

Exploring Ethnicity and the State through Tourism in East Asia

NELSON GRABURN

This set of research papers focuses on the articulation of indigenous people and other minorities with the state through the lens of ethnic tourism within East Asia. We focus as much on the nature of “ethnicity” or “indigeneity” as on the “tourism”. We use the “lens” of tourism to illuminate and discriminate the nature of the “ethnicity/indigeneity/identity” of the target groups and the changes to their evolving identity in the emerging multicultural societies of East Asia, each of which is constrained by their national state policies. We focus on “ethnic tourism” which is the branch of cultural tourism in which people are motivated to visit and experience communities of cultures outside the mainstream majority of their own society. These minorities may be (1) indigenous peoples of these countries e.g. the Ainu in Japan, or (2) non-indigenous minorities such as the communities of the Noto Peninsula in Japan and the Tunpu Han in China, or (3) they are ethnically distinct immigrant communities, such as the Chinese in Japan. As increased travel and now globalization sweep the world, these minority peoples are expected to respond to tourists’ interests by showing their unique “traditional cultures”—the commoditization or “selling” of their cultural features for the tourist gaze (watching, photographing), the tourist experience (tourists joining in local customs of dancing, eating, etc.) and tourist purchase, souvenirs (*omiyage*) to take home with them. The useful “ethnic” features include especially their crafts, music, songs, dances, languages, foods, houses and sometimes religious, agricultural and hunting customs.

Introduction

This set of research papers focuses on the articulation of indigenous people and other minorities with the state through the lens of ethnic tourism within East Asia. We focus as much on the nature of “ethnicity” or “indigeneity” as on the “tourism”. We use the “lens” of tourism to illuminate and discriminate the nature of the “ethnicity/indigeneity/identity” of the target groups and the changes to their evolving identity in the emerging multicultural societies of East Asia, each of which is constrained by their national state policies. We focus on “ethnic tourism” which is the branch of cultural tourism in which people are motivated to visit and experience communities of cultures outside the mainstream majority of their own society. These minorities may be (1) indigenous peoples of these countries (e.g. the Ainu in Japan), or (2) non-indigenous minorities such as the communities of the Noto Peninsula in Japan and the Tunpu Han in China, or (3) they are ethnically distinct immigrant communities, such as the Chinese in Japan. As increased travel and now globalization sweep the world, these minority peoples are expected to respond to tourists’ interests by showing their unique “traditional cultures”—the commoditization or “selling” of their cultural features for the tourist gaze (watching, photographing), the tourist experience (tourists joining in local customs such as dancing and eating) and tourist purchase, souvenirs (*omiyage*) to take home with them. The useful “ethnic” features include especially their crafts, music, songs, dances, languages, foods, houses and sometimes religious, agricultural and hunting customs.

The range of types of “ethnic” peoples or small nationalities in East Asia and their articulations with their national societies are in many ways different from those of North America or in Europe which served as the basis for many

anthropological considerations of the topic. Thus models of the “impacts” of tourism and adaptations of minorities worked out elsewhere may not work in East Asia. Within China especially, the range of variety of different kinds—and sizes—of recognized ethnic groups is far greater than in Europe or North America, though it may be comparable to South America or Southeast Asia. Thus we hope to learn about “minoritiness,” ethnic identity and multiculturalism by viewing how the touristic encounter with both agents of the nation-states and with the tourists differentiates and highlights the specificity of the ethnic peoples.

This chapter illustrates the variety of ways that minority ethnic groups articulate with their majority national states through tourism. In China, the government is concerned with national unity and with ensuring that each of the 55 minority *minzu* adheres to the Communist state while maintaining some of their unique traditions. Although we do not have any case studies in our volume, we know that similar situations of indigeneity and ethnicity are found in Taiwan too (Brown 2001). The Japanese state is less concerned with national minorities and domestic unity—the Ainu are the only officially recognized indigenous minority and that is very recent; Okinawa has often been treated as a special “ethnic” version of Japanese-ness, as Sumii’s and Tada’s chapters tell us, but at times Okinawan culture has been upheld as a model of rational or pure Japanese-ness (Yanagita Kunio, *Kaijō no Michi*).

Japanese have long been far more concerned with their relations with the outside world (Ohnuki-Tierney 1993), so “ethnic tourism” in Japan emphasizes relations with other national cultures, including the Korean and Chinese immigrant communities, and with imported foreign communities that Japanese tourism can experience in the many *gaikoku*

mura “fake foreign villages” and museums such as Little World (*Ritoru Wārudo*) (Graburn 2008a, 2008b, 2009).

