Pergamon

Annals of Tourism Research, Vol. 27, No. 2, pp. 371–390, 2000

Printed in Great Britain
0160-7383/00/$20.00

www.elsevier.com/locate/atoures

PII: S0160-7383(99)00065-1

POWER AND TOURISM
A Foucauldian Observation

So-Min Cheong
Marc L. Miller
University of Washington, USA

Abstract: Tourism outcomes are often regarded as driven by the tourist. The influence of tourism on society is often anticipated to be negative. This conceptual paper extends the power vocabulary of Michel Foucault to challenge the exclusivity of this view. Power is conceptualized as omnipresent in a tripartite system of tourists, locals, and brokers. The Foucauldian framework reveals that the tourist—like the madman and the incarcerated criminal—is frequently vulnerable to the composite gaze of others. Further, the framework shows that productive power generates touristic knowledge. This orientation to touristic power recommends increased analytical attention to the role of brokers prominent in tourism development. **Keywords:** Foucault, power, tourism system, broker. © 2000 Elsevier Science Ltd. All rights reserved.

Résumé: Pouvoir et tourisme: une observation foucauldienne. Les résultats du tourisme sont souvent considérés comme étant déterminés par le touriste. On suppose souvent que l'influence du tourisme sur la société sera négative. Cet article théorique apporte le vocabulaire du pouvoir de Michel Foucault pour mettre en question l'exclusivité de ce point de vue. Le pouvoir est conceptualisé comme étant omniprésent dans un système tripartite de touristes, habitants et intermédiaires. Le cadre foucauldien révèle que le touriste, tout comme le fou ou le criminel incarcéré, est souvent vulnérable au regard fixe composite des autres. En plus, ce cadre montre que le pouvoir productif génère les connaissances touristiques. Cette orientation au pouvoir touristique fait appel à une attention analytique intensifiée aux intermédiaires occupant une place importante dans le développement du tourisme. **Mots-clés:** Foucault, pouvoir, système de tourisme, intermédiaire. © 2000 Elsevier Science Ltd. All rights reserved.

INTRODUCTION

From the perspective of Western society, tourism is often understood as a product of the individual decisions of tourists. The relationship forged between the tourist and the local is routinely depicted as socioeconomic in character; tourists and locals interact either in a warm social milieu as "guests and hosts", or in the economic marketplace as "consumers and producers". Where a power

So-Min Cheong (Department of Geography at the University of Washington Email: ⟨somin@u.washington.edu⟩) holds a B.A. from Yonsei University (Korea) and M.A. in International Studies and Marine Affairs (University of Washington). Her research concerns regional economic development and coastal tourism. **Marc Miller**, a cultural anthropologist and Professor in the School of Marine Affairs has research interests in marine recreation, coastal zone management, and environmental ethics.

relationship is perceived to exist as between First World tourists and Third and Fourth World locals, this power is interpreted as colonial and imperialistic with a high potential for negative distributional outcomes. With this view, the influences of the tourist on the social world are expected to be at best benign, while more likely to be seriously negative.

Indicative of the negative perceptions of tourism and tourists in contemporary Western society are the pejorative connotations of the terms. Commonly the tourism phenomenon is condemned for its creation of unthinking and materialistic consumers, and the rise of an irresponsible and greedy industry. Similarly, people readily stigmatize others as tourists while denying the applicability of the label to themselves. Furthermore, power as allegedly exercised by the tourist over other people produces negative consequences. These include the display of materialistic consumerism, the commodification of culture, and the one-sided domination and exploitation of members of visited societies by the privileged class. That people so routinely experience ambivalence about the prospect of becoming tourists may reflect a basic misunderstanding of the position of tourists in power relationships. This leads to questions as to whether excess attention to the actions of tourists—as opposed to those of other institutional actors—is warranted, whether power should be always identified with the tourist, and whether the exercise of power is one-sided and exclusively repressive.

This paper responds to these questions by invoking the political thought of Michel Foucault. The thesis developed is that there is power everywhere in tourism. At the individual level, power relationships in the behavior of tourists among others are often constrained and managed. At the institutional level, the industry produces a vast network of specialties and services. It is thus appropriate to review here the ways in which power relations in tourism have been examined in several academic literatures. In the main body of the paper, four core features of Foucauldian power are introduced and subsequently discussed in the tourism context.

A recent report prepared for the World Tourism Organization (WTO) shows that domestic and international tourism in 1995 combined to created over 200 million jobs worldwide. Output reached US$3.4 trillion in the same year, and the industry's contribution to the world's gross domestic product reached 11.4% (Waters 1996:6). Demographic statistics demonstrate that more people engage in pleasure and business tourism than ever before. WTO experts have estimated that in the year 2020 roughly 1.6 billion of the world's 7.8 billion people will take a foreign trip (Crossette 1998:5). In light of such expansion in the business, tourism studies merit considerable attention.

Introductory textbooks promoting a multidisciplinary perspective on tourism have been compiled by specialists with backgrounds in tourism structure (Gee, Choy and Makens 1997), hospitality and business management (McIntosh and Goeldner 1990), state planning and marketing (Gregory and Goodall 1990; Gunn 1988;

Rosenow and Pulsipher 1979), marketing (Fesenmaier, O'Leary and Uysal 1996; Plog 1991), and current issues (Shaw and Williams 1994). Relative to the substantial attention given to the practical business and marketing of tourism and its economic costs and benefits, very little is presented about its political nature. Ritchie and Goeldner's (1987:6–12) edited handbook, *Travel, Tourism, and Hospitality Research*, is the only beginning text with a chapter that focuses on the industry's political dimensions. In recent years, the political study of tourism has slowly gained recognition as a subfield of its own. Research may be classified into two broad categories. In the first category are public policy and planning analyses. Richter emphasizes that "there is often a political agenda—wise or foolish, benign or selfish, compatible or incompatible—underlying the explicit tourism program" (1989:19). However, tourism policy is often entangled with, or subordinate to, other policies, which may well hinder policy intervention in development and weaken the representation of the stakeholders in such places. The policy and planning studies have addressed this problem and advocated community solutions to tourism opportunities and problems (Elliott 1983; Farrell 1986; Murphy 1985; Reed 1997; Ringer 1993; Whittaker 1997). The appropriateness of tourism development among planners, developers, and locals is a hotly debated issue in all this literature. Reed (1997), for instance, has explicitly explored the power relations among stakeholders as these are affected by community-based tourism planning activities in British Columbia, Canada.

