14. From Shakespeare’s *As You Like It*, Act II, Scene II: “All the world’s a stage, And all the men and women merely players; They have their exits and their entrances, And one man in his time plays many parts.”

15. Until his retrospective writing at the turn of the twenty-first century (1999; 2005b; 2005e; 2010; 2012), Bruner was surprisingly mum on the details of these travels. In fact, even today some of the information is found only in his typescript curriculum vitae. This omission parallels anthropologists’ failing to specify the nature of the colonial situations in which they were pursuing their research on “traditional” societies, only in reverse: Bruner was overtly a tour participant or guide while quietly developing an anthropological understanding, a process he unpacks only minimally (but see, for example, Bruner 2012, 154–55).

16. While there is but one mention of Clifford and Marcus’s 1986 volume in Bruner’s primary works (2005b, 6), he participated in numerous conference sessions bringing together the same group of individuals. See Di Giovine, this volume.

17. See Bruner (1999, 461–62; 2005b, 18–19) for discussion of additional, closely related concepts from non-anthropologists, including Mary Louise Pratt’s (1992) “contact zones” and Homi Bhabha’s (1994) “third space.”


Chapter Two

{Genealogies}

On the Emergence of Identity and Borderzones as Key Concepts

Kathleen M. Adams

The exploration of identity dynamics and touristic borderzones are two recurrent analytical targets in Edward Bruner’s tourism research. This chapter argues that these foci are natural outgrowths of his earliest work in Native America and Indonesia. Going back to his days as a graduate student, Bruner’s writings have revisited three analytical issues: mobility, inter-group encounters, and identity. Although Bruner has embraced varied ethnographic writing strategies and fieldwork settings over the course of his career, a consistent thrust of his work has entailed analyzing the creative interplay between these three conceptual realms. As I suggest in this chapter, Bruner’s long-term engagement with these classic anthropological issues (migration/mobility, cultural encounters, and identity/ethnicity), in tandem with his “radically reflexive ethnography” (E. Bruner 2005b, 9), laid the foundation for his subsequent critical interventions in tourism anthropology.

Bruner’s analytical contributions to our understanding of identity and borderzones are entwined with his ethnographic and methodological strategies. For tourism anthropologists conducting identity-oriented research in “small places” (Eriksen 1995), Bruner has modeled a pathway for adeptly moving from locally specific, vibrantly textured intercultural encounters to broader levels of analysis (see, e.g., K. Adams 2006; Leite 2017; Markula 1997). From his earliest writings to the present, Bruner’s work has reminded us of the necessity of situating mobile persons in the context of broader historical, political, and economic undercurrents, thereby providing us all with the methodological scaffolding for analyzing inter-group relations, identity dynamics, and contests over meaning in and beyond touristic borderzones. This chapter examines Bruner’s key contributions to our understanding of migration, identity, and meaning-making and underscores how this work has inspired scholarship in the anthropology of tourism.
ON THE TRAIL OF EARLY BRUNER: DISCOVERING NATIVE AMERICAN “BORDERZONES” AND CREATIVE IDENTITY-MAKING SPACES

Bruner’s interest in cultural encounters, mobile people, and shifting identities dates back to his dissertation research on a North Dakota Mandan-Hidatsa community (E. Bruner 1954; Graburn and Leite, this volume). He succinctly described this early research in a 1989 biographical statement: “I studied Native Americans: why and how they changed, why some individuals changed more than others, who left the reservation for the city, and which aspects of culture were more persistent” (E. Bruner 1989a). His first dissertation-based publications were produced in an era in which acculturation studies were in vogue, so it is not surprising that his emphasis is on cultural transmission and change (e.g., 1956a; 1956b). Yet even in this early period, as with his later work on tourism, Bruner rejected approaches that simply describe differences in acculturation or “correlate them with a checklist of unweighted factors” (1956b, 605). Rather, from early on, Bruner interested himself in the processes whereby individuals and kin groups reaffirm and rethink their identities.

For instance, in his article “Primary Group Experience and the Process of Acculturation” (1956b), Bruner goes beyond simply identifying the presence of a “white model” (non-Native American relative) living in a Mandan-Hidatsa household as a significant factor in orienting a family toward the non-Native world. He unpacks fieldwork observations and interviews to showcase the processes whereby “parents consciously, deliberately and actively train their children to become like whites” (1956b, 619). His work takes us into the intimate world of “acculturated” family homes in which Native American parents push their children to speak only English and to socialize with other families that have turned their backs on the Native world. Likewise, in a move that foregrounds his long-term interest in the interrelations between performance and identity, he highlights the ceremonies and powwows avoided by acculturated families, noting that these public rituals “best symbolize . . . and make legitimate the traditional Indian values” (1956b, 607). Bruner gives his readers a suggestive sense of the identities at play in these ceremonies by drawing on the voice of an “acculturated Indian” man who tells him:

I never go to any dances or pow-wows. These dances are for fellows [sic] breeding grounds; they go there to drink, to raise hell, and they are not Christians. A lot of these fellows . . . go there to take some gal out . . . and get her drunk. That’s all these dances are for, as far as the younger people are concerned. The older people go there to get these donations; something for nothing. . . . They take their kids and the kids don’t learn much from that. They give things away and that money can be used to educate their children, buy provisions and things. It seems like with an Indian they think they are in the spotlight; it makes them feel good. (1956b, 607)

In narrating what happens at Mandan-Hidatsa ceremonies and dances, Bruner’s interlocutor is, in effect, crafting his own subject position as an “acculturated Indian” who stands apart from the Native world. Via early writings such as these, we can catch initial glimpses of some of the identity-oriented themes that were to blossom in Bruner’s later work on tourism.

