

**GENERATING THEORY, TOURISM, AND “WORLD
HERITAGE” IN INDONESIA: ETHICAL QUANDARIES
FOR ANTHROPOLOGISTS IN AN ERA
OF TOURIST MANIA**

KATHLEEN M. ADAMS
Loyola University, Chicago

This article is broadly concerned with the unique ethical quandaries anthropologists face when conducting research in touristic milieus, as well as the ethical dilemmas that ensue once we have left the field and are engaged in constructing theoretically informed portraits of the communities we researched. Specifically, drawing on experiences in two contrasting Indonesian field settings (Tana Toraja and Alor), I explore the ways in which contemporary anthropological theories about culture, identity, and identity politics can collide with local perceptions and local tourism-generating aspirations, placing researchers in potentially problematic ethical terrain.

Key words: ethics, tourism, Indonesia, identity politics, Toraja, Alor

INTRODUCTION

My initiation into the personal and professional negotiations embedded in field research in a touristic setting began on a June morning in 1984 in the much-toured Toraja village of Ke'te' Ke'su. I had arrived on the Indonesian Island of Sulawesi two months earlier with a plan to conduct dissertation research on Toraja art and identity politics in the context of tourism development. Newly settled into the comfortable household of my host family bordering a “traditional carving village,” I was in the midst of interviewing one of the family's sons when my host burst into the room. Waving her arms excitedly, she called out to me “Katlin! Do you hear? There is a big tourist bus coming! Quick, come down to the *tongkonan* [ancestral house] to work.” Assuming I'd been granted

NAPA Bulletin 23, pp. 45–59, ISBN 1-931303-22-3. © 2005 by the American Anthropological Association. All rights reserved. Please direct all requests for permissions to photocopy or reproduce article content through the University of California Press's Rights and Permissions website, www.ucpress.edu/journals/rights.htm.

tacit permission to begin interviewing tourists while they toured the village, I grabbed my notebook, and together we scurried down the path to the cluster of traditional houses where other villagers were already setting up their wares.

As my host hurriedly unloaded carved wall plaques, trays, key chains, and textiles onto the front porch of the *tongkonan* (which doubled as a souvenir stall), she recited selling prices to me, urging me to repeat her. I began recording these prices in my notebook but was quickly interrupted by my host. Gesturing towards the European tourists leisurely ambling down the village path, she instructed me, “You can write in your book later—your foreign tourist friends are almost here. Quick, call them over, or they’ll end up buying things next door!” Not knowing what else to do, I complied, and soon we were encircled by a large group of tourists and their guide, all of whom seemed quite intrigued to discover an anthropologist in the midst of this “traditional village.”

As my savvy host had anticipated, with me there to serve as translator and object of touristic curiosity, the trinkets flew off her shelves. While her competitors’ sales were sluggish that morning, hers were better than ever. As the tourists clambered back onto their bus, she chuckled and declared that she would enjoy having me work with her each day, though her neighbors might not be too pleased. Nodding awkwardly, my heart sank, as I realized that I was headed into an ethically murky zone and that my research project could ill afford such an overt economic allegiance. Although I was ultimately able to navigate my way out of this particular situation, other potentially more troubling situations followed, all of which were outgrowths of my role as a foreign anthropologist researching a touristic setting.

This article is broadly concerned with the unique ethical quandaries anthropologists face when conducting research in touristic milieus. It is also concerned with the ethical dilemmas that ensue once we have left the field and are at home constructing theoretically informed anthropological portraits of the toured communities we studied. Whether we anticipate it or not, those of us involved in academic research in touristic settings often find ourselves inadvertently drawn into more applied endeavors in the tourist sector. In some cases, government officials to whom we are indebted for research permits request our assistance in assessing potential and existing tourist sites. In other instances, hoteliers, guides, and travel agency owners who have generously shared insights and indulged our incessant requests for interviews subsequently solicit us to promote their enterprises abroad. And in still other cases, we are asked to “market” particular locales, or to promote particular versions of local history, or more simply to hawk touristic merchandise for particular hosts (as in

the vignette above). Finally, once we become established in the academic or practicing world, those of us working in tourist destinations are often invited to lecture on tourist cruises and to serve as anthropologist guides (cf. Bruner 1995; Kaspin 1997). As paid authorities, it is expected that we will present captivating, entertaining, and tantalizing accounts of the cultures being toured. In short, our own identities as “cultural authorities” and “representatives” of tourism-generating countries can prompt unanticipated reverberations that deserve our consideration.