By looking at articulations of identity through the lens of cultural tourism, we aim to foster critical dialogues surrounding representation, (re)claiming heritage, cultural revitalization, and self-commodification. We hope that these papers will serve as the core of this volume which addresses themes of identity construction, art and performance, self- and other-representation, cultural commoditization and political mobilization, drawn from a variety of case studies on the topic of indigenous and minority tourism. Indigenous agency in cultural tourism is a relatively new global phenomenon—most operating indigenous cultural tourism venues are at the most a few decades old or are still currently in planning stages (Bunten and Graburn 2009)—made possible largely through second generation of Post-WWII educated leadership, increased communications technology, the rapid expansion of the domestic and international tourism industry, and government policies aimed to rectify multi-generational trauma and poverty resulting from past colonial engagements and assimilationist policies.

The literature on the rapidly growing ethnic tourism industry has tended to valorize a development-based theoretical framework that regards at tourism as a panacea for struggling, often rural, communities to revitalize their economies. We propose a different way of looking at cultural tourism, through analysis of the cultural production and generative interactions taking place through tourism. The public context of the cultural tourism site gives rise to creative expressions of identity on the parts of both the hosts and the guests. For hosts who market themselves as indigenous, tourism provides an opportunity for them to work through identity struggles with real ramifications in terms of the maintenance of cultural and political sovereignty vis-à-vis the dominant society. For the guests, that is for the tourists interacting with locals through the intimacy of the tourism encounter might eventually encourages creative self-reflexivity and often gives rise to changed relationships across cultural divides.

These articulations of indigeneity may also give rise to new alliances with the formation of regional—or national and transnational—indigenous tourism organizations, as they have outside of East Asia.

Porous Boundaries, Switched Identities and Individual Agency

Here is a short vignette based on Jessica Turner’s work of which my wife Kathy and I now have some recent personal experience:

Wu Jinmin, a musician and entrepreneur of the Dong minority *minzu* of Guangxi Zhuang Autonomous Region, built a tourism performance village called Yinshui on his own initiative in the late 1990s. This was a great success for some years but eventually the tourist numbers began to fall off partly as a result of competition from the very successful Zhuongzu minority village of Ping’an in the Longji terraced mountains north of Guilin. So he moved his Dong performance group there, built a stage and became the number one attraction, displacing the Zhuong performance group run by the local Liao family. Wu incorporated some local

Zhuong performers, added some new songs he composed and changed the name of the group to the “Longji Folk Performance Group,” named after the famed terraced hillsides that are the main tourist attraction. Thus, to avoid criticism and to reassert some authenticity, he changed its name from one based on ethnicity to locality.

This is the village where Jenny Chio (2009) also worked and we met some of her contacts there too. Jessica said that we might meet the Liao family (we did) and Wu Jinmin (we did not) though he may have gone off to nearby resort town of Yangshuo on another venture.

When we got back to Jinzhongshan, the mountain tourist resort south of Guilin where we were staying for a “Tourism Summit Conference,” we found to our surprise that the troupe had actually moved to perform nightly in the Water Restaurant, the huge centralized eating place in the resort. And they had changed their name back to the famous “Dong Folk Performance Group; A National Intangible Cultural Heritage.” We did not actually meet the fabled Mr. Wu but we talked to his Dong deputy who ran the troupe, he told us that Wu had indeed gone off to Yangshuo to look for further ventures.

This story illustrates two major trends that are emerging from recent research on our topic. These are:

- 1) The increasingly porous and flexible nature of the socio-cultural boundaries by which we recognize the ethnic and social groups which constitute ethnicity and identity in the various forms of multiculturalism emerging in East Asia nations.
- 2) The second notable feature is the emergence of the agency of individuals within the social milieu of tourism and development, often beyond the bounds of their official classification and designated communities.

Both of these remarkable trends could be “real” or merely “apparent.” The latter possibility could stem from the improvements of ethnographic research in the past few years. As Prof. Peng pointed out in his discussion (Peng 2009) in our panel at the IUAES meetings in Kunming last year, researchers often put an undue emphasis on “official” identities, such the *minzu* classifications in China, which as only implemented as part of the consolidation of the country under the Communist regime in the 1950s and early 1960s. In his research and in the discussion he emphasized that the minority people primarily identified with place, that is with their village rather than their *minzu*. And, as the regime changes have come to China in increasing rapidity, the authoritarian classification “from above” has been stretched by demographic trends and migratory movements, as well as by shifting consciousness of place and community. But his main point was that researchers were and tourists are overly accepting of the hegemony of the fairly recently endowed *minzu* identities.

The same might be said about the emergence of the agency of particular individuals in recent ethnographic accounts. Last year in her IUAES paper in Kunming Zhang

Xiaoping (2009) challenged what she saw the over-emphasis on the erosive effects of commoditization, and on group dynamics and the boundaries of identity, in her paper about the rise of a silver craftsman Cun Fabiao of the in Xinhua Village of Heqing, Yunnan who turned from being a wandering “craftsman” who was awarded a masters of folk arts by UNESCO, to international fame, joining the cultural and social elite of internationally recognized artists in China. She implied that it was the hegemony of Western anthropologists’ emphasis on the commoditization of ethnicity that suppressed accounts of this nature which might have been common for a long time. In her chapter Zhao Hongmei tells us of an even more spectacular emergence of an ethnic Naxi performer/artist from Lijiang, Yunnan, to international fame as the leader and reviver of the Dongba orchestra.

