

## Introduction

The inspiration for this book came from the red dust left trailing behind a moving car. It was a severe summer in Mozambique. That afternoon, I talked with a forty-seven-year-old woman who was seated close to the trail that crosses through the village of Canhane. She was peeling marula fruits when a metallic grey four-wheeler transporting two European tourists flew past us at high speed. Cars are not a common sight in the village, but it was the velocity of its passing that caught our attention. The freshly washed and still-humid marula fruits became covered by the red dust from the road, as did we. After the cloud of dirt dissipated, the woman commented calmly, 'They may be coming here to visit the community.' My eyes followed the vehicle, scanning the children playing on the road; chickens and goats scampered out of its way. The vehicle's brake lights did not illuminate even for a moment. I asked her the obvious: 'Why would they want to visit this village?' Now clothed in a veil of dry dust blanketing her skin, she replied: 'Because the tourists want to see what we are doing with their money. They want to see how the community is developing.'

She gave me a key to unveil the new basis for the 'art of living' (Bourdieu 1977: 88) in this Mozambican village since its introduction to community tourism (also known as community-based tourism). Indeed, her response suggested something that became more obvious to me over the next few months: residents of Canhane, located in the southwest corner of Mozambique, had established in their consciousness their new identitarian value in the world – the value of being a 'developing community' in tourism.

There is an expanding body of literature that addresses the growth of both global aid and the transnational monitoring of conduct in contemporary life. Whether from the perspective of development, climate change, human rights, public health or even commodity

consumption, in these debates, the ‘practice of assistance’ – the extending of aid to those who have less – is based on a notion of benevolence that extends beyond borders. In this book, I explore these growing processes of translocal ethical mobilization and campaigning from an anthropological perspective.

I analyse the role of destination populations and the physicality of their spaces as producers and products of a particular tourism business that operates in a global market industry. This business sells participation in community development and, in turn, commodifies the ethical dimension implied in such a participatory endeavour to international tourists. In particular, but not exclusively, I focus on a historically marginalized ‘collective’ (Latour 2007) in Mozambique. I employ a Foucauldian discourse analysis, but also critically develop a ‘performative understanding’ (Barad 2003: 802)<sup>1</sup> of the sociomaterial dynamics generated by the inclusion of this collective in community tourism. Hence, in contrast with most of the literature on tourism, I dedicate more space to the people visited than to the visitors.<sup>2</sup> This means that I explicitly acknowledge the decisive and consequential role of the hosts in the outcomes of tourism activity. Moreover, I bring forward the role of the sensory and ‘the sheer materiality of being there’ (Bruner 2005: 24) in the constitution and reproduction of the subjectivities that make tourism meaningful for all its participants.<sup>3</sup>

One of these subjectivities in community tourism is ethics. The commercialization of ethics in community tourism does not necessarily lessen the virtue intrinsic to the ethics themselves. As I show throughout the book, the consumption of ethics can result in a practice of meaningful self-cultivation for the tourists, while for the hosts, selling the ethics of ‘helping the local hosts’ can generate a new field of reflection, self-construction and confidence in themselves. In this way, I demonstrate how the commodifying dimension in tourism provides opportunities for the self-constitution of both tourists and hosts in moral terms.

Finally, I discuss the ways in which ethical consumption, understood as a modality of participation in local development through tourism, can camouflage what is in effect an attempt to institute an industry of non-governmental governance by international actors. In this process, the advocacy for local development and benevolence energizes the transnational expansion of governance in parallel with the transnational expansion of (ethical) consumer freedom. It paves the way for the expansion of governing action through consumption. Accordingly, by promoting international responses to local rural

poverty and by providing moral justification for commodity consumption abroad, community tourism can operate as a technique for converting development institutions, their professionals, and tourist-consumers into agents of governance. They arrive in the ‘communities’ not as simple facilitators of development or as tourist-visitors, but as agents who can assume a governing role in these ‘communities’.

As I will demonstrate, the institution of local development through tourist ethical consumption can indeed open up local populations and local resources to new forms of international governance. And this is conspicuously evident in Mozambique, a country that in the last decades has fallen into the hands of international development agencies (Negrão 2003); a country, like many other countries in the Global South, in which the vigorous contemporary re-emergence of locality is fundamentally stimulated by transnational agents (Obarrio 2010).

## Meaningful Commodities and the Body in Research

Over the last three decades, we have witnessed the rise of new benevolent<sup>4</sup> trends in tourism.<sup>5</sup> Studying these trends leads us to wider reflections, and various questions arise. Why do they develop at a particular time? What made them happen? What consequences do they have in different locations, for different people? Community tourism is one such new trend in international tourism. The organization and activities of community tourism, involving as they do mobility and local and international structures, affect the formation or reformation of subjectivities such as identity, development and ethics. More importantly, studying community tourism allows us to engage with the sociocultural and political processes that are bound up with such subjectivities. Should community tourism in rural Africa be understood as a distinct manifestation of aid? Or, as David Telfer (2012: 156) and others put it, should it be interpreted primarily as a technical programme of local empowerment in line with the alternative development paradigms that arose during the 1970s? Do intentions to help others remain ethically valid after being commercialized in the form of community tourism? Ultimately, studying community tourism allows us to investigate some of the key issues that help shape definitions of modernity, local and transnational governance, systems of power, globalization and ethics in contemporary life. What does the community tourism trend tell us about the present global system in which we live?

In both tourism and development industries, community tourism is commonly associated with moral worth. This is particularly evident in projects developed in rural areas in the Global South. In the African countryside, it is promoted as an opportunity for tourists to contribute to the improvement of the living conditions of the deprived populations they visit. However, behind such visions associating it with a principled, humanistic model, we should keep in mind that community tourism is basically a business. Like all businesses, it depends on the income (which can take the form of donations) that it generates to continue operating. Community tourism is contingent on the existence of ethical consumers. It depends on the market demand for responsible, conscientious tourism. It subsists, fails or grows mostly through the purchasing and selling of commodities in the tourism sphere, whether these are goods, imaginaries, services or even ideals of ‘doing the right thing’, and in order to be transactional, all these have to be commoditized.