Not only do these situations suggest a pressing need for more careful and systematic ethical reflection, but they also bear relevance for the theories we develop in the field, particularly those concerning tourism, agency, and identity politics. In her insightful article exploring the risks and rewards of involvement in heritage tourism, Benita Howell (1994:150) refers to the intellectual and ethical challenges of work in this arena as a potential “Bermuda Triangle,” concluding nevertheless that we should not simply observe from a distance and steer clear of direct involvement. I would add that most of us conducting research in tourist sites do not have the luxury of choice: our research projects are superimposed on a stage on which there is already an ongoing local drama. Our voices and subsequent writings have implications for this drama and invariably become drawn upon by local, national, and international actors with very different sets of interests and orientations. Ironically, the biases and weaknesses of our earlier theories concerning tourism left us a legacy of blind spots in this area. Earlier theories assumed that tourism struck local communities from the outside like a billiard ball, to quote Robert Wood’s now-famous analogy (Wood 1980:585, 1998:223),¹ jostling and transforming these passive local communities. As tourism denied local people agency, it was assumed that a researcher could stand by the sidelines and chronicle this process of touristic transformation. However, as more recent research has shown (Adams 1995; Silverman 2001), local communities are hardly passive, and touristic phenomena are actively manipulated by local community members for their own objectives. Likewise, anthropologists working in toured settings are drawn upon in these local and often politicized dramas. It is therefore imperative that we reflect more carefully on the ethical (and entwining theoretical) dimensions of our enterprise.

In the pages that follow, I draw on my experiences in two contrasting Indonesian field settings to elaborate on the ways in which contemporary anthropological theories about culture, identity, and identity politics can collide with local perceptions and local tourism-generating aspirations, placing researchers in potentially ethically problematic zones. These two field settings

represent opposite ends of the continuum in terms of tourism development. The dilemmas in the first portion of this chapter are drawn from my research in the heavily toured Toraja highlands, in Upland Sulawesi, Indonesia. Higher-volume tourism in this area was established over twenty years ago, and local villagers—as well as regional, national, and international businesspeople and politicians—have established interests in this area. The second portion of this chapter concerns cases drawn from my research on the remote Eastern Indonesian island of Alor, where tourism is, at present, more a fantasy than a reality. However, it is a vibrant fantasy that animates local actors and fuels relationships with outside researchers. In both of these locales, as I will illustrate, my role as researcher and my theoretical interests and perspective posed challenges requiring careful ethical reflection.

ETHICAL TIGHTROPE IN TANA TORAJA, SULAWESI

Tourism to the Tana Toraja highlands of Sulawesi, Indonesia, began to flourish in the 1970s, when Toraja entrepreneurs who had visited Bali began to recognize the potential for tourism in their homeland. Noting the trickle of adventure tourists lured to their homeland by rumors of spectacular scenery, pageantry-filled funeral rituals, scenic traditional villages, and carved cliff-side tombs, these Toraja entrepreneurs began to produce articles and guidebooks touting their homeland. Soon the national Indonesian government took note and, in 1974, added Tana Toraja Regency to their second Five Year Plan as a site for tourism development. By 1984, when I first arrived in Tana Toraja, the region was receiving thousands of domestic and foreign tourists annually and local Toraja leaders were eager to add new villages to the list of official “tourist sites,” hoping to extend tourist stays and spread revenues to other areas of the region.

