternatives to models of development based on the inevitable transition from developing to developed status. This temporal repositioning would also allow the North to see Southern communities as offering alternatives to development in the present, rather than being assigned to an imaginary, distant past for the purposes of market integration through tourism.

The thesis’s principle contribution to tourism studies is its approach to authenticity and its relationship to sustainable development. While there is a considerable body of theoretically grounded critiques of mass tourism, specifically focusing on mass tourism as a neo-colonial representational and material enterprise, there is a lack of critical engagement with responsible tourism, other than policy-oriented discussions. I propose that, rather than the current concentration on finding the correct model of tourism (from, most broadly, a range of alternative tourisms as opposed to mass tourism) there is a need for a deeper critical engagement on the part of policy makers, practitioners, communities and tourists. By employing the principle methodologies of critical genealogical analysis and multi-scalar approaches, this thesis has aimed to contribute to new ways of critically examining homestay tourism in the following ways. Critical genealogical analysis has been employed to uncover the often highly conservative roots of responsible, homestay tourism, which I propose undermine its radical agendas of cultural revival among indigenous communities and sustainable socio-economic development.
Most critiques of both mass and alternative/responsible tourism function through assumptions of authenticity through binaries of past/present, staged and non-staged (MacCannell 1973) and within the parameters of the destination lifecycle model (Butler 1980). In contrast, this thesis’s exploration of postcolonial approaches to authenticity offers possibilities to challenge responsible tourism's replication of colonial imaginations of authenticity. Concepts of cultural hybridity and non-linear time present new ways to viewing indigenous culture and ways of escaping the power relations inherent in past/present, authentic/inauthentic, staged/non-staged binaries. Currently, popular and academic critiques of both mass and alternative tourism place indigenous peoples’ authenticity in the past. That is, within the destination lifecycle’s imaginative schema, communities’ engagement with ‘modernity’, through contact with tourists, supposedly leads to a loss of authenticity. This temporal fixing of authenticity exposes communities involved in homestay tourism to the destination lifecycle, whereby tourists bypass destinations thought to be corrupted by modernity.

Moreover, the policy-oriented literature on alternative/responsible tourism fails to challenge assumptions that market mechanisms can provide cultural revival and sustainable development. Perspectives that highlight the co-option of sustainable development principles by the neo-liberal agenda of market integration of previously non-commodified resources, principally the environment and culture, provide opportunities to critique responsible tourism as offering an alternative to global capitalism. Rather, I have argued that responsible tourism’s approach to authenticity as lying in the past denies the possibilities offered by indigenous ways of life as viable, present-day alternatives to capitalist modernity.
Summaries of chapters 4, 5 and 6

The empirical chapters 4, 5 and 6 reflected the multi-scalar character of homestay tourism. Chapter 4 concentrated on the ‘demand-side’ of the tourism equation, by looking at the constitution of homestay tourism through sustainable development discourses at the international level. It took a genealogical approach to exploring institutional sources in order to uncover the power relations that run from North to South. Popular and promotional sources from the UK press and Northern travel agents were also examined. It argued that earlier alternative sustainable development principles have been appropriated by neo-liberal approaches from the 1992 Rio Earth Summit onwards, which have promoted the delivery of environmental and cultural preservation through market mechanisms. The financing of homestay tourism projects through international development funds, channelled through NGOs, and the emergence of auditing systems were examined as a means of mainstreaming dissent and ensuring the reproduction of hegemonic approaches to development. Chapter 4’s focus on Northern discourses of sustainability within neo-liberal frameworks does not mean to privilege Northern power over the South, nor to advance the idea of neo-liberalism as a monolithic project.

Chapter 4 also proposed that responsible tourism reproduces highly conservative colonial imaginations of authenticity and class-based concerns over mass and niche travel. These anxieties intersect with notions of responsibility as fulfilling a lack and need (for development and cultural revival) and sustainability as imposing limits on development. I argued that the production of homestay tourism as a morally superior, tasteful and exclusive product allows the accumulation of cultural capital and reconfirms the superior class positions of its consumers. The vilification of mass tourism by promoters of responsible tourism masks the structures of inequality in which both operate. Also, the calling on these imaginations of superior class and moral positions, coupled with the promotion of tourists adopting the role of auditors and enforcers of ethical standards, reinforces unequal power relations between tourists and their hosts.
Responsible tourism, in common with ethical consumption principles, emphasises the choices and power of individual consumers, rather than promoting a more equitable approach to social justice through collective action and notions of solidarity. In short, tourists are empowered with the constitution of development, authenticity and sustainability.

Communities are presented as models of pre-modern spiritual and sustainable living, to be revived and preserved through tourism and markets. Nevertheless, the temporal fissure between hosts and tourists which functions within notions of linear time means that communities are relegated to the past, rather than co-existing with ‘modern’ tourists. I argued that, while communities are presented as learning opportunities of better ways of living for tourists, this temporal assignation, denies communities’ ways of life as viable alternatives to modernity and capitalism. I also suggested that sustainable development discourses’ limiting of development to the small scale and to individual exchanges between tourists and hosts fails to address global and national inequalities in economies and identity politics. Moreover, sustainable development limits development to the fulfilment of basic needs in order to preserve a morally superior cultural difference. What is more, limiting tourist numbers has implications for the financial viability of this kind of tourism.

Chapters 5 and 6 turned to examine the ‘supply-side’ of the tourism equation, looking at the ways in which tourism and homestay tourism are constituted at the national and local levels. When read together, Chapters 4 and 5 show the differing historical and geographical trajectories that have led to contrasting interpretations of tourism and sustainability at the international and national levels, while also highlighting the similarities in these discourses. The aim of presenting both international and national approaches to tourism was to illustrate the ways in which international discourses of sustainable development have influenced national thinking about the relationship between tourism and development as well as tourism and culture. However, the examination of national debates within the specific geographical and historical context of Peru demonstrates the influence of the country-specific situation on local attitudes.
and reactions to tourism development and cultural representation in tourism promotion. Chapters 5 and 6 intended to show the agency with which neo-liberal approaches have been adopted by Southern actors, as well as their heterogeneity.

Chapter 5 examined the Peruvian State’s approaches to tourism and sustainable development, the role representations of Peru’s indigenous past and present plays in the promotion of the country as a tourism product, and concerns surrounding the sustainable development of tourism in the national press. The chapter situated current state tourism policy in the post-Fordist trends of the decentralisation and diversification of the tourism industry, as well as the specifically Peruvian movement towards economic decentralisation from the post-independence period onwards. The neo-liberal shift from state control and funding of tourism organisations and activities to hybrid public-private partnerships was also traced, which further echoes World Bank policies. The Peruvian State’s development of niche tourism products, including homestay tourism, in conjunction with the maintenance of its classic tourist destinations of Cusco, Machu Picchu and Puno, is being pursued mainly because of alternative tourism’s low investment costs and higher potential returns. The Peruvian Ministry of Tourism sees responsible tourists as demanding less in terms of infrastructure and facilities and as willing to pay more for authentic experiences: they thus represent a high degree of added-value to the industry. The minimising of costs and maximising of profits also coincides with neo-liberal utilitarian economic paradigms.

In common with international sustainable development discourses, the Peruvian State is pursuing a decentralised and diversified tourism industry as a development strategy in order to counter socio-economic marginalization and to preserve environmental and cultural resources. Peruvian concerns with uneven development and socio-economic marginalization are interpreted through anxieties surrounding Peru’s national reputation as a tourism destination from the period of Fujimori’s presidency. Attempts to pacify unrest through calling on
a unified national spirit to protect the tourism industry and tourists for the
greater good of national development also come from this time. I argued that
protests at the uneven development provoked by neo-liberal economic strategies
represent dissent against these policies. The calling on the state to calm unrest
reflects neo-liberal conceptualisations of the state’s role in development, which
is to ensure national security in order to facilitate smooth market integration.
Furthermore, rather than concentrating on the issue of the lack of linkages
between tourism and the wider economy, elite attitudes reflect the historical
legacy of assumptions about inhabitants of provincial areas outside of the capital
being ignorant and hindering modernisation and progress. The promotion of
sustainable development discourses within particularly Peruvian identity
politics can be interpreted as elites embracing modernisation theories and neo-
liberalism to further their economic position and social identity.