Central to this later work is a conception of performances and cultural displays as realms in which various identities (cultural, ethnic, national, and so on) are not only performed and narrativized, but strengthened, challenged, transformed, or rearticulated (see Bruner 1991; 2005a). For instance, via Bruner’s research on American tourists visiting New Salem, a reconstructed heritage site celebrating Abraham Lincoln (1993b; 1994), and in his study of Kenyans viewing ethnic displays at Bomas (2001), we see how the activities of domestic tourists strengthen sensibilities about “a patrimony that is already theirs” (2005b, 10). Yet Bruner also shows us that tourist sites do more than simply affirm identities; they are also spaces in which competing narratives about cultural identities and cultural patrimonies struggle for dominance—as he illustrates via his (2005a) analyses of New Salem, Masada, and Ghana’s Cape Coast castles. In short, Bruner adeptly showcases the complexity of tourist spaces vis à vis identity dynamics.

I circle back to Bruner’s theme of struggles over meaning and identity narratives in tourist spaces shortly, but first let us further examine his early work on Native American acculturation. From the outset, Bruner demonstrates the productivity of focusing on cultural borderlands in which individuals from different backgrounds come together and interact. For instance, his article on the varying degrees of acculturation in a Mandan-Hidatsa community identified interactions and intermarriages with whites as fertile realms for better understanding people’s experiences of acculturation (1956b). Likewise, one of his initial Indonesia articles (.961) zeros in on the experiences of Batak migrants in the ethnically diverse city of Medan (Indonesia) in order to address theoretical debates concerning the impact of urbanization on ethnic identity and kinship relationships.

In his later tourism work, Bruner’s focus on zones of intercultural interaction becomes more refined and reoriented toward spaces beyond the intimate realm of nuclear or extended family life: he targets what he terms “the touristic borderzone,” which he defines as a creative space where “the natives have to break out of their normal routines to meet the tourists: to dance for them, to sell them souvenirs, or to display themselves and their cultures for the tourists’ gaze and for sale” (1996b, 158; see also Simoni, this volume). Bruner’s vision of touristic borderzones encompasses local-tourist interactions, habitual
behaviors in these spaces of encounter, and even reflections about these encounters. Thus his analyses highlight an array of locales, ranging from sites such as Mayers Ranch, Kenya, where international audiences observe Maasai “tribal” dancing and share scenes on the lawn with their British ex-colonial hosts (Bruner and Kirshenblatt-Gimblett 1994), to the moldy dungeons of historic Ghanaian slave castles, in which North American tourists on heritage pilgrimages to “Mother Africa” encounter local Fanti guides and performers (E. Bruner 1996a).

Bruner’s pioneering work on touristic borderzones has inspired subsequent scholars to further explore these spaces of intercultural encounters, in an effort to better understand how stories and sensibilities about self and other come to shape in the context of international tourism. For instance, Andrew Causey’s (2003) work builds on Bruner’s legacy by spotlighting marketplace interactions between international tourists and Batak carvers on Samosir Island (Sumatra, Indonesia). As Causey observes, this particular borderzone has the quality of a “utopic space” wherein both Batak and Westerners have license to transgress their own cultural rules of polite behavior and playfully experiment with new identities and narratives. Causey’s utopic tourist spaces have stage-like qualities: they occupy “a place in between reality and desire, a place that is both home and not-home, a place where things can be imaginatively re-created” (2003, 69). In short, certain touristic borderzones function as utopic spaces, rich in possibilities for emergent formations of self and other identities (see also Simoni, this volume).

**MOBILITY AND MIGRATION IN BRUNER’S INDONESIA WORK**

After Bruner completed his PhD, his post-dissertation research shifted to Indonesia, where he embarked on a project focused on what was to become a recurrent theme in his work: the interplay between mobility and identity. His first long-term ethnographic research on the island of Sumatra (1957–1958) centered on understanding urbanization and ethnic identity (see figure 2.1). Initially he spent seven months in a rural, highland Batak village researching kinship and change, but because a regional revolution provoked safety concerns, he relocated and spent the remaining five months studying among urban, “Westernized” Batak migrants in the coastal city of Medan (E. Bruner 1961, 508; 2005b, 8). Bruner’s resulting publications productively questioned then-accepted truisms about the rise of secularism and individualism amongst rural-to-urban migrants. His analysis showed that Batak urban migrants maintain corporate lineage group affiliations irrespective of residence and that they returned to the village with their children “for important ceremonies and to spend vacations and holidays with their relatives” (E. Bruner 1961, 516). This prescient 1961 passage is perhaps the first passing mention of the dual dimensions of migrants’ return travel to the homeland: they return both to vacation and to quench a thirst for family, heritage, and home. Still, Bruner’s overarching objective in this early article is to identify variables that might explain why urban Batak migrants remained engaged in kinship organizations, contrary to the then-dominant theories of urban migrant identity transformation.