Within several months of my settling into one of the most-toured “traditional” villages, my host (an elite, locally respected elder) and I were invited to serve on the newly-formed Toraja Jelita Tourism Planning Team.² Specifically, we were asked to participate in a community-based team to assess and nominate potential new tourist sites. I was told that my invitation stemmed from my identity as a Westerner who spoke Indonesian, and not from my status as an anthropologist studying tourism. That is, the team leader envisioned me as someone who could represent and communicate “Western tourists’ tastes.” I felt indebted to the individuals on the team, who were local politicians and respected elders with various tourism involvements. One of them had helped me

get situated, and others had granted me interviews or had provided essential data. Moreover, I recognized this as a potentially rich research opportunity. However, I had great trepidations about agreeing to assume an active role in tourism planning, given my objectives as a researcher. Clearly, “mapping” sites for future tourism development would have tremendous economic implications for competing local villages; should I allow myself to become involved in such politically charged activities? Given my research debts, could I refuse?

The fact that the “community-based team” was largely composed of like-thinking elites from the Northern areas of Tana Toraja Regency also gave me pause. Chambers’ (1983) work had impressed upon me that development planning projects needed to recognize indigenous pluralism and the range of ideological positions within local communities. However, as a young female graduate student in my first months of fieldwork, I did not feel comfortable questioning the planning strategies of my benefactors (particularly as the “traditional” model of fieldwork I embraced at the time dictated that my task was simply to observe and, where possible, to reciprocate local community members for their favors and time). Nothing in my training had prepared me for the dilemma I faced. My research debts rendered me morally obliged to participate in the planning team’s activities, yet I also felt that actively participating risked compromising my impartiality by publicly aligning me with Northern Toraja elites inclined to nominate tourism development sites in their own area.

As discussed earlier, some of my ambivalence about joining the team stemmed from the problematic theory of culture to which I subscribed at the time: I simplistically assumed that active involvement in tourism planning would locate me on the extreme “participant” end of the spectrum, hence removing me from my desired position as “observer–participant” and sideline chronicler of changes. I did not yet appreciate that this neatly drawn participant–observer dichotomy was predicated on a static vision of culture.³ It was only after a number of months in the field that I began to perceive that my very presence as a researcher meant that a personal engagement in the unfolding local drama of tourism was inevitable.

Ultimately, I decided to join the small team of four on a rollicking three-day survey of local sites. I resolved to remain in the background and weigh in with my “tourist taste” perspective only after the Toraja team had made its decisions about which villages were worthy of inclusion on the new expanded list of *obyek turis* (literally, “tourist objects,” or sites). In subsequent discussions with the members of the team, I gently encouraged them to seek input from the lower-ranking residents of the villages they had selected (most Toraja villages

are comprised of nobles, commoners, and descendants of slaves),⁴ as well as from Toraja people residing in the southern portion of the Regency. However, I suspect my suggestions had little impact on the biases inherent in my friends' approach to tourism management in their community.

My Toraja friends were hardly alone in their approach. As Natcher and Hickey (2002) recently observed, while many community-based resource management programs have met with success in including local voices in the planning process, these local voices are often drawn from a small, non-representative pool, as there is still a tendency to approach local communities as "homogenous sites of social consensus." In similar situations today, a tactful solution might entail providing such planning teams with a translation of Natcher and Hickey's article, as well as other writings illustrating the long-term advantages of a more broad-based approach to representing the "community" in tourism resource planning. Unfortunately, this diplomatic option was not available to me at the time.

Despite my ethical dilemmas and misgivings, for a variety of reasons I do not regret my decision to participate in the Toraja Jelita Planning Team. As Fischer (2003) recently noted, ethnography is uniquely situated to amass and articulate observations essential to the creation of new social institutions. Certainly, practicing anthropologists are well aware of the value of ethnographic skills for calculating potential impacts of development projects. Although my participation on the planning team was not predicated on my anthropological background, it turned out that my ethnographic training and my fieldwork among tourists visiting the Toraja area enabled me to discern and convey the potentially disruptive ramifications of several dimensions of the planning team's visions for village-based tourism development. Several projects which would likely have resulted in sites spurned by tourists were dropped, sparing great expenditures and subsequent local disappointment.

