Anthropological Tourism

As anthropologists we often find ourselves engaging in informal aspects of ethnographic access and participant observation that have much in common with tourist practices involving eating, travel, lodging, and cross-cultural interaction. Often these reflect and signal class-based standards of food and habitation. These tourist practices can be extremely economical according to U.S. Middle-class standards, but they are qualitatively different than the living conditions of the people being studied. This demonstrates the economic predication of the anthropologist as a patron (but not the type of debt peonage) or padrino. In some cases, it is rationalized that the best way to help the people is to contribute to their economic empowerment by paying for their products and services. Another role taken by the anthropologist and tourist is the observer, who avoids personal interaction and involvement. A role usually taken only by anthropologists is the expert who has come to solve a problem. Each of these roles determines the ways that an anthropologist employs participant observation differently.

At times, anthropological fieldwork is conducted under the guise of tourism, especially when doing research outside of the U.S. This practice of engaging in anthropology and ethnography while being a tourist, or using tourism as a cover for anthropology and ethnography, is generally referred to as anthropological tourism in this paper. Through this lens we can see that anthropology and tourism are complementary activities that offer important lessons about fieldwork and the negotiation of borders and power relationships. Importantly, the correlation of anthropology with tourism based on common eating, lodging, and travel practices also strongly suggests that anthropologists often engage in globalization in much the same way as tourists. Although anthropologists may focus their efforts on humanitarian or conservation projects, their American habits of consumption have a globalizing character associated with tourist spending and cross-cultural interaction.

But let us talk about this on the theoretical level. Taking a postmodern and post-structural approach to agency it is important to examine the anthropological tourists. As tourists and anthropologists, a specific combination of social predisposition, privilege, and socialization provide a recognizable savoir faire. This savoir faire, being the ability to say or do the right or graceful thing, is one of the more intimate products of Pierre Bourdieu’s (1984; 1990) habitus. Applying this micro-social theory provides a view of tourism and anthropology as intersecting and overlapping cultural fields in which anthropologists and tourists interface with familiarity derived from their habitus. Imagining anthropology and tourism as a set of ideologies and practices that the anthropological tourist utilizes in custom-
ary and familiar ways, provides a view of the habitus as the social disposition and tools derived from socialization that provide the meaning and action that the anthropological tourist engages in a foreign land. I argue that this produces a relationship that is qualitatively different from that of a native anthropologist engaging the habitus, observable as ideologies and practices customary and acceptable in Native society. This paper progresses from a discussion of anthropological tourism to a discussion of Native Anthropology, which eschews identification with the social disposition and perceived action of tourism and even anthropology itself. This can result in the ethnographic collaboration of a Native Anthropologist identity based in solidarity with the Native community and enunciated by statements such as, “yeah, but he’s not that kind of anthropologist.” This understanding of the enunciated statement as an affirmation of social truth or ideology is derived from Foucault’s (1972) The Archaeology of Knowledge.

However, before we move the discussion towards Native Anthropology, let us examine anthropological tourism. The following ethnographic examples illustrate the practice of disguising anthropology as tourism in Peru, how being tourists saved anthropologists from mob violence, and the unintended use of anthropology-as-tourist to learn about an ideology whereby Mexican drug cartels protect tourists and anthropologists in Copper Canyon.

Anthropology in Disguise

First, the practice of disguising anthropology as tourism can expedite travel and relationships that help to mitigate negative attitudes toward anthropology and anthropologists. This is based on the understanding that ethnographic access through travel, and community willingness to accept the ethnographer, provides key conditions making ethnographic fieldwork possible, this in turn contributing to the quality of ethnographic access. Ethnographic access constitutes the conditions to engage Malinowski’s caveat that the anthropologist must be able to say, “I was there!”; thus, providing opportunities for the researcher to engage in social context through participant observation and producing ethnographic data.