However, the conversion of the environment and indigenous culture into
economic resources in tourism represents a reversal of post-independence
imaginations of indigenous geographical spaces as obstacles to modernisation
and progress. Nevertheless, concerns over the accessibility of sites of alternative
tourism to markets remain, as do anxieties over present-day indigenous
identities. I argued that the Peruvian State’s promotion of a national identity for
tourism of Peru as the ‘Land of the Incas’ follows in the post-independence
glorification of an imagined past, while erasing present-day indigenous
identities. Elite institutions, of which Promperú is one, promote an elite past,
which serves to de-value present-day indigenous identities. Taking a postcolonial
perspective, that sees the representational as impacting on the material, I
proposed that representations of Peru’s indigenous people as descendents of the
Incas, renders them timeless and unchanging. I propose that the deployment of
an indigenous identity grounded in the past in tourism promotion depoliticises
developmental difference. The production of indigenous identity through
temporal difference erases the North’s and national elites’ role in actual
inequality.
Chapter 6 looked at homestay tourism at the local level, examining the constructions of culture and development by consultants, tourists and communities. It discussed homestay tourism’s agenda for the revival of indigenous culture within a specifically Peruvian historical context of ‘indigenismo’, of cultural revival as an elite, middle-class concern to forge a non-indigenous national identity based on a glorious, Inca past. By suggesting that the revival of indigenous culture originates in middle-class, elite concerns with national identity and market demands for authenticity, I argued that cultural revival provides a value-added product, while maintaining social and racial categories. Moreover, I suggested that community elites, given their educational status, Spanish language skills, personal histories of migration and positions as market traders might not consider themselves ‘indigenous’. I propose that social and racial categories are flexible, and that community leaders actively engage in folkloric performances of indigenous culture for tourist consumption, which allows for their increased social mobility, while reconfirming hierarchical categories. That is, while past, mediated forms of indigenous culture are valued by middle-class Peruvians and international markets, contemporary indigenous people remain marginalized in Peruvian society.

This chapter also examined the historical appropriation of pre-Columbian identities by both the political establishment and counter-establishment groups. It contrasted their agendas with the predominant lack of a grassroots indigenous movement in Peru, which distinguishes it from neighbouring countries, most notably Bolivia. I proposed that the co-option of indigenous symbols and ways of life continued in Toledo’s venture with the World Bank to integrate indigenous communities into global markets. I argued that while homestay tourism is promoted within imaginations of alternatives to mass tourism, modernity and markets, it further integrates indigenous communities into markets. Moreover, this co-option denies the radical possibilities offered by indigenous ways of life as alternatives to market development and of indigenous symbols as rallying points against uneven development under neo-liberal economic policies.
Processes of professionalisation were examined, especially in the emphasis on training in the production of authenticity and standards of comfort and service acceptable to tourists. Community leaders themselves become professionals, and use their trained status to differentiate their tourism associations in the market. I argued that the emphasis on the implementation of successful models of homestay tourism, in order to attract funding beyond the project cycle, and in order to maintain consultancy positions, leads to the dulling of critical perspectives.

This chapter also explored communities’ mechanisms of exchange and reciprocity as being employed by both consultants and community leaders to further homestay tourism’s developmental agenda, by distributing the socio-economic benefits of tourism throughout the wider community. These mechanisms were conceptualised as the cultural capital of the poor that calms dissent and enables the peaceful functioning of markets. Conversely, minor acts of sabotage and protest against homestay tourism associations were seen as manifestations of the wider communities’ insistence on the maintenance of egalitarian traditions. Rather than presenting neo-liberalism as a monolithic, homogeneous project, chapter 6’s examination of specific interactions between consultants and communities at the local level has shown the heterogeneous nature of responses to market integration. Moreover, traditional mechanisms of reciprocity and exchange are seen as opening up spaces within neo-liberalism which can temper the socio-economic differentiation and racialised hierarchies that it reinforces.

7:4 Arguments, policy implications and suggestions

As postcolonial approaches teach us the representational impacts on the material (chapter 4). Representations of indigenous communities and their relationships with markets and modernity have material implications for the ways in which development is implemented in homestay tourism. I have argued that homestay tourism works through paradoxes. This kind of tourism is
promoted within imaginations of indigenous communities as standing outside of markets and modernity. It also functions through notions of sustainable development which are anti-market and modernity. However, it proposes that indigenous culture is revived and development is delivered through markets. Homestay tourism is promoted within sustainable development principles of limiting economic development and placing controls on markets, through limiting tourist numbers, restricting tourist behaviour and, in the case of Fair Trade tourism, by fixing prices, whilst functioning through markets that are supposedly free and open (chapter 4).

The deployment of this contradiction between imaginations and implementation has material consequences for indigenous communities. One consequence is that greater market integration brings with it increased socio-economic differentiation between and within communities and instigates competition between rival tourism associations (chapter 6). Tourist numbers also need to attain a certain level for homestay tourism to be commercially viable. Moreover, in order to meet tourism associations’ aspirations for increased tourist numbers, as well as meeting the expectations of increasing numbers of tourism associations, tourist numbers need to meet certain levels and rise. Conversely, restricted numbers of guests need to pay more. Another implication is that, since homestay tourism functions within imaginations of the tourism destination lifecycle, communities that are involved to a greater extent in homestay tourism (such as Taquile and Amantaní) can be deemed to have been corrupted by contact with tourists, money and modernity. Greater success in the market can affect the sustainability of homestay tourism sites, with travel companies and tourists moving onto newer, more ‘authentic’ and cheaper sites.

In order to counter this cycle, I propose that notions of sustainability need to be reconceptualised in terms of representations of authenticity and assumptions of the limited carrying capacities of communities with fragile cultures and environments. Within popular conceptualisations of the tourism destination lifecycle tourists motivated to experience authentic cultures move onto newer
sites when destinations become perceived to be ‘inauthentic’ and over-crowded with mass tourists. This is an especially pertinent imaginative framework for alternative tourism destinations and products, which specifically market themselves as being authentic, niche and exclusive, against mass destinations. The perceived loss of authenticity centres on the apparent deterioration of tourist/host relations. Tourists and tourism service providers imagine a transition from hosts’ reciprocating tourists’ own motivations for personal contact in the homestay, to being motivated by financial gain. Tourism is imagined to corrupt hosts: they become materialistic, demonstrated by a corresponding lack of personal warmth, good service and rising prices. Authenticity is also imagined to be lost though modernisation of dress and buildings (chapter 6).

I propose an approach to de-essentialise authenticity in representations of homestay tourism that breaks down the dichotomies of past/modernity, staged/unstaged and true/fake. Conceptualisations of modernity and tourism as an agent of modernity are needed that do not follow the seemingly inevitable trajectory proposed in the tourism destination lifecycle model from diverse, traditional societies to a homogenised, corrupted modernity. Postcolonial perspectives of ‘traditional’ societies as hybrid, diverse and dynamic combinations of tradition and modernity would contribute to a reconceptualisation, if not abandonment, of these boundaries. Postcolonial non-linear approaches to time could also contribute to a re-thinking of separate pasts and presents, particularly notions of knotted time. Rather than defining tourists and host communities through essentialised difference, which is expressed in temporal and spatial terms (indigenous communities are imagined to be remote in time and space, and authenticity to be divided between front and back spaces) I propose that tourists and hosts should be viewed as co-existing and covalent in modernity. This would also challenge the unequal power relations inherent in past/modernity binaries. Leaving these binaries behind would also challenge representations of the seemingly inevitable cycle of decay in ‘alternative’ tourism.
destinations, and would perhaps lead to more established alternative tourist sites being less at risk of tourists moving on to ‘unspoilt’ destinations.

Homestay tourism, while maintaining that it works within sustainable development principles of limiting tourist numbers and tourism development, is nonetheless a market-led development strategy, which creates the market contingencies of expansion. I propose that lack of equitable socio-economic development in tourism needs to be addressed through fostering greater linkages between this sector and the wider economy, rather than on the current position of national elites, which is to insist on national unity in the hope of pacifying dissent. Families involved in homestay tourism demonstrate agency in seeking out markets and express the desire for more tourists in order to create and maintain viable businesses. They also convey the need for more tourists in order to be able to extend homestay tourism to other members of the community, who insist on sharing the benefits of tourism development among the wider community through job creation and funding community development projects. Homestay tourism, in common with its mass counterpart, sets in motion mechanisms of socio-economic differentiation characteristic of neo-liberal markets within communities. That is, homestay tourism benefits richer community elites more than non-elites, and reinforces and increases these inequalities between and within communities. Encouraging increasing numbers of tourists to visit homestay projects would open up possibilities to share work and spread the benefits of tourism. Rather than limiting homestay tourism to the small scale, the possibilities and challenges of growth need to be addressed by homestay tourism. In terms of the sustainable destination lifecycle model, the growth of tourism needs to be presented in a more positive light, as a means of creating more opportunities for communities to share in the economic benefits, thus stemming the possible departure of tourists to newer destinations.

Moreover, the encouragement of growth, managed by employing traditional community mechanisms of reciprocity and exchange, may help to minimise the
competition between rival tourism associations. Sustainability needs to be reconceptualised as regular and adequate flows of tourists to sustain existing tourism associations and to benefit emerging groups. Higher tourist numbers may also allow communities to insist on the maintenance of adequate prices in their dealings with travel agents and tourists. Strong community leadership structures and mechanisms for sharing the benefits of tourism, based on solidarity, may also help to maintain the prices of homestay tourism, both within and between communities. Finally, notions of carrying capacity, based on cultural fragility and dichotomies between mass and niche tourism, need to be challenged. For example, increased income from tourism could be invested in improving the environmental carrying capacity of destinations.