There is some truth to these accusations, in the “collusion” between anthropologists and ethnic minorities to achieve and promote recognition of their rights as minorities, particularly when these people are marginalized as have been many rural Chinese *minzu*, or even denied their ethnic identity as was the case for the Ainu in Japan. At the same time, there has been a hesitancy of some anthropologists to focus on the singular and often divisive or overbearing nature of some members of these groups. We have a tendency to stress more harmonious behaviors, contrasting them with the selfish or authoritarian nature of the majority or nation who we and they may see as oppressors. This has been true of most of the accounts of Japan’s Ainu, who in fact have been deeply divided amongst themselves, even to the point of internal warfare in the past and who remain fragmented and not necessarily supportive of their own today, as the chapters by Cheung and Lewallen tell us.

In fact Cheung’s paper illustrates another facet of minority ethnicity and tourism, one that is probably more prevalent than the literature would lead us to think. Cheung’s ethnography takes us down to the personal level, describing the life courses of various individuals within a family. For our purposes the salient features are the frequency of mixed marriages which immediately problematizes ethnic identity. It is quite possible that traditional kinship and descent systems would assign the children to the kin group of only one parent—e.g. adoption of matrilineal descent for the offspring of the overwhelming proportion of mixed marriages among the Alutiiq Native Alaskans of the Pacific coast and the Huron villagers engaged in the tourism industry near Quebec City. In the Alaskan case identity switched from patrilineal to matrilineal when these former descendants of Russian-employed Scandinavian sailors and fishermen settlers and the indigenous Sug’piq Eskimos became eligible for the great financial and legal benefits of the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act of 1971 only by being able to trace their ancestry unbroken to the original inhabitants of the areas of each newly formed and financed Native Corporation. In the Huron case, the village depended on being populated and performed by Huron First Nations (Native Canadians) and although these people looked like French Canadians, they could recount their “Huron” identity by narrating that “... My Huron grandma married a Frenchman and her daughter my mother married a French, so I am Huron by matrilineal descent...!”

But the Ainu case illustrates two more facets: the offspring

were, in Japan, able to choose whether to affiliate with the majority *Wajin* or the minority Ainu in their life practices and claimed identity—something not open to all mixed offspring, for instance those of African Americans and white Americans. Secondly, Cheung shows that the married-in majority-spouses may actually choose to identify with the minority to which they have attached themselves and even learn their language and become active in their causes, something quite widespread in North America and Europe but possibly less so—and definitely less reported—in East Asia. Peggy Swain’s chapter on indigenous cosmopolitanism shows in an even more detailed way, the boundary crossing and varieties behaviors of some contemporary Sani *minzu* women in Yunnan.

Wang Yu’s research on ethnic tourism in Yunnan, also takes the ethnography down to the personal level to show great divisions and little solidarity both among the Naxi inhabiting the touristified Dayan old city-center of Lijiang (Wang 2002; 2006), and even more unproductive hostility among the very poor Hani farmers in the face of tourist developments related to the incredibly picturesque mountains rice terraces which they labour to maintain (Wang 2008), which have now become internationally famous photo opportunities (Wang 2010) and a candidate for UNESCO Natural and Cultural World Heritage status.

The porosity of official ethnic status is illustrated in three other instances which could probably be multiplied 1,000 times. At the entrance to the Hani Qinkou village the souvenir craft stands are operated by Naxi minority salespersons who migrate there, possibly from Lijiang, to represent “minoritiness” to ignorant tourists and who far outsell the locals. Jenny Chio’s work on photography in Ping’an (2009a, 2009b) tells us that the “minority models” all dressed up and ready to pose for a fee with the tourists who come to this Zhong village in the terraced slopes are in fact never local Zhong. They are outsiders who come in by day to take up this low paying and somewhat exploited form of livelihood. And just as duplicitously, when Sandra Hyde went to work (as a masseuse) in the brothels of Xishuangbanna in SW Yunnan, in order to research the spread of AIDS among the local Dai minority, she found that the prostitutes who posed as local Dai women, long fantasized as remote and beautiful women by the majority Han, were in fact Han women dressed up as Dai who learned a few words of Dai to make their disguise more convincing (Hyde 2007).

Tourism and Identities which are not “Ethnic”

A third important general feature emerging in these chapters and from other recent research is the growing emphasis and importance of group identities that are not “ethnic” per se. The papers on Japan by John Ertl and Megumi Doshita and by Felix Giron and Ge Rongling on China usefully examine cases of group “sub-ethnicity” based on locality and/or history among the *Wajin* or Japanese and the Han in China. Again we have to question whether this emerging phenomenon is a result of anthropology’s perception of the fact that ethnicity does not exhaust identity or whether the general public’s fascination with “ethnic” tourism brought to light selected “ethnic” features which differentiate localized parts of the national majorities. After all ethnicity itself only became a concept in anthropologist’s armory in the

1960s and 1970s (Barth 1969; Karen Blu 1977) reflecting the American public's replacing the prior major categories of race, religion or tribe with "ethnicity."

