

Ivana Pražić*

Indonesian Consortium for Inter-religious Studies,
Gadjah Mada University in Yogyakarta, Indonesia
iprazic@gmail.com

TOURISM-STUDIES IN INDONESIA: POLICIES, PRACTICES, AND DISCOURSES

Apstrakt: Turizam je, mogućno, industrija koja beleži najbrži rast na svetskom nivou. S tim u vezi, studije turizma neretko se svode na izučavanje ekonomskih dimenzija ovog fenomena. Proučavanje turizma kao inter-, trans-, kros-, kao i intra-kulturološkog fenomena je relativno nova pojava u okviru socioloških nauka uopšte, a posebno u okviru antropologije. Preduslov za inter-disciplinarni pristup izučavanju turizma može se dovesti u vezu sa srazmerno nedavnim paradigmatiskim "otklonom" u društvenim naukama uopšte, a samim tim i u antropologiji. Novi(ji) paradigmatiski pristup(i), tako, insistiraju na proučavanju turizma kao prevashodno kulturološke pojave.

Ključne reči: Antropologija turizma; turizam kroz inter- i intra-disciplinarnost; turist(kinj)a/etnograf(kinja)—identitetski "prestupi"; studije turizma u (post)modernizmu; turizam kao metafora postmodernog društva.

The substantial growth of the tourism activity clearly marks tourism as one of the most remarkable economic and social phenomena of the past century. The number of international arrivals shows an evolution from a mere 25 million international arrivals in 1950 to an estimated 806 million in 2005, corresponding to an average annual growth rate of 6.5%.¹

A. Introduction

The quotation above defines tourism both as social and economic phenomenon. It also suggests that—measured by the number of people involved in "tourism activity"—the phenomenon is experiencing a long-term growth. Provided that the quoted paragraph has been taken from the official World Tourist Organization website, it is of no surprise that the predominant appro-

* PhD candidate at the ICRS GMU, Yogyakarta

¹ Taken from the official website of the World Tourist Organization: www.unwto.org

ach to studying tourism world-wide has been to focus on its economic dimensions.

Importantly, the quotation above is indicative of those issues that this article will attempt to critically reassess—the predominant paradigms in tourism-studies in general, and in Indonesia in particular. In line with the abovementioned thinking, the "growth" of tourism becomes a statistical datum measurable by number of people involved in tourism, which is here defined as "activity." Tourists are, therefore, reduced to quantifiable bodies, hence being transformed into numeric indicators of a social phenomenon to whose growth or decline they contribute in figures. It may be argued that such definition of tourism, thus understood as a social phenomenon of measurable, quantifiable, and—most importantly—economically/politically controllable features, reduces it to an object in much the same way in which 19th-century positivism did with observed and studied social phenomena. Such approach, furthermore, proposes that the ways in which this socio-economic phenomenon and its "progress" could be quantified, hence politically controlled, may be achieved by institutionalizing discursive formation practices. Seen in this light, tourism has its own history that can be traced down by discovering set of events that marked its clear social emerging and economic "development." In fact, search for "origins" in the spirit of the 19th-century evolutionism is what uncritical tourism studies for the most part seem to have been engaged in. In addition, "tourist" becomes a social marker, a label easily attachable to certain (groups of) people thereby positioned against those who are perceived as "non-tourists."

It can be argued that modernist dichotomist and reductionist thinking, pertinent to mainstream tourism-studies, reveals an underlying ideology of cognitive homogenization in that it has helped to conceal the complexity of the phenomenon and to its inherent dynamics of political, religious, cultural, and social processes. More importantly, from discursive practices dichotomization and reductionism are further translated into those ideologies that shape tourism-related policies both at national and international level, few of which are being designed in a way to disturb the given power-relations by means of epistemologically and conceptually unfixing otherwise both socially and politically compelling discursive borders.

As a foreign-featured woman residing in Indonesia, it is impossible for me to forget or deny the experience of "touristification," to borrow Picard's (1996 [1992]) term, which surfaces in my almost daily labeling as "tourist." Wherever I go, whatever I do, I am being labeled as "tourist." I often feel compelled to position myself against/towards such labeling, as much as I am prompted to reflect upon its intended meanings and significations. In line with such thinking, in this essay I will attempt to explore certain discourses, narratives, practices, policies and representations within which the term "tourism" has been contextualized in (post)modern social sciences, particularly anthropo-

logy, on the one hand, and surfaced to construct social realities and experiences on the other. The socio-cultural, as well as discursive settings on which I will focus here is the modern state of Indonesia. Provided the experience of living as a "tourist" in Indonesia, self-reflection and observation are among the research-methods I have deployed in conducting the research which has led to composing this essay.