Additionally, the disconnection between imaginations, communities’ aspirations and the material consequences of homestay tourism indicates imbalances in power between middle-class, educated, urban tourists and consultants and indigenous communities. Tourists and consultants see indigenous communities as models of Rousseauian pre-contact harmony, sustainability and spirituality, and view sustainable development in terms of limiting tourism to the small scale (thus also preserving the exclusivity of their own class-based experience). However, communities live in constant contact with markets and modernity, and aspire to more even market integration and development. This can be seen in communities’ agency in seeking out NGO and travel agency support in developing homestay tourism and the proliferation of competing tourism associations (chapter 6). Protests against lack of integration in mainstream tourism at the national level (chapter 5) and also community-level unrest and acts of sabotage of homestay tourism projects indicate local demands to be integrated into tourism markets. Nevertheless, communities’ following of traditional mechanisms of reciprocity and exchange indicate the maintenance of more egalitarian alternatives to more individualistic capitalist systems. These systems also represent alternative spaces within neo-liberal regimes.
Chapters 5 and 6 have attempted to show that neo-liberalism is not homogeneous and there is a need for international tourism policy makers and practitioners to learn about the specificities of national and local contexts when planning tourism projects. Moreover, those responsible for the development of national policy and the implementation of tourism projects should consider the positions of local people more carefully in tourism planning. I call for a greater recognition of the national and local scales in development interventions and a wider dialogue with local stakeholders, including those within communities not directly involved in tourism projects. I argue that there are historical conflicts of perspectives between elite policy makers and practitioners and communities that need to be addressed through dialogue. Local communities should be given the opportunity of having a voice in national debates on tourism development and its relationship to culture in order to manage some of the conflicts that can arise from the resulting uneven socio-economic development and contentious representations of national identity and indigenous culture.

Within homestay tourism’s proposals for the revival and revaluing of indigenous culture and the delivery of development through market integration, spaces need to be made in order to redress the imbalances of power within cultural representations and the distribution of the economic benefits of tourism within communities. The performance of folkloric representations of indigenous culture, mediated by white, middle-class consultants and tourists, provides elites within communities with opportunities for greater social mobility, while fixing indigenous categories to the colourful and the past. Such representations depoliticise cultural revival by reducing culture to certain fixed displays to fulfil consultants’ perceptions and tourists’ demands. They also fail to challenge ambivalent attitudes towards indigenous identity within urban society and communities: the label ‘indian’ or ‘indigenous’ remains stigmatised and one of the lowest social categories in Peru.
Firstly, presenting indigenous culture as a tourism product, whose revival and value is conveyed by the market, denies the political possibilities of the deployment of indigenous culture as a rallying point against capitalism, as experienced in the neighbouring Latin American countries of Ecuador and Bolivia. That is, while homestay tourism represents indigenous culture as a model of sustainable living, it simultaneously denies its viability in modernity. It does so by fixing indigenous ways of life to folkloric performances of an imagined past and to the market which demands such representations. Secondly, homestay tourism’s fixing of indigenous culture to a static, imaginary past and bounding as a tourism product denies its radical possibilities as an alternative, sustainable model to capitalism. I recommend that development actors (including tourists) need to engage at a deeper level with indigenous culture and the desires of indigenous communities in order to work towards a reconceptualisation of the place of indigenous culture within ‘modernity’ and the power relations that this implies. For example, employing ‘traditional’ community mechanisms of reciprocity and exchange in homestay tourism could be considered as strategies to open up alternative spaces within ‘modern’ neoliberalism.

While tourists are encouraged to learn lessons of spirituality and sustainability from the indigenous communities they visit, the geographical bounding of indigenous life to the remote and exotic, and its temporal bounding to a distant past (often of the Incas) makes these lessons difficult to translate to a Northern context. Moreover, by promoting the idea that tourists themselves, through their demands for authentic experiences, have the power to revive and revalue indigenous culture privileges assumptions that markets can be called on to provide solutions to non-market issues. Thus unequal power relations between tourists and their hosts, developed and developing countries and markets, and non-market ways of life are maintained while purporting to reverse these power relations. A more equal conceptualisation of indigenous communities and their relationship to modernity and markets is needed, rather than one based on lack and need on the part of communities, which replicates unequal power relations.
between tourists and hosts. Responsibility on the part of tourists towards their hosts should be shifted from individual consumers to more equal notions of collective action and solidarity. This could mean that the more ‘modern’ aspects of indigenous culture are also presented to tourists, or that tourists are asked to reflect on the ‘traditional’ aspects of their culture, or to reflect on the structural and political causes of developmental difference.

Community elites involved in homestay tourism display agency in pursuing homestay tourism as a development strategy, in seeking out external funding and expertise and in responding to tourist perceptions and demands for what constitutes responsible, homestay tourism products. They also demonstrate pragmatism in etching tourism onto traditional community structures of reciprocity and exchange, as ways of minimising conflict within the community. Those members of the community who protest at the unequal access to tourism resources (for example training provided by NGOs, and tourists) equally show agency in their insistence on accessing these. The basing of homestay tourism on traditional community structures and mechanisms of reciprocity and exchange can be seen as a strategy to calm dissent on the part of development agencies and community elites and to facilitate market integration.

The insistence on claiming a share of the benefits of tourism by those members of the community not participating in or directly benefiting from homestay projects can be seen as strategies of resistance to the socio-economic differentiation triggered by market integration. Proponents of homestay tourism promote community-wide inclusion in the developmental benefits of tourism by, for example, donating a percentage of profits into community development projects. However, given the conflict and dissent which accompany homestay tourism projects, more attention needs to be paid to respecting traditional, egalitarian values, structures and mechanisms and bring a greater share of benefits to the wider community. A more rigorous adoption of community
mechanisms for sharing may prove to offer an alternative to the vertical integration into markets that presently characterises indigenous peoples’ relationships with tourism.

7:5 Final remarks

Responsible, homestay tourism is constructed through paradoxes. On the one hand, it promotes imaginations of indigenous communities through difference: as existing outside markets and offering models of sustainability and spirituality for Northern tourists. On the other, it advances the delivery of cultural revival and sustainable development through further market integration. It proposes that tourism brings developmental benefits, while limiting these to individual transactions between tourists and their hosts and to small scale projects. It also functions through binaries of mass/niche products, past/modernity, and authentic/inauthentic cultures within the contingencies of the destination lifecycle model.

While I cannot hope to solve these paradoxes, I have suggested directions for discussion and policy development. Challenging the perceptions of authenticity deployed in homestay tourism as rooted in the past would allow indigenous cultures a more equal place in modernity. This approach would encourage their more egalitarian approaches of coping with uneven capitalist development to be viewed as viable alternatives to individualistic systems. Moreover, this approach would promote a more equal conceptualisation of responsibility, based on co-existence, equality and solidarity, rather than on tourists responding to lack and need. It would also protect communities against the destination lifecycle.

A new conceptualisation of sustainability is needed which includes the commercial viability of homestay tourism. Currently, limiting homestay tourism to niche markets and the small-scale can hinder commercial success, which is a priority for communities who have often invested their own resources into
homestay businesses. Allowing more spaces for communities’ traditional mechanisms of equality and sharing more explicitly in homestay tourism could provide a more equal distribution of the benefits of tourism throughout communities.

Finally, instead of the current concentration of producing the right models of tourism based on the uncritical reproduction of assumptions surrounding the relationships between culture and development, this thesis hopes to open up debates and policy development to a consideration of the imaginative and material structures on which this form of tourism is based.
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Chapter 2

2:1  dar espaldas al presente

2:2  (...) la idealización del pasado, o la “utopía andina”, que es la que últimamente viene suplantando a la historia de las negaciones (...) Pues si se idealiza o exalta el pasado, en este caso el más remoto, es justamente en compensación por lo que se ve negado en el presente.

Chapter 5

5:1  Hay que recordar siempre el hecho de que dos turistas generan un puesto de trabajo.

5:2  La actividad turística puede ser una importante herramienta para alcanzar diversos objetivos de desarrollo, como la generación de empleo descentralizado, la conservación de nuestro patrimonio cultural y natural con participación de al sociedad civil y el fortalecimiento de al pequeña empresa, entre otros (...) Estas acciones serán realizados dentro de la filosofía del desarrollo sostenible, el cuidado del medio ambiente, el respeto de las tradiciones culturales de los pueblos y la participación active a de la sociedad.

5:3  Objetivo general: Alcanzar un turismo sostenible en el Perú como herramienta de desarrollo económico-social del país. Objetivos estratégicos: Objetivo 1: Promover la cultura turística y la seguridad para el visitante.

5:4  La percepción de inseguridad no solo se relaciona con el incremento de la delincuencia o el mayor número de accidentes viales, sino que tiene también que ver con la poca confianza que tiene la ciudadanía en la capacidad de las entidades del Estado encargadas de garantizar el orden en el país. Se ha constatado que el programa de seguridad es fundamental para enfrentar esta situación, y es por ello que las autoridades regionales y nacionales deben iniciar sus procesos de control en los distintos destinos turísticos del país.

5:5  (...) que sea prioritaria la apuesta del Estado por desarrollar intereses especiales de viaje —como el turismo rural comunitario, observación de aves, gastronomía, surf—, llegando a espacios no tradicionales y asegurando una mejor distribución de los ingresos por turismo hacia la población.
De acuerdo con la segmentación de mercados de PROMPERÚ, el 39% de los turistas busca actividades relacionadas a nichos específicos o multitemáticos ligados a experiencias (vivenciales), mientras que el resto se interesa por visitar iconos en circuitos tradicionales. De este modo, las actividades de nichos y multitemáticos tienden a ser más especializadas, por lo que además de atraer turistas con un mayor gasto promedio, poseen una mayor adaptabilidad a los servicios.