A priori, the economics at work here seem to complicate the aura of ethics surrounding the ideal of community tourism. The crucial role of money in such a model opens up doubts about its benevolent character. David Bell thought the same about ‘hospitality’: in contrast to accommodation, he says, the idea of hospitality is projected in terms of a “holy trinity” of the provision of food and/or drink and/or accommodation’. At its simplest, ‘hosts provide the “holy trinity” of hospitality for guests’ (Bell 2012: 20; see also Brotherton 1999). However, when Bell examines hospitality as an economic transaction, a service provided in the commercial domain of tourism, this leads him to questions about motive, profit and exploitation. It muddies the generosity and reciprocity supposedly inherent in the concept. The idea of buying and selling hospitality demolishes the beauty purity of this relationship between hosts and guests, he says; it reveals hospitality to be a cynical performance (Bell 2012: 22). Bell’s questions and suspicions draw on the belief that commodity consumption is, in one way or another, always implicated in broader networks of socio-economic inequality and environmental harm (Barnett et al. 2011: 6). This is a view that considers commercial practices to be inimical to the values of genuine goodwill.

However, what is peculiar in community tourism is that it is precisely the commodity consumption dimension that confers ‘goodness’ on the relation between economically unequal people. It has a pivotal role in the moralization of the encounters and social relations between international tourists and their hosts (Miller 2012:

184). Consumption here, as Juliet Schor and colleagues say, represents ‘a realm of intensely practical morality’ (2010: 282). If tourists do not ostensibly spend their money in the disadvantaged communities that they visit and stay in, they do not gain the qualities of agents of social and economic change; simply put, they do not contribute or help. Hence, consumption in community tourism must be understood as an active and contextual process whereby the objects and subjects consumed can be made to *matter* (Miller 1998).

In recent work, scholars have argued that commodities are given new significance and meanings through the particular ways and spaces in which they are consumed (Tilley et al. 2013). Especially among anthropologists, this view posits consumption<sup>6</sup> as productive of subjectivity in everyday life (Douglas and Isherwood 1979; Baudrillard 1981; Bourdieu 1984; Carrier 1990; Miller 1992, 2012). This current of thought helped me to structure my analysis. Expressly relevant in this book is the study of the meanings attached to the commodities purchased. Jean Baudrillard’s notion of ‘sign value’ exemplifies this. Influenced by Thorstein Veblen’s (1899) concept of ‘conspicuous consumption’, Baudrillard claims that most North Atlantic societies are organized not around the consumption of material and immaterial commodities but around the meanings attached to them. It is through such meanings, he argues, that individuals acquire and express identity, prestige and status. Following this reasoning, I demonstrate how and why ethical consumption and the consumption of ethics in community tourism can contribute to the self-(re)constitution of tourist-consumers in ethical terms. In this process, not only can the moral worth of the tourists become a commodity, but commodities can also become moralized in community tourism.

My goal is to contribute to discussions that exceed the field of tourism studies. The objective is ambitiously anthropological: to produce, as Philippe Descola says, ‘knowledge about the nature of being human’ (2013: 86) in a particular feature of contemporary global modernity – community tourism. In this endeavour, I built on a long lineage of anthropological research, especially that on development, consumption and ethics.<sup>7</sup>

I rely extensively on my research in Mozambique. This is a country with a history deeply affected by events on a global scale: Portuguese colonialism, socialism, war, democratization, decentralization and neo-liberal politico-economic opening to the ‘outside’ (e.g. Negrão 2003; Pfeiffer 2004; West 2005b; Hanlon and Smart 2008; Obarrio 2010; Igreja 2015b). At the culmination of this

historical path, Mozambique is now a post-colony in which its 'local communities' represent a value in the international realm, and therefore have or serve different sorts of power. In a sense, this book is an invitation for the reader to accompany me into the heart of one such 'local community': the Mozambican village of Canhane.

This book is also an opportunity for the reader to access discussions, dilemmas, questions, answers and declarations that can be only collected and realized through a bodily, sensorial way of researching. As Merleau-Ponty famously put it, the 'body is ... the general instrument of comprehension' (1962: 235). It absorbs, generates and expels knowledge. I wish it were possible to immerse you, the reader, in a cloud of red dirt, as the woman peeling marula fruits and I were, while you read the first paragraph of this introduction. I wish you could feel the 45°C heat during that paragraph, as we felt it that afternoon. I wish you could hear the contrast between the sound of the four-by-four vehicle passing us and the sound of the goats bleating afterwards. Frédéric Gros (2014: 19) says that in all too many books the reader can sense the seated, stooped body of the writer. These are books grafted to chairs and desks in academic offices because they were thought and written in such settings. In the same sarcastic tone, Annie Dillard notes, 'Many writers do little else but sit in small rooms recalling the real world' (1990: 44). I hope to communicate a different impression, an impression loyal to the moments of bodily movement and sensation from which this work was largely conceived and written.

What I am trying to say is that, in this book, the production of knowledge is related directly to the bodily experience of the moments that originated the subjects of that knowledge. This implies the recognition of the corporeal entailments and connections in the theorizing and writing. The sometimes long and sensorial ethnographic descriptions I make of materials, events and individuals are intended to give you, the reader, some impression of the sensations that were part of the corporeal experience of those moments, of those subjects. They are an attempt to transport you mentally out of the place where you read the descriptions to the place and occasion where and when they actually happened. Ultimately, this book is an invitation for the reader to comprehend the topics of community, development, tourism, ethical consumption and governance by sharing in a sensorial sensibility that the writer gained in rural Mozambique. All forms of knowledge come from somewhere. In this sense, I want to make clear that this book is the product of an attempt at a bodily way of producing knowledge.

## Community Tourism and the Economies of Novelty

The first project of community-based tourism in Mozambique dates back to May 2004. Although it was implemented by an international non-governmental organization (NGO), Helvetas, the ownership and responsibility for its management was attributed to the local population where the project was developed – the residents in the rural village of Canhane in southwest Mozambique. Helvetas announced this initiative as part of a scrupulous development strategy seeking to improve the well-being of the local population. Soon after the tourism project started, the village of Canhane was taken up by the development industry as a successful and exemplary case of development through tourism. In contrast to destination societies dealing with insensitive hedonistic forms of tourism, the residents of Canhane were celebrated as decision makers in their own right and not as objects of tourism exploitation. On paper, these people are proactive participants in a tourism business in which the main goal is to contribute to the improvement of their own society. The Mozambican village of Canhane became a symbol of the merits of community tourism worldwide.