In Ertl's chapter on archaeology in Japan, we see that it plays a key role in both claiming uniqueness and of binding one's region to the central pole of Japanese history. And Felix Giron's paper on the southern Cast city of Shantou raises the possibility of Huaqiao—overseas Chinese—being a kind of ethnicity, and "sub-ethnicity" to quote Ge Rongling—with the varieties of Han identity within and outside of China, something that has been brought up by other scholars in other contexts. Han Min has recently (2010) published a case studying of "competitive representation" in her analysis of two tourist institutions, one local historically library run by the state and another ancestral upper class mansion restored and offered for visits by a family in the same village of in Yunnan.

Nationality as Ethnicity in the Context of Tourism

Shinji Yamashita and Okpyo Moon's chapters bring up another facet of "ethnic tourism" in multicultural and historically mobile societies. That is the situation which is culturally "multinational" such as people of Korean and Chinese descent living in Japan, is labeled "multicultural" but could it be labeled "multi-ethnic?" Again the boundaries between imposed categories are called into question, both by emergent social situations in the context of tourism and by the peoples involved both as tourists and tourees (hosts). Recent research has emphasized the visibility and the opportunistic functionality of such identities, especially for Chinese in Yokohama (Chen 2010) and Nagasaki (Wang 2010).

Moon's case is an example of what I have called attention to as the corollary *kokunai kokusaika kankō*—domestic foreign tourism (2009), as I have mentioned, Japanese finding foreignness within—the Koreans in the Korean-Chinese area of China is a reaching out, in this case to ancestral identity abroad—which we could call *kokusai kokunai kankō*—international domestic tourism.

Domestic tourism to "communities of foreignness," such as Korea towns and China towns is supplemented by attention to communities of the past too. For instance I have elsewhere reported on the recent upsurge in interest of tourism to archaeological or ethnological Koreanness in Japan, especially the case of *Kudara no Sato*, an inland village in Miyazaki-ken which is allegedly the settling place of the ousted royal family of seventh-century Paekche (Graburn 2008b). Here the "ethnicity" that attracts Japanese is a kind of "ghost" ethnicity or heritage of former Koreanness, a kind of *kokunai kokusaika kankō*. The local and prefectural governments have also tried to attract Korean tourists, flying directly from Korea to see the archaeological and ethnological remnants of their putative ancestors, or close relatives of their ancestors, as a kind of historical-ethnological roots tourism comparable in some ways to Moon's chapter on Korean roots tourism to the archaeological Koguryō in the ethnically Korean part of North China. However, unlike the majority of the ethnic communities discussed in this volume, there really is no "ethnic" community in Miyazaki which has a distinct consciousness any more, except for the local Japanese who have decided to "play up" their "difference" in order to become a successful tourist destination.

Similar attempts to make visible "ethno-national communities of (past) foreignness" focusing on historic relations to Korea have also emerged along the coast of the Sea of Japan.

I have reported another version of the same phenomenon when Koreans come to visit Miyama and celebrate the ceramic artist Kim Su Kwan XIV—a descendant of the Korean potters "stolen" from Korea by the invading forces of the Imjin War of 1596. These artists and their descendents scattered around Kyushu are the true carriers of the old and highly esteemed Korean ceramic traditions which had since died out in Korea, but were revived again due to both Japanese and Korean enthusiasm in the 1930s (Moon 1997). So Korean aficionados come to Miyama and have lionized and feted Kim Su Kwan when he visited Korea. In this case Kim Su Kwan and his family do represent themselves as "ethnically Korean" at least as far as their art traditions are concerned.

These contemporary cases of foreign immigrant "National" communities becoming destinations for "ethnic" tourism with Japan usually are communities of other Asians. Though Yamashita's chapter focuses on Okubo Korean as a tourist attraction, he mentions that Okubo is a complex multiethnic (multinational) community where, for instance foods and restaurants of many Asia countries can be found. This form of ethno-national immigrant status is also extended to Brazilians. However, the reason for the large presence of Brazilian legal workers and their families being in Japan is the special law of 1990 which was aimed at welcoming back Nikkei-Brazilian workers (Tsuda 2008) in order to solve the problem of Japan's labor shortage without having to let in "foreign" workers. However, though the legal status and the literature focus on these "Japanese-Brazilians" the general public usually just refers to them as *burazireiru*, not because of their phenotypic ethnicity—and the law allows mixed-race descendants of Japanese emigrants to return—but because of their cultural and stylistic behaviors, of speaking, dancing, cuisine, clothing, and inter-personal manners.