The second category of research includes political economy and development studies. One analytical trend has involved a market-oriented view of development policies and a focus on structural adjustments to the changing global economy. Researchers such as Hall (1994), de Kadt (1979), Lea (1988), Matthews (1978), and Poirier (1995) have documented the process of tourism development *vis-à-vis* other national/international development programs. A more critical approach in development studies is revealed in research that examines issues of unequal development, and the hierarchical relationships that embody the hegemonic power of developed nations and transnational corporations. In this regard, such researchers as Britton (1989), Francisco (1983), Mowforth and Munt (1998), and Place (1995) point to the perpetual problem of dependency even in the age of new tourism designed to remedy the unequal balance of power between rich and poor, and society and environment. The one-sided flow of power delineated in some of these studies has been contested in light of the research that explores the global–local nexus. In making this case, some researchers (Cameron 1997; Milne 1998; Oakes 1995; Shaw and Williams 1998) illustrate the global–local flows of power, claiming that locals are not always passive when facing economic and social change. Instead of accepting their predicament, locals can be proactive and resistant, as they constantly negotiate and contest the direction of development in the pursuit of their rights and interests.

The incorporation of local activism in these studies has added a new dimension to the familiar binary picture of dominated locals pitted against the dominator industry and tourists. With this change of perspective, power operates in both directions, and the assumption of the continual oppression of the locals is rejected. Even so, few studies have looked at the manner in which power relationships govern the behavior of tourists in tourism systems. To address this oversight, the paper considers how Michel Foucault's conceptualization of power is pertinent to the study of tourism.

FOUCAULT, POWER AND TOURISM

Michel Foucault is widely acknowledged as one of the most influential thinkers in the Western intellectual tradition (Dreyfus and Rabinow 1982; McNay 1994; Sheridan 1980). To date, a small number of scholars in the overlapping fields of postmodernism and cultural studies have employed Foucault's concepts in the study of tourism. Studies have, for example, concentrated on aspects of gaze (Hollinshead 1994; Labone 1996; Rojek 1992; Urry 1990), body (Veijola and Jokinen 1994), and resistance (Wearing 1995). These studies have, however, interpreted power in very generalized terms and have utilized Foucault's particular concept of power in oblique ways. This paper is not concerned with postmodernist theses and instead focuses intensively on Foucauldian power. This entails an interest in Foucault more as a political scientist than as a philosopher, social historian, or transdisciplinary figure. His interest in power *per se* is evident in his study of topics as varied as madness, criminal punishment, and sexuality. In short, Foucault (1988d:102) was stimulated to examine how power was ubiquitous and central in institutions.

Foucault and Power

The key features of Foucauldian power pertinent to a consideration of tourism include three preliminary points. First, Foucault challenges what he sees to be a mainstream conceptualization of power as "a certain strength" with which people are endowed (1978:93). Elaborating on his idea, he explains:

> By power, I do not mean "Power" as a group of institutions and mechanisms that ensure the subservience of the citizens of a given state. By power, I do not mean, either, a mode of subjugation, which, in contrast to violence, has the form of the rule. Finally, I do not have in mind a general system of domination exerted by one group over another, a system whose effects, through successive derivations, pervade the entire social body (1978:92).

Second, Foucault reconsiders power in a more fluid way than that brought to mind by an inventory of formal laws and rules, or a vision of an exercise of power by one dominant group over another. Power for Foucault is a "complex strategical situation", consisting

of "multiple and mobile field of force relations" that are never completely stable (1978:93–102). In viewing power as a relationship rather than an entity, and in seeing power to flow in multiple directions, Foucault finds common ground with most political scientists. Third, Foucault insists that power is so inextricably wedded to knowledge that one cannot be analytically considered without the other. In recognition that "[t]he exercise of power perpetually creates knowledge and, conversely, knowledge constantly induces effects of power", Foucault (1980a:52) meshes the two concepts into "power–knowledge" in many of his writings.

Against this backdrop, several main features of Foucauldian power—its omnipresence, its form as relationships, its gaze, and its repressive and productive aspects—are presented next. (For detailed discussion of how Foucault regards the mechanisms and technologies of power, see Foucault 1980a:38–39; 1977:19, 135–169.)

The Omnipresence of Power. Focusing primarily on power in explaining all human affairs, Foucault virtually assigns himself the role of a political scientist. He sees power everywhere,

> ...not because it has the privilege of consolidating everything under its invincible unity, but because it is produced from one moment to the next, at the very point, or rather in every relation from one point to another (1978:93).

This leads one to interpret all situations as embedding power relationships. Hence, power exists 'between every point of a social body, between a man a woman, between the members of a family, between a master and a pupil" (1980 d:187). Given such an orientation, power is to be expected to be present in institutions of all kinds. Foucault makes the case that the question of power is not limited to institutions of economic significance but extends to the lesser ones of "psychiatric internment, the mental normalization of individuals, and penal institutions" (1980c:116). Thus, seemingly nonpolitical institutions also create specific power relations and particular mechanisms of power useful for the general functioning of the formal politics.

Power in a Network of Relations. For Foucault, power is not a commodity or a possession tied to a particular individual or collective entity:

> We must not look for who has the power ... and who is deprived of it; nor for who has the right to know and who is forced to remain ignorant. We must seek, rather, the pattern of the modifications which the relationships of force imply by the very nature of their process (1978:99).