Tourism – in particular, mass tourism – has always generated criticism (Crick 1989). From being blamed for its harmful impacts on the environment, to being considered a threat to small-scale societies and their traditions, the word *tourism* has been widely used as a synonym for malignancy. In the last decades, however, tourism has become the subject of moral renovation (Pritchard, Morgan and Ateljevic 2001; Butcher 2003; Cravatte and Chabloz 2008; Fennell 2008; Jamal and Menzel 2009; Spencer 2010). There has been a massive call by the tourism sector for the incorporation of global sustainability principles and the values of assistance. This was formally expressed in Agenda 21, adopted at the 1992 United Nations Conference on Environment and Development held in Rio de Janeiro. There, 178 governments voted to adopt the program that states that ‘Travel and Tourism should assist people’ (WTTC, WTO and the Earth Council 1995: 34). A new domain of influence ascribing moral value to tourism businesses and tourists’ practices emerged. At the heart of this new approach was the campaign for the development of small-scale tourism enterprises, where local control and decision-making predominate (Wheeler 1995: 45). This movement generated a wave of new ethical tourism alternatives to the destructive format of package holidays: community tourism is one of them.

Although the term started to become popular during the 1990s, there is no single definition of community tourism. It is a term that remains vague and contested, despite its massive use in political, legal and development discourses. Community tourism often means different things to different people (Ndlovu and Rogerson 2003: 125; Kiss 2004: 232). Its definition has been blurred by commonplace ideas of promoting welfare for so-called rural, poor and economically marginalized populations. Yet the concept is commonly associated with principles of participation, local empowerment, economic and environmental sustainability, community well-being, self-reliance, responsible travel, gender egalitarianism, pro-poor benefits and local activism.

As far back as the late 1980s, Louis Deroi conceptualized community-based tourism as a ‘privately offered set of hospitality services (and features) ... by a local community’ (in Pearce 1992: 18). Since then, a plethora of new definitions has emerged. Dallen Timothy considers it ‘a more sustainable form of development than conventional mass tourism because it allows host communities to break away from the hegemonic grasp of tour operators and the oligopoly of wealthy elites at the national level’ (2002: 150). Clearly, the idea of community tourism came to be used to evoke empathic virtues (e.g. Pearce 1992; Reid 2003; Ryan 2005; Bartholo, Delamaro and Bursztyn 2008; Mowforth and Munt 2009). It suggests a rightful mutual relationship where the tourist is not given central priority but becomes an equal participant in the system (Wearing and McDonald 2002; Salazar 2012). To put it in Latour’s terms, tourists are constituents of a “‘We all” in the place of others’ (2004: 148). In this vein, Timothy (2002: 150) says that community tourism is about ‘grassroots empowerment’. It develops in harmony with the ‘needs and aspirations of host communities in a way that is acceptable to them, sustains their economies, rather than the economies of others, and is not detrimental to their culture, traditions or, indeed, their day-to-day convenience’ (Fitton 1996: 173). Along the same lines, to Polly Patullo and colleagues, ‘community-based tourism is where visitors stay in local homes, have a glimpse into traditional life, and most importantly, where management and benefits remain with the community’ (Patullo et al. 2009: 1).

Community tourism is, of course, a domain of thought that exceeds the scholarly field. In particular, the development institutions, tourism agencies and media associated with the promotion of ideals of local economic sustainability have become central determinants in the constitution and diffusion of public definitions of



community tourism. The NGO Planeterra, for example, considers it as an exclusive ‘community development strategy’.<sup>8</sup> The travel agency Responsible Travel asserts that, in this format, ‘at least part of the tourist income is set aside for projects which provide benefits to the community as a whole’.<sup>9</sup> Finally, for the environmental magazine *EarthTalk*, ‘community-based tourism generates lucrative revenues for poor or native communities in developing countries while enabling travelers usually accustomed to chain hotels and beachfront resorts to learn about traditional cultures’.<sup>10</sup>

According to these visions, the relationship between hosts and tourists in community tourism encompasses the desirability of local development. This is a model presented as introducing a range of possibilities for solving problems that other forms of development have not solved. Implicitly, too, community tourism seems to make tourists ‘better persons’; it gives them a gratifying role informed by virtue. It offers tourists the opportunity to be good by redressing economic inequalities, respecting other cultures and protecting the environment while on vacation. In a nutshell, with community tourism, ‘Tourism is no longer a dirty word’ (Tourism Concern 2009: 7).

However, there is also a growing body of literature addressing the pitfalls of this model. One of the main arguments is that community tourism is a ‘neo-liberal trap’ that can encourage local populations into systems of delocalized dependency (e.g. Beeton 2006; Giampiccoli 2010). Drawing from research on tourism development projects in Kenya, Manyara and Jones say that it ‘reinforce[s] a neo-colonial model, with ... heavy reliance on donor funding reinforcing dependency’ (2007: 630). Along the same lines, Kirsty Blackstock (2005) addresses the three major failings of community tourism. Firstly, it takes a functional approach to community involvement; secondly, it treats host populations as homogeneous blocs; and thirdly, it neglects the structural constraints on local control of the tourism industry. More broadly, Mick Smith notes that the key problem in all the tourism formats that fit into the framework of ethical tourism – including community tourism – is that the industry’s actions behind the scenes bear little resemblance to their ethical campaigns (2013: 617). This is so, the argument continues, because of sophisticated processes by which tourism companies hide the negative aspects of their commercial activities, using various forms of image and imaginary management that include exaggerated ethical claims on the part of their businesses (Henderson 2007). Altogether, the central argument for most of the scholars criticizing community

tourism is that there is a lack of coherence between its underlying messages and its practices.

While there is no shortage of literature advocating or disputing ethical claims in community tourism, these discussions tend to focus on case studies of ‘best practices’ or the opposite. To a lesser degree, authors have provided insights into more fundamental questions about how and why ethical values become associated with community tourism; or how tourists’ ethical and developmental attributes might come to be recognized in community tourism. The crucial question that needs to be answered is this: what places community tourism in the fields of ethics and local development at all?

### *Community Tourism: Development in Tourism*

In the popular discourse of our times, the classification area of the Global South bears the markers of weakness, shortage and underdevelopment (Escobar 1995; Mbembe 2001; Ferguson 2006). In practice, this means the Global South has the character of a social and material terrain that needs to be developed. More than any other region in the Global South, says Achille Mbembe, ‘Africa stands out as the supreme receptacle of the West’s obsession with, and circular discourse about, the facts of “absence”, “lack”, and “non-being”’ (2001: 4). Africa is the field of development par excellence.