In some cases, unexpected ethical quandaries may arrive long after we have left the field and are back at our home institutions writing up our ethnographies. My second example illustrates some of the entwined theoretical and ethical issues that emerged for me years later, in writing about Tana Toraja for scholarly audiences. While in Tana Toraja Regency, various community members cautioned me that much of what was written about Toraja was "inflated," elevating certain groups at the expense of others.⁵ One Toraja acquaintance repeatedly urged me to write about "the true Toraja," "the Toraja without makeup." Another Toraja friend urged me to put an end to rivalries between local elites whose natal villages had become tourist sites "by determining once

and for all which village had the oldest and most authentic *tongkonan* [ancestral house].” He presumed this might have ramifications for the flow of tourists and revenue through his own village, but claimed he was interested in “truth.” Many of my Toraja friends who reflected on tourism were deeply interested in issues of authenticity and in sorting out “true” culture from “false” culture. They envisioned culture as a bundle of traditions passed down from the primordial past. For these local intellectuals, one of the challenges posed by tourism development was to separate out the “true” elements from the more recent “false” accretions of culture and present only the “true” elements to tourists. For them, culture was not something that gets invented, reconfigured, constructed, and rearticulated while still remaining “authentic.”

However, over the past two decades anthropological and historical theorists have embraced a more constructivist approach to culture (cf. Handler 1984; Hanson 1989; Hobsbawm and Ranger 1983; Linnekin 1983, 1990, 1991; Handler and Linnekin 1984; Keesing 1989). As these writers have conveyed, “tradition” and “authenticity” are problematic concepts, as cultures are fluid and people routinely invent culture as they go along. With regard to tourism theory, Crick (1989:336) summed up the heart of the issue when he raised the question, “What in a culture is not staged? What does cultural authenticity consist of?” and cited Greenwood’s (1982:27) observation that “all cultures are in the process of ‘making themselves up’ all the time. In a general sense, all culture is ‘staged authenticity’.” Such anthropological approaches to culture have the potential to come in direct conflict with local cultural perspectives, as Hanson, Linnekin, and others have discovered (cf. Linnekin 1991). Moreover, in settings where cultural heritage tourism is being developed, the stakes become even higher. As Howell observed, this theoretical shift in anthropology

forces us to ask: what is the tradition that heritage tourism planners and other cultural conservationists supposedly conserve? Perhaps cultural conservation is a cruel illusion. We ineluctably conserve only what we ourselves construct, guided implicitly or explicitly by our own or clients’ political agendas. . . . In practical terms, popular interest in cultural conservation encourages countless groups and localities to discover, create, or rehabilitate “traditions” that serve their social, political, or economic ends, and these are our clients. [1994:152–153]

Although Howell is primarily concerned with applied work in cultural heritage management, even those of us not actively consulting on such projects can find ourselves drawn into ethical dilemmas due to the theoretical disjuncture

between our constructivist perspective and differing conceptions of tradition and heritage, be they local or be they embraced by external heritage agencies.

I became personally conscious of the problematic ethical ramifications of this theoretical disjuncture when I was invited to participate in a scholarly conference on the politics of UNESCO's World Heritage Sites, which also included UNESCO leaders.⁶ In spring 2001, the village in which I had based my field research was nominated for possible inclusion on UNESCO's lists of World Heritage Sites. I shared in the excitement of my friends in the village, who had long lobbied for this recognition, but also experienced anxiety knowing that UNESCO's conceptions of heritage are different from anthropologists' conceptions of heritage, which differ yet again from local Toraja conceptions of heritage.