Sitting on a CopaAir jet approaching Lima, Peru, a flight attendant brings over the visa and declaration form. Upon filling out the form with my personal data, I come across questions asking my reason for visiting Peru. Feeling like a real anthropologist I consider officially declaring myself to be one. But just before I put pen to paper, I feel a tap on my shoulder. It’s Arthur Campa of Metropolitan State College of Denver telling me, “I hope that you did not put research or anthropology as the reason for the visit because we will be held up by customs and they may not even let you through.” It is very difficult to get the Peruvian government to officially sanction research efforts and Non-Governmental Organizations in general. I ask: “What should I put down instead?” He tells me, “Just write ‘tourist.’”

Although I had done this many times in Mexico, this was the first time that I realized that such effacement was official anthropological protocol. Were we undercover anthropologists? In further discussion, I found that Peruvian Eco-sustainability through Research and Understanding [P.E.R.U.] and Engineers Without Borders, the NGOs that we represented, were both unofficial organizations in Peru, just as we were “unofficial” anthropologists. In addition, a number of occurrences in Peru (as will be noted) provide important lessons on how being a tourist can serve as cover and protection for anthropology.

Second, being a tourist provides a unique application of participant observation of the tourist service worker and tourist context. So, if this context exists and the anthropologist enjoys the service of the tourist service worker the class position of the anthropologist is self-evident. However, the tourist service worker may also be a successful entrepreneur and of comparable class, especially as the economies of Peru and Mexico grow and the spending power of the American anthropological tourist decreases.

Based on these ethnographic understandings of anthropological tourism, we can see anthropology and tourism constituted by complex political and economic relationships tied to globalization and its attendant hegemony of consumerism. This social context, commonly referred to as development, progress, and neo-liberalism, historically results in exploitation and perpetuates asymmetrical power relations at the class, gender, and race levels. José Limón’s (1994) use of Antonio Gramsci’s concept of hegemony specifically outlines the conditions of globalization that progress towards greater deregulation in order to optimize flexible accumulation, which increases the wealth of the elites and impoverishes the lower classes. Anthropology has been key in providing critical ethnography regarding the ways that tourism becomes a new experience of hegemony, assimilation, and cultural devastation in the wake of globalization. In response, local communities engage in various counter-hegemonic processes and present challenges to globalization, the practice of which ideologically relegates tourism and often anthropology to antagonistic roles. Under certain circumstances Native Anthropology becomes the work of a “special case” anthropologist who operates as a collaborator and recognized ally by the ethnographic community.

To provide a brief example, this opposition became most poignant at Mission San Juan Capistrano in San Antonio, Texas, where local community members and Native American activists witnessed the transformation of a site of
considerable historical and cultural importance, first into an archaeological site and then a National Park Service managed site (Maestas 2003; Thoms 2001). This supports the theory of hegemonic globalization and counter-hegemonic local response. It provides a conceptual stage upon which we can examine tourism, anthropology, and Native Anthropology. The following two sections relate specific ethnographic experiences that demonstrate the complex and often ambiguous relationship of anthropologists and their intersection with tourist practice and position.

How Being Tourists Saved Us from Mob Violence

In mid-July 2010 my wife and I were in the small city of Chao in northern Peru. We were conducting health surveys and facilitating the formalization of a working cooperative in a small town outside of the city, but our lodging was the Hotel Oasis right on the Pan-American Highway, which runs through the center of Chao. This is an area ideal for people watching because so much is always going on. We had been in town for a little over a week and had made some acquaintances in local stores and restaurants, so we were starting to feel more comfortable - maybe too comfortable. My Spanish was good and getting better by the day.

About a week into our visit, we noticed a crowd of workers on the west side of the highway opposite the Hotel Oasis. We were on the second floor and had a commanding view. Asking around, we learned that local laborers had started gathering the day before for a strike and public declaration of their grievances. After stopping outside the hotel for a kachanga [fried bread] and avena [oatmeal], we walked over to the local public school. On the way we passed in front of the crowd of strikers, which had grown to include people on both sides of the street leading to the Chao Market. A truck pulled up and two men were throwing mandarinas [mandarin oranges] to the crowd and soon the air grew thick with the sweet smell. A couple of hours later, we walked back from the school; the crowd had diminished and regrouped in a single location outside of a streetside business.