The view of power as existing within a set of specific relationships opposes all notions of it that depend on the subjectivity or agency from which it originates. Instead of stressing the role of the individual *per se*, Foucault emphasizes one's place/position within a network of relations. He does not disregard the role of human agency and its

power to transform society. For individuals are always in the position of simultaneously undergoing and exercising this power: "They are not only its inert or consenting target. Individuals are vehicles of power not its points of application" (1980b:98). Given the elusive character of power which is "circulating and never localized here or there, never in anybody's hands, never appropriated as a commodity or piece of wealth", a variety of people can possess and dispossess power in varying circumstances, and at different points in time and place (1980b:98).

This idea of power relations also defies the binary social structure of "dominators" on one side and "dominated" on the other. Instead, the specific and multiple production of relations of power manifests itself in different localized settings with their own rationalites, histories, and mechanisms (Foucault 1988b:37–38). For him, the localized settings mark "the point where power reaches into the very grain of individuals, touches their bodies and inserts itself into their actions and attitudes, their discourses, learning processes and everyday lives" (1980a:39). In examining power relationships, then, the first Foucauldian task is to identify the *targets* and the *agents* that structure the differentiated positions of individuals in a localized institution/system: "What is needed is a study of power in its external visage, at the point where it is in direct and immediate relationship with that which we can provisionally call its object, its target, its field of application" (1980b:97). The target is the subordinate actor in power relationship and exists in relation to the agents. In Foucault's varied works, targets have included the prisoner, the insane, and the child in prison, mental clinic, and home/school institutions (1978, 1977, 1975).

Foucault's agents are "responsible for [phenomena of repression or exclusion]" and consist of "the immediate social entourage, the family, parents, doctors, *etc*." (1980b:101). They include chief inspectors, subordinates, educators, magistrates, doctors, guards, family, and psychiatrists in these institutions. Agents repress/produce the child's sexuality, imprison the criminal, and confine the insane for economic or political gain. The target retains the choice of potential refusal or revolt. Thus, the agent derives power not from pure force but from inducement, that is, only when the target has been caused to behave in a certain way and "can be induced to speak" (1988c:83). The role of the agents is, then, to deploy tactics and strategies to this end.

Power of the Gaze. Foucault's agents perform their power *via* the construction and exertion of knowledge, normalizing discourse (what is acceptable and not acceptable), and an "inspecting gaze". Among them, the gaze is especially relevant to the discussion of power in tourism because seeing is so much a part of touristic experience and because the manipulation of the imagery is so important in the marketing of tourism. The concept of the gaze originates from the spatial arrangement of Bentham's Panopticon, an architectural model for a prison in the eighteenth century. The Panopticon

is designed in such a way that whomever is at the center sees everything, enabling one to watch many. In the absence of a chief inspector in the center of the edifice, any agent—for example, a member of the prisoner's family, a friend, a visitor, and even a servant—can operate the system. Hence, anybody can watch and be watched by somebody depending on where they are placed. Important in this spatial arrangement is the place of the individual. The agents construct the gaze as they observe the target. In this process, the target ends up internalizing the gaze to the point that he is his own overseer (Foucault 1977:200–203). Examples are "parental gaze" and "clinical gaze" exercised by the agents who compel the children and patients to learn to see and accept a certain kind of behavior and norm (Foucault 1975:120). In these instances, gaze serves to reform prisoners, treat patients, instruct school children, confine the insane, and supervise workers.

Repressive and Productive Aspects of Power. Through his work until the mid-70s, Foucault consistently regarded power as an elementary social force of repression. Its repressive aspects consist of "rejection, exclusion, refusal, blockage, concealment, or mask", and the binary distinctions of "licit and illicit, permitted and forbidden" (1978:83). Foucault saw repressive power as operating at the level of the individual as agents (such as prison guards, medical specialists) who control or regulate the everyday behavior of targets (such as inmates, patients). With the publication of *Discipline and Punish* in 1977, Foucault modified his conceptualization of power to include its productive nature. The irony of power is found in the fact that even though the target is constrained, the supporting institution of the agents is expanding through the creation of technical discourses, professional disciplines, and bureaucracies.

The productive aspect of power is exemplified in his two case studies of prison and sexuality. In *Discipline and Punish*, Foucault asserts that the centralized design and the disciplinary strategies of the prison reduced the cost of surveillance, thereby producing an economy of power. He also elaborates on the positive effects of sexuality construed by others as mainly repressive in the Victorian era. This sexuality was "repressed but also put in light, underlined, and analyzed through techniques like psychology and psychiatry" (1988a:9). Discourse on sexuality generated the standards for a healthy body, established schooling and public hygiene practices, and contributed to a general "medicalization of the population" (Foucault 1978:126). In observing that the productive mechanisms of power can combine with repressive mechanisms, Foucault realized that the double dynamics of power underwrites the social order:

> What makes power hold good, what makes it accepted, is simply the fact that it doesn't only weigh on us as a force that says no, but that it traverses and produces things, it induces pleasure, forms of knowledge, produces discourse (1980:119).

Foucault's template for the analysis of power is unprejudicial in that productive power found in the growth of institutions is not *a priori* assumed to warrant repressive powers over targets. His perspective does not value the culture or politics of agents over targets. Instead, his posture calls simply for a frank realization that while power is everywhere in society, and while it may be simultaneously constraining and generative, the judgement or moral evaluation of it is not the task of the analyst. In his words:

> We must cease once and for all to describe the effects of power in negative terms; it "excludes", it "represses", it "censors", it "abstracts", it "masks", it "conceals". In fact, power produces; it produces reality; it produces domains of objects and rituals of truth. The individual and the knowledge that may be gained of him belong to this production (1977:194).

Foucault and Tourism

Foucauldian power elucidates a multiplicity of power relationships involving targets and agents in every social situation. Each case entails a specific mixture of productive and repressive strategies and techniques exercised by the agents over targets, an example of which is the inspecting gaze. The four features of Foucauldian power can be applied to tourism.