The spread of associations between the African continent and incompleteness in the public domain is part of the global political understanding that the world is made up of two unequal halves – the wealthy North and the wanting South – and furthermore, that one half needs to be helped by the other half. This assumption, premised upon a binary ‘donor’ vs. ‘beneficiary’ logic, underpins international development. In the background, however, there are a myriad of ideological scripts encouraging, implicitly or explicitly, such a perception of the world. The most convincing and effective of these scripts originate from the offices of international development organizations (Ferguson 1994). Development rationale cultivates mainstream assumptions of what constitutes a ‘developed’ and ‘developing’ society through hierarchies of values, statistical charts and commensurable indexes of life (Escobar 1984). It is precisely the efficacy of this rationale in promoting a normative reading of the world that assigns Africa to a special state of insufficiency (Mbembe 2001). This rationale and its scripts help to produce a global perception of Africa’s reality in such a way that the continent becomes an open field for the exercising of the authority of international development.

Of course, these arguments are not new. There is a vast body of illuminating literature that critically addresses the strategies of development, aid and humanitarian intervention.<sup>11</sup> Among other scholars, Arturo Escobar, James Ferguson, Charles Piot, Didier Fassin, Tania Li, Gilbert Rist, David Mosse, Gustavo Esteva, Majid Rahnema, Wolfgang Sachs, Serge Latouche and Fabrizio Sabelli have all made valuable contributions in this domain, namely in the so-called post-development theory. But by bringing up these broad perspectives on the character of development rationale, I want to call attention to one of its ramifications: community tourism. Indeed, for the majority of scholars and activists focused on this tourism model, and despite the variety of definitions of community tourism, there is a single aspect on which all seem to agree: community tourism derives from the development industry. As Scarlett Cornelissen says, ‘The theoretical premises of community tourism have a long history, originating from the participatory and empowerment development models that emerged as a new paradigm in development discourse in the 1970s’ (2005: 21). Hence, it is no surprise that international aid agencies are increasingly encouraging and financing NGOs to promote and implement such a concept in the areas rhetorically and symbolically located in the southern, deprived half of the world. As the director of the NGO monitoring community tourism in the Mozambican village of Canhane once told me, ‘Now all the funders, NGOs and communities want community tourism in Africa: it’s the new fashion here.’

One of the most common ways of talking about community tourism is by associating it with the attempt to free local populations from inequality and poverty. Revealingly, this is the very same association usually made to justify, or to legitimize, development interventions. As Björn Hettne says, development ‘has changed in everything except its normative concern with emancipation from inequality and poverty’ (2002: 11). The forces supporting the relevance of the industry of development in the Global South are, to a great extent, the same forces campaigning for community tourism in that region. These are the forces that pushed for the universalization of codes of conduct in tourism, as was evidenced in the famous publication *Global Code of Ethics for Tourism* by the World Tourism Organization in 1999. And these are the same forces that help push the subjects of poverty and inequality into the tourism industry, transforming these subjects into the products and attractions that need to be helped through tourists’ visits.

Community tourism was born from these forces and, therefore, is often accompanied by moralistic assertions, such as ‘Leave the world a better place’ (Sustainable Travel International), ‘Your holiday can make a big difference’ (community-based-tourism.org), ‘Give Sustainability a Local Flair’ (Tourism Intelligence Network), ‘Travel with a cause’ (Ecoteer), ‘Towards a new culture of peace and sustainability’ (Tribal Travel) or ‘Fighting poverty, protecting biodiversity’ (United Nations Volunteers). In community tourism, statements of morality and approval come from various spheres. In May 2015, European Union ambassador to Swaziland, Nicola Bellomo, made the grand claim that ‘community tourism is beneficial to the traveler and destination. It takes development to the grassroots and has great potential to alleviate poverty in rural communities’.<sup>12</sup> The language used to refer to tourists in community tourism is that of social development workers rather than holidaymakers. In such a way, international tourists are conceptualized beyond fun, relaxation and hedonism: they are crusaders against poverty and inequality.

Although community tourism is a product of ‘developmentality’ (Deb 2009), there is not only one singular power behind it. Community tourism is the result of various forces. At the large scale, however, I argue that community tourism has emerged mainly through a process of convergence between two previously differentiated spheres of activity and interests: it is where the forces of development and tourism overlap each other’s domains. The agency generated by the interaction and alliance between these two industries helps to produce a new singular and powerful industry in its own right: the industry of novel development solutions to touristified old problems. I refer to this hybrid industry, in which the strategies, activities and goals of development and tourism are the same, as *developmentourism*.

Developmentourism represents a different phenomenon from ‘development tourism’ (Salazar 2004; Spencer 2010). As I explain more thoroughly in Chapter 3, development tourism is fundamentally about a certain type of tour and touring – the so-called exposure trips or development-oriented tours. The tourists that take these tours remain ‘tourists’, and the international development professionals that work in the areas toured, or that plan, organize or coordinate such tours remain official development representatives. Now, in developmentourism, this distinction is radically blurred. Developmentourism involves the absolute blending of the two domains of activity into each other: development is tourism, and tourism is development. In this way, not only are tourists’ motivations and actions fused with

development work, but the professional undertakings of development employees are also indistinguishable from tourist activities. I contend that developmentourism is the industry that bolsters community tourism.

From the marketing point of view, such a hybrid industry lives through its constant communication of the problems of small-scale societies, and the promotion of new delocalized solutions to those problems. It is through the diffusion of local problems and the potential ability of development professionals and international tourists to solve them that certain populations are constituted as developing communities in community tourism, which in turn allows them to simultaneously gain the status of both development and tourism protagonists; that is, they become useful or valuable assets in the sphere of developmentourism.

### *Community Tourism: Benevolence in Tourism*

Community tourism as a morally superior alternative to the package holiday necessitates no less critical evaluation than any other contemporary form of human activity. Of particular importance, for example, is the way in which the ‘empowered’ hosts create, adapt to, apprehend and appropriate tourists’ demands. In what way do these people project themselves into the collective role of being a ‘developing community’ in tourism? On the part of the tourists, one could wonder what motivates them to engage in and spend money on community development during their leisure time abroad. What or who mobilizes these individuals to incorporate the role of assistants to distant Others?

It is often said that we inhabit an increasingly mobile and interconnected world, in which peoples, ideas, imaginaries and materials flow physically and virtually in time and space. Actually, the world as it is known today exists as evidence of the fact that people and ideas travel (Jamal and Robinson 2012: 3). Basic human needs, such as finding food and shelter, guided most early patterns of travel. In a later stage, trade, escaping natural phenomena like floods or droughts, and military conquest and conflict also played central roles in human travel. Although migration today continues to be largely influenced by the quest for nourishment and safety, in the last five decades or so, ‘having fun and relaxing’ have become conspicuous forces stimulating transnational human mobility. At the end of this sequence, in more recent times, another motive for travelling became popular: benevolence.