My documentation of the village's history illustrated that the village was very much a product of local interactions and adaptations to a series of global forces, including Dutch colonization,⁷ independence, and tourism development. From a constructivist theoretical perspective, these factors did not challenge the village's authenticity and merit as a World Heritage Site. Yet UNESCO officials appeared to embrace a more static concept of heritage,⁸ and I feared that misinterpretation of my discussion of the village at the conference could potentially jeopardize the village's hard-earned status as a potential World Heritage Site. Anthropological ethics rightly dictate that our first obligation is to protect our informants and ensure that no harm befalls them as a result of our work. However, it also did not seem ethical to reinvent the village's history to mesh with UNESCO's more static conception of heritage. Ultimately, after much reflection, I opted to use my talk to argue that most culturally oriented UNESCO World Heritage Sites were actually products of histories of interactions with the global world and that the village in which I worked was typical of many World Heritage Sites. In short, I reframed my talk as an opportunity to stimulate UNESCO officials to reconsider their more static notions concerning heritage.⁹

The case discussed above reveals some of the collisions between contemporary anthropological theories and those embraced by others (be they locals or external groups such as UNESCO) and illustrates some of the emergent ethical dilemmas such collisions prompt for anthropologists working in heavily toured settings. I turn now to address tourism-related ethical dilemmas that emerged in the more remote setting of Alor, Indonesia, where tourism is in its infancy.

ANTHROPOLOGISTS AND IDENTITY AMPLIFICATION ON ALOR

In contrast to Tana Toraja Regency, tourism on Alor is embryonic at best. The island of Alor has never figured prominently in Indonesian tourism promotion. Although a few English-language adventure tour books give the island passing references as the site of celebrated anthropologist Cora Du Bois's field research and as the island of bronze drums and tradition, most give it no mention whatsoever. More significantly, Alor is not mentioned in the government's *A Tourism Master Development Plan for Nusa Tenggara Timor*. In 1994, prior to the political and religious turmoil which have decimated tourism in Indonesia, just 220 foreigners stayed overnight on the island and only three small cruise ships docked for half-day visits on the island (several dozen small diving groups also toured offshore reefs, never actually landing on the island).

The rarity of tourists, however, does not render Alor insignificant for our understanding of tourism-related issues and ethics. As I have argued elsewhere (Adams, in press), even in such remote Indonesian locales, where tourism is barely existent, ideas and fantasies about tourism can color local politics, flavoring discussions of identity and channeling local actions. Moreover, such fantasies about tourism can have reverberations for interactions with and expectations from visiting anthropologists. Hence, looking at tourism-related research ethics in a locale where tourism is embryonic can be instructive.

Despite Alor's lack of touristic celebrity, as I visited potential field sites on the island in the 1990s,¹⁰ it became clear to me that the expectation of tourism animated local activities and fantasies. Since the late 1980s, the discourse on tourism has become increasingly ubiquitous in Indonesia. In the 1990s, the Indonesian government developed an active and extensive Tourism Consciousness Campaign. In preparation for Visit Indonesia Year (1991) and Visit ASEAN Year (1992), the Indonesian government launched a national Tourism Consciousness Campaign (*Kampanye Nasional Sadar Wisata*). As part of this campaign, the Minister of Tourism, Post, and Telecommunications proclaimed the Seven Charms (*Sapta Pesona*) to which all Indonesian groups should aspire. These tourist-pleasing charms include security, orderliness, friendliness, beauty, comfort, cleanliness, and memories. The Tourism Consciousness Campaign was widely discussed in the Indonesian media, and the Seven Charms were posted on plaques in villages. The campaign helped prompt even villages off the beaten track in Outer Indonesia to consider their own touristic charms and attraction powers, as I discovered on my research visits to Alor.

When I arrived on Alor in 1996 for longer-term research, I registered at the local Office of Education and Culture, as is legally required in Indonesia. As one of the first foreign anthropologists interested in conducting research on the island since the days of Du Bois (the 1930s), I was embraced by officials at the Alor Office of Education and Culture, who urged me to assist them in their project of “inventorying” local culture while I searched for a field site. For several weeks, my hosts took me to a series of scenic villages to photo-document traditional houses, megalithic remains, and various village-rebuilding rituals. It soon became apparent that the villages selected for me to help “inventory” were hardly random: many of the sites were the natal villages of my official sponsors. Moreover, our inventory clearly sparked an array of powerful fantasies about tourism development and the riches it would bring. Residents in each locale enthusiastically declared that the “seven touristic charms” were present in their villages and speculated that their own dances, architecture, and scenic landscapes would be of interest not only to other anthropologists, but to tourists.