Omnipresence of Power in Tourism. Foucault's notion that power is omnipresent in human affairs clearly implies that tourism is no exception, although not immediately obvious for two reasons. First, power relationships in tourism are commonly masked in everyday discourse by facts and statistics communicated as indices of business that draw attention to its social importance. Second, the very complexity of a global tourism "industry" (service and manufacturing sectors and a mix of heterogeneous ventures in entrepreneurship) interferes with an appreciation of power relationships. In this view, power is invisible in tourism when it is conceived after the image of rulers and politicians. This approach instead focuses on the ground-level and everyday (micro)interactions of tourists and institutional actors in localized settings. For the Foucauldian analyst, instances of power relationships are located in the seemingly nonpolitical business and banter of tourists and guides, in the operation of codes of ethics, in the design and use of guidebooks, and so on. Tourism systems are sustained by the gaze at the individual level and by productive effects of power at the institutional level.

Power in Tourism Networks. Foucauldian power relationships are situated in tourism systems. To elaborate on this proposition, it is helpful to specify their components, and to identify the targets and the agents as Foucault has accomplished in his institutional studies of sexuality, prisons, and mental clinics. As to components, both the public and academics alike have tended to conceive of tourism as a

two part social system consisting of hosts in the vicinity of the destination and visiting guests. This view has its roots in the 1977 first edition of V. Smith's *Hosts and Guests: The Anthropology of Tourism* (1989). Pearce has written that "the basic dichotomy of 'host and guests' popularized by the comprehensive anthropological volume ... is generally accepted" (1989:216). While many continue to base analyses on this distinction, the limitations of the framework are gradually being corrected. In this regard, cultural anthropologists have insisted that tourism is an activity substantially shaped by middlemen (Chambers 1997; Cohen 1985a; van den Berghe and Keyes 1984). In rejecting this binary classification, Miller and Auyong (1991a:76–77, 1991b) have proposed a sociological model for tourism comprising three standard elements: tourists; locals; and several categories of brokers. In this framework, the new category of brokers is employed to denote those who derive a living (receive monetary remuneration) for an involvement with tourism production. Hotel owners and employees, vendors, and guides who provide tourists with goods and services exemplify private-sector brokers. Public-sector brokers include city planners and politicians, those who work in government-operated tourism information centers, and police and guards at the sites. Other broker variants include social movement brokers, academic brokers, travel media brokers, and consulting brokers (Miller and Auyong 1998:4–5).

Power relations in tourism systems are dynamic and constantly changing. With this, the absolute numbers and ratios of tourists, locals, and brokers at destinations change throughout the phases of development. Tourists can become brokers by starting entrepreneurial businesses or by assuming government positions as consultants or enforcement agents. They can also become locals by establishing permanent residency at destinations. Similarly, locals can become brokers by engaging in the business or management and planning of tourism; they can also become tourists. Brokers can change their identity to tourists or cease to be involved in tourism-related ventures and become locals. The shifting identities of tourists, locals, and brokers largely depend on contingencies, time, and place. Consequently, there is no one-sided, fixed flow of power from one individual to another.

Within the foregoing scheme, tourists are most obviously seen as Foucauldian targets. As noted, a mainstream view takes the tourist to be a rational, independent, and powerful actor who initiates the touristic trip and accordingly is responsible for its consequences on locals and the environment. In contrast, the tourist, in the tripartite system is the Foucauldian target (Table 1), is positioned against brokers in the same way as Foucault has seen the child, the woman, the criminal, and the madman to be positioned against agents in their respective institutional systems. Foucauldian power works in many directions and there certainly are cases in which locals and even brokers are told what to do by tourists. This granted, the concentration here is on how they can be targets because this power is so often underestimated.

At first glance, Table 1 invites challenge on two grounds. First, some might argue that the the tourist trip is institutionally too different from that of the prison, mental clinic, school, or home experience to warrant such an application. Thus, the table's designation of the tourist as a target (as opposed to an agent) could be contested. Second, the table may suggest too simplistic a portrayal of the control of the target by the agent without due consideration to varying tourist types. It could, for example, be pointed out that some tourists—the most affluent and otherwise privileged come to mind—operate entirely on their own terms when traveling.

The first challenge stems from the fact that tourists are freer to wander around than are the incarcerated prisoners, mental patients, children and women studied by Foucault. True enough, they are not subject to the identical means of surveillance that constrains other Foucauldian targets. Nonetheless, tourists qualify as targets because they necessarily operate from insecure positions. By definition, they are found on unfamiliar political and cultural turf, and they often communicate at a distinct linguistic disadvantage. In the course of sojourn, they are stripped of many of their cultural and familial ties and protective institutions, and are exposed to new norms and expectations. Their culture, in the sense of what "one has to know or believe in order to operate in a manner acceptable to its members" (Goodenough 1957:167), loses its supremacy if not its validity. In response to these insecurities, they are compelled to reconsider their political status and to adjust to the situation with justifications, behaviors, and gestures acceptable to those in command of the destination and culture. Tourists are power-bound not by the mental clinic or prison, but by the trip.

The second challenge concerns the degree to which the Foucauldian model allows for diversity among tourists. In the consideration of the so-called "independent traveler", the model of controlling agents seems at first to be inapplicable. However, no tourist can make all touristic decisions without consultation or advice. Foucault would concede that the wealthy aristocrat (or an ecotourist, or a professor on sabbatical) receives a different touristic treat-

Table 1. Four Examples of Foucauldian Power Relations[a]

Object of study	Target	Agents
Sexuality (school, home)	Child, woman	Family, educators, psychiatrists, psychologists
Penal system (prison)	Criminal	Chief inspectors, subordinates, educators, magistrates, psychiatric experts
Madness (mental clinic)	Patient	Doctors, guards, family
Tourism (tourist destination)	Tourist	Public/private sector brokers, locals, academics, market researchers, travel writers

[a] Adapted from Cheong (1996).

ment from guides, hotel concierges and staff, and other agents than do those who are members of an organized tour, but it is a treatment nonetheless. The independent tourist may resist suggestions and planned itineraries more than other types, but the resistant act presupposes the position of the tourist as target. Power in tourism can be negotiated, even mediated, but it cannot be denied.