En la identificación del perfil del nuevo turista extranjero, PROMPERÚ encontró que este busca nuevas experiencias y crecimiento personal. Además, necesita sentir que descubre civilizaciones antiguas y tener un alto contacto con la naturaleza. Estos exploradores, quienes generan opinión en su grupo, tienen mente abierta y positiva, consideran que los viajes son importantes en sus actividades y poseen un alto nivel de educación. Es decir, el turista actual busca experiencias.

El Primer Encuentro Nacional de Turismo Rural en Puno

El MINCETUR ha decidido usar el turismo rural como un elemento de frontera, nosotros creemos que esto beneficia directamente a la población.

El Turismo Rural Comunitario en el Perú es toda actividad turística que se desarrolla en el medio rural, de manera planificada y sostenible, basada en la participación de las poblaciones locales organizadas para beneficio de la comunidad (…)

El Plan Estratégico Nacional de Turismo es una herramienta que encamina nuestro país hacia una mayor competitividad económica, un mayor equilibrio y un desarrollo sostenible dentro de un territorio accesible y bien conectado.

Yo te lo digo que desde mi particular punto de vista, el turismo, no es el hada madrina que va a tocar la vida de las personas, y uy repentinamente les va a convertir en algo que nunca has habido imaginado, no?, el turismo como cualquier otra actividad productiva, se establece en puntos, y en corredores donde se pueda realizar la actividad, un pueblo rural, una comunidad por mas bella que sea si está a cinco mil metros sobre el nivel del mar, detrás de toda la cordillera de los Andes sin ningún camino, va seguir siendo una comunidad rural a cinco mil metros de altura, detrás de toda la cordillera de los Andes porque no hay como llegar ¿no? Entonces esto se trata de establecer uno que el turismo se da donde hay las condiciones mas propicias para que los pasajeros puedan llegar, donde hayan servicios.
Las OGD son asociaciones público-privadas sin fines de lucro que implementan planes de desarrollo turístico. Se financian mediante cuotas periódicas de sus miembros y a través de otros aportes financieros, tales como los de la cooperación internacional.

Hay muchos recursos sin uso que no son transables, que no reciben inversión y que no generan trabajo. Y todo ello por el tabú de ideologías superadas, por ociosidad, por indolencia.

El incremento de la participación del sector turístico en la economía del país es una meta cuantificable que se debe considerar junto con el aprovechamiento y la conservación de los valores socioculturales y medioambientales que constituyen la ventaja competitiva del Perú en materia turística.

(...) un sistema que necesita producir diferencia para constituir mejor a sus consumidores.

Perú, país de los Incas es mas que nada el tema de la estrategia de la diferenciación, lo nuestro no es la marca país, lo que nosotros tenemos es una marca turística, que nos tienen que ayudar a diferenciarnos de la competencia, a través de una propuesta de valor única y diferente a todos los demás países que pueden competir con nosotros en términos de historia y arqueología, ningún otro país además del Perú, puede decir que es el país de los incas (...) para nosotros es una herramienta de diferenciación poderosa en los mercados en los que bueno, competimos con destinos, de estilo como Petra, Angkor Watt, Tical, las pirámides etc. etc.

Nosotros tenemos todavía muchos temas, muchos conflictos por el tema de que se puede pensar que la marca puede ser como una bandera, pero la marca es lo que nos tiene que ayudar a entrar en la mente del consumidor y ayudar a entrar en los mercados, luego ya tu podrás hacer desbajo de toda esta lanza, decir bueno pues nosotros además tenemos mochica, tenemos wari, tenemos wancas, tenemos aymaras, tenemos este pueblos nativos etc. Pero está creo yo probado, que la gente se aturde cuando hay demasiadas cosas, es como entrar en un gran mall, tu quieres comprar en un par de zapatillas, la tienda tiene miles de pares de zapatillas, por lo general la gente puede salir sin ninguna zapatilla.

Empezamos a cuestionar, poner en duda el posicionamiento de Perú como Cusco-Machu Pichu únicamente (...) estábamos por descubrir que el Perú era mucho mas que las piedras Incas y lo que mas interesada era culturas vivas ya? Entonces se empieza a hacer todo un trabajo de replanteamiento que fue una pelea muy dura con las agencias tradicionales que ellos querían vender Cusco-Machu Pichu. Finalmente paso todo lo que paso, con Fujimori, vino el gobierno de Toledo y de repente de un día a otro,
nuestra marca de país, nuestro branding empezó a ser the Land of the Incas, y ahora somos the Land of the Incas.

5:20 Prom Perú ha gastado varios cientos de miles de dólares promocionando una imagen donde pareciera que los grandes cambios del siglo XX (migraciones, pobreza urbana, nuevas estéticas) hubieran tenido poco impacto en el llamado mundo tradicional. Sus folletos y su participación en distintas exposiciones internacionales muestran siempre al Perú como un país donde los grupos indígenas son los encargados de representarnos a todos y donde ellos, estetizados, están siempre sonriendo ante una cámara que los despoja de todo el frío y la pobreza: de todo su presente.

5:22 Turistas afectados por bloqueo del tren perdieron US $ 432 mil (...)
Fueron unas 250 personas las que causaron este daño a la imagen del Perú.

5:22 La autoridad lamento que este tipo de actos, que tienen que ver con problemas internos de un municipio, terminen por afectar a miles de personas que solo traen desarrollo para el Cusco.

5:23 Protesta Social: La toma de carreteras es una medida radical de quienes en nombre del pueblo impiden el libre tránsito de las personas. Sin duda un golpe mortal para el turismo y la economía del país.

5:24 Me preocupa la versión sobre nuestro país que se llevan los turistas.

5:25 La gente pobre puede creer que los que pierden por las tomas de carretera son los del grupo Romero o la gente de Hayduk, no son concientes de que perdemos todos. Ellos también.

5:26 Acabemos de una vez con la agresión al turista y al turismo.

5:27 Esta semana 16 turistas fueron asaltados y golpeados cobardemente en el Camino Inca, es decir, en pleno Valle Sagrado. Los delincuentes arrasaron con todo-el dinero y otras pertenencias de los visitantes-, pero también con las expectativas de un grupo de ciudadanos extranjeros deseosos de conocer el Cusco y que ahora, probablemente, nunca regresarán al país.

5:28 El daño fue, pues, doble. Perdieron los turistas y perdió el Perú, cuyo turismo sigue maltratado y agredido, pese a ser la séptima actividad económica más importante del país, que aporta el 3,3 % al PBI y genera más de 600 millones de dólares en divisas.

5:29 Otras naciones vecinas, con menos atractivos y recursos, atraen un mayor volumen de visitantes que-\textit{y eso es lo mejor!}-regresan o se convierten en los primeros promotores turísticos de países donde simplemente se les ofreció una estancia grata y placentera. Aquí tenemos Machu Pichu,
Patrimonio Histórico de la Humanidad, entre otras bellezas, pero carecemos de conciencia turística.

5:30 valorar la riqueza que poseemos

5:31 a ser buenos anfitriones y a atraer a los turistas, en lugar a ahuyentarlos

5:32 una causa que quiere aportar propuestas nuevas que construyan las bases de un proyecto nacional que asuma el Perú como promesa y posibilidad.

5:33 No hemos incluido en nuestra visión de futuro a las comunidades locales. El turismo del futuro deberá incluir a esos actores fundamentales en todas las decisiones. Si no, seguiremos alimentando la farsa.

5:34 Los empresarios de turismo trafican con la cultura y dejan poco dinero en las comunidades. Entonces no podemos quejarnos de que haya casos adversos y levantamientos pues las personas no se sienten identificadas con el turismo.

5:35 La esencia del negocio turístico son las personas, las culturas y se debe buscar la manera de integrarlos en esta actividad.

Chapter 6

6:1 Reciben también turistas nacionales, y muchas veces de repente el turista nacional es el que menos valora lo que le están dando, el turista nacional de repente no nota la dimensión del cambio o del producto que ellos están ofreciendo, porque para ellos sacar un platito con crema de maíz, de quinua, han tenido que pasar por muchas cosas, para mejorar toda su presentación han tenido que superar muchas cosas, entonces el turista nacional no valora realmente como ha trabajado esa persona para llegar a este punto.

6:2 Se ha visto que si se les capacita a la gente de comunidades tratando un poco de rescatar lo que ellos tienen, no cambiar, no se trata de cambiar su comida sino todo lo contrario, es enseñarle a los pasajeros como ellos se alimentan de forma natural, con el aporte de los productos que tenemos en los Andes, y que los conozcan, entonces ellos están haciendo tratando de elaborar su comida, con productos típicos de la zona, de su propia producción para darle un valor agregado, cosa que así no es solamente vender un kilo de papas, sino el de vender un plato de comida hecho con las papas que ellos han producido en la chacra, y ya tienen mayor valor.