We returned to the Hotel Oasis for lunch and spoke with Gloria, the manager of the hotel and daughter of the owners. She told us that workers usually began strikes because they were being worked longer hours without extra pay. Gloria told us that Chao had been the site of a violent labor dispute three years earlier regarding health insurance and raising the minimum wage. She backtracked a little to give us some background and explained that her family had moved to Chao when she was 14 years old in the 1990s. CampoSol, the largest multinational and agribusiness corporation in the region—owned by Peruvian President Alan Garcia and his U.S. partners—moved into the area in 1997 after the Chavimochic Irrigation Project made water available. (James Kus [1987] outlines the development of the Chavimochic project and the migration of people to work in the newly watered Chao Valley.) According to Gloria, CampoSol had a history of abusing and exploiting the workers. She told us that three years earlier a strike had taken place that resulted in violence, death, and doubling of the minimum wage. After beginning in much the same way as the strike we were witnessing, the earlier strike had continued, and during the third week thousands of strikers had chased out the small local police force, which precipitated military intervention. Over 700 national police officers had entered Chao and tear-gassed the people. Gloria described this as a scene of people, including many children, lying unconscious in the streets. In all, the earlier strike resulted in several deaths, many injuries, and dangerous exposure to tear gas by strikers and locals alike. It also spurred a series of negotiations partly responsible for raising the minimum wage from 10 soles/US$4 to 20 soles/US$8, and to improved health care benefits.

Hearing this brought me a sense of anticipation and concern. However, when I asked about the current strike I was told that it probably would not last long because it was only being held by the workers in the vegetable packing plants. Their grievance had to do with preparing asparagus for freezing and packaging, for which they had to peel the outer skin of the asparagus spears with a knife. This action released a milky substance that ran over the skin of the workers because their work uniforms had a space between the shoulder short sleeves and the protective sleeve that they wore over their lower arms. Because the protective sleeve was plastic, when the asparagus fluid spread over the arms of the workers it became trapped and caused a fungus that led to itching and skin disorders. The strike was intended to communicate the demands of workers for better protective clothing and health care that would alleviate these skin disorders.

By the morning, large holes had been dug in the dirt on the side of the PAH opposite to our hotel. We could hear speeches being given and see increasing crowd activity across the street. As we were preparing to leave for the villages up the valley, my wife started taking photos from the 2nd story window of our hotel. This seemed to spark some agitation in the crowd. We made our way downstairs and to the corner where small buses waited to take people up into the villages, and my wife took some photos of the buses and the people traveling.

Suddenly a small group of strikers surrounded my wife and me, demanding that she give them her camera. They accused us of being company or government informants—which would be one and the same given the Garcia/U.S.
partners ties. One loud woman started screaming and threatening us with a stick, and soon many of the strikers moved across the PAH and centered on this altercation. Just as this happened, a boy ripped the camera from my wife’s hands and a man grabbed my pants by the pocket and made a small tear. The boy with the camera started looking at the pictures and demanded that my wife “Borrar las fotos,” which means to erase them. She and I both tried to explain that we were working on projects to help the villagers in the region. The strikers were yelling that we were “gringos!” which is a generally negative term for foreigners. However, there was another chant coming from other locals, saying “¡Son turistas! ¡Son buena gente! Estan haciendo proyectos.” They are tourists! They are good people! They are doing projects [in the valley]. Our defenders eventually calmed the crowd and we were able to listen to some of the strikers explain their position. Being seen as tourists saved us from mob violence.

There are various elements of significance in this experience. For the novice ethnographer and graduate student, although this is one of the most difficult obstacles to be faced, it is essential to work on one’s communication skills. Language competence will improve. It is also an important signal of humility; this can result in friendship bonding between the ethnographer and the people with whom one is working or studying. For us, the urgency and open communication from a shared experience with the potential for crisis brought out conversations at a deeper and historical level. Although we would not have sought out such a cultural faux pas, it provided a means for understanding social history and political economy in Chao (at the local level) and Peru (at the national level).