In this light, all tourists are captives to a wide variety of agents including brokers and guides. The package tour is the extreme case of constrained movement, the self-guided tour the least. In the setting of the former, tourists can find themselves quite literally imprisoned on buses and boats, and in enclave resorts. In these moments, they depend considerably on guides, among other agents. But the self-guided tour also shows the movements of tourists limited and structured by the guidebook, the agent, or the signpost. To differing extents, then, tourists are power-bound and are influenced by Foucauldian agents from the time they first seek information and make travel plans until they return home.

Given that tourists are targets, the Foucauldian agents of tourism power are composed of the various kinds of brokers, as well as some categories of locals (Table 1). Brokers drawn from private and public sectors include government officials, tour guides, and hotel/restaurant employees, guidebooks, academics, and market researchers. They compel the tourist to function in a certain way. By the Foucauldian perspective, brokers are not weak intermediaries and providers of tourism-related services as the customary view might suggest. Importantly, brokers do not serve a neutral role. Rather, they intervene and constrain tourism activities generally for the sake of profit and public service (Cheong 1996).

In addition to participating in the formulation and implementation of tourism ethics, heterogeneous types of brokers collaborate to develop strategies. At any given time, divergent brokers in different professions align themselves around an issue. They discuss and negotiate how far development should proceed, what type of development is optimal, who should enter as tourists, and so forth. On-site brokers (those who influence destinations) exercise enormous discretion in dealing with tourists. Because of their proximity, park guards watch over tourists to see if they litter; guides protect, oversee and educate them about how to act properly, and offer them interpretations of historic sites, cultures, and customs; restaurant employees instruct them in what and how to eat. Subsequently, brokers as agents in a variety of guises constrain their movements, behaviors, and even thoughts, and act as a powerful force in the system. In passing, it deserves to be noted that off-site brokers—those who are not in direct contact with tourists—also manage tours and contribute to tourism plans and strategies.

Turning to locals, the mainstream view holds that they exert the least control over what takes place in the touristic region, and are argued in selected instances to be the most oppressed and victimized. Having the least control can translate into having the least involvement in and being indifferent toward tourism activities. As

locals by definition do not earn income from the industry, unlike tourists or brokers, they have no immediate vested economic interest in its production. Whereas the latter two groups express a concern for tourism ethics and conduct, the locals—to the extent they do not interact with tourists or witness tourism in action—conduct daily activities and rituals in the context of a different set of cultural values and norms. Some locals, however, are fairly considered as Foucauldian agents. They behave as agents in power relations by galvanizing (active or passive) resistance to tourists, or endorsing tourism. In the event that they oppose tourism, they can go to great lengths to inhibit and constrain it, as, for example, in blocking the entry of tourists into regions or sabotaging the industry by refusing to be "tourism objects". Such overtly political actions may not be approved of by brokers who require locals as unpaid labor to avoid charges of "staged authenticity" (MacCannell 1989). Further, experience in many resorts and destinations supports the idea that locals control the behavior of tourists in subtle but effective ways *via* informal face-to-face interaction. In this regard, the socialization of tourists to local traditions and manners is one outcome of social control.

The Touristic Gaze. In addition to the agent and target concepts, that of gaze is useful in tracking the development and maintenance of power relationships in tourism. In using the term "tourist gaze", Urry borrows from Foucault and focuses on what and how the tourist sees. Urry recognizes that the ability to gaze is afforded to tourists by a power relationship in which agents (brokers and locals) produce power effects and create tourists:

> And this gaze is as socially organized and systematized as is the gaze of the medic. Of course it is of a different order in that it is not confined to professionals "supported and justified by an institution". And yet even in the production of "unnecessary pleasure" there are in fact many professional experts who help to construct and develop our gaze as tourists (1990:1).

This confirms that Urry is alert to the fact that the tourist gaze exists together with the gaze of experts. But he establishes the tourist as the potent actor in these interactions. He concentrates on what the tourist views and interprets rather than on the techniques and strategies that agents use to instruct tourists to see. Consequently, Urry places the tourist in the same category (that of agents) as Foucault's clinicians who have the medical gaze (Table 1). This clashes with the argument that the tourist is more of a target than an agent, and that the tourist's knowledge is constructed by surrounding brokers. As Leiper (1992:606) points out, Urry fails to examine the power of the gaze as "Foucault's *Birth of the Clinic* saw the clinical gaze as about power and scientific knowledge" (1992:606). Hollinshead reconciles Urry with Foucault in writing that "he [Urry] aims to uncover the way tourism practitioners and tourists help normalize some activities and behavior and define

others as bizarre or deviant" (1994:388). But a stronger Foucauldian statement would stress that practitioners define, constrain, and elicit a normalizing behavior for tourists. For, while tourists do acquire a gaze, agent–target power relations guarantee that it is the "touristic gaze" of agents that manufactures the sociological gaze of tourists that Urry describes.

A major reason tourists are the primary objects of the gaze of brokers and locals has to do with their very visibility, hence targetability. They are not only conspicuous in organized tours and through processes of registration and documentation, they are also physically distinguishable from locals. Their style of dress, language, accent, and possessions contrasts with those of the residents of the destination. Although international tourists more clearly fit this profile, domestic ones nonetheless are exposed to similar experiences. The contrast between them and the people they visit exists, not necessarily in terms of physical appearance and language, but in regard to income gap, urban/rural orientation, and inland/coastal dwelling. Tourists are inherently threatening because of these contrasting qualities. Ironically, the contrast enhances their visibility, which situates them in a vulnerable position to be managed by agents of power.

In direct interactions with tourists, Foucauldian agents employ strategies that entail education, instruction, persuasion, advice, interpretation, surveillance, and coercion. At times, agents are buffers who protect tourists from the ethnocentrism of locals (and locals from the prejudices of tourists) *via* the communication of cultural manners and mores. Agents also contribute as experts in shaping the decisions tourists make in purchasing commodities and services, and the conclusions they draw in appreciating (or devaluing) amenities and other features of the destination. Agents, then, transmit distinctions. They influence what tourists can and cannot do, where they can and cannot go, and what they select and reject. Agents do not only focus the gaze, they also determine what is *not* to be seen or experienced. The touristic gaze is actually evident in the actions and discourse of three agents—the travel agent, the guide, and the local—which constitute the focus of the flow of power from the agent to the target and not vice versa.