6:3 Para el pasajero es un valor agregado porque no se queda en un hotel, es una cosa muy fría, en donde no se tiene contacto mayormente con la gente local ¿no? Se alojen, se queden, coman la comida que ellos preparan, y esa
es la parte más bonita no?, creo que eso es la nueva tendencia que actualmente tener el turismo, entonces es algo bastante positivo.

6:4 Antes de que se interviniera se diere estas capacitaciones y se hiciera la consultoría de lo que era turismo vivencial, ellos ya habían perdido el tema de sus trajes y de su identidad cultural (...) Y se ponían trajes modernos, y de pronto realmente cuando se les explica que realmente el turista viene a ver lo original, como era, es la cultura real, ellos han vuelto a optar su cultura de antes, lo que ya se había ido perdiendo entonces han entendido que lo valioso no está en vestirse como se visten en Europa.

6:5 Entonces los turistas me decían nosotros nos queremos esas cosas de calaminas de cemento de fierro de plástico queremos ver lo que es la autenticidad a eso queremos venir nos han dicho entonces por eso uno de mis objetivos fue recuperar y revalorar nuestra identidad cultural si.

6:6 Antes no pensábamos nada [pero] siempre nuestra cultura hemos mantenido desde antes.

6:7 Interviewer: Y estas costumbres se estaba perdiendo antes ¿o? 
Raúl Rodrigo: Eso del pago al tierra no, siempre esta mantenido
I: Pero la ropa sí
R.R.: La ropa sí, estaba perdido, eso sí.

6:8 Interviewer: Y la identidad cultural, como, como fue entonces ¿como? 
Raúl Rodrigo: ¿Identidad cultural? Antes nosotros no usábamos esa vestimenta típica que ahora estas viendo, ya estaba perdiéndose, años estaba perdiendo, años esta perdiéndose y nosotros se ha recuperado ¿no?
I: ¿Y por qué?
RR: Porque revaloramos nuestra cultura andina, sí, estamos revalorando ¿no?
I: Pero porque de repente, por el turismo ¿o por?
RR: Por el turismo y también por nuestra identidad cultural, nuestra identidad
I: ¿Y como es tu identidad cultural?
RR: Um, sí, yo soy orgulloso de ser descendiente quechua, quechua hablante, campesino, nuestra ropa llevamos con orgullo.

6:9 Interviewer: Pero dice que costo mucho rescatar al ropa ¿no?
Raúl Rodrigo: Mucho, mucho, críticas por aquí por allá.
I: ¿Críticas?
R.R.: Sí, abuelitas, viejitas.

6:10 Interviewer: ¿Y el programa cultural, la ropa, llevaron ustedes antes?
Abelena Inca: No, no, antes, no, pero ahora sí, como estamos trabajando con turistas por eso hemos recuperado nuestra ropa también
I: Por el turismo
A.I.: Uh hum.
I: ¿Porque les gusta a ellos?
A.I.: Les gusta esta ropa, igual seria como usted, algo así, también, igual me pongo, también con esta ropa estamos mas, mejorada

6:11 Esa es muy interesante porque si ha generado mucho desarrollo la gente desarrollo economico sobre todo este digamos que ha perdido la esencia ya todo el mundo sabe que esto es fake ¿no?

6:12 Empezamos el proyecto con las familias ¿Por qué esas familias? ¿Por qué esas familias? Por varias razones, uno porque nos parecia enorme Amistad, no sabiamos por donde empezar, como promocionar gente, otro que como teniamos como la certezade que el turismo puede impactar muy negativamente en gente campesina que tiene muy debilitado sus valores o su autoestima, entonces ésta ONG ..., venía trabajando ya hace tiempo no sé con cien familias, en esto de afirmación cultural, de entendimiento de su riqueza cultural, y dijimos queremos trabajar con gente de ese grupo, los interesados de este grupo que han demostrado que ya tienen su clima para trabajar y que tienen mucho convencimiento de su cultura, entonces el riesgo va ser menor con el turismo.

6:13 Con qué criterio elegir una comunidad? Yo creo que por ejemplo una de las variables a tener en cuenta es el nivel educativo, el nivel educativo creo que marca una diferencia muy grande en cuanto atención a turistas (...) el manejo de lengua por ejemplo ¿no? y bueno la gente educada tiene mas capacidad de ponersela visión de negocio que la gente que no, la gente menos educada es mas dependiente de la ONG, y del Estado. Y mira eso que suena una cosa muy simple es una verdad, o sea el nivel de educación determina la viabilidad de un proyecto.

6:14 El problema es que si la familia es muy miserable ¿no? Un turista no quiere ver la miseria (...) quiere sentir un poco o entender un poco la cosa pero tampoco esta ahí para vivir la pobreza del otro.

6:15 Entonces estas familias (...) ellos eran ya promotores de su cultura en su comunidad, por ejemplo el señor Alvaro Medina es un líder por lo que es recuperación de variedades nativas de papa, Manolo Medina fue él que empezó la práctica de recuperar el vestido, el señor Manolo Medina M. es un antiguo sastre, es uno de los pocos que fabrica ropa tradicional de Amistad también. Entonces son gente por eso digo que los seleccionamos, convocamos a los que ya sabiamos que tenian un valor por ellos mismos sin que nadie de afuera le diga, porque pensamos que eso evitaría un poquito el impacto negativo en su cultura porque ellos ya tenían una cosa
de valoración propia y tenían cierta actividad de promoción en su comunidad.

6:16 Muy aparte de socios con mi caserío ya con mi sector si entonces hay mayor, mas población beneficiarían como 100 personas en un solo alojamiento, entonces ese administraríamos a una persona capacitada para mejorar, para aperturar mas trabajos para tener otro ingreso para la comunidad no es para la comunidad del Amistad sino para [mi] caserío.

6:17 Entonces también llegó el neo-liberalismo a Taquile porque las familias que han podido salir y pueden desarrollar empresas de artesanía, de restaurantes, de alojamiento este ellos van creciendo y hay otro sector de la comunidad que solamente está cargando el agua para esos restaurantes ante, esta limpiando los cuartos de esos habitaciones entonces es como que ha perdido lo que era antes ¿no? (…) Por el tema del desarrollo económico, por el tema del uso de repente exagerado como mercancía de lo que es la cultura de allí es donde yo le veo porque igual hay un desnivel socio-económico.

6:18 En la comunidad es como el bien cultural es colectivo, es también diseñar propuestas que le beneficien colectivamente y no yo porque tengo capital o porque tengo mas educación o que se yo, yo me convierto pues en el gran empresario de la comunidad donde todo los demás me dan solo servicios.

6:19 El andino, tradicionalmente, una estructuralista, vivía en una cosmovisión y todos los astros y estos ciclos astronómicos, tenía una sincronía con los ciclos de la cosecha, los ciclos de crianza animal, las actividades humanos, todo esta relacionado y necesitamos un mano de obra conjunta para poder manejar mejor (…) eso en el tiempo eran los ayllus se ha ido convirtiendo en las comunidades legalmente, bueno el día de la (…) llega también allí. Y hay una individualización (…) entonces sigues substituyendo la personalería jurídica de la comunidad, con sus tierras comunes con algunas características como el ayni o la minka que son los trabajos comunales o las faenas, los trabajos juntos, pero, muchos se han tirando para su lado.

6:20 (…) que llevo acá casi todos los casos, mientras mas alejado estas, mas cohesión hay en la comunidad (…) en pleno proceso de transición, por eso tienes comunidades que ya no son comunidades son plobadores ¿menores tienes parcelación de tierras en muchos casos, ya son de los comuneros, y tienes algunos que estamos en el proceso o sea decir que ya no se crea en la estructura comununal efectivamente estamos en proceso de transición, en proceso de transición donde algunos salen aprovechando
mejor, entonces en esta lucha de miradas, hay algunos que dicen, porque salir solitos cuando somos una comunidad ya?

6:21 (...) hemos buscado también basados en la fortaleza de la organización comunal, hemos buscado también, basado en la fortaleza común, hemos buscado crear una organización más allá de las organizaciones solamente familiares no, es una, ellos tienen ya una organización social propia, antigua, entonces hemos adaptado a esa organización social a varias asociaciones con especialidad dentro de la comunidad, hay asociación de alfareros, hay asociación de proveedores de comidas, hay asociación de turismo que son adaptaciones de una forma tradicional de organización no, ah, el manejo de la asociación se ha hecho de la manera más tradicional a través del consejo, todos tienen voz, todos tienen voto y la gran mayoría de decisiones se aprueba no por mayoría sino por llegar a acuerdos.

6:22 (...) vamos por listas, orden del turno, entonces el, si y a otros por suerte les toca dos, tres días, y mas tienen, me van a igualar

6:23 (...) de la lista tenemos que repartirnos, tenemos cuaderno y así según cuaderno, según, de la lista tenemos que atender.

6:24 Para eso nosotros podemos sentirnos mas orgullosos porque ya le van a dar trabajo a otras personas, como, este, para hacer pachamancha a el puede trabajar, y a el puede aprender otras personas, nosotros podemos pagar sus jornales y también comprar productos a otras vecinas, productos, entonces ya tienen su ingreso para ellos también, de esa manera se puede mejorar la calidad de vida de otras personas también.