At the same time, transportation workers on the Pan-American Highway closed the road with burning tires because of labor disputes, partly to gain attention by delaying travel during the Peruvian Independence holiday. Yet, it is also important to note that tourism is welcome and sought after in the region as an expanding market that will bring prosperity to the people. This is evident in the justifications for shielding us from violence. It is also interesting to grapple with the way that the identifiers gringos, turistas, and haciendo proyectos clearly tie the practice of foreign applied anthropology (itself not a phrase in the local vocabulary) to tourism in the words of the people with whom we interacted. Overall, this provides strong ethnographic evidence for correlating tourism with anthropology under the term anthropological tourism.

This also points to a specific case in which the crisis bonding made possible by the cultural faux pas of taking unsolicited photographs opened up a conversation about a local woman’s eyewitness account and interpretation of labor disputes in Chao. Whether through tourism or anthropology, or as a tourist or anthropologist, this is not a dream, but clear enunciation of a local voice laced with social truth.

In the next example, the ambivalence and ambiguity of tourism and anthropology draw out further methodological and theoretical considerations.

**Mexican Drug Cartels Protect Tourists in Mexico’s Copper Canyon**

On a separate occasion, my wife and I were traveling by bus between the Mexican states of Coahuila and Chihuahua. We accidentally ended up in a town called Janos, south of El Paso, Texas, on New Year’s Eve 2008. Our intention was to reach Casas Grandes and spend New Year’s Day at the ancient city of Paquime, but we missed the stop and could not get off for about 40 miles. During our trip from Del Rio, Texas, to Janos, we were warned and admonished by my wife’s family members in both Coahuila and Texas that we should not travel because of drug cartel violence. Janos itself appeared to be the quintessential drug cartel town with highway crossroads and few streetlights. The next morning was New Year’s Day and it turned into a series of disappointments as we waited for public transportation back to Casas Grandes or even to El Paso. After several hours at the side of road, an elderly white couple pulled in for some snacks and after introductions invited us to accompany them to Casas Grandes. If we were not tourists before, we certainly were once we joined Oz and his wife, a couple of avid Mata Ortiz pottery collectors.

Over the hour’s ride to Casas Grandes we heard about Juan Quezada, a man who had learned Hopi and Zuni ceramic traditions and taught them to his family and community. Today, Mata Ortiz, 20 minutes outside of Casas Grandes, has a population of some 600 people and boasts 400 potters. Mata Ortiz pottery has become the premier contemporary pottery tradition in Mexico, standing alongside Pueblo and Navajo pottery in many shops. That evening we were hosted by an anthropologist and met a group made up of a mixture of American Mexicans who were anthropologists, artists, and of course tourists.

At this party, I heard an amazing story about the nature of the Tarahumara Indians in Copper Canyon. It was explained that the Tarahumara Indians constituted the drug cartels of the region and maintained an enforced autonomy with respect to the Mexican government and its military forces. It was well-known that narcotics traffickers frequented the canyon. Less well-known is that anthropologists and tourists are especially welcomed and appreciated in the canyon, and that they are specifically protected. There is a standing drug cartel order to leave anthropologists and tourists alone. Why? Because anthropologists and tourists are important (if unwitting) players in the money-laundering
of the drug cartels. This information introduces us to a constructed ideology that Tarahumara drug trafficking in Copper Canyon has tipped the balance of power in favor of Tarahumara cultural conservation over Mexican government regulation and intervention. However, when we look at other sources—journalists and Tarahumara activists—the Tarahumara are represented as victims of drug cartel violence and extortion, this forcing them to grow and engage in the trafficking of marijuana and opium for heroin (Frontera NorteSur 2008; Salmon 2010; Weisman 1994). We see an interesting narrative emerge that projects a false ideology arguing for the safety of tourists and anthropologists in the face of clear evidence to the contrary, i.e., the August 18, 2008 massacre at Creel (Frontera NorteSur 2008).