In Professor Shoji's (2004) exhibition *Taminzoku Nihon* (Multiethnic Japan) the Minpaku museum and its exhibitions of ethno-national communities of the Kansai were tourist attractions; Brazilians were included along with Asian communities such as Chinese, Koreans, Philipinos, Bangla Deshis. One might add that the children of these groups and immigrant Vietnamese are often taught to dress and dance in their "ethno-national" cultural styles for secular *matsuri* in Osaka, at the behest of the schools and sometimes their parents (Okubo 2008).

Another question came up in planning the exhibition: "What about *hakujin* (immigrant or resident white people)? Should we include them as one more ethno-national community?" Shoji reports that the Kansai ethno-national communities unanimously decided not to invite *hakujin* because of their relative power and the lack of discrimination against them in Japanese society. But does that mean that white Westerners and their communities cannot be ethnic tourism destinations in Japan? Not at all: the general public and tour agencies have dealt with whites Euro-Americans as "Ethnic" under certain historical circumstances. For instance Dejima, the small island of traders in Nagasaki Bay—both historically and in its recent replica form—was always a target of curiosity and tourism for Japanese who were

titillated and envious of aspects of Dutch culture. And in the 150 years since the end of the Do period, white Westerners' communities in parts of Kobe, Kagoshima and Yokohama, have appeared on tourist maps, and since the Second World War, the American military presence and its support communities in Okinawa have been a huge tourist attraction, indeed it is often remarked that "American" is the tourist ethnicity of Okinawa for many Japanese.

Representation as Ethnic: Self and Outside Forces

The study of representation in the analysis of ethnic tourism is a complex phenomenon. Representations come in many forms, the most obvious are visual, for instance tourist photographs or ethnic dances costumes, simplistically dichotomizing the topic into self-representation and representation by others. But representation is a constitutive key to the articulations between "ethnic" communities and the state. In spite of the fact, as we cited Peng (2009) saying most ethnic peoples in China identify more with their locality than their officially declared ethnicity or *minzu*-status, it is the latter which, having been put into place by the efforts of the *minzu shibie*, the Communist "ethnicity research teams" of the 1950s and the subsequent national level list-making, determines much of their legal and economic status and even where they are allowed to live, much as the Japanese government determined these and other life chances of the "unofficially" recognized "former aboriginal" Ainu. Harking back to Anderson (1983), these identities are put in place by the apparatus of modernity based in literacy, such as books, maps, newspapers, censuses, school education, and the legal system. This has enshrined these ethnic designations especially for the tourists through advertising, education, electronic media etc. which create the "imaginaries" (Salazar 2010)—the off-site markers, in MacCannell's (1976) terms—that are so essential to drive the tourism industry. Although the construction of imaginaries is essential to drive almost any form of tourism, in the case of ethnic tourism, they are created by more "powerful" others such as: the tourists who selectively photograph ethnic people and phenomena, the industry which uses extensive and selective advertising both visually and in the accompanying "narratives of ethnicity" which are supposed to distinguish peoples and places as different and unique (Chio, this volume), and by the institutions of "the state." Furthermore, as shown in Sumii's powerful case study of Okinawa, we can see the very common phenomenon of collusion between two or even all three levels of stakeholders in building the all important tourist imaginary. For instance Okinawa has been historically represented by agents of the central state as a foreign entity, a tributary, a daimyoship, a subsidiary prefecture and a prime location for military bases—and its people have in the past century been held up as the inheritors of the true essence of traditional Japan, as exotics with strange practices such as powerful female shamanism, and as a magically successful antidote to civilization who have found the key to harmonious *furusato* life and communion with nature leading to the greatest longevity of any human group. Tada and Sumii both allude to a set of television dramas which have brought the usually marginalized Okinawan culture into the bosoms of Japanese homes. Kyushu, especially itself southern part, and particularly Okinawa and the Ryukyus still bear the promise

of a degree of foreignness compared with theist of Japan. In guide books Okinawa is described as *Ikoku*, which is a word that connotes a certain alterity, but not as much as the more usual designation of *gaikoku*, the more usual word for foreign, meaning outer or other country.

In the numerous cases in our papers, the efforts of the state, from the central state's classification of all minorities as has been going on in China for more than 300 years, the region's efforts to establish a unique identity by co-opting the images of the many minorities within, as is often found in Yunnan or Guizhou, and almost ubiquitously the efforts of local governments to cash in on the specialness of the local minority Graburn, Chio and Turner have experienced in the Guilin region of Guangxi Zhuang Autonomous Region. Felix Giron's chapter shows in detail the contested struggle over reorientation and meaning of Shantou temples and their rites by tourists, Huaqiao and resident Ma Zu worshippers, and city officials. Almost as complicated is Peng Zhoarong's chapter concerning KeYi village where the various villagers "collude" to represent themselves not to themselves but to the local politicians and enquiring visitors as Bimo (shamans) and heritage experts while others "act the primitive" by painting themselves and the children's naked skin for crass photographers.