In other words, I will attempt to examine not only some discourses exploring the phenomenon of tourism from within frameworks of various scholarly disciplines, but also several case studies related to contemporary tourism-studies in Indonesia deploying what Bucholtz phrased as "reflexivity and critique in discourse analysis" that, I hope, will help me answer the question of how do I feel about what I claim to be experiencing and seeing (Bucholtz 2003). In so doing, I hope to emphasize the complexity of re-connoting the term "tourism," whether the term is understood as an analytical category, a designed and/or applied policy, a writer's positioning, and/or a wider social experience, as well as to its related social labeling.

B. Pilgrimage, travel, tourism: transgressing phenomenological and disciplinary boundaries²

I came here as a tourist, and I'm returning as a pilgrim. In the silence of the heights, I heard the call of the Weeping Virgin; the call wounded me, and my wound will never heal. For me, that's what the Church is: a profound community life, brotherly groups, people loving one another. (Antier 1984:387)

What I had in mind by introducing the term "boundaries" here is the postmodernist reconstruction of processes, practices and policies deployed in theorizing identity on the one hand, and blurring the disciplinary boundaries on the other. Instead of the modernist self-other dichotomy, postmodernist relativity unfixes bipolar oppositions perceiving them as ever-changing processes instead of fixed or inherent essences. In Laurie Sears' opinion, it is the relativity of boundaries of the self that determines postmodern self-identification as a changing and always contextualized process, in and against the self as much as with respect to the other. In addition, this relativity is open to everyone, and as such can be used as an attempt to de-authorize those mechanisms (both academic and social ones) that turn differences into hierarchized oppositions between the "colonized" and the "colonizer," the "center" and the "periphery" (Sears 1996:14-18), to name some of the often cited pairs of concepts constructed as mutually excluding. Sears writes from a position of a postfoundational feminist and with re-

² See Laurie J. Sears, *Introduction: Fragile Identities*, in *Fantasizing the Feminine in Indonesia*, Laurie J. Sears [ed.]. 1996. Durham & London: Duke University Press, 1996.

gard to the contemporary Indonesian representational policies, practices, and women-related discourses. However, by choosing to appropriate Sears' approach and framework, I hope to open a legitimate access point to observing, theorizing, and reflecting on the discursive, socio-cultural, as well as political boundaries of the phenomenon/discipline/experience/practice of tourism.

Is there any connection between modern pilgrimage, modern travel and modern tourism? To some, the connection is obvious, hence *problematic* both at phenomenological and disciplinary levels. To others, the connection is obvious thus *invigorating*, ushering deployment of inter- and multi-disciplinary approach(es) in studying the complexity of the mentioned phenomena. Even a superficial consideration of tourism, travel, and pilgrimage suggests there is a strong, albeit elusive, interconnection between the three phenomena. It may be argued that the elusiveness of this interconnection is related to the point from which the consideration is being made. I tend to agree with those authors who claim that (self)situated-ness³ is an ideological position, reflective of the disciplinary/discursive, experiential, and otherwise historicizing boundaries that contextualize the subject engaged in a particular consideration. In other words, whether a scholar, a traveler, a tourist, or pilgrim is considering the abovementioned interconnectedness, the cognitive process is nevertheless reflective of the "hidden agenda" underlying his or her social, cultural, religious, gender, class, age, ethnic, and other politicized/politicizing (self)positionings, here reflected and constructed through meanings ascribed to the labels "tourist," "pilgrim," and/or "traveler."