In all, the examples of anthropology in disguise, how being tourists saved us from mob violence, and the ideology that Mexican drug cartels protect tourists and anthropologists in Copper Canyon provide a glimpse into the complexity, ambiguity, and ambivalence that exists in the world shared by the tourist and the anthropologist. Methodologically, this pushes us in the direction of examining the roles and research strategies that we engage as anthropologists, but more importantly, it describes the practical ethnographic efficacy of getting involved, and of learning what the social context you have entered means to the people there. In essence, these are stories and voices that most likely will find you as their only outlet and are always at the heart of the cultural whole, the gestalt. In the next section, I look at the negotiation of identity through cultural and language code-switching as part of participant observation.

**Application of Participant Observation to the Tourist Context**

Being an American, can be masked or emphasized for those of us who are multicultural. I shift between Apache, Azteca, Indian, Chicano, American, Mexicano, and Native American quite easily and have been mistaken for mixed race Filipino, Japanese, Peruvian, and Ecuadoran, among others. Tourist behavior emphasizes American identity abroad, while using another identity will provide for different responses. In this way we can see that an anthropologist’s behavior can alter the context of participant observation. Sometimes, this may even provide access to the tourist service worker context. My facility in Spanish allowed me to engage in conversations, sometimes as an American and sometimes as a Mexican. As a Mexican, I was given unguarded opinions about American mistreatment of situations and people, whereas as an American tourist I never heard these ideas.

As a tourist visiting the Huaca del la Luna, an ancient site in northern coastal Peru pertaining to the Moche culture, I become part of a tour group, a central practice for tourists. As such, I may receive an authoritative representation about the site complete with tales of virgin sacrifices. If I do not take a tour, my identity as a tourist is in doubt and an effort is made to ignore me. In finding lodging, a tourist is often catered to, though in a begrudging manner. This brings us again to the roles taken by both tourist and anthropologist. However, the ideological position of Mexico and hence, Mexicanos, is distinct from the United States and hence, Americans who are referred to as gringos or norteamericanos are grouped with Canadians. Language and cultural competence allows for multiple dimensions of ethnographic experience and is the first step towards Native Anthropology. It is interesting to note, that such linguistic and cultural competence is the textbook recommendation for anthropologists to conduct the most successful and desirable form of fieldwork and ethnography. However, most anthropologists do not achieve this, so this type of fieldwork has become an important contribution of Native Anthropology. The examples that I will refer to are Americo Paredes, José Limón, Jomo Kenyatta, Nakanishi Yuji, Kirin Narayan, and Darren J. Ranco. However, I will relate this literature review to my own understandings and ethnographic experiences of Native Anthropology.

**Native Anthropology and Its Applications**

Returning to the discussion of Malinowski, it must be recognized that there are different levels of “being there.” For instance, researchers may find that ethnographic access is restricted to limited visits. The ethnographers may sadly find themselves in formal accommodations distant from the community. I say sadly, because informal accommodations in which ethnographers are invited to engage in cohabitation provide much greater depth and breadth in the acquisition of ethnographic data, mainly allowing the researcher to engage in and observe daily routines and chores. One important difference between Anthropology and Native Anthropology is that informal familial cohabitation without prejudice is much more likely with the latter. So, if a researcher has a chance to reside with the people he or she is working with, it should be taken! This will certainly improve ethnographic access as well as linguistic and cultural competence, and it may open the door to the social bonding that will push in the direction of Native Anthropology.

Importantly, Native Anthropology is used to refer to a continuum of practice, because some people are certainly “more native” than others when it comes to linguistic
and cultural competency. This was the lesson provided by Americo Paredes in his scalding criticism of Anglo sociologists and folklorists regarding their linguistic and cultural incompetence in looking at the people of South Texas. In a more positive light, Jomo Kenyatta (1965) provided a clearly definitive anthropological and ethnographic account of his people, the Kikuyu. Similarly, José Limón (1994) demonstrated his bilingual and bicultural facility in central and south Texas. He outlined the processes of globalization in the production of a lived experience that he named postmodern Mexicano.