In many sites, residents lobbied for me to write a book about their local cultural area, just as Du Bois had done for Atimelang (which was one of the few sites for sporadic touristic pilgrimage on the island, largely by anthropology fans). The mythic power of Du Bois’s classic 1944 ethnography to generate trickles of tourists and revenues for the village in which she worked was palpable to my Alorese acquaintances. Although only a few copies of her book existed on the island, many village leaders were well aware of the celebrity-creating results of Du Bois’s 1930s research in Altimelang. As anthropologists writing texts for largely academic audiences, we tend to overlook the unanticipated ramifications our publications may have for the communities in which we work. Clearly, Du Bois’s writings had prompted a certain local perception—and an appreciation often lost on us—of the powers of anthropological publications. In short, our footprints may be larger and last longer than we tend to assume.

The villagers I met on Alor were not shy in conveying their expectations about the publicity and funds they hoped I would generate via my anthropological publications. At several stops, villagers described the hardships of seasonal droughts and the difficulties of getting by, and urged me to help rescue them from poverty by publicizing their village’s touristic charms.

As rumors of my plans to conduct research on the island spread, people from an assortment of Alorese ethnic groups appeared daily at my temporary lodgings, each lobbying me to write a book like Du Bois’s but on their group, so that they, too, could stand out. As a number of these lobbyists told me, their

own cultures were even more interesting than Atimelang's and deserved to be made famous by the book they imagined I would write. As many claimed, Atimelang was no longer traditional. Even Du Bois's house, I was told, had decayed, like the Atimelang traditions. But in their distant villages, tradition was still alive. Although I attempted to convey to my Alorese acquaintances that my writings were destined for obscure journals and would never be able to generate the tourist flocks they imagined, their disbelief was obvious. For them, anthropologists were amplifiers of identity, with the potential to transform impoverished, off-the-beaten-track villages into prosperous international celebrities.

Grasping the enormous expectations tagged to associating myself with a particular village, I wrestled with the ethics of the situation. To avail myself of the hospitality of villagers who had clearly conveyed their expectations for the longer-term results of their generosity was clearly a breach of ethics. Ultimately, I decided to remain based in my temporary lodgings in the main town.

The problematic role researchers in touristic and proto-touristic settings may play as "amplifiers of identity" presented itself to me in a new form when, two years later, I was invited to lecture on a luxury cruise ship slated to stop on Alor for an afternoon. Given my research interests in internal and external constructions of Alorese identity, the cruise ship position offered an irresistible opportunity to interview some of the normally difficult to access, fleeting visitors. The cruise passengers were largely composed of members of the American Academy for the Advancement of Science and several upscale American travel groups. These tourists were unusually intellectual in their approach to travel. A number of them had read as many Indonesian ethnographies as they could in preparation for the trip, including Du Bois's (1944) classic work on Alor. Accordingly, the tour organizers had devoted careful attention to selecting an array of experts to offer the serious educational experience expected by the passengers.

However, just as Kaspin (1997) observed when she lectured on a Yale trip to Kenya, our "expert" constructions of Indonesia were mediated by the largely Balinese and Javanese cruise ship tourism personnel and infrastructure. For many of the shipboard Javanese and Balinese travel industry employees, Eastern Indonesia (where we were voyaging) was a land of "primitives." As I struggled to convey a sense of the complexity of Alor and the issues faced by contemporary Alorese and the other groups we were to visit, the shipboard Balinese tourism director put forth a very different "iconography of primitivism"¹¹ when he offered his daily itineraries and commentaries. Politeness and professional ethics

prohibited me from directly contradicting my shipboard superior, yet we were both acutely aware that I offered a less exotic and, to his eyes, less marketable narrative. As Kapin observed in the Kenyan setting, the local tourism industry “actively marketed an iconography of primitivism that found anthropological expertise useful[primarily] when it operated according to the parameters of that iconography” (1997:53).