6:25 Pero también gana este del fondo este, nos reparte, si, la guiada, todo, de allí también nosotros recogimos la parte de, para el fondo tenemos un poquito siempre lo dejamos para hacer pachamancha o otras cosas.

6:26 En principio es nuestra política generar un trabajo equitativo que haga trabajo para todos ese es nuestra política que el trabajo debe ser equitativo para todos, entonces por ejemplo yo no puedo tener lanchas tampoco puedo tener bote de renta, a lo mucho solo puedo tener solamente restaurante y hospedaje nada más, porque si yo hago todo puede ver un problema social. Porque el y porque nosotros que somos se pueden decir entonces eso quiero evitar.

6:27 La comunidad hasta cuando hemos construímos nuestros locales que ahorita están funcionando como alojamiento pensaban recoger para la comunidad pero no se ha realizado así y entonces ya el Fundación de la Montaña han otra forma de pensar para levantar ahorita esta casa de
abuelos entonces ya cuando se levanto esa casa ya mas o menos bueno se calmaron.

6:28 ‘Un tiburón’

6:29 **Valeriano Quispe:** Bueno le cuento también que en esos años al principio yo quería hacer un turismo comunitario, comunal y pensé yo de otra forma trabajar en comunidad que todas las casas deben arreglar sus casitas las familias que duerman los turistas en toda la comunidad. (…)

Pero un poco que no, no resulta eso

**Interviewer:** ¿No?

**VQ:** No ha resultado

**I:** ¿Cómo, por qué no?

**VQ:** Bueno al principio teníamos un local, en la plaza teníamos un comedor su cocina su salón artesanal y su oficina de turismo teníamos (…)

Pero eso no ha resultado viene la envidia de las autoridades, las autoridades el noventa y seis nos han apoyado y el noventa y ocho ya no han dicho vayase, ustedes están ganado plata y pueden irse nos han botado. Nos han cortado el teléfono, la llave lo han cambiado el candado, pero ese golpe a mi me ha enseñado [una lección], sí. Como me han quitado el teléfono comunitario y la llave, me he comprado celular y ahora en vez del comedor he adecuado mi casa pues yo no pensaba tener acá comedor iba a ser en la plaza.

**Interviewer:** ¿Y por qué las autoridades no estaban ganando o cómo?

**VQ:** Por envidia

**I:** ¿Envidia?

**VQ:** Sí porque ellos no mas se van a beneficiar que nos dirán pues.

6:30 **Valeriano Quispe:** pero digo yo a buena de buena forma me han para mi es fortaleza que me hayan dicho ya ustedes pueden irse y ya y es mejor porque es problema con el trabajar en comunidad sí. Mejor es trabajar en forma asociativa en forma grupal sí, explica a mis socios, bueno yo entonces yo arreglo mi casa los vecinos se harán sus cuartitos y así

**Interviewer:** ¿Así que están trabajando?

**VQ:** Grupo, grupo

**I:** ¿Un pequeño grupo no de seis familias?

**VQ:** Sí

**I:** ¿Se arregla entre sí?

**VQ:** Sí y tranquilo no hacemos problema a nadie, nadie no nos molesta entonces estamos trabajando en paz.

6:31 No, como recién estamos trabajando dos años, recién recibimos poco no más, todavía.

6:32 La idea es también es que cuando vienen mas turistas damos mas trabajo a los otros (…) a los músicos, a los tejedores entonces hay mas trabajo para otros también, no solo para nosotros.
6:33 Estamos apoyando a las escuelas con pequeñas donaciones, pequeños libros, colores lapiceros así no. Como hasta ahorita todavía no tenemos turismo suficiente no podemos gran cantidad para donar mesas sillas todavía no, no solamente pequeñas regalos lápices así, cositas.

6:34 Una vez nos han quitado a los turistas de la plaza (...) Estaban llegando a nuestro grupo, entonces a nosotros, a nosotros les han dicho, les ha atendido en la plaza.

6:35 Ahora viéndonos a nosotros hay un grupo que está apareciendo, como se llama, nosotros somos, ah, hemos hecho llamar una faina, hay 80 comunidades aquí, entonces la oficina de Corredor ha dicho quien quiere participar, entonces que se anoten nomás, así, entonces, no quería, pero en los primeros días han querido 20 integrantes y se han reunido, pero entonces, tenemos que papelear, así tenemos que ir a la oficina, entonces se han salido, como estaba difícil invertir así camas hay que comprar. Entonces se han salido, de 20 ahora 13 personas estamos, entonces viéndos a nosotros ya toda la comunidad ya también quiere hacer, entonces ya hay un grupo, casi de ellos, no se, escucho no más que dicen que hay 10 integrantes, incluso ahora ya están trayendo.

6:36 Los otros grupos también ahora recién, como ya nosotros hemos empezado a trabajar, gran parte hemos pasado capacitándonos, ellos también me parece que están organizándose o sea, esta organizándose ellos quieren atender al mismo a los turistas sin recibir capacitación o sea, haciendo una copia de lo que estamos haciendo, una copia, pero no vale, es que no están capacitados, están improvisando, improvisación, entonces, un poco mal.

6:37 Están mal vistos los turistas también, como atienden así en la calle, los turistas estaban queriendo baño, nosotros estábamos preocupados, como van hacer así decíamos.

6:38 Pero no es water, no es así, para echar con baldecito, así nomás, pero nosotros queremos mejorar nuestros baños.

6:39 I: ¿Y que le parece Amantani? ¿Le gustó?  
DQ: Sí, me ha gustado, pero estaban baños todavía lejitos  
I: Están aparte.  
DQ: Lejitos. Incluso nosotros también, todo tenemos en la casa, baños en la casa.

6:40 Hemos buscado llegar a un estándar mínimo de servicios en términos calidad alimentaria, limpieza de los productos, ellas cocinan muy bien, o sea, todo es muy sabroso ¿no? entonces lo único que hemos hecho es
utilizar su propia cocina para mejorar un poco a nivel de que sea aceptable al mercado del turismo.

6:41 ¿Pero ahí qué ocurre? Otra gente en su comunidad les pide ayuda en asesoría, capacitación para que hagan otros negocios, y esta gente del proyecto si quiere ayudarlos pero tampoco no tanto ¿no? (...) Por ejemplo el grupo de jóvenes de Amistad que estudia turismo, que quieren hacer un proyecto de turismo (...) y estoy segura que la gente del proyecto conoce eso, pero no están ayudándolos, pero si es cierto que quieren.

6:42 Uno de los temas de la red es justamente construir una imagen diferenciada (...), efectivamente con la red se trata de diferenciar la cualidad de servicio.

6:43 La idea es que el proceso lo manejan ellos y a través de una carta de cualidad que todos los miembros de esa red, pueden ofrecer como mínimo cualidad de atención y servicio, una cualidad de atención. Estandarizar la cualidad de atención al cliente, sí, si hablamos de alimentación, todos tiene que ofrecer santidad, todos tiene que ofrecer higiene, todos tiene que ofrece una cierta sazón local, sazón local, no la misma sazón, pero si la sazón local.
Appendix 4  Glossary of non-English terms

Ayllu  
(Quechua) A rural community. Translated by Mayer (2002: 333) as ‘a kinship and social unit’.

Ayni  
(Quechua) reciprocal or communal work arrangements. Translated by Mayer (2002: 333) as ‘symmetrical reciprocal exchange’.

Campesino/a  
(Spanish) (o ending=male, a ending=female) Literally, ‘peasant’, but also means an indigenous person. Mayer (2002: 334) describes ‘campesino’ as: ‘a politically charged word describing a rural dweller. (In 1969 the government of Peru officialised this word as a substitute for the derogatory ‘indio’.)

Compadrazgo  
(Spanish) Fictive-kin relationships, primarily godparents. For example, the children of rural families may have godparents who live in urban area who act as guardians or patrons, offering them contacts for employment and education in nearby towns (Radcliffe 1990).

Criollo  
(Spanish) Creole

Faena  
(Spanish) Translated by Mayer (2002: 335) as ‘obligatory work for a community or a section of a community’.

Fiesta/s  
(Spanish) Festivals, feast days, community celebrations

Gringo  
(Spanish) Foreigner, American, the term is also used for ‘white’, middle-class Peruvians by members of rural communities.

Madrina  
Godmother: a fictive kin relationship whereby that person helps the godson or daughter to become established in a trade or profession, and someone to support them financially.

Mestizo/a  
(Spanish) Person (o ending=male, a ending=female) of mixed indigenous/Spanish descent. Also used to refer to indigenous people who have migrated to urban centres from rural areas, and gained access to Spanish and literacy skills through education (de la Cadena 2000).