As to travel agents, the influence of their gaze on tourists is most apparent when they can establish that they are not just sources of information or access, but are instead "experts" or human resources of significance. Their "knowledge" and "competence" is legitimized by the tourist, and they can create the framework of a trip by recommending prices, airlines, hotels, and routes, and even full itineraries, destinations, and activities (Johnson and Griffith 1995). Their gaze is typically supported by the technological features of the modern office, where they govern interaction with the tourist. They have exclusive control over computers that contain information and command over the dissemination of brochures, travel videos, hotel and destination reviews, and other materials. Travel agents provide expert insights and personal opinions about the pre-

vailing political climate, weather, and safety concerns at destinations, and other conditions subject to sudden change. While often forceful, they can also be subtle in the management of tourists. In all of this, travel agents create and limit opportunities for tourists.

As to guides, everyone who has traveled has encountered one who dominates the touristic stage. Tourists see through their eyes, as they choose the objects of interest to be viewed and steer attention to the selected objects (Cohen 1985b). An important implication is that tourists will not see what guides prefer they ignore. Of course, their success (and failure), like that of travel agents, lies in their ability to "read" tourists and to judge motivations and elicit attitudes. Guides are not always able to rely on repeat customers, but they do depend on the tips and word-of-mouth advertising of satisfied tourists. They construct the gaze through their special expertise, esoteric "local knowledge", and abilities. Thus, they demonstrate their worth by being able to converse with tourists in their language, by knowing popular trails and interesting flora and fauna, by recounting cultural and architectural histories, by knowing local customs, and so forth. Those who provide highly organized, scheduled, and expensive services show their prowess in museums and at ruins, on hiking, kayaking, and other ecotouristic treks, and on safaris, cruiseships, and bus tours. Many offer casually arranged impromptu services in taxis and on foot. Throughout the guided tour, thereby, tourists are socialized to the agendas of guides by the gaze. Examples of results of it include tourists who change their way of thinking (and behavior) to incorporate cultural, religious, political, or ecological principles introduced by guides. Those sensitive to the stigmatized identity of the "Ugly Tourist/American" are candidates for transformations of this variety (Miller 1993). Guides also implement their own agenda when they orchestrate interactions with allied brokers such as those employed at hotels, restaurants, retail shops, and stands.

As to locals, they also contribute to the formation of the gaze. In many respects, they share power strategies with the above agent and guide groups. Like them, they observe tourists, making inferences about their aspirations and judgements about their behavior. The principal difference in the use of power between locals and the others is that the former have no short-term stake in forging relationships with tourists. Unlike agents and guides, they are not seeking clients and consequently have the option of behaving as host, becoming antagonistic, or exhibiting utter indifference to the presence of tourists. Except those locals who hardly have any face-to-face encounters with tourists, many intermittently find themselves in the company of tourists in markets; on roadways, airplanes, and boats; in churches, universities, and sports stadiums; and in myriad business establishments. In these brief encounters, they display the gaze toward tourists in their actions, gestures, insinuations, and other communications. The force of this gaze is multiplied when locals coalesce. Whether they direct their gaze as individuals or as participants in organized coalitions or in unorganized crowds,

tourists are wise to take notice. The power of the local gaze on tourists (and their attending guides) can lead tourists to quickly understand where they might go and what they might do. For example, the local gaze has drawn tourists into homes and into the private spaces of locals, while it has also prohibited the same. There are many examples of tourists being enthusiastically welcomed by the local community, but others involving "Tourist Go Home!" attitudes and violence.

Repressive and Productive Touristic Power. As to repressive and productive touristic power amid that of agents, guides, and brokers, as noted earlier, Foucault gradually developed his perspective to account for power's repressive and productive expression at the level of the individual and the institution. This framework is entirely compatible with the realities of tourism. Tourists as individual Foucauldian targets have historically both been liberated and constrained by opportunities mediated by the gaze of brokers and locals. As has been pointed out, this gaze consists of activities in which these agents instruct, educate, and reform the tourist, and also those that result in agents inspecting, monitoring, and generally managing tourists. Ultimately, experiences challenge and reward tourists precisely because they do not know precisely in advance how, or in how many different ways, they will be influenced. At the level of the institution, the productive aspect of power is apparent first in the manifold professional specialties that have grown up around the theme of tourism, second in the elaborate structure of the tourism discourse that has emerged concurrently, and third in the generation of the great diversity of tourism commodities that these specialties and discourse require. In short, the productive power is found in the rise of tourism field and the expansion of knowledge about it.

Tourism has steadily grown since Thomas Cook invented the role of the modern agent and broker in the last century. Since the end of World War II, its explosive growth is apparent in the legitimization of tourism "experts" in the public, private, academic, and media sectors. The industry underwrites multidisciplinary activity in design, marketing and sales, among many other business specialties. The result is that tourism has become an academic specialty in fields as diverse as cultural anthropology, history, public affairs, planning, business, political science, and sociology, to name but a few. The varied disciplines and subdisciplines in academia find their extensions and counterparts in government and industry where tourism specialization has grown at a rapid rate. This expansion has fostered the idea that tourism growth is assisted through understanding market segmentation and multiple land-use planning strategies tempered by sustainable development ideals. It also helped in creating a vast inventory of training and certification programs, and regularly scheduled professional and scientific meetings, trade shows, and conventions.