In (post)modern anthropological studies of tourism, there is a list of authors who pointed to dangers of "tourist labeling." It is useful here to recall Butler's words as illustrative of such critical reassessment of tourist labeling. Thus, he writes:

"The labels that are placed on what are called different kinds of tourism can be extremely misleading. All aspects of tourism are parts of the same phenomenon [...], they come from the same basic sources. Tourists are people, and people change. The so-called ecotourists or cultural tourists of today may well be mass tourists of yesterday and tomorrow [...]."⁴

³ It is in these terms that Miroslav Volf writes on the "situated selves", that are "female or male, Jew or Greek, rich or poor—as a rule, more than one of these things at the same time ("rich Greek female"), often having hybrid identities ("Jew-Greek" and "male-female"), and sometimes migrating from one identity to another." See Miroslav Volf. 1996. *Exclusion and Embrace: A Theological Exploration of Identity, Otherness, and Reconciliation*. Nashville: Abingdon Press. p. 21.

⁴ Richard W Butler, *The Role of Tourism in Cultural Transformation in Developing Countries in Proceeding of the Indonesian-Swiss Forum on Culture and Interna-*

Furthermore, from within the framework of postmodern relativism, any claims to a "neutral" or "objective" position in scholarship have been dismissed as self-referential, uncritical, normative, if not altogether voyeuristic, entrenchment within boundaries of "fixed," "inherent" and "unchanging" identities (Sears 1996). Applied to the abovementioned relation between tourist, traveler and pilgrim, the modernist polarity structuring discursive practices of labeling is revealed through critical postmodernist deconstructive rereading of those labels and concepts/practices that are supposedly fixed by and within them, as Butler showed above. Thus, expanding on Barnes' and Hoose's theorizing the "guest-host" distinction in tourism-studies, it could further be argued that while such tourist-traveler-pilgrim polarization "is helpful as a starting point in any attempt to understand the tourist phenomenon, it can provide too static a model of what is always going to be a fluid and ever-changing set of interactions between 'hosts' and 'guests'" and—it may be added here—a transformed spiritual self of a pilgrim (Barnes and Hoose 1999:19). Consequently, the adoption of the discursive practice grounded in blurring conceptual/experiential dichotomies could, perhaps, strengthen my writing position here in that by claiming that my experience of a tourist *and* a foreign Ph.D. student in Indonesian settings has not only motivated me to conduct a short research and produce an essay to present to it ensuing results, but has also framed my writing both at theoretical and experiential level. Indeed, the "foreign-ness" of my scholarly position in Indonesia seems to have been the primary motivating force behind my urge to search for discursive practices and paradigmatic shifts related to tourism studies in my current studying/living environment.

Be that as it may, it is hopefully clear by now that the real problem in theorizing tourism in any "sustainable" manner consists in construing such academic discourses intended to transgress the proposed disciplinary and definitional boundaries in an attempt to provide dynamic theoretical models and research methods that would be more appropriately designed to describe the changing realities and experiences of self and other as constructed through those practices and policies that contextualize tourism, travel, and/or pilgrimage on the one side, and scholarship investigating the phenomena on the other. The use of the term "sustainable" is intentional here, as it frequently appears in tourism, museum, and heritage studies where, in words of Pigram and Wahab (1997), it "has become the catch cry of the 1990s". As an illustration of the authors' claim, I find it appropriate here to recall definition provided by the World Commission on Environment and Development, where it is stated that a sustainable development—in which the idea of sustainable tourism develop-

tional Tourism (1995) *Tourism and Culture: Global Civilization in Change?* 1996. W. Nuryanti [ed.]. Yogyakarta: Gadjah Mada University Press: p. 99.

ment is grounded—is such "development that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs."⁵ The World Tourism Organization, in line with such thinking, defines sustainable tourism development as "that which meets the needs of present tourists and host regions while protecting and enhancing opportunity for the future. It is envisaged as leading to management of all resources in such a way that economic, social and esthetic needs can be fulfilled while maintaining cultural integrity, essential ecological processes, biological diversity and life support systems."⁶ In words of Pigram and Wahab (1997), "[c]oncern for sustainability, and for the environmental management processes which contribute to it, is of crucial importance in the future growth of tourism." However, the authors also point out that "[t]he term sustainability, which has gained prominence in tourism jargon, is seen by many writers as an important part of the philosophy permeating all levels of tourism policy issues and practice from national to local (Edgell 1993). Others understand sustainability as a deep-rooted concept that relates to the fundamentals of life which sometimes are obscured by the ongoing public/private debate, regulation and rationalized government intervention."⁷

