

2010

Afterword: Journal of Tourism Consumption and Practice Volume 2 No.2 2010

Strathern, M.

Strathern, M.(2010) 'Afterword', Journal of Tourism Consumption and Practice, 2 (2), pp. 80-82.

<http://hdl.handle.net/10026.1/11551>

Journal of Tourism Consumption and Practice

University of Plymouth

All content in PEARL is protected by copyright law. Author manuscripts are made available in accordance with publisher policies. Please cite only the published version using the details provided on the item record or document. In the absence of an open licence (e.g. Creative Commons), permissions for further reuse of content should be sought from the publisher or author.

Afterword

Marilyn Strathern

This collection epitomizes some of the enchantment of tourism for anthropology. In becoming a field of study in itself, with its own dynamic, [the study of] tourism also becomes capable of attracting to itself theories first generated elsewhere.¹ Here we encounter both a practice -- reflexive analysis -- and a topic -- gender relations -- that one might find in any area to which anthropologists pay attention. So many of the issues that the contributors raise are generic to social anthropology as such. When they are applied to the person of the fieldworker, who is a crucial focus in these accounts, they are given an edge by the fieldworker's proximity to the tourist's. The result is an interrelated set of arguments about the kind of knowledge that comes from consciousness of such proximity in the fieldwork situation.

In two of the contributions (Chiara Cipollari and Filareti Kotsi) the direct subject of research is tourism, while in the other two (Claudia Campeneau and Pamila Gupta) tourism affords an indirect commentary on the practices of fieldwork. In three, the anthropologist as ethnographer makes a return to a place identified as a 'home' from which she has been away. All four authors draw attention to their depiction of themselves, and how these ascriptions led them to engage in a reflexive questioning of their subject position -- not just reflecting on it, but using such ascriptions to reveal to themselves something of their own condition. Gender is flagged as a salient dimension.

Gupta was constantly marked as a girl, as well as a particular kind of Indian working in a part of India distant from her own that of her origins. She argues that her gender gave a specificity to the kinds of relations she was able to establish and information she could have access to. Access was also a crucial issue for Kotsi who after many

¹ From comments made by Nelson Graburn and Richard Fardon at the ASA conference, 'Thinking through tourism' (2007), at which these papers were first aired.

possibilities ended up as a single woman studying the pilgrimage centre of a male monastery. There was much more to her than people could see -- she kept diaries in three languages not just one -- but she was categorically troublesome, to men particularly, and her landlord above all, until in lieu of a husband she managed to produce her mother. The question of marriage was crucial in Cipollari's case, but here her already married status - something to which she had given no thought -- instead led to questions of why she was living away from her husband. Some of this was concern on the part of one of the households with which she lived, a familial or kinship-like concern. For Campenau, on the other hand, the crucial gender dynamic was not of a familial kind, but concerned her status as a woman trying to find local work. The division between men's and women's expectations of the working day structured the way she managed things, male sociability forcing her into the company of other women in a similar situation.

It is significant to the way these reflexive moments are described that (in each case) we recognise a moment of enchantment, a moment that holds the fieldworker captive. There is an emotional pause, a sense of amazement or surprise, a small shock, disappointment or even a sensation of self-dislike, but in any event an unexpected openness of sensibility. It is that openness of sensibility that often creates the conditions of cathexis, that is, of how the subject (the fieldworker) connects with or identifies with -- recognises -- an issue or concern of significance. So it suddenly seems that this [issue or concern] is a key to everything else -- if this could be resolved or understood then others things would fall into place too! It might look as though one is lingering on one's own situation for the sake of it, yet I suspect that such an emotional locking in to what suddenly seems the most important thing with which to come to grips is a condition of authorship (and I subsume ethnographer, the writing fieldworker, under author). Emotional investment in a problem, so the emotion itself troubles, can even be something of a pre-condition: sorting out oneself is sorting out the intellectual problem. (Perhaps this is why it is so often impossible afterwards to recover the reason for writing this or that, since the resolution means the crisis has passed.) In any event, I welcome the openness with which such moments are described here.

However, they are not an end in themselves. I conclude by focusing on one of the points that Gupta makes when she puts forward suggestions for a new theorisation of gendered reflexivity. She is drawing on an argument made some years ago by Judith Okely, namely the idea that reflexivity forces us to think through the consequences of our relations with others. The critical analysis of social relationships set up during fieldwork, Gupta goes on to say, has the power to reveal so much. I couldn't agree more, but would want to push that boat out even further.

It is here that the lens of tourism -- as Hazel Andrews has put it -- becomes relevant. In the various diagnostics of how anthropologists in particular places might or might not share (be seen to share) characteristics with tourists in particular places we often tend to forget the key one: the kinds of *relation*, conceptual or interpersonal, at issue. Relationships have their own dynamics. You can't actually read off from the characteristics -- including race, gender, class -- of any of the parties to a relationship just how that specific relationship is going to grow, unfold, develop a history, implicate others, expand, shrivel, die, and so forth, or what rules or expectations get put into place. Campeneau gives an example of the way a set of relationships unfolded over time, so that she came to understand what at first she simply had an aversion to, men's drinking, in a new light. Indeed, one could re-read the papers as being less about the fieldworker's presence and more about the multiple relationships that presence triggered, which in turn would lead the fieldworker to think about the multiple relations others had too.

This gives us fresh possibilities. We can then ask what kind of relationships are open to tourists as opposed (say) to anthropologists. This means one can also see, as Cipollari and Kotsi's accounts indicate, the privilege it is to be able to be a tourist in this kind of relationship, an anthropological fieldworker in that.

Marilyn Strathern was Professor of Social Anthropology at Cambridge until her retirement in 2009