Tourism knowledge includes the totality of ways in which topics are discussed in disciplinary and everyday speech and texts, and also the ways in which its operational symbols appear in advertising, the media, and the arts. It is not surprising that an organizing theme running through this composite discourse is that of economic profit. Decisions of tourists, brokers, and locals that affect the quality and quantity of investments are discussed, interpreted, and judged with great emotion and intensity. In this discourse, the costs and benefits of policies are debated with reference to knowledge and theories as these are identified with the science and technology, with the aesthetic, and increasingly with the ethical establishments. This total knowledge informs discussions both serious and thorough, and casual and short-lived. Variations include academic and professional conversations as well as the ordinary chat about tourism memories, planning trips, and comparing experiences and impressions. (For Foucault's treatment of "disqualified" knowledges—for example, "popular", "local", and "regional" variants of "experiential" knowledge, and non-scientific scholarly knowledge—that compete with "scientific knowledge", see 1980b:78–108.) In the production of knowledge, a specialized language, and rules for its criticism tourism has emerged as a topic of real significance in society.

CONCLUSION

The principal intention of this paper was to contribute to the emerging body of knowledge concerning power in tourism. By invoking the political ideas of Foucault, the paper has sought to establish a conceptual bedrock and foster a Foucauldian agenda asking for a conceptual change in how analysts study power in tourism. It highlighted dimensions of power in this industry often overlooked by members of the public and researchers more accustomed to regarding tourism relationships as outcomes of the marketplace choices and power of tourists.

In summary, the paper makes four points. First, Foucauldian power is omnipresent in tourism as in virtually all other human affairs. Second, the power relationships are conspicuous for inspection in the micro-interactions of brokers, locals, and tourists in tripartite tourism systems. While acknowledging that power works in many directions, the paper has emphasized the potentials for tourists to be Foucauldian targets and for brokers and locals to be Foucauldian agents. Third, the touristic gaze is considered a primary mechanism by which travel agents, guides, and some locals operate in the power relationship *vis-a-vis* tourists. Finally, the last application emphasizes the productive effects of power demonstrated in the proliferation of tourism studies and formation of knowledge in this field.

This orientation to touristic power recommends attention be rather diverted from the tourists and redirected to focus on agents who are prominent in the control of tourism development and tourist conduct. Power works in many directions and at many levels.

Ultimately, the success or failure of "appropriate", or "sustainable" tourism programs lies more substantially in the power of brokers and locals than in the power of tourists. This understanding about power in tourism can assist in the rethinking of tourism development, and can perhaps contribute to the formulation of innovative tourism policies. ■

REFERENCES

Britton, S.
1989 Tourism, Dependency and Development. *In* Towards Appropriate Tourism: The Case of Developing Countries, T. Theuns and F. M. Go, eds., pp. 93–116. New York: Peter Lang.

Cameron, C. M.
1997 Dilemmas of the Crossover Experience: Tourism Work in Bethlehem, Pennsylvania. *In* Tourism and Culture: An Applied Perspective, E. Chambers, ed., pp. 163–182. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Chambers, E.
1997 Introduction: Tourism' Mediators. *In* Tourism and Culture: An Applied Perspective, E. Chambers, ed., pp. 1–12. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Cheong, S.
1996 A Political Framework for Tourism Study: The Case of Cheju Island, Korea. Unpublished M.A. Thesis. University of Washington.

Cohen, E., ed.
1985a Special Issue: Tourist Guides—Pathfinders, Mediators, and Animators. Annals of Tourism Research 12.
1985b The Tourist Guide: The Origins, Structure and Dynamics of a Role. Annals of Tourism Research 12:5–29.

Crossette, B.
1998 Surprises in the Global Tourism Boom. The New York Times (April 12):wk-5.

Dreyfus, H., and P. Rabinow
1982 Michel Foucault: Beyond Structuralism and Hermeneutics. Chicago: Harvester, University of Chicago Press.

Elliott, J.
1983 Politics, Power, and Tourism in Thailand. Annals of Tourism Research 10:377–393.

Farrell, B.
1986 Cooperative Tourism and the Coastal Zone. Coastal Zone Management Journal 14(1/2):113–120.

Fesenmaier, D., J. O'Leary, and M. Uysal
1996 Recent Advances in Tourism Marketing Research. New York: Haworth Press.

Foucault, M.
1975 The Birth of the Clinic: An Archaeology of Medical Perception. New York: Vintage Books.
1977 Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison. New York: Vintage Books (Translated by A. Sheridan).
1978 The History of Sexuality: Volume I: An Introduction. New York: Vintage Books.
1980a "Prison Talk," Interview by J. Brochier. *In* Power/Knowledge: Selected Interview and Other Writings 1972–1977, C. Gordon, ed., pp. 37–54. New York: Pantheon Books.
1980b Two Lectures. *In* Power/Knowledge: Selected Interview and Other Writings 1972–1977, C. Gordon, ed., pp. 78–108. New York: Pantheon Books.

1980c "Truth and Power," Interview by A. Fontana and P. Pasquino. *In* Power/Knowledge: Selected Interview and Other Writings 1972–1977, C. Gordon, ed., pp. 109–133. New York: Pantheon Books.
1980d "The History of Sexuality," Interview by L. Finas. *In* Power/Knowledge: Selected Interview and Other Writings 1972–1977, C. Gordon, ed., pp. 183–193. New York: Pantheon Books.
1988a "The Minimal Self." Interview with S. Riggens. *In* Politics, Philosophy, Culture: Interviews and Other Writings 1977–1984, L. D. Krtizman, ed., pp. 3–16. New York: Routledge.
1988b "Critical Theory/Intellectual History." Interview with G. Raulet. *In* Politics, Philosophy, Culture: Interviews and Other Writings 1977–1984, L. D. Krtizman, ed., pp. 17–46. New York: Routledge.
1988c Politics and Reason. *In* Politics, Philosophy, Culture: Interviews and Other Writings 1977–1984, L. D. Krtizman, ed., pp. 57–85. New York: Routledge.
1988d "On Power." Interview with P. Boncenne. *In* Politics, Philosophy, Culture: Interviews and Other Writings 1977–1984, L. D. Krtizman, ed., pp. 96–109. New York: Routledge.

Francisco, R.
1983 The Political Impact of Tourism Dependence in Latin America. Annals of Tourism Research 10:363–376.