Lewallen's penetrating study of contemporary Ainu, gives an interesting example of representation from above. UNESCO is an international organization above the state level which can work with or against a state in using the tools of late modernity to "name, frame and elevate" (MacCannell 1976) for special recognition a people or feature within a nation. UNESCO placed the Ainu into an unaccustomed superordinate position vis a vis the Japanese government, which had refused to give the Ainu recognition as a separate ethnic group—this moved the Ainu into a position of prominence with respect to ecotourism in the new UNESCO Heritage Park in Hokkaido. Lewallen warns is that even though this might please Ainu leaders and empower Ainu communities, this could inscribe an essentialist view of and hence by the Ainu, of their "primitive, close to nature" uniqueness, something which probably has diffused across the Pacific from twentieth-century North American movie-mediated view of "Indians." Being "in tune with nature," which is an imaginary covering a variety of differences, and harks to a mythic past which no longer exists, or maybe never existed? We should compare this with Rodrigo Grunewald's (2009) study where the local Pataxo Indians took advantage of the celebrations of the 400th anniversary of the "Discovery" to say they were the people who originally welcomed the Portuguese! But, dismayed by the tourists' disbelief of their real Indian status, they invented their own language, new dress, set up shamanism of offered seances, and turned their small forest into an "ecotourism preserve." Rodrigo questioned the common anthropologists' skeptical views of cultural authenticity, by pointing to the Pataxo's amazing cultural creativity. In an earlier work, MacCannell (1992) labeled this kind of process as "reconstructed ethnicity."

Jenny Chio's work on filming is a close examination of commercial representation which may be independent entertainment but more probably part of the commercial presentation of places in constructing tourist imaginaries.

Categorization of *minzu*, the films of the 1950s, Oakes (1998) contentions about learning modernity through acting traditional for tourists. Jenny Chio on Upper Jidao Miao who got wealthy enough to go on tour themselves, and dressed up and went on a group tour of Beijing, Shanghai etc. wearing their “traditional” costume—a form of self-advertizing.