In my role as shipboard anthropological teacher, I was determined to out-amplify the Balinese tourism director’s sensationalized imagery of the Alorese. Also, given some passengers’ familiarity with Du Bois’s work, an additional challenge was to address and contemporize Du Bois’s pioneering yet dated research, which had been conducted in the 1930s and was no longer an up-to-date portrayal of life on Alor. Sensitively engaging with, yet adjusting, these competing images of Alor seemed to offer the most ethically responsible path. However, I was unprepared for the scene which greeted us on Alor as we debarked. Assembled in the bustling port was a troupe of bare-chested, spear-clutching male dancers, as well as female dancers, barefoot and clad in hand-woven ikat sarongs. The troupe proceeded to perform a series of dances billed as “welcome dances,” “hunting dances,” and “headhunting dances.” The “Alorese = savage” iconography I had worked to dispel was apparently being embraced by our local greeters.

As I later learned, these Alorese dancers came from an array of different Alorese ethnic groups and had been schooled by a local tourism official who believed that the imagery of primitivism was a surefire way to captivate tourists. He may well have been right. As the tourists looked to me in my role as anthropological teacher to authenticate or question the welcoming performance, my own sensibilities concerning my ethical responsibilities to the Alorese to deconstruct certain problematic popular images suddenly became more complicated. As anthropologists working in tourism, it pays for us to be acutely aware of our own identities as amplifiers and authenticators of local identities. Our consciousness of this is crucial, as the ethical quandaries of trafficking in representations are multiple and murky.

CONCLUSION

Whether we anticipate it or not, those of us conducting academic research in touristic settings frequently find ourselves inadvertently drawn into more applied tourism activities. As I have illustrated, our contemporary anthropological

theories and perspectives can collide with local perceptions and local tourism-generating activities, landing researchers in ethically murky zones. However, I would not advocate withdrawal as a solution. Rather, we should devote more energy to careful and systematic anticipatory ethical reflection as we embark on these projects.

Moreover, for practicing anthropologists, active involvement is more the norm. As tourism projects mushroom around the globe, anthropologists have the potential to play key roles in understanding and ameliorating some of the more troubling dynamics of tourism. As some have noted, our critical perspective and awareness of power issues (cf. Errington and Gewertz 1989) enable us to serve as useful voices in tourism-related development projects in our field communities, as does our community-oriented, diversity-attentive approach. As authoritative outsiders, we are also aptly positioned to address externally imposed stereotypes of the peoples with whom we work, as long as we are reflective and responsible about ethical issues and our roles as identity amplifiers.

NOTES

1. Also see Picard 1990:74.
2. Toraja Jelita roughly translates as “Charming Toraja.”
3. It seems to me that this theme is also at the heart of the class dichotomy between anthropology and development. For a relevant discussion of these issues, see Gow 2002.
4. Slavery is illegal in Indonesia, although in the 1980s some older rural Toraja elites still had difficulty adjusting to the more egalitarian dictates of the nation.
5. They were largely referring to the tourist literature. For a fuller discussion of the politics underlying such concerns, see Adams 1995.
6. For a summary and sample proceedings of the conference, see David Harrison and Michael Hitchcock (2004).
7. Soon after the arrival of Dutch colonialists, for example, the primary ancestral houses comprising the village were moved from various mountaintops to the current site, so that the elites could be closer to the new Dutch sources of power.
8. This assertion is based on UNESCO reports concerning criteria for World Heritage Sites.
9. See Adams 2003.
10. I conducted field research on the island of Alor in 1989, 1993, and 1996, with a brief return in 1998.
11. Kaspin’s term (1997:53).

REFERENCES CITED

Adams, Kathleen

- 1995 Making-up the Toraja: The Appropriation of Tourism, Anthropology and Museums for Politics in Upland Sulawesi. *Ethnology* 34:143–154.