To avoid essentializing the Native Anthropologist, we can point out that some non-native speakers gain native-like facility and gain access to a much wider array of data than linguistically challenged Native Anthropologists. This is similar to Kirin Narayan’s (1993) suggestion of a deessentialized conceptualization of Native Anthropology. In my case, I couple my facility with central Mexican Spanish with a general Latin American indigenous or mestizo phenotype, and can gain access to political rhetoric in Lima, Peru as both a Gringo Americano and a Mexicano. As a Mexican tourist, I was privy to complaints about US anti-immigrant attitudes, while as an American these topics were never broached. Although not suitable for formal fieldwork, this can be an important way to gain general understanding about ideology and provide important background knowledge. However, speaking Spanish like a Mexican could only take me so far; it appeared that my knowledge of world cup soccer was also an effective ice breaker. More importantly, my collaboration as a Native Anthropologist has always been established on my acceptance and advocacy of the local community project. Examples are the establishment of Native American religious freedom at Mission San Juan Capistrano, Native American reburial and restoration of burial grounds in Victoria, Texas, documentation of the oral and written tradition of Danza Azteca in Colorado and Texas, and the religious use of peyote in Texas.

Native Anthropology is most effectively different from other forms of anthropology because it configures an identity distinct from tourists and anthropologists. A common basis for comparison with regards to my work in Mexico is the contrast several of us make between Native identity and both tourist and anthropologist identity. For instance, unquestioned unalienable Native rights to identity, religious practice, and cultural heritage can be contrasted with the tourist and anthropologist perspectives about legal and social conditions regarding these Native rights. Ideological boundaries exist in the practice of Native Anthropology as activist-oriented that often distinguishes its methods and relationships from those of tourism and certain approaches to anthropology. These ideological boundaries are drawn around the legacy of mistrust engendered by paternalistic and colonial roles played by anthropologists that have resulted in perceived damage to communities, families, and individuals. My particular experience has been with the native perspective regarding archaeologists seen as grave robbers and people committed to native cultural appropriation.

Thus, ideological distinctions arise in conducting Native Anthropology that lead to constructed identities which eschew correlations with both anthropology and tourism. Nakandi Yuji (2010) provides a detailed cultural and historical analysis of the growth of Japan Studies as a form of Native Anthropology that provides a basis for establishing the perceived cultural and historical authenticity of Japanese folklore. Because of political and economic barriers blocking inclusion of this field of study in anthropology, Japan Studies scholars constructed a new identity for themselves that Yuji represents as Native Anthropology. Similarly, but on a more personal level, Darren J. Ranco (2006) narrates his struggle to establish a Native American anthropology that serves a community-centered agenda.

My own experience can shed light on these ideological boundaries and the circumstances of engaging in Native Anthropology. The primary distinction between Native Anthropology and other forms is that my engagement and integration into a community pre-exists my work as an anthropologist. In addition, the intention of research to focus on the needs and agendas of the community takes precedence over academic or applied anthropological agendas. It is truly reflexive. In some cases, this becomes part of the conditional expectation for collaboration and can be likened to the political term “common ground.” For example, when working with the Lipan Apache to negotiate the restoration of burials grounds, my Native Anthropologist identity was antithetical to that of the archaeologists and other cultural anthropologists working for Coastal Environments, Inc. and the Army Corps of Engineers. In this case, referencing the primary dataset of the Buckeye Knoll TXVT98 archaeological site in Victoria, Texas, private- and government-contracted anthropologists and archaeologists made political and academic use of the data in an attempt to convince the Invista Victoria Nylon Plant to marginalize the Lipan Apache Band of Texas, Inc. On the other hand, I used the same dataset to convince Invista to establish a co-stewardship of the Native American burial grounds on plant property with the Lipan Apache Band.

Another example involves my work in Guerrero, Mexico, in which my identity as Danza Azteca granted me access to ritual space closed to other tourists and anthropologists. In this case, the decision to advocate rather than publicize resulted in non-inclusion of certain geographical and ritual knowledge in publications, thus making it less accessible.
ble to tourists, anthropologists, and others. This is very similar to the expectations and admonishment expressed by my adopted Hopi family, who frowned heavily upon unauthorized sharing and use of Hopi knowledge.