Gee, C., D. Choy, and J. Makens
1997 The Travel Industry (3rd ed.). New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold.

Goodenough, W.
1957 Cultural Anthropology and Linguistics. *In* Report of the Seventh Annual Round Table Meeting on Linguistics and Language Study, P. L. Garvin, ed. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Monograph Series on languages and Linguistics No. 9.

Gregory, A., and B. Goodall
1990 Marketing Tourism Places. London: Routledge.

Gunn, C.
1988 Tourism Planning. New York: Taylor & Francis.

Hall, C.
1994 Tourism and Politics: Policy, Power, and Place. New York: Wiley.

Hollinshead, K.
1994 The Unconscious Realm of Tourism. Annals of Tourism Research 21:387–391.

Johnson, J. C., and D. C. Griffith
1995 Promoting Sportfishing Development in Puerto Rico: Travel Agents' Perceptions of the Caribbean. Human Organization 54(3):295–303.

de Kadt, E.
1979 Tourism—Passport to Development?: Perspectives on the Social and Cultural Effects of Tourism in Developing Countries. New York: Oxford University Press.

Labone, M.
1996 The Roaring Silence in the Sociology of Leisure. Social Alternatives 15:30–32.

Lea, J.
1988 Tourism and Development in the Third World. London: Routledge.

Leiper, N.
1992 The Tourist Gaze. Annals of Tourism Research 19:604–607.

MacCannell, D.
1989 The Tourist: A New Theory of the Leisure Class. New York: Schocken Books.

Matthews, H.
1978 International Tourism: A Political and Social Analysis. Cambridge MA: Schenkman.

McIntosh, R., and C. Goeldner
1990 Tourism: Principles, Practices, Philosophies. New York: Wiley.

McNay, L.
1994 Foucault: A Critical Introduction. New York: Continuum.

Miller, M. L.
1993 The Rise of Coastal and Marine Tourism. Ocean and Coastal Management 20:181–199.
Miller, M. L., and J. Auyong
1991a Coastal Zone Tourism: A Potent Force Affecting Environment and Society. Marine Policy 15(2):75–99.
1991b Tourism in the Coastal Zone: Portents, Problems, and Possibilities. *In* Proceedings of the 1990 Congress on Coastal and Marine Tourism, vol. I and II, M. L. Miller and J. Auyong, eds., pp. 1–8. Newport OR: National Coastal Resources Research and Development Institute.
1998 Remarks on Tourism Terminologies: Anti-tourism, Mass Tourism, and Alternative Tourism. *In* Proceedings of the 1996 World Congress on Coastal and Marine Tourism: Experiences in Management and Development, M. L. Miller and J. Auyong, eds., pp. 1–24. Seattle WA: Washington Sea Grant Program and the School of Marine Affairs, University of Washington.
Milne, S.
1998 Tourism and Sustainable Development: Exploring the Global-Local Nexus. *In* Sustainable Tourism: A Geographical Perspective, C. Hall and A. Lew, eds., pp. 35–48. New York: Longman.
Mowforth, M., and I. Munt
1998 Tourism and Sustainability: New Tourism in the Third World. London: Routledge.
Murphy, P.
1985 Tourism: A Community Approach. New York: Methuen.
Oakes, T.
1995 Tourism in Guizoh: Place and the Paradox of Modernity. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation. University of Washington.
Pearce, D. G.
1989 Tourist Development (2nd ed.). New York: Wiley.
Place, S.
1995 Ecotourism for Sustainable Development: Oxymoron or Plausible Strategy? GeoJournal 35:161–174.
Plog, S.
1991 Leisure Travel. New York: Wiley.
Poirier, R.
1995 Tourism and Development in Tunisia. Annals of Tourism Research 22:157–171.
Reed, M.
1997 Power Relations and Community-Based Tourism Planning. Annals of Tourism Research 24:566–591.
Richter, L.
1989 The Politics of Tourism in Asia. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.
Ringer, G.
1993 The Wilderness Begins at McCarthy: Perceptual Impacts of Tourism on Communities. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation. University of Oregon.
Ritchie, J. R., and C. Goeldner
1987 Travel, Tourism, and Hospitality Research: A Handbook for Managers and Researchers. New York: Wiley.
Rojek, C.
1992 "The Eye of Power": Moral Regulation and the Professionalization of Leisure Management from the 1830s to the 1950s. Society and Leisure 15:355–373.
Rosenow, J., and G. L. Pulsipher
1979 Tourism, the Good, the Bad, and the Ugly. Lincoln NB: Century Three Press.
Shaw, G., and A. Williams
1994 Critical Issues in Tourism. Oxford: Blackwell.
1998 Entrepreneurship, Small Business Culture and Tourism Development. *In* The Economic Geography of the Tourist Industry: A Supply-side Analysis, D. Ioannides and K. Debbage, eds., pp. 235–255. London: Routledge.

Sheridan, A.
1980 Michel Foucault: The Will to Truth. New York: Tavistock Publications Ltd.
Smith, V. L., ed.
1989 Hosts and Guests: The Anthropology of Tourism, 2nd ed. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
Urry, J.
1990 The Tourist Gaze. London: Sage.
van den Berghe, P. L., and C. F. Keyes
1984 Introduction: Tourism and Re-created Ethnicity. Annals of Tourism Research 11:343–352.
Veijola, S., and E. Jokinen
1994 The Body in Tourism. Theory, Culture and Society 11:125–151.
Waters, S. R.
1996 Travel Industry World Yearbook—The Big Picture—1995–1996, 39. New York: Child & Waters.
Wearing, B.
1995 Leisure and Resistance in an Aging Society. Leisure Studies 14:263–279.
Whittaker, E.
1997 The Town that Debates Tourism: Community and Tourism in Broome, Australia. *In* Tourism and Culture: An Applied Perspective, E. Chambers, ed., pp. 13–30. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Submitted 9 September 1998. Resubmitted 9 March 1999. Accepted 23 March 1999. Final version 16 April 1999. Refereed anonymously. Coordinating Editor: Robert A. Poirier