The abovementioned inter- or multi- disciplinary tools desired for studying tourism in a more diversifying, thus inclusive, manner are offered not only by Sears' academic utilization of the postfoundational feminist framework, but also in what may be termed as a "self-reflective ethnographic discourse", as proposed by Kenneth George in his Preface to *Showing Signs of Violence: The Cultural Politics of a Twentieth-Century Headhunting Ritual* (1996). In an attempt to delineate his study approach, George states that his work should be understood as "a rejection of transcendent constructs and vantage points that would harness ethnography to the manufacture of a certain and fixed human universe" (George 1996: xi). In addition, reflecting on the self-other relations, structuring the focal point of ethnographic studies, George makes the following claim:

⁵ Cited from M. Barnes and Jayne Hoose, *Tourists or Travelers? Rediscovering Pilgrimage in The Way: Contemporary Christian Spirituality* (January 1999): Spirituality and Travel. Michael Barnes [gen. ed.]: p. 20; footnote 13.

⁶ WTO (1995: 30); cited from Pigram and Wahab 1997, p. 278. For the complete reference, see below.

⁷ See John J. Pigram and Salah Wahab, *The Challenge of Sustainable Tourism Growth in Tourism, Development and Growth: The Challenge of Sustainability*. 1997. Salah Wahab and John J. Pigram [eds.] London and New York: Routledge. pp. 3 and 277. Also compare with *Tourism and Sustainability: New Tourism in the Third World*. 1998. Martin Mowforth and Ian Munt [eds.] London and New York: Routledge; the volume is more inclined to the "culture-as-product" approach in studying tourism.

[e]thnography, I would argue, is a revisionary task as well. In taking ideas and theories and placing them in tension with a lived-in world, ethnography offers us a measure of our limits and our historicity. It is a means for acknowledging those who remain resistant to our sense of things, an entanglement with that recalcitrant other who demands nothing less—and perhaps nothing more—than recognition⁸. It calls for readjustment to our moral and conceptual horizons. (George 1996: xi-xii)

In light of the shifting postmodernist boundaries that keep making it hard to distinguish between the tourist, the pilgrim, and the traveler, it would seem appropriate to think of the shift that has been at work in "revising" approaches to studying tourism for the past several decades.

B. The paradigmatic shift: from economics to anthropology of tourism

The paradigmatic shift in tourism-studies seems to have occurred five decades ago, when tourism—understood as a cultural process that as such is involved in (self-other) identity-formation dynamics—started being "anthropologized," so to speak. The initial focus was placed on the host-guest relationship. Thus, in the 1970s, Graburn claimed that "[t]he anthropology of tourism, though novel in itself, rests upon sound anthropological foundations and has predecessors in previous research on rituals and ceremonials, human play, and cross-cultural aesthetics."⁹

⁸ The concept and to it related politics of "recognition" in terms of collective and individual identities is extensively elaborated in Charles Taylor's essay on multiculturalism and the politics of recognition written in response to the contemporary separatist movement in Canada. Taylor's theorizing multiculturalism gives a clue to "understanding [modern] individual identity," as experienced in contemporary liberal democracies, by tracing its roots to the Enlightenment and connecting it to development of the notion of authenticity. Charles Taylor, *The Politics of Recognition in Multiculturalism: Examining the Politics of Recognition*. 1994. Amy Gutmann [ed.] Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press.

⁹ See N. Graburn, *Tourism: The Sacred Journey* in *Hosts and Guests: The Anthropology of Tourism*. 1978[1977] Valene L. Smith [ed.]. Oxford: Basil Blackwell: p. 17. Similarly, in the same volume T. Nunez writes about *The Touristic Studies in Anthropological Perspective* observing that "[s]ince its beginning little more than a decade ago, the study of tourism by anthropologists has been characterized largely by serendipity. This, however, is not an irony, for many of now traditional and established interests of anthropologist derive from fortuitous observations or accidental "discoveries" while researching other or unrelated topics or problems." (p. 207)