Minka  
(Quechua) reciprocal arrangements. Described by Mayer (2002: 337) as: ‘Reciprocal exchange
in which a quantity of goods and a meal compensates for work or a service performed. It can be reversible or irreversible; the latter is also known as ‘asymmetrical reciprocity’.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pachamanca</td>
<td>(Quechua) A traditional celebratory meal of meat and vegetables that is cooked underground.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pentur</td>
<td>(Spanish) Plan Estratégico Nacional de Turismo, National Strategic Plan for Tourism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quinoa</td>
<td>(Spanish quinua, from Quechua kinwa) a cereal grown in Andean regions of Latin America, principally Peru, Bolivia and Ecuador.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quechua</td>
<td>(Quechua) refers to the indigenous Quechua language, spoken in the Central Andean regions of Peru, south-western and central Bolivia, southern Colombia and Ecuador, north-western Argentina and northern Chile. It also refers to indigenous identity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Señora</td>
<td>(Spanish) literally translated as lady, a better translation would be ‘madam’. Indigenous women working in the tourism projects were often referred to, respectfully, as señora.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 5  List of actors: anonymous

International development agencies

Silvio Moreno, Project Leader of Alternative Routes in the Sacred Valley, Cusco, Swissaid/Japanaid

Angela Ton, Swissaid, Lima

Martin Reichmann, Senior Economist/partner, Strategy and Enterprise Development Agency (Formerly) Consultant for Swissaid tourism projects in the Cusco/Puno region, Lima

Peruvian State agencies

Ernesto Valencia, Technical Secretary of PENTUR, Ministry of Foreign Trade and Tourism (Mincetur), Lima

Esteban Aragón, Assessor, Ministry of Foreign Trade and Tourism (Mincetur), Lima

Dolores Takahashi, Director of Domestic Tourism, Promperú, Lima

Jorge Colon, Head of the Huascarán National Park, Huaraz

Eleanor Alarcón, Coordinator of Cusco’s Project of Business Networks, PROMPYME, Centre for the Promotion of Small Businesses, Ministry of Work and the Promotion of Employment, Cusco

NGOs

Tina Ramirez, General and International Relations Secretary of CCIP, Centre for Indigenous Cultures, Peru, Lima

Miranda Toledo, Tourism and Protected Areas Specialist, Mountain Foundation, Huaraz

Hugo van Dyck, Project Coordinator, Mountain Foundation/Centre for Responsible Tourism, Huaraz
Marieke Jansen, MA Tourism student and Volunteer for Centre for Responsible Tourism, Huaraz

Benicio Torres, INCATUR, (NGO to promote tourism in the region around Huari) Huari (Ancash)

Bertina Klein, Tourism Consultant, Cusco Centre for Andean Studies/German Technical Co-operation, Cusco

Javier Ortiz, Tourism Consultant Cusco Centre for Andean Studies, Cusco

Consultants

Roberto López former tourism consultant for Promperú, writer, journalist and TV presenter of Peruvian travel programme, Lima

Joaquín Martínez independent travel guide and consultant, investigated alternative circuits in the Sacred Valley for Swissaid and works for Promperú, Lima

Lena Claes, Freelance consultant, academic, works for Promperú and the Belgium government development agency, Lima

Antonio Álvarez, Freelance Consultant, Cusco, involved in Bienvenido homestay project

Juan Yupanqui. Freelance Consultant, Cusco, Cusco-Puno Corridor/Rural Tourism Network

Martin Alonso, Economist and Consultant, Cusco, Cusco-Puno Corridor/Rural Tourism Network, Cusco

Tania Morales, Freelance Consultant, Chef and gastronomy consultant for the Corridor Cusco-Puno, Cusco

Travel agents

Tina Leyhart, Co-founder of Winding Roads Travel, US-based Responsible Travel Company, Huaraz
Valentina Acosta, Huaraz Office manager and mountain guide, Exploración, Lima-based adventure travel company specialising in travel in Peru and Ecuador, Huaraz

Lily Iglesias, Cusco office manager, responsible for the preparation of the environmental management system ISO 14,001 Exploración, Lima-based adventure travel company specialising in travel in Peru and Ecuador, Cusco

Susana Pachacútec, Managing Director, The Travel Bureau, Cusco-based Peruvian Travel Company offering a range of tours around Cusco and homestays in Cusco and the Sacred Valley as part of educational packages for high-school students, Cusco

Federico Navarro, former director and mountain guide for Exploración, Cusco, Lima-based adventure travel company specialising in travel in Peru and Ecuador, now has his own travel company and shop, Vida Ecológica (Ecological Life) specialising in environmentally friendly travel and organic products (handicrafts, food).

Raúl Vega, Managing Director, Apu Travel, Adventure and Cultural Travel Company, works with Bienvenido, Cusco

Linda Davies, Andean Travel, Cusco-based travel company specialising in trekking and adventure travel, works with Bienvenido, Amantaní and Taquile, Cusco

Jean Veron, Hotelier, Director, Vida Travel, based in Cusco, specialising in homestays in Encuentro, Cusco

Diana Palma, Manager of Exploración Puno Office, works with Encuentro, Puno

Valero Perez, Managing Director, All Paths Travel, works with Encuentro, Puno

Manuel Rodriguez, Marketing and Sales, Exploración, Lima,

**Indigenous Community Associations leaders (male and female)**

**Amistad, Huaraz**

Alvaro Medina and his wife Maria Solana, homestay accommodation providers, Amistad, Huaraz

Manolo Medina homestay accommodation provider, Amistad, Huaraz

Placido Escobar guide at homestay tourism project, Amistad, Huaraz
Pablo Toledo, President of the Amistad homestay tourism project, Amistad, Huaraz

Lilian Flores, Pablo Toledo’s wife, Amistad tourism project accommodation provider, Amistad, Huaraz

María Sotomayor, Amistad tourism project accommodation provider, Amistad, Huaraz

Adán Villa, Manager of Centre for Responsible Tourism, Huaraz

Inca Road, Ancash

Jorge Ramírez, Guide and Member of Tourism Association at Tambo on the Inca Road, Ancash

Bienvenido, Cusco/Puno Corredor

Raúl Rodrigo Tourism Association Guide at Bienvenido, Cusco/Puno Corredor

Leonora Mamani, Treasurer, Bienvenido, Cusco-Puno Corredor

Abelena Inca, Homestay Tourism Association, Bienvenido, Cusco-Puno Corridor

Dominga Quispe, Homestay Tourism Association, and Potter, Bienvenido, Cusco-Puno Corridor

Encuentro, Puno

Valeriano Quispe, President of Tourism Association, manager of homestay tourism, Encuentro, Puno

Lucy, Valerio’s daughter, Encuentro, Puno

Tito Amaru, homestay tourism, Encuentro, Valeriano Quispe’s neighbour, Encuentro, Puno

Anton Yupanqui and his wife Neida Mamani, Encuentro, Valeriano Quispe’s neighbour, Encuentro, Puno
Homestay Tourists, Amistad, Huaraz

Melanie Peters, 30, Environmental education and mass communication major, Seattle University, US

Tim Carlson, 21, Travel and Tourism major, Seattle University, US

Sally Jones, 21, Travel and Tourism major Seattle University, US

Joanne Herltz, 19, Psychology and International Business major, Seattle University, US

Andrea Marks, 19, Spanish and International Studies, Seattle University, US

Natalie Lloyd, 25, Recreation Management, Travel and Tourism, Seattle University, US

Gill Fuller, 48, Independent Traveller, from New Zealand

Others

Cecilia Alarcón, Teacher at Tourism Institute, Ayacucho, on a government sponsored visit to Bienvenido, Bienvenido

Pedro Rivera, Centre for Andean Development, Bolivia, Newcastle
Appendix 6  Original research questions

Development

How do different actors represent the relationship between development and homestay tourism?
How do tourists see their role in development through homestay tourism?

How do different actors represent household economic transactions in homestay tourism?

How are unequal economic relations between tourists and households represented by different actors, including tourists?
How are these representations received and interpreted by tourists?

How are the economic and social benefits of homestay tourism distributed between households, communities and ‘gatekeepers’? How do tourists negotiate these dynamics, for example, do they barter for goods and services?

How are different developmental time scales represented by different actors to tourists? For example, are communities represented as living in the ‘past’? How are communities relationships with ‘modernity’ represented?

How are issues of cultural sustainability conveyed by different actors? How are these received and interpreted by tourists?

Cultural Authenticity

How are indigenous identities represented for tourist consumption by different actors? How are these representations received and interpreted by tourists?

How do different actors envisage an ‘authentic’ experience and how is this communicated to tourists?

Is indigenous culture sanitised and packaged for tourist consumption? If so, how? For example, are there ‘front’ and ‘backstage’ areas within households and communities? If so, how are these expressed spatially?

To what extent are households and communities active in performances of ‘authentic culture’ for tourists? For example, do they decide to wear traditional dress for tourists, or organise displays of dancing, handicraft production etc?

How do tourists define ‘authenticity’? How do they receive and interpret the homestay experience from this perspective?

To what extent does the commodification of indigenous culture enhance or degrade communities’ social standing and self-esteem?
Agency

To what extent are individual households and indigenous communities agents in the development of homestay tourism?
How do individual households and communities negotiate access to gatekeepers and tourists?

How do individual households and communities manage their relationships with ‘gatekeepers’ in the tourist industry?

How are these relationships represented to tourists by the various actors involved? How do tourists interpret these relationships?
Appendix 7  Semi-structured interview questions

Questions for NGOs and Travel Agents

(Economic) Development/Desarrollo Económico

How much is a trip?
¿Cuánto cuesta un viaje?