Bibliography

- Barth, Fredrick**, ed. 1969. *Ethnic Groups and Boundaries: the Social Organization of Cultural Difference*. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.
- Blu, Karen**. 1977. “Varieties of Ethnic Identity: Anglo-Saxons, Blacks, Indians, and Jews in a Southern County.” *Ethnicity* 4: 263–286.
- Brown, Melissa J.** 2001. “Reconstructing Ethnicity: Recorded and Remembered Identity in Taiwan.” *Ethnology* 40(2): 153–164.
- Bunten, Alexis, and Nelson Graburn**. 2009. “Current Themes in Indigenous Tourism.” *Special Issue of London Journal of Tourism, Sport and Creative Industries* 2(1): 2–11.
- Chen, Tien-shi**. 2010. “Reconstruction and Localization of Ethnic Culture: The Case of Yokohama Chinatown as a Tourist Spot.” Pp. 29–38 in *Tourism and Glocalization: Perspectives on East Asian Societies* (Senri Ethnological Studies 76), eds. Min Han and Nelson Graburn. Osaka: National Museum of Ethnology.
- Chio, Jenny**. 2009a. *Landscape of Travel: Tourism, Media and Identity in Southwest China*. PhD Diss., University of California, Berkeley.
- . 2009b. “The Internal Expansion of China: Tourism and the Production of Distance.” Pp. 207–220 in *Asia on Tour: Exploring the Rise of Asian Tourism*, eds. Tim Winter, Peggy Teo, and T.C. Chang. London: Routledge.
- Graburn, Nelson**. 2008a. “When is Domestic Tourism International? Multiculturalism and Tourism in Japan.” Pp. 218–240 in Nelson Graburn, John Ertl and Kenji Tierney (eds.) *Multiculturalism in the New Japan: Crossing the Boundaries Within*. New York: Berghahn Press.
- . 2008b. “The Past and the Other in the Present: *Kokunai Kokusaika Kanko*—Domestic International Tourism.” Pp. 21–36 in *Japanese Tourism and Travel Culture*, eds. Sylvie Guichard-Anguis and Okpyo Moon. London: Routledge.
- Grünewald, Rodrigo de Azeredo**. 2009. “Indigenism, Tourism and Cultural Revival Among the Pataxó People in Brazil.” *Current Themes in Indigenous Tourism. Special Issue of London Journal of Tourism, Sport and Creative Industries* 2(1): 21–27.
- Han Min**. 2010. “Representing Local Culture and Heritage in Heshun, Hometown of Overseas Chinese in Yunnan.” Pp. 163–175 in *Tourism and Glocalization: Perspectives in East Asian Studies* (Senri Ethnological Studies 76), eds. Han Min and Nelson Graburn. Suita: National Museum of Ethnology.
- Han Min, and Nelson Graburn**, eds. 2010. *Tourism and Glocalization: Perspectives in East Asian Studies* (Senri Ethnological Studies 76). Suita: National Museum of Ethnology.
- Hyde, Sandra**. 2007. *Eating Spring Rice: The Cultural Politics of AIDS in Southwest China*. Berkeley: University of California Press
- MacCannell, Dean**. 1976. *The Tourist: a New Theory of the Leisure Class*. New York: Schocken.
- . 1992. “Reconstructed Ethnicity: Tourism and Cultural Identity in Third World Communities.” Pp. 158–171 in *Empty Meeting Grounds: The Tourist Papers*, ed. Dean MacCannell. London: Routledge.
- Moon, Okpyo**. 1997. “Tourism and Cultural Development: Japanese and Korean Contexts.” Pp. 178–193 in *Tourism and Cultural Development on Asia and Oceania*, eds. Shinji Yamashita, Kadir Din and Jerry S. Eades. Bangi: Penerbit Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia.
- Oakes, Tim**. 1998. *Tourism and Modernity in China*. London: Routledge.
- Ohnuki-Tierney, Emiko**. 1993. *Rice as Self: Japanese Identities through Time*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Okubo, Yuko**. 2008. “‘Newcomers’ in Public Education: Chinese and Vietnamese Children in a Buraku Community.” Pp. 171–187 in *Multiculturalism in the New Japan: Crossing the Boundaries Within*, eds. Nelson Graburn, John Ertl and Kenji Tierney. New York: Berghahn.
- Peng, Zhaorong**. 2009. “Ecological Crisis in Local Societies Aroused by Modern Tourism: A Case Study—Rural Tourism in Guangxi Xiushui Village.” Paper presented at *The International Union of Ethnological and Anthropological Sciences*, Kunming, 28 July.
- Salazar, Noel**. 2010. *Envisioning Eden: Mobilizing Imaginaries in Tourism and Beyond*. New York: Berghahn Press.
- Shoji, Hiroshi**, ed. 2004. *Taminzoku Nihon-Zainichi Gai-kokujin no Kurashi* [Multiethnic Japan: Life and History of Immigrants]. Suita: National Museum of Ethnology.
- Tsuda, Takeyuki**. 2008. “Crossing Ethnic Boundaries: Japanese Brazilian Return Migrants and the Ethnic Challenge of Japan’s Newest Immigrant Minority.” Pp. 117–138 in *Multiculturalism in the New Japan: Crossing the Boundaries Within*, eds. Nelson Graburn, John Ertl and Kenji Tierney. New York: Berghahn.
- Wang Yu**. 2002. *Naxi and Ethnic Tourism: a Study of Homestay Tourism in Lijiang Old Town*. Chinese University Hong Kong: M.A. Thesis in Anthropology.
- . 2006. “Customizing Authenticity Begins at Home.” *Annals of Tourism Research* 34(3): 789–804.
- . 2008. *Naturalizing Ethnicity, Culturalizing Landscape: The Politics of World Heritage in China*. PhD Diss., Duke University.
- Zhang, Xiaoping**. 2009. “From Economic Capital to Cultural Capital and Social Capital: Rethinking Commoditization in the Context of Ethnic Tourism.” Paper presented at *The International Union of Ethnological and Anthropological Sciences*, Kunming, 28 July.

観光から見る東アジアのエスニシティと国家

ネルソン・グレイバーン

本論文では、先住民およびその他のマイノリティと国家の関連を、東アジアのエスニック・ツーリズムという視点から考察する。ここで新興多民族社会のツーリズムを通して取り上げたいのは、「エスニシティ／先住民性／アイデンティティ」の性質とその変遷を明らかにすることである。「エスニック・ツーリズム」は文化ツーリズムの一種であり、観光客が社会のマイノリティのコミュニティを訪れるような事象を指す。これらのマイノリティは(1)先住民(日本のアイヌなど)、(2)非先住民であるマイノリティ(日本の能登半島の住民、中国の客家など)、そして(3)移民コミュニティ(日本の中国系移民など)などを含むことが多い。旅行とグローバリゼーションの拡大にともない、マイノリティは自身の「伝統的」文化的特徴を展示・商品化することによって、観光客が持つ、観光的眼差し(見ること、写真を撮ること)・観光的経験(土地の慣習に参加すること)・観光的買い物(みやげ物の購入)などの関心に応対している。「エスニック」な特徴には民芸品、音楽、歌、踊り、衣服、食料、建築、宗教的儀式などが含まれる。

本報告では「マイノリティネス」、エスニック・アイデンティティ、多文化主義を分析するに当たり、政府関係者や観光客との関わり合いによってツーリズムが形成されていくなかで、マイノリティの特徴の差異化や強調はいかにして生じるのかについて考察する。中国では国家の統一性に重点を置いているため、55少数民族それぞれが固有性を保ちつつ共産主義国家に忠実であることが政府の関心となっている。日本ではツーリズムにおけるマイノリティと国家の統一性には中国ほどの関心はなく、アイヌが公認された唯一の少数民族であり、沖縄はしばしば日本人の特殊な「エスニック」バージョンとして扱われる。日本は長い間外の世界との関係に関心を持ち、したがって「エスニック・ツーリズム」の対象は、朝鮮および中国の移民コミュニティを含めた他国の文化、また外国村のような輸入された外国人コミュニティ、リトルワールドといった博物館などを指してきた。