Growing literature on tourism shows that modernist distinction between tourist, traveler, and pilgrim is gradually being replaced with various typologies of tourists understood as analytical category.¹⁰ Categories of tourists—mostly designed to accommodate, as well as to evaluate and control, the quality of touristic experience and/or motivation measured, for instance, by the tourist's positioning on the "novelty-familiarity" stimulus scale—for the most part do not entirely escape popular stereotypes¹¹ about tourists (Barnes and Hoose 1999). It seems that what escapes most researchers is that the modern categories of pilgrimage, tourism, and travel—when taken out of their modernist epistemological and theoretical framework—fail to provide sustainable models for what is meant, practiced and experienced in traveling, pilgrimage and tourism in the postmodernity. In his sociological work exploring the structure of modern society, Dean MacCannell writes about "cultural experience," which he defines as a subclass of experience and relates it to tourism, here used as a metaphor for modern society in general. The author further argues that "[c]ultural experiences are valued in-themselves and are the ultimate deposit of values, including economic values, in modern society" (1999 [1976], 28). Since MacCannell's work is primarily sociological in that the label "tourist" is intended to be understood as a metaphor of modern-man-in-general, his theory may indicate ways to further blur the conceptual, theoretical, as well as disciplinary boundaries in a search for more appropriate approaches to and in studying tourism.

Thus pilgrimage, as both modern and post-modern(ized) form of "transformational travel" (Sheldrake 1999), fits well into the range of motives behind the postmodernist categorizations of tourist; as such, it prompts redefinition and extension of both concepts (i.e. pilgrimage *and* tourism) rather than reaffirmation of dividing boundaries between them. The "postmodern category of tourist" has been intended to deliberately expand the conceptual horizon of Urry's (1996) category of "post-modern tourist." Despite his shrewd remark

¹⁰ See, for instance, Barnes and Hoose (1999), Philip Sheldrake (1999), John Mary Waliggo (1999), John Urry (1996), Jean-Jacques Antier (1984).

¹¹ It is useful to recall here Cantwell's view of the stereotype as a mechanism by which the other is situated in relation to the self: "Stereotype is *stereo*, the fixed or solid, *type*, the stamp or seal, from which every individual impression takes its form in thought, so that the particularity of the impression, even when it occludes, distorts, or breaks the image of the seal, is nevertheless always conceived as a more or less imperfect record of its pressure of imprint. As such it is the mechanism by which we describe, assess, and situate others in relation to ourselves, figuring each individual as an expression of a particular class." Robert Cantwell, *Ethnomimesis: Folklife and the Representation of Culture* (Chapel Hill and London: The University of North Carolina Press, 1993): p. 167.

that "[n]ot everyone is a post-modern!" he nevertheless characterizes the novel type of the "post-modern tourist:"

"1. There is no authentic tourist experience – all such experiences are constructed

2. Both the producers and the consumers know that this is so – that tourism is a series of games

3. Visitors can pick and choose what to see and experience and do not simply accept what producers want to produce for them

4. Visitors develop the capacity to compare tourist sites from around the world and this generates a certain tourism cosmopolitanism

5. Visitor's experiences are structured by new forms of visual and electronic media and it becomes increasingly difficult to separate travel experience from other visual experiences

6. Efforts are made to narrow distance between the visitors and the visited – neither is a privileged category

7. There are multiple cultural voices and so there can be no single authoritative account of what the tourism experience has been like

8. There is an appreciation of the very processes by which tourist sites have been fabricated for visitors

9. There is no presumption of the superiority of the modern world and especially of western culture

10. No sustained distinction can be drawn between the insightful traveler and the mere tourist – that too is a modern distinction which post-modern culture itself dissolves."¹²

It seems in place to recall here Graburn's reflections on tourism—understood as *the* object of anthropological exploration—since his thinking well expresses the approach to studying tourism within "the wider examination of race, ethnicity and identity" (Hitchcock and King 2003), to which I am personally inclined, and which seems to be more in line with blurring analytical and disciplinary categories inherent in modernist theories of tourism¹³:

¹² John Urry, *Post Modern Society and Contemporary Tourism in Tourism and Culture: Global Civilization in Change?* 1996. Wiendu Nuryanti ed. *Proceeding of the Indonesian-Swiss Forum on Culture and International Tourism*, Yogyakarta, Indonesia (1995) Yogyakarta: Gadjah Mada University Press: p. 90.

¹³ Once again, the question of tourism as process of (self)identification seems to revolve around blurring the boundaries between self and other. In his book entitled *Bali: Cultural Tourism and Touristic Culture* (1996), Picard elaborates his observation about the interrelatedness between the culture and tourism, perceiving it as indicative of another significant point in theorizing phenomenon of tourism, which is its

Tourism-studies in Indonesia...