By benevolence, I refer to the pursuit of value for the self in such a way that it may also be of potential benefit of others. At the general level, it means a commitment to a policy of moral action for living in society with others. This does not imply the existence of benevolent totalities in the world. What constitutes and counts as benevolence varies depending on time, location, situation, context and experience – benevolence is not singular but plural. At the micro level, benevolence involves an individual's purposive acts, or inclination to act, to further her/his moral self-enrichment by benefiting others. In this regard, I find David Hume's ([1751] 1998) moral philosophy particularly relevant in my analysis of the politics of benevolence in community tourism. Hume related benevolence to the origins of morality and, in contrast to Kant, he did not see benevolent action as necessarily motivated by obligation or duty. For Hume, the lack of duty in, for example, a charitable act is what attributes the virtue of benevolence to that act. Accordingly, going on vacation is not a duty, and neither is humanitarian behaviour while on holidays. Indeed, holidays are commonly associated with the opposite of duty. They are a period of time devoted to pleasure or relaxation, a break from the constraints of obligations. This is why people's meritorious practices during this period of a 'break from it all' are especially related to benevolence. These are optional practices and for that reason, at least in public and strategic discourses, they can gain the character of benevolence.

From the satisfaction of basic human needs to the pursuit of self-cultivation by acting benevolently towards distant others, the motivations underlining the history of human travel are vast (e.g. Cohen 1972; Crompton 1979; Dann 1981; Gnoth 1997; George 2001; Venkatesh 2006). This variety of motivations opens the door for new fields of inquiry and reasoning. Robert Fletcher (2014), for example, suggests that the recent increase in participation in rigorous and strenuous ecotourism activities resonates with the cultural values of upper-middle-class Westerners, who constitute the majority of ecotourists. According to Fletcher, typical characteristics in ecotourism's outdoor activities, such as the delay of gratification, determination through suffering and willingness to assume risks, reproduce the faculties originally cultivated to further individual professional success in North-Atlantic societies. Indeed, we should not forget a simple but fundamental premise: the practices and structures of travelling are indicative of the social, economic, historical and material contexts from which the demand for them emerges.

Following this perspective, the contemporary emergence of community tourism in ‘the South’ should be interpreted, among other sources, within the politics of travel and benevolence in the tourists’ own societies. Whether referred to as ‘moral tourists’ (Butcher 2003), travellers, visitors, ‘new tourists’ (Poon 1993), ‘guests’ (Smith 1989), ‘justice tourists’ (Pezzullo 2007), ‘political tourists’ (Moynagh 2008) or even friends, all these individuals who travel and spend their time and money in community-based lodges are, nonetheless, consumers. What makes these tourist-consumers more responsible, more ethical than other tourists travelling to the casinos in Las Vegas or the sun in Majorca is their explicit willingness to participate in the solution of problems in the societies they visit with their consuming behaviour. In practice, they express goodness through commodity consumption. They embody the righteousness of action by consuming for the ‘significant Other’. Under this view, and in contrast to the destructive character commonly attributed to tourism (e.g. Nash 1977; Crick 1989), tourists visiting Canhane in Mozambique are not seen as irresponsible hedonists. Rather, they are celebrated for their benign character. Hence, it is possible to integrate Canhane into a contemporary way of vacationing that implicitly links tourists to the well-being of societies ‘in need’. To put it differently, community tourism in the Mozambican village of Canhane is part of a more general trend in tourists’ North-Atlantic societies. This is a trend that connects consumption behaviour with the lives of Others – tourists can engage in moral action and ‘make a difference’ through their informed, conscious decisions about where and of what to consume while vacationing. The webs of meaning that associate such consumption decisions with an ethics of benevolence are critically analysed in this book.

### *Community Tourism: Consuming (as) Self-Cultivation*

Since its origin, and regardless of the variety of forms that it takes, community tourism has been associated with alternative development approaches concerned with issues beyond strict economic reasoning (e.g. Telfer 2012). More critically, however, one could say that it descends from a system that generates market novelties. Besides deriving from the international development industry, this is a system in line also with the economies of production and consumption in North-Atlantic societies. These economies are mostly fuelled by the constant replacement of what is no longer new – a

continual renovation and renewal which both Joseph Schumpeter and Friedrich Nietzsche called 'creative destruction'.

Among other authors, Zygmunt Bauman (2008) says that the structural engine driving North-Atlantic economies, where most of international ethical tourists originate, is the pursuit of gratification through the purchasing of tangible and intangible things. Without the continuous production and acquisition of commodities, the gross national product (GNP), which is the official index of collective well-being, is low. This tells us why today's poorer class, at least in capitalist societies, is made up of non-consumers. Certainly, societies energized through commodity consumption depend on humans' cyclical dissatisfaction, rather than fulfilment, with their possessions and situation. This, in turn, leads to humans' continual search for solutions to their dissatisfaction in the market. Colin Campbell calls it the 'cycle of desire-acquisition-use-disillusionment-renewed desire' (1987: 90), and identifies 'insatiability' as 'the most characteristic feature of modern consumption' (37).

Following this reasoning, a main argument developed in this book is that the consumption of vacation experiences in the community tourism's form in Canhane, as in most 'elsewheres' in the Global South, is part of the tourist-consumer quest for a new moralized 'I'. This relates to a mode of being-in-the-world – Heidegger's (1996) *Dasein* – that encourages the individual to conceptualize herself/himself as a project that needs to be continuously improved and developed. It therefore entails a strong emphasis on self-actualization, an injunction to fully engage in life by spending time and money improving oneself (Fletcher 2014: 66) – always *becoming*, rather than *being* (Bauman 2008: 13).

Community tourism is often an opportunity for tourists engaging in projects of social change abroad. However, while allowing the moralization of tourism (Butcher 2003), community tourism also provides the conditions for tourists to reform their own selves. Taking part in community tourism is more meaningful than simply going on vacation. It is a moral event in which the act of consuming 'for others' can work also as a way for the consumer to acquire – even provisionally, as most of all gratifications in the commodity world are provisional – a moral 'I'.