In a final detailed example from Mexico, my engagement with the Danza Azteca community of Calpulli Tecuanichan (based in the city of Chilpancingo) led me to work with the village of Xipetlan. I gained access to these communities because of my position and involvement in Danza Azteca. By way of background, in 1992 I traveled to Mexico City to take part in ceremonies marking the 500-year date of Columbus’ landing in the Western Hemisphere. Ideologically, this marked a celebration of survival and resistance of Native American peoples. On October 12 of that year, I took part in a Danza Azteca ceremony in the Zocalo central plaza of Mexico City. During the ceremony, I was introduced to representatives of Tecuanichan who played music for the ceremonial dancers. Two weeks later I traveled to Chilpancingo and toured the nearby towns and visited with members of Los Pueblos Indigenas en Resistencia. I was then invited to attend and participate in a Spring Fertility ceremony in the remote village of Xipetlan.

My identity enabled my invitations. The agenda set forth in Xipetlan was to revitalize fertility ceremonies because the village was experiencing a crisis of low birth rates and poor crops. Although residents maintained many aspects of the fertility ceremonies, the village did not have ceremonial dancers to make appropriate offerings. This is where other Danzantes and I were invited to play a role. At each point of introduction and travel, I was reminded that this was not for tourists or anthropologists. This was for indigenous people in resistance to cultural destruction brought about by the legacy of the Spanish invasion and subsequent governmental intervention. The words used to represent general group membership and solidarity were, “somos los pueblos indigenas en Resistencia,” which means “we are the indigenous peoples in resistance,” connoting resistance to the European invasion that had been going on for 500 years.

On the journey I was taken on a charter bus because even the entrance to the dirt road that leads to the village is not served by buses from outside of the region. Traveling with a politically-motivated extended family that indoctrinated me with native ideology was quite distinct from the practice of taking formal tourist transportation. I was specifically admonished against engaging in anthropology, signaled by a pantomime with me playing the role of an Indian, the admonisher playing the role of an anthropologist with a huge insincere smile with his arm around me, and his wife taking a photograph of us for my book exploiting the village and culture for my personal advancement. So, rather than engaging in traditional ethnography I found other ways to do anthropology.

The primary reason that I had been invited to attend was as a traditional ceremonial collaborator in which songs, dances, and ritual were to be conserved through shared practice among the village of Xipetlan, Calpulli Tecuanichan, other Danzante Aztecas, and me. Once I carried a Ph.D., I took on other roles which proved beneficial. In the roles of official investigator and negotiator, I provided credibility for community projects. In addition, I later engaged in a trade in feathers and traditional crafts to support the Tecuanichan community and the allied Danza Azteca communities in the U.S. In essence, my presence and participation hinged on my not being a tourist or anthropologist and instead on my identities as a Danzante and indigenous person.

Conclusion

Anthropological discussion of the complementary nature of tourism and anthropology provides practical lessons about how to use tourism as a disguise for anthropology by expediting travel and relationships. This discussion also highlights ideological distinctions that arise in conducting Native Anthropology and becoming part of a counter-hegemonic identity that eschews perceived connections with anthropology and tourism. Stories of my own experiences demonstrate the dual nature of tourism as a hybrid cultural context engaging globalization processes, and also demonstrate key methodological implications of Native Anthropology as a distinct type of ethnographic fieldwork practice.

Anthropology and tourism are clearly complementary activities that provide practical knowledge for new anthropologists going into the field. They address important theoretical implications for understanding the conditions of ethnographic fieldwork and differences in the practice of Native Anthropology. However, this discussion also raises important issues of ambiguity and ambivalence regarding ideological distinctions that become fluid and negotiable over time, as access to and understanding of Native intentions, agendas, and issues are considered.

In sum, anthropological discussion of the complementary nature of tourism and anthropology provides practical lessons about how to use tourism as a disguise for anthropology, theoretical implications regarding the dual nature of tourism as a hybrid cultural context that highlights globalization processes, and methodological implications of Native Anthropology as an identity opposition to anthropology and tourism.
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