- 2003 *The Politics of Heritage in Southeast Asia: Interplaying the Local and the Global. Indonesia and the Malay World* 31(89):91–107.
 In press *The Genesis of Touristic Images: Politics and Poetics in the Creation of a Remote Indonesian Island Destination. Tourism Studies.*
- Bruner, Edward
 1995 *The Ethnographer/Tourist in Indonesia. In International Tourism: Identity and Change.* Lanfant, M.-F., John Allcock, and Edward Bruner, eds. Pp. 224–241. London: Sage.
- Chambers, Robert
 1983 *Rural Development: Putting the Last First.* Harlow, England: Longman.
- Crick, Malcolm
 1989 *Representations of International Tourism in the Social Sciences: Sun, Sex, Sights, Savings and Servility. Annual Review of Anthropology* 18:307–344.
- Du Bois, Cora
 1944 *The People of Alor: A Social-Psychological Study of an East Indian Island.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Errington, Frederick, and Deborah Gewertz
 1989 *Tourism and Anthropology in a Postmodern World. Oceania* 60:37–54.
- Greenwood, Davydd
 1982 *Cultural “Authenticity.” Cultural Survival Quarterly* 6(3):27–28.
- Gow, David D.
 2002 *Anthropology and Development: Evil Twin or Moral Narrative? Human Organization* 61(4):299–313.
- Fischer, Michael J.
 2003 *Emergent Forms of Life and the Anthropological Voice.* Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Handler, Richard
 1984 *On Sociocultural Discontinuity: Nationalism and Cultural Objectification in Quebec. Current Anthropology* 25: 55–71.
- Handler, Richard, and Jocelyn Linnekin
 1984 *Tradition: Genuine or Spurious. Journal of American Folklore* 97: 273–290.
- Hanson, Alan
 1989 *The Making of the Maori: Cultural Invention and Its Logic. American Anthropologist* 91:890–902.
- Harrison, David, and Michael Hitchcock, guest eds.
 2004 *The Politics of World Heritage: Negotiating Tourism and Conservation. Special double issue, Current Issues in Tourism* 7(4–5).
- Hobsbawm, Eric, and Terrance Ranger, eds.
 1983 *The Invention of Tradition.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Howell, Benita J.
 1994 *Weighing the Risks and Rewards of Involvement in Cultural Conservation and Heritage Tourism. Human Organization* 52(2):150–159.
- Kaspin, Deborah
 1997 *On Ethnographic Authority and the Tourist Trade: Anthropology and the House of Mirrors. Anthropological Quarterly* 70(2):53–57.

Keesing, Roger

1989 Creating the Past: Custom and Identity in the Pacific. *The Contemporary Pacific* 1:19–42.

Linnekin, Jocelyn

1983 Defining Tradition: Variations on the Hawaiian Identity. *American Ethnologist* 10:241–252.

1990 The Politics of Culture in the Pacific. *In* *Cultural Identity and Ethnicity in the Pacific*. Jocelyn Linnekin and Lin Poyer, eds. Pp.149–173. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.

1991 Cultural Invention and the Dilemma of Authenticity. *American Anthropologist* 93:446–448.

Natcher, David C., and Clifford G. Hickey

2002 Putting the Community Back into Community-Based Resource Management: A Criteria and Indicators Approach to Sustainability. *Human Organization* 61(4): 350–363.

Picard, Michel

1990 “Cultural Tourism” in Bali: Cultural Performances as Tourist Attraction. *Indonesia* 49:37–74.

Silverman, Eric

2001 Tourism in the Sepik River of Papua New Guinea: Favoring the Local Over the Global. *Pacific Tourism Review* 4:105–119.

Wood, Robert

1980 International Tourism and Cultural Change in Southeast Asia. *Economic Development and Cultural Change* 28(3):561–581.

1998 Touristic Ethnicity: A Brief Itinerary. *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 21(2):218–241.