How much do you pay the communities (accommodation, mule drivers, camping)?
¿Cuánto paga a las comunidades (alojamiento, arrieros, camping)?

How do you decide the price?
¿Cómo deciden los precios?

What's your profit margin?
¿Cuánto es tu ganancia?

How many groups go?
¿Cuántos grupos van?

How many in a group?
¿Cuántos son en un grupo?

How do you get groups, through the Internet...?
¿Cómo recogen grupos, a través del internet...?

Who in the community do you choose to work with?
¿Con quiénes en la comunidad trabajan ustedes?

How do you choose?
¿Cómo eligieron?

Are there conflicts?
¿Hay conflictos?
(Social) Development/Desarrollo Social

How do you avoid the negative impacts of tourism?
¿Cómo evitan los impactos negativos del turismo?

(How) Do you support the communities socially?
¿(Cómo)? ¿Apoyan ustedes las comunidades en plan social?

Culture/Authenticity Cultura/ Autenticidad

How does your work engender pride in culture?
¿Cómo revaloran ustedes la cultura tradicional a través del turismo?

Questions for indigenous community association leaders

Background information: family name, member
Su nombre de familia, señor, señora, hijo, hija

Background:

Why did you choose to get involved in the tourism project?
¿Por qué eligió ser socio en el proyecto del turismo?

Why did other people not want to be involved in the tourism project?
¿Por qué la otra gente de la comunidad no quería ser socio?

Were there any problems with your neighbours at first? How did you resolve them?
¿Había problemas con los vecinos al principio? ¿Cómo se han sido resueltos?

What are the positive aspects of the experience?
¿Qué son los aspectos positivos de la experiencia?

What are the negative?
¿Qué son los aspectos negativos?
Socio-Economic Development/Desarrollo Socio-Económico

How many visitors have you received? How much have you earned? Is it worth it? Does it cover the costs?
¿Cuántos visitantes han recibido? ¿Cuánto ha ganado? ¿Vale la pena? ¿Cubre los gastos?

What are you spending with the extra income?
¿Qué compra con el mayor ingreso?

What do you spend the money you make from tourism on?
¿A qué va el dinero que gana del turismo?

Would you like more visitors?
¿Quiere que vengan más visitantes?

What will happen with your neighbours if you start to earn a lot?
¿Qué pasará con los vecinos si ustedes empiezan a ganar bien?

How did you decide on the price?
¿Cómo decidieron ustedes en el precio?

What will happen if other agencies or tourists ask for a lower price?
¿Qué pasará si otras agencias o turistas piden un precio más bajo?

Now you're taking turns to accommodate visitors, but what will happen if an agency only wants to work with one family?

Ahora ustedes toman turnos en alojar visitantes, ¿Qué pasaría si alguna agencia solamente quiere trabajar con una familia?

Indigeneity/Authenticity/Intercultural exchange:

How did you choose the tourist programme and activities?
¿Cómo eligieron los programas/las actividades turísticas?

Do you feel proud of showing your culture to tourists? Why? Were you proud of your culture before the tourists came?
¿Se siente orgulloso mostrar aspectos de su cultura a los turistas? ¿Por qué?
¿Tenía orgullo antes de que han venido (los turistas)?
If a lot of tourists come, for example if you had to do Pacha Manca every week, or twice a week, or if there were always tourists at home, would you get tired, how would you feel?
Si vienen muchos turistas, por ejemplo hay que hacer Pacha Manca cada semana, o 2 veces a la semana, o siempre hay turistas en casa, le cansaría? ¿Cómo se sentiría?

The visitors really enjoyed staying with you, they said they learned a lot, did you learn anything from them? If so, what?
A los visitantes les encanto quedar con ustedes. Dijeron que aprendieron mucho. ¿Ustedes han aprendido algo de ellos? ¿Qué?

**Questions for tourists**

Background information: contact details, age, area of studies,

Have you travelled before? Where? How?

Why did you choose this particular way of travelling, this company, Winding Roads, community based tourism, responsible tourism?

What did you get out of, learn from, the experience of staying with a family in Amistad?

What do you think they got out of it?

You stayed in people’s homes, with families, what did the experience make you think about home and family, in comparison with your own?

What did you notice, do you think about the roles played by men and women in your homestay families?

This project is very new, and very much small scale. One of the things that impressed me was the friendliness of the people of Amistad, the time they took with us. They have expressed the desire to have more visitors, what do you think that means for the project and the community? Do you think there will be more divisions in the community? What do you think about this?

Do you have anything else you’d like to add about your experience?
Appendix 8  List of Codes

Supercodes

CUL  Culture
IND  Indigeneity/Race
EDU  Education
MIG  Migration
JIS  Jump in Scale
TOU  Tourism
DEV  Development/Livelihoods/Economic Reproduction
COM  Community
GEN  Gender
TIM  Time
MOD  Models of developing tourism
VNO  Visitor numbers

Codes

CUL  Culture/Indigeneity

CULREV  cultural revival
CULPRI  cultural pride
CULSHA  cultural shame
CULCHA  cultural change (modernity, globalisation, contact with tourists)
CULCOM  commodification of culture (value, a product)
CULAUT  cultural authenticity (the past, markers, dress etc.)
CULEX  cultural exchange
CULPAS  culture-the past
CULLOS  cultural loss
CULCOMP  cultural comparison (e.g. US/Peru)
CULID  cultural identity

IND/RA  Indigeneity/Race

INDRAC  indigeneity race
INDDIS  indigeneity racial discrimination

EDU  Education

EDU  education (in general)
EDU PROF  education (to become a) professional
EDUTRA  education training (for tourism)
EDUTOU  education (of) tourists
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MIG</th>
<th>Migration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MIGLEA</td>
<td>migration leave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIGRTN</td>
<td>migration return</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REL</th>
<th>Relations (changed from jump in scale)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RELTC</td>
<td>relations-tourist-community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RELCC</td>
<td>relations-community-community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RELNC</td>
<td>relations-national context-community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RELTAC</td>
<td>relations-travel agent-community TOUTAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RELSC</td>
<td>relations-state-(could be local authorities)-communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RELNGOC</td>
<td>relations-NGO-community</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOU</th>
<th>Tourism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOUMA</td>
<td>tourism-mass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOUSUS</td>
<td>tourism-sustainable (carrying cap, sm-scale, fut) DEVSUS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOURES</td>
<td>tourism-responsible (ethical, community-based, eco)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOUSTA</td>
<td>tourism-standards (service, hygiene)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOUEXPC</td>
<td>tourism-expectations/hopes (communities)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOUEXPT</td>
<td>tourism-expectations (tourists)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOUSTA/D</td>
<td>tourism-standardisation/differentiation of product</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOUALT</td>
<td>tourism-alternative (routes), alternative income</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOUVA</td>
<td>tourism-value added products</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOUVIV</td>
<td>tourism-viviencial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOUTA</td>
<td>tourism-travel agents TOUTAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOUPRI</td>
<td>tourism-prices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOUPAK</td>
<td>tourism-package</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOUPART</td>
<td>tourism-participatory (also helping communities)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOUNIV</td>
<td>tourism-investment (who invests)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOUPRO</td>
<td>tourism-promotion (advertising)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOUPROD</td>
<td>tourism-a product CULCOM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOUCCLASS</td>
<td>tourism-class/kind of tourist</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEV</th>
<th>Development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DEVEC</td>
<td>development-economic (trickle down)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEVECLIV</td>
<td>development-economic-livelihoods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEVDIFF</td>
<td>development-differentiation (socio-economic)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEVSUS</td>
<td>development-sustainable TOUSUS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEVMAR</td>
<td>development-market (money, competition)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEVQUA</td>
<td>development-quality of life/standard of living</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbreviation</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEVPAT</td>
<td>development-paternalism (asistencialismo)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEVPOVA</td>
<td>development-poverty alleviation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEVREG</td>
<td>development-regulation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COM</td>
<td>Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMCON</td>
<td>community-conflict (internal and external)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMHAR</td>
<td>community-harmony</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMIND</td>
<td>community-individualism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMWORK</td>
<td>communal work, ayni, turns, work to com DEVDIF, DEVEC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMFAM</td>
<td>community-family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMELT</td>
<td>community-elite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMSUP</td>
<td>community-support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMCHO</td>
<td>community-choice, selection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMINCTP</td>
<td>community wants to be included in tourism project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMLEAD</td>
<td>community-leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMOWN</td>
<td>community-ownership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEN</td>
<td>Gender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GENDIV</td>
<td>gender-division of labour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GENCOMP</td>
<td>gender-complementarity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GENCON</td>
<td>gender-conflict</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIM</td>
<td>Time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOD</td>
<td>Models of development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MODNET</td>
<td>model-network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MODDMO</td>
<td>model-DMO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MODNGO</td>
<td>model-NGO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MODPP</td>
<td>model-public-private</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MODPENT</td>
<td>model-PENTUR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MODASS</td>
<td>model-association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MODFUN</td>
<td>model-funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MODJV</td>
<td>model-joint venture (community and private enterprise)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MODSC</td>
<td>model-state-community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VNO</td>
<td>Visits-numbers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRIZE</td>
<td>Prize</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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