By the late 1990s, his research turned to a direct exploration of tourism-oriented identity dynamics. Bruner’s interest in mobile subjects led him to chronicle the activities of Batak visitors at Jakarta’s Beautiful Indonesia in Miniature Park (Taman Mini) in order to tease out some of the identity-oriented ironies of ethnic theme parks (E. Bruner 2005d). He noted, “ethnic theme parks are paradoxical because they display difference yet promote unity” (2005d, 212). Moreover, he tells us, the ethnic theme park recipe for promoting unity appears to vary from country to country, in accordance with a country’s social demographics. This chapter showcases Bruner’s ability to productively travel between varied levels of analysis, moving from fine-tuned examinations of visitors’ engagements with specific ethnic theme

![Figure 2.1. Edward and Elaine Bruner with two Indonesian research assistants (an unidentified male and Mian Tobing) in a Toba Batak village, Sumatra, Indonesia, 1957. Photo credit: Edward M. Bruner.](image-url)
parks in Kenya, China, and Indonesia to broader cross-cultural comparisons. Ultimately, in this later writing, he sheds light on the varied ways in which national demography, cultural politics, and identity come into play in the touristic borderzones of cultural theme parks.

FINAL WORDS

Despite an array of topical interests ranging from kinship and migration, to texts, play, and stories, and finially to tourism; throughout his career, Bruner has rooted his inquiries in richly textured, fine-grained ethnography. His evocative descriptions, such as his account of impatient, hungry tourists anxious to abandon a sweltering Balinese temple festival—an anthropologist’s nirvana—in pursuit of lunch, conjure up empathy for all involved. But his vignettes also serve up important insights into the disparity between anthropological and touristic “ways of seeing” (E. Bruner 2005b, 7). As underscored at the outset of this chapter, Bruner does far more than simply offer evocative ethnographic descriptions and vignettes about locally specific encounters in small places. Rather, his localized vignettes are breeding grounds for broader insights into the nature of human experience and meaning-making.

In following the path of Bruner’s academic journey, we find that a staple in his scholarly suitcase has been the creative interplay between mobility, intergroup encounters, and identity. His attentiveness to these analytical targets in diverse settings and at varied analytical levels has ultimately fueled two of his critical interventions in tourism anthropology: an understanding of tourism settings as borderzones and a richer appreciation of identity dynamics at play in societies on the move. These critical interventions promise to pave the way for more nuanced, finer-grained understandings of topics of interest to a new generation of anthropologists engaged in critical tourism studies, including inequality, social justice, environmental justice, and tourism ethics.

NOTES

1. Bruner’s earliest work on acculturation also reflects a vision of group identities as dynamic and fluid at a time when most scholars were still embracing more primitivist understandings of group identities as fixed inheritances from the past. It was Bruner’s approach to ethnicity as dynamic that informed my own dissertation field research on tourism, ethnicity, and art in 1984–1985.

2. I am indebted to Jean-Paul Dumont’s insightful discussion of the expression vignette. As he observes, a vignette is not only a story but a “little vine” that twists, turns, and climbs to higher places (Dumont 1992).

Chapter Three

{Influence}

“So in Effect I Was Studying Myself”

Knowing (Our) Tourist Stories

Julia Harrison

In 1994, as a newly hired anthropology professor, I fretted over the viability of conducting research with domestic tourists. All sage wisdom would suggest that those with my pretenure status should simply build on an established research agenda to ensure that the requisite number of grants could be obtained and publications realized in time for the all-important tenure application. Never mind launching into a field of research that in the mid-1990s had limited visibility, not to mention credibility in the field of anthropology. If tourists were found in anthropological field sites, generally they were ignored. If noticed, they were likely to be disparaged, dismissed, and trivialized; at best, they were considered to be polluting irritants (see Errington and Gewertz 1989).

Regardless of these considerations, I had wanted to study tourists since the late 1970s. I had marked my determination to do so by purchasing Valene Smith’s new edited volume Hosts and Guests (1977). Symbolically to me, it was the first scholarly book I acquired that was not a university course textbook. I lamented at the time that tourism and tourists were not something I could have studied during my undergraduate years in anthropology. The discipline had a long way to go before such courses were included in the curriculum. Some twenty years later, after a diversionary career in another field, I had completed my doctorate and secured a tenure-track academic position, yet I still had not started on such research.

Shortly after completing my undergraduate degree in 1974, I had set out with my backpack for nearly two years of global travel to find out what it really meant to be a tourist. For better or worse, throughout my journey I was plagued with the mind-set of a fledgling anthropologist. I never stopped wondering why I and many other young Canadians, Americans, Australians,
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