Tourism activity has been widely mentioned as an opportunity for individuals to remove themselves from their everyday routines and social pressures where they live (e.g. MacCannell 1973; Turner and Turner 1978; Graburn 1983; Leed 1991). What has been less explored is how tourism can be used as a way for individuals to



reformulate themselves; resorted to as a means to be ‘born again’, morally; or, to build upon Regina Bendix’s words, as ‘central to the project of be[com]ing human’ (2002: 472). In this book, I further explore this view. I analyse the production, embodiment and diffusion of moral strategies in tourism activity as part of a project of becoming human, or rather, becoming *humane*. I develop the argument that the ethical register associated with community-based tourism is the product of the campaign of a large-scale industry that sells solutions to both local social problems in the Global South and existential ethical crises in ‘the North’. In practice, these solutions are about the making of horizons of hope for the local populations, and the production of commodities of self-cultivation and spiritual elevation for the international tourist-consumers.

Although I specifically consider the village of Canhane, community tourism is a phenomenon that goes far beyond the local scale and the blending of development with tourism. As already addressed, analysing community tourism, as I propose to do here, allows us to engage with the progressive politics of individuals’ self-making, as well as with questions of hope, representation, social and economic development, ethics/morality, non-governmental governance, and transnational systems of power in the contemporary world. My last and fundamental wish is that the information and reasoning presented in this book will be inspiring to the reader and will add ‘something else’ to our knowledge about the variety of ways, possibilities and politics implied in the quest for the ‘humanely human’ in contemporary life.

## Contextualizing Knowledge

The world and the realities that inhabit it are subjective and relational. Academic articles, reports and books should be considered in terms of this reasoning. They come from somewhere and are created by someone. In particular, anthropology acquired its historical legitimacy from ‘being there’, in the sense that the researcher witnesses and assumes an active role in the subjects of study. There is no passivity here: the personal characteristics of the anthropologist are inevitably and actively implied in the type of information produced and, therefore, are integral to the outcomes of the research. What comes to be anthropological knowledge is nothing more than a version of reality provisionally determined by specific methods in which the body and background of the researcher matter.

That said, the most credible and honest way I know to present this book is to relate the way the information and knowledge that support it were produced, and to disclose any personal idiosyncrasies that may have helped or hindered in this process. Familiarizing the reader with the ethnographer may help diminish the aura of mysticism that often hovers over the idea of fieldwork, and can demonstrate how problematic such a process can be. Thus, the condition of introducing the figure of the researcher and first-person descriptions into the text goes beyond style. Rather, it is a matter of validity that involves the partial view through which knowledge is created, namely through someone's experience.

In January 2008, when I was on my way to the town of Chókwe in a *chapa* (the most common public form of transportation in Mozambique, the Toyota Hiace), I initiated a fruitful conversation with a woman in the seat next to me. She had lived for two years in Massingir, which was the district where I would eventually establish myself. She introduced me to some of the characteristics of the region. Other people inside the van started participating in the conversation, sharing the names of people they knew who could be useful for my work. The driver also joined in. He heard me say that I was living in Germany, so he commented about how good the Germans are for the Mozambicans. He drew a parallel with what he called the 'colonists', saying that, in contrast to the Germans, the 'colonists' still think of Mozambique as their colony and not as an independent country. He was referring to the Portuguese.

The driver continued with this topic, always in a critical way, until he asked me if I knew Portuguese people in Germany. I then announced myself as Portuguese. The interior of the van, containing some sixteen people, became instantly silent. The lively and informative talk we had been having up to this point was replaced by expressions of embarrassment, and the next hour and a half of travel was mostly silent. By revealing my nationality, I had eliminated any chance of continuing the conversation and, perhaps, accessing more important information, as I had been until that point (although the collective reaction to my nationality can be interpreted as important information in itself). The environment in the *chapa* was suggestive of what I could expect for the next year in southwest Mozambique. Indeed, I was about to establish myself in the interior of the province of Gaza, which was one of the regions in the country most resistant to Portuguese hegemony (Liesegang 2007) and, according to various scholars, the heart of the 'Shangaan sense of superiority' (Lubkemann 2005: 501).

A Portuguese person in the countryside of southwest Mozambique is not neutral, and can inspire extremes; as I was told once, admitting to being Portuguese can stimulate sentiments of both love and hate from the residents. The knowledge of my nationality might have limited my access to certain topics, inhibited the sharing of views on specific issues, increased suspicion about my long-term presence in the countryside, and even contributed to perceptions of me as a sort of ‘colonial’ spy. What I want to make clear here is that, as a Portuguese anthropologist, announcing neutrality in a Lusophone postcolonial setting is not acceptable; being Portuguese in Mozambique inevitably affects the politics of fieldwork and, in turn, the construction of knowledge.

The main region where I conducted research is highly patriarchal, showing strong gender-based structural differences. As a man, I occupied a position in the social structure of the village of Canhane that a woman researcher could never attain, in the same way that a woman researcher could access and generate information that I never could. The fundamental intimacy of face-to-face research in the village was shaped by the local gender order. Hence, regardless of my effort to accomplish a pluralistic perspective and represent multiple voices, a disproportion in gender perspectives exists, and therefore the female voice is somewhat less prominent in this book.

In contrast to the coastal area of Mozambique, being *branco* (white), as I used to be called by random people, in the inner east region of the province of Gaza is not discreet. Among other aspects, being *branco* carries implications of excessive public attention with regard to one’s behaviour. This enormous interest in one person’s individuality can obviously affect the productivity of fieldwork, particularly by fostering a sort of chronic, long-term psychological fatigue, diminishing the capacity to maintain tactful and emphatic behaviour so commonly identified as essential qualities in ‘the field’.

Finally, with regard to myself as ‘tourist’: to approach tourism through the lens of anthropology implies dealing with one of the biggest threats to the legitimacy that derives from anthropology’s methodology; a methodology founded in the idea of ‘getting close to people and making them feel comfortable’ with that (Bernard 2006: 342). Anthropologists have long pointed out the similarities between their empirical work and tourists’ activities. Sidney Mintz, for example, referred to anthropologists as ‘serious tourists’ (1977: 59–60), Pierre van den Berghe ‘in-depth tourists’ (1980: 370), and Jean-Paul Dumont ‘sophisticated tourists’ (1977: 224). Of course, this association is even more loudly voiced outside the discipline.

Geographer Jim Butcher, for example, goes a step further and says that the field of 'New Tourism is a little like amateur anthropology' (2000: 46). While, in the popular arena, anthropology seems to have succeeded in divorcing itself from colonialism (Lewis 1973), in the last decades, however, it has gained a new partner: tourism. More subtle than before, this new coupling raises unvoiced concerns within the profession about what anthropology is and where it is headed (Wolf 1980).