Tourism [...] does not universally exist but is functionally and symbolically equivalent to other institutions that humans use to embellish and add meaning to their lives. In its special aspect—travel—it has antecedents and equivalents in other seemingly more purposeful institutions such as medieval student travel, the Crusades, and European and Asian pilgrimage circuits. (Graburn 1978)

Indeed: we live a world where discourses on globalization and localization contextualize, conceptualize, and politicize not only traveling, but also religious experience and to it related politics of (re)presentation. In Indonesia, as much as elsewhere, it becomes very hard to argue against those who claim that the line between *hajj* and *umroh* pilgrimage trips and "mere" traveling tours has become almost indistinguishable.¹⁴ Along similar(ly conceptually blurred) lines of thinking, Kathleen Adams conducted an anthropological exploration of tourism as a nation-building—thus politicized/politicizing—strategy in the New Order Indonesia,¹⁵ whereas Dahles (2001) sees in tourism one of the ways in which the New Order regime¹⁶ institutionalized self-representa-

political-ness. Touristification as a (historical, as well as historicizing) discursive process through which cultural identities are constructed is just as ideologically biased as it is reflective of those power-relations that lie behind political agendas designing (cultural) tourism policies. In fact, it may be argued that touristification is a discursive process through which these power relations are institutionalized at "cultural" level. See Picard, M. 1996[1992]. *Bali: Cultural Tourism and Touristic Culture*. Singapore: Archipelago Press.

¹⁴ The particular argumentation on the issue was developed by Abdurrahman, Moeslim. 1996. "Ritual Divided: Hajj Tours in Capitalist Era Indonesia." [ed.] Mark Woodward, *Toward a New Paradigm: Recent Developments in Indonesian Islamic Thought*. Tempe (Ariz.): Arizona State University, 1996. pp. 117-132.

¹⁵ In her article on *Domestic tourism and nation-building in South Sulawesi* (1998), Adams proposes that "the interrelations between tourism and nation-building in contemporary Indonesia" suggest there is an intentional ideological differentiation at work in structuring socio-cultural practices and to them related policies regulating and constructing ethnic tourism experience for domestic and foreign tourists respectively. Thus, she claims that "[f]or many European and American travelers, *individual* identity is discovered through touristic pilgrimages to encounter 'exotic; peoples in Indonesia. In contrast, I argue that Indonesian domestic tours are intimately bound to questions of ethnicity and nationalism. This is not to say that issues of group identity are absent for European and American ethnic tourists or to deny that Indonesian domestic travel prompts rethinking or reaffirmation of individual, gender, religious, or class identity. [...] My point is that, in contrast to foreign tourists, many Indonesian domestic tourists' experiences are mediated by the national government's emphasis on tourism as a nation-building strategy" (Adams 1998: 77).

¹⁶ The "New Order" period in Indonesian history was marked by over thirty years of Suharto's (dictatorial) rule, which ended in 1998.

tion as a foreign-policy tool¹⁷. The question remains whether or not, apart from within the framework of modernity, such conceptual and experiential lines between pilgrimage, tourism, and travel had ever been "universally," "functionally" or even "symbolically" existent at all.

D. Tourism, culture and politics in Indonesia: the case studies

The three chosen case studies to be discussed shortly were obtained during my two-month internship program undertaken in the Gadjah Mada University's Pusat Studi Pariwisata¹⁸ (hereafter: PUSPAR). I have chosen to follow Urry's "new methods of tourism research" which, in both his and mine opinion "should involve studying not just buildings, but also texts, and not only written texts, but also maps, landscapes, paintings, signs, films, townscapes, TV programmes, brochures and so on," with the idea that any tourist site "is in effect produced by multiple texts which combine together to produce the particular tourist site, albeit one whose meanings are shifting, unstable and contested" (Urry 1996: 89)¹⁹. Apart from the touristifying image-making, this approach should, as I will attempt to demonstrate, be useful in revealing political agendas behind the shaped tourism policies, as much as it should blur the boundaries between touristic, religious, and scholarly experiences.