本報告では、文化ツーリズムという視点を經由しながらアイデンティティの表明に関わる問題を取り扱うことによって、表象、遺産の(再)主張、文化復興、自己商品化に関する批判的対話を促進する。本報告に含まれる各論文では、アイデンティティ構築、芸術とパフォーマンス、自己表象と他者表象、文化の商品化と政治的動員について取り扱う。

一般的に、エスニック・ツーリズムに関する研究は、苦戦する地方コミュニティが経済を立て直すための万能薬としてツーリズムを展開するというような、発展に基づいたフレームワークの中で注目されてきた。ここではツーリズムを通じて行われる文化的生産、そして、生成的な相互作用について分析することを提言したい。文化ツーリズムは、ホストとゲスト双方がアイデンティティを創造的に表現する場となる。先住民として自らを売り出すホスト側にとっては、社会のマジョリティに対して文化的・政治的主権を主張するという観点から見ると、ツーリズムはアイデンティティの闘いを追求する機会である。ゲストにとっては、観光先での地元の人々との交流や親密な出会いは、自己再帰性を促進し、文化の相違を超えた関係を作り出す可能性がある。

本学会におけるケーススタディから、エスニック・ツーリズムの人類学における主な4つの流れをみることができる。

(1) とくに東アジア諸国の新興の多文化的状況に見られるように、エスニックおよび社会集団によって形成される社会文化的境界は、越境を生み出すような柔軟性を備えている。個人はエスニックのパウンダリよりも、村や地域に強くアイデンティティを感じる場合があり、また個人的、観光的、政治的理由によってさまざまなパウンダリを渡り歩くことがある。

(2) 観光と開発の社会環境において個人のエージェンシーが出現し、しばしばそれは公的な区分を越えることがある。成功を収めるパフォーマーや事業家は地元での名声をはるかにしのぐ名声を獲得し、過去辺境に位置したマイノリティ集団は、観光客や旅行会社や行政との関係のなかで自らの政治的・経済的方向性を決めることを学ぶこともある。

(3) 今日のメディアについてのチョウ氏(9章)の研究によると、エスニック・ツーリズムを成功させるためには、「目に見える差異」が必須であることがわかる。このような差異化は公的に承認されていないエスニック集団によって利用されることもある。歴史的・地域的にはマジョリティの下位集団とされてきた中国の客家、華僑(海外在住中国人)や屯堡人、そして日本の能登や和歌山の僻地の人々などの例が挙げられる。沖縄の人々については、日本政府は承認していないにも関わらず、彼ら自身もそして観光産業および観光客も別個のエスニック・グループであるとみなしている。

(4) 国籍は観光という文脈においては、一つのエスニシティと捉えられることもありうる。山下は東京のコリアンタウンをエスニック・ツーリズムの観光地として論じ、また文氏(7章)は韓国が考古学的な故郷として主張する中国北部にある地をめぐる争いについて考察する。鹿児島県と宮崎県にある朝鮮の文化的・考古学的遺跡は、近年日本人および朝鮮・韓国人観光客にとって新しい呼び物となっている。

結論

現代の東アジアにとって、ツーリズムは伝統文化とアイデンティティを具体化し、また国家のなかで過去弱い立場にあったマイノリティの人々とほかの人々とのつながりを生み出すような、強い影響力を持つものとなっている。エスニック・ツーリズムは、国家が国民を分類し、かつ、経済発展を促進する手段であるだけでなく、個人と集団が国家の政治経済システムの硬直さを乗り越える契機ともなりうる。このプロセスにおいて東アジアの国家は展開しつづける文化多元主義の様々なカタチであり、それは国民国家を攪乱すると同時に統合する作用がある。

—プロフィール—

ネルソン・グレイバーン氏は、ケンブリッジ大学、マギル大学、シカゴ大学で教育を受けた。1964年よりバークレーで人類学を教えており、フランス、日本、ブラジル、中国、イギリスでも客員として教鞭をとったことがある。1959年以来カナダ・イヌイット社会の文化変化、アイデンティティ、民族芸術、美術館／博物館、観光に関するフィールド調査を行ってきた。1974年には、鹿児島に住む妻の家族を訪ねるために初来日している。その後、1979年と1989～90年に大阪の国立民族学博物館で研究に従事し、

その頃から日本国内の観光と多文化主義についての調査を開始している。1991年に初めて中国を訪れて以来、中国の国内旅行研究にも強い関心をもっている。グレーバー氏は、国際観光研究アカデミー（International Academy for the Study of Tourism）やバークレーにある観光研究ワーキング・グループ（www.tourismstudies.orgを参照）の創設メンバーでもある。