Arguably, the growing spread of the equivalence between anthropology and tourism may justify why anthropologists, in particular those that conduct fieldwork in regions popularly known as tourist destinations, continually confront and defend their professional status against the image of the tourist. In fact, over the years, whether in conferences, small workshops or private conversations, I have noticed numerous manifestations of this anxiety about legitimacy in my fellow anthropologists.

So far, this is a largely confused subject because it is about the construction and demarcation of a status by anthropologists themselves – the self-proclaimed non-tourists. By saying this, I do not want to trivialize its relevance. For example, a great percentage of the anthropology students coming to my Anthropology of Tourism seminar are in search of such clarification. They are concerned with their anthropologist-selves, and resort to my seminar to find convincing arguments that they can use to soothe their identitarian embarrassment. What has become evident for me is that most of them feared tourists, as they represent something close to what the anthropology students idealize as their professional lives, while at the same time also representing what they as anthropologists should never become.

Let me give a concrete example from the classroom that, I believe, illustrates to a great extent the politics of distinction, not only by anthropology students but even more markedly by established anthropologists, in relation to the tourists. At some point in the seminar, I assign a task to my students in which they have to play a role. I divide the class into two different groups: long-term tourists interested in local culture travelling to a certain region, and anthropologists travelling to the same region during the same period of time for fieldwork research. In the second half of the class, each group presents what they intend to do in order to pursue their goals. The results are often uncomfortably enlightening. Basically, both 'tourists' and 'anthropologists' do the same things. The difference comes from the labels they attribute to what they do. I find this revealing because it illustrates accurately many of the discussions I have with

other anthropologists researching tourism. What the outcomes of this exercise reveal – even, I suggest, beyond the classroom – is that the specialized labels used by the group of ‘anthropologists’ to represent their ethnographic methods are no more than a conspicuous attempt to claim difference from the ‘tourists’.

To clarify my position, the differences that might exist between anthropologists and tourists do not come from the posture or methods employed in ‘the field’, but depend rather on what one does or makes with the information acquired and produced while there. This book is the product of my own making. In this vein, I believe it materializes the result of my stay in the village of Canhane in such a way that it can be considered anthropological.

## **Book Overview**

Tourism, development and the Mozambican village of Canhane (its residents and materials) constitute the backbone that binds together all the chapters in this book. Yet I extend the themes and space of discussion further than these in order to accomplish cross-cultural comparative perspectives. This approach reflects my general belief that a critical analysis of an array of subjects and multilocal angles, together with an assessment of the global forces at work, provide the clearest route towards the anthropological understanding of what makes people who they are, and of the hows, whats and whys of their aspirations.

I make use of discourses, ideologies, performances and sensorial dispositions implicated in the production of new sites of meaning. I analyse these productions and sites of meaning mostly through the study of the agency generated by the blending of development with tourism. Finally, the arguments presented here draw upon fourteen months of fieldwork undertaken by me in Mozambique, mainly in the village of Canhane, between 2006 and 2008.<sup>13</sup>

In each chapter, I focus on a different theme. Each of these is marked by ethnography and theoretical specificity. In the next section, Chapter 1, I introduce the reader to the village of Canhane, through what is basically an ethnographic descriptive account of the implementation of community-based tourism in the village. Critical discussions of community tourism are not explicitly part of this initial section of the book. This chapter, however, is essential to provide a factual context to serve as the basis for the theorizing in the book.

Community tourism is a practice of vacationing that helps to constitute situated realities and delocalized subjectivities, according to which people can strategize about themselves and others. Although this might seem obvious, it is worth emphasizing that the starting point for any community-based tourism is the demarcation of a specific group of people as ‘the community’. What makes a community in tourism? Why is the concept of community used in the way that it is? Not surprisingly, the discussion around the concept of the concept of community suggests an analysis that extends beyond the field of tourism. Accordingly, Chapter 2 is an attempt to deconstruct the meanings of community as one of the most conspicuous categories to have emerged since ethics became a determinant in tourism. I demonstrate that in development, in tourism, and in the industry that results from the blending of the two, the particular ways in which ‘community’ is evoked help to promote and constitute specialized economies of performance. Declarations of community also serve to cultivate certain expectations and imaginaries in the tourists’ minds, specifically related to ideals of purity, harmony and escapism, to the exclusion of other possible ones. Ultimately, in Chapter 2, I focus on the nature of the meanings of community in community tourism and explore their consequences.

In Chapter 3, I take a comparative approach between two villages in Mozambique: Canhane and Mbueca. The starting point for the discussion is the strategic representations of tourists as protagonists of assistance in the two societies. The ways such representations are locally produced and reproduced reflect something broader: the emerging interlaced relationship between the development and tourism industries. I introduce the concept of developmentourism in this section. As in many other destination societies in the Global South, in the villages of Canhane and Mbueca, development and tourism are merged into one singular practice. This is a practice that exceeds the meanings conveyed in the familiar concepts available to characterize either development or tourism practices. The concept of developmentourism captures the undifferentiated character of this hybrid industry, and this is empirically supported by the residents’ representations of the international tourists as donors and the international donors as tourists. I analyse the broader economic and moral order informing the local politics of representation in destination societies and the ascent of worldwide developmentourism.

Chapter 4 is about a dilemma motivated by the allocation of tourism benefits in the village of Canhane. I discuss the role of space and infrastructure in ordering the social, and how efforts at

development and ‘community empowerment’ through tourism can prompt local conflicts. The spotlight is on water supply. With profound water shortages persisting in the village, the local residents decided to invest revenue generated through the community tourism business in a water supply system. Since its completion, however, the village has experienced contradictory social upheaval. Although the water system is functioning, in practice it is not being used. In this chapter, I address the reasons behind the water supply paradox in Canhane. I hope to transmit what I felt while experiencing the enigma of water use in the village: a paradox that seemed to require a detective of social causes to unravel residents’ neglect of what they most wanted.

Chapter 5 proceeds from the conclusions of the previous chapter. This is one of the most ethnographic sections in the entire book. The contradictory outcomes of the water supply situation in Canhane, as discussed before, are analysed in a different way, specifically through the practice of a tourist walking tour. I explore the role of immediate sensation in the knowledge that results from tourists’ participation in that tour. I try to lead the reader through this walking tour, as it is sold in the community tourism lodge in the village. I then discuss the processes and the underlining logic leading to the institutionalization of ordinary places, materials and people as tourist attractions. My goal here is to explore why the inoperable water tank, installed by the residents with the money generated by the local tourism venture, has become the tourists’ most visited sight. While digging deeper into the hidden nature of community tourism, this chapter is ultimately an analysis of the regulation principle of walking tours and of the sensory in tourism activity. In this spirit, I address the tourist subject as a sensing subject. I argue that tourists’ ethical meanings in Canhane reside not only in the so-recognized power of the gaze and representation in tourism, but fundamentally in direct sensing.