According to the Final Report consisting of the Master Plan for the Local Tourism Development in North Halmahera Province (Rencana Induk Pengembangan Pariwisata Daerah Kabupaten Halmahera Utara.²⁰ hereafter RIPPDA),

¹⁷ In her inspiring post-doctoral research on *Tourism, Heritage and National Culture in Java: Dilemmas of a Local Community* (2001) during the New Order, Heidi Dahles relates tourism to politics and sees it as the Indonesian government's instrument in promoting the *pancasila* ideology of Indonesian nationhood through stressing its "Unity in Diversity" doctrine, albeit for different political aims in foreign and domestic tourism-policies respectively. Thus, she claims that "the New Order government has been strategically promoting the expansion of tourism to implement its political agenda," which, in turn, remains hidden behind rhetoric of economic prosperity and national development. Whereas for international visitors tourism serves to represent Indonesia as "an economically prosperous, politically stable, and culturally advanced country," for domestic ones it is used as a means to promote "national unity, *pancasila* ideology and other government-orchestrated values" (Dahles 2001:vii-viii)

¹⁸ Center for Tourism Studies.

¹⁹ Compare also with MacCannell's (1999 [1976]) and Picard's (1996 [1992]) research methodologies.

²⁰ This unpublished work, completed in 2006, is available at the PUSPAR: Kompleks Bulaksumur J-3, Yogyakarta.

the national policy on tourism²¹ should be improved in order to strengthen "our *bargaining position*" as one of the ASEAN²² member-nations. New policies should facilitate the large-scale tourism development ("*corporate tourism*"), since the existing small-scale development policies are not in line with "our cultural and environmental diversity" (RIPPDA: VI-4). Apart from English-language terminology intentionally left in italics, as found in the original text, phraseology like 'restrukturasi produk wisata' (restructuring tourist products) and 'pasar' (market) (RIPPDA: VI-5) immediately point to the managerial understanding of tourism based on the culture-as-product and tourism as income-generating industry views, where tourism is expected to boost economy in terms of measurable growth. Cultural objectification is made apparent in enumerating houses of certain ethnic communities under "objek dan daya tarik wisata budaya material"²³ (material objects of tourist attraction; RIPPDA: III-63; III-66) which, in turn, is in line with long-standing governmental (re)presentational policies "museumizing" Indonesian ethnic diversity into an array of cultures whose diversity is codified—and thus controlled—in and by representation of traditional houses (Hellman 2004), as promoted in *Taman Mini Indah Indonesia* in Jakarta.

The second case concerns the rhetoric of national "development and modernization" policies as reproduced in the short brochure on PUSPAR.²⁴ The brochure cover defines PUSPAR as a research center which "endeavors to develop and advance tourism studies aimed at community- and nation-character development,"²⁵ and thus stays within the proposed limits of tourism as an instrument in nation-building. According to the brochure, PUSPAR's vision is to become an independent research center, a kind of umbrella-organization that would gather professionals involved in inciting scientific, technological and artistic development at community- and national level, and from within the field of tourism.²⁶

²¹ In particular, "undang-undang no 9 Th 1990" and "Peraturan Pemerintah No 18 Th 1994" (RIPPDA: VI-4).

²² Association of Southeast Asian Nations.

²³ As Kathleen Adams observes, "*wisata* translates as 'tour', and *obyek wisata* can be translated as 'tourist object'. The Indonesian government has promoted the use of these expressions as part of its tourism development project. The very use of these terms suggests a reconditioning of the local gaze, as village inhabitants come to perceive their homes as 'objects' for tourists" (Adams 2003, 105: footnote 13).

²⁴ Available in Indonesian language at the PUSPAR. The brochure equals to little over 7,000 characters (circa five A-4 pages) in its English translation.

²⁵ In original: "Aktualisasi Peran Penelitian Dalam Mengembangkan Ilmu Kepariwisataan Untuk Membangun Masyarakat Dan Bangsa Yang Berkarakter."

²⁶ In original, "Visi Pusat Studi Pariwisata Universitas Gadjah Mada: MENJADI PUSAT STUDI YANG MANDIRI, PROFESIONAL UNTUK MEWADAHAI AKTUALISASI PERAN ILMU PENGETAHUAN, TEKNOLOGI DAN SENI DALAM PEMBANGUNAN MASYARAKAT DAN NEGARA DALAM BIDANG PARIWISATA."

Indeed, in just over 7,000 characters, the term "development" in its various forms²⁷ appears more than thirty times in the brochure as if its frequent repetition has been intended to actually bring about "development," thus illustrating in what ways language or phraseology construct and reproduce certain ideologies.

The third case regards the result of the joined project realized in cooperation between PUSPAR and the Kementerian Koordinator Bidang Kesejahteraan Rakyat Republik Indonesia ('Coordinating Ministry of Social Welfare of the Republic of Indonesia'). This collaboration resulted in the short booklet published by the mentioned Ministry and entitled "Panduan Praktis: Menjadi Wisatawan Peduli" (A Practical Guidebook: How to Become a Concerned Tourist)²⁸. The booklet is aimed to inform a prospective concerned tourist how to not only "maintain the harmonious relations with local community in the tourist destination,"²⁹ but also to "help in reducing the poverty in a tourist destination."³⁰ However, provided that the booklet is in Indonesian language, it is hard to imagine that it would ever be used to raise awareness about cultural and socio-economic differences between the (presumably) Western visitors³¹ and various Indonesian ethnicities³² in Western visitors for whom the booklet was supposedly produced in the first place. Since it is advised that in preparing for the trip the prospective visitors inform themselves about the cultural, political and socio-economic conditions in their future destinations (p. 2), as well as to learn a few words of the local language (p. 5), it is reasonable to presume that such visitors are having no previous knowledge of Indonesian language. On the other hand, given the role in advancing tourism studies, PUSPAR is, in the least, accessible to under- and post-graduate students of the Gadjah Mada University majoring in tourism; through them—at least potentially—the booklet becomes available to wider population. The "nation-building" image offered by the booklet is that of a government concerned with cultural and environmental³³ well-being of its ethnically diverse, but ideologically united nation and, more importantly, the one that is active in designing tourism-related strategies aimed at eradicating poverty. Overall impression is

²⁷ As in 'pengembangan', 'mengembangkan', 'pembangunan', 'membangun', 'perkembangan', and 'dikembangkan'.

²⁸ The booklet is available at PUSPAR.

²⁹ In original: "menjaga hubungan harmonis dengan masyarakat di daerah destinasi." (p. 1)

³⁰ In original: "ikut membantu penanggulangan kemiskinan di daerah tujuan wisata." (p. 1)

³¹ Racial features such as skin- and hair-color, and protruding noses, clearly define depicted tourists as "white Caucasians."

³² Most "locals" are dressed in distinguishable "traditional" costumes.

³³ Page 9 of the booklet advises potential tourists not to litter and to keep the environment clean.

that the government makes an effort not only to control the potentially negative impact of overseas tourism, but also to redirect this impact towards providing community-oriented economic growth. Be that as it may, it can be argued that the ideology underlying the booklet might produce a contrary effect on potential Indonesian readers by reaffirming their positioning within the global power-relations—which thus remain unchallenged by tourism—where they are (self)perceived as economically weak and culturally threatened by the unawareness and insensitivity of the "first world" tourists.

E. Instead of conclusion: an inclusive journey

The closing case in this section of the essay lies within the realm of personal(ized) experience, which I offer here to display how my dichotomist thinking pre-structured my perception of the event in question, impeding me to focus on its complexity in a futile search for fixed and discrete analytical categories in practice.

The last days of May and the first ones in June 2007 in Central Java were marked by the celebration of the Buddhist holiday³⁴ of Waisak. Being trained as art historian, with an M. A. degree in Buddhist sculpture, I immediately decided to attend the event from purely touristic and the reasons I then related to attraction towards participating in a pilgrimage walk, with the decision to make numerous slides of the famous sculptures adorning the Mendut temple, from where what I thought would be a religious procession would begin its "traditional"³⁵ walk to Borobudur. Upon arrival to the village of Mendut, I realized

³⁴ The choice of the term "holiday" here is intentional, because of its etymology derived from the terms "holy" and "day." See Soccoro Mendes, *Impact of Tourism on the 'Ethics' of Developing Countries* in --Jeevadhara: A Journal of Christian Interpretation (Vol. XXVI No. 156: Ethical Reflections on Economic Liberalization), [ed] Thomas Srampickal (November 1996, India: Kottayam): p. 459.

³⁵ The term "tradition