In Chapter 6, I show how the residents of the village of Canhane have adopted and put into practice the principle that their development and tourism value relies on them being poor. I conceptualize poverty as a strategic and technocratic category invested as a field of development tourism intervention as well as a category of *potential* integration for local residents. I think of ‘potential’ here as a condition in its own right, which makes things happen, and not as something inconsequential, lying somewhere between what does not exist and what might come to pass. From this perspective, I analyse the production of both subject-problems and their solutions. Finally, I

reason about the role of such a production in ethical tourist consumption. To demonstrate my point, I go beyond Canhane and community tourism, and I engage in case studies of slum tourism in the Global South.

Finally, Chapter 7 is the most conclusive. Here, I explore the role of tourist moral agency in governing. Community tourism in Canhane is the effect of a capitalist expansion in which ethics, development and governance are conflated with tourists' consumption. I demonstrate in this final section that the commodifying logic emerging from the presence of tourists in the village derives primarily from three subjects: tourists' self-aspirations, residents' ambition to integrate into extensive webs of opportunity, and the politicization of virtue stimulated by the development tourism industry. This chapter shows how the cultivation of ethics through tourism consumption has become an ally for the exercise of non-governmental governance over public spheres.

This book results from seven years of discussions, reflections and commitment. It is also a product of personal perseverance and, most of all, enjoyment, and I hope the reader also enjoys it. I did not write it only for anthropologists, but for all those dedicated to considering the world as it is now and ourselves within it. In other words, although I approach the world we live in mostly through the lens of community tourism, this book is fundamentally a reflection of what make people simultaneously subjects and objects, governors and the governed, self and Other in it.

## Notes

1. In consonance with Karen Barad, by 'performative understanding' I mean an understanding not limited to the representationalist power of words. 'Performativity,' Barad says, 'is precisely a contestation of the excessive power granted to language to [understand and, thus,] determine what is real' (2003: 802). Hence, this implies the recognition of the nonrepresentational capacities and efficacious powers of material configurations (Bennett 2010: ix) and sensorial grasp in the process of understanding.
2. For a similar approach see, for example, Brennan (2004), Evans-Pritchard (1989), Stronza (2007) and Theodossopoulos (2014).
3. By subjectivities, I mean three interrelated phenomena: (a) humans' ways of perceiving, thinking, feeling, understanding and aspiring; (b) the



ideas, realities, values and truths that these generate; and (c) the broader forces that produce and organize them – these forces may be cultural, social, political or material. In this sense, subjectivities are necessarily ‘dynamically formed and transformed’ (Biehl, Good and Kleinman 2007: 10), as well as always unfinished and unfinishable. They are inherent to both ways of being and means of governance. Yet, as João Biehl and colleagues say, subjectivities are more than ‘just the outcome of social control or the unconscious’; they also provide ‘the ground for subjects to think through their circumstances’ (2007: 14).

4. Here and throughout the book, I do not refer to benevolence uncritically, as an absolute equivalent to kindness, altruism or generosity. Benevolence is not free of strategies and politics, and therefore it can serve political and economic interests. As the reader will understand more comprehensively during the series of events and arguments that I narrate and explain in the next seven chapters, I do not approach benevolence as an independent intuitive structure of feeling. Rather, I consider benevolence as a performative inclination or behaviour that can be structured and even deliberately governed by broader interests and forces. Hence, when I argue that we are now witnessing an unprecedented emergence of benevolent trends in tourism, I obviously do not intend to imply that these are absolute and unproblematic modes of goodness.
5. There is a growing body of literature in this domain. See, for example, Butcher (2003, 2007), Macbeth (2005), Cravatte and Chabloz (2008), Fennell (2008), Higgins-Desboilles and Russell-Mundine (2008), Jamal and Menzel (2009), Mowforth and Munt (2009), Butcher and Smith (2010, 2015), Pritchard, Morgan and Ateljevic (2011), Scheyvens (2011), McCabe, Minnaert and Diekmann (2012), McGehee (2012) and Mostafanezhad and Hannam (2014).
6. Although the term *consumption* can be referred to the use of non-commodified goods (Hugh-Jones 1995; Wilk 2004), I use it in relation to commodities (e.g. Miller 1995).
7. Among other anthropologists and works, these have an explicit and significant impact in my argumentation: on *development*, Escobar (1988, 1995), Ferguson (1994, 2006), Mosse (2005, 2013), Li (2007b) and Rottenburg (2009); on *consumption*, Douglas and Isherwood (1979), Baudrillard (1981), Bourdieu (1984), Carrier (1990), Wilk (2001), Graeber (2011) and Miller (1992, 2012); and on *ethics*, Robbins (2004), Lambek (2010), Fassin (2011), Faubion (2011) and Zigon (2014).
8. [http://www.planeterra.org/pages/community\\_based\\_tourism/37.php](http://www.planeterra.org/pages/community_based_tourism/37.php), accessed 19 May 2010.
9. <http://www.responsibletravel.com/Copy/Copy901197.htm>, accessed 19 May 2010.
10. <http://www.divinecaroline.com/33/55728-community-based-tourism-brings-experience#ixzz25lW97DeZ>, accessed 8 August 2012.

11. In the late 1980s and early 1990s, the relationship between anthropology and development was redefined. There was a fundamental shift from applied forms of ‘development anthropology’ to a more detached ‘anthropology of development’. The latter implied an explicit focus on the very institutions and forms of knowledge through which ideas of development were produced. Therefore, from initially being regarded as a self-evident process, development began to be understood as an ‘invention’ and as the means by which its supposed superiority was tautologically reproduced. This shift motivated anthropologists to question the apparatus that was ‘doing’ the development (see Yarrow and Venkatesan 2012: 3).
12. <http://www.observer.org.sz/business/73090-private-sector-must-steer-tourism-initiatives-eu.html>, accessed 4 June 2015.
13. In this book, I do not use pseudonyms nor do I refer to the names of the participants. However, there are passages in which who I refer to is obvious, as for example with the community leader of a village or the head of an NGO. In these cases, the acknowledgement of their social or professional positions is important for the arguments at stake. Yet all the people I interacted with and who I quote or simply mention were aware of my research and they authorized me to use our conversations and any photos in which they might be pictured for the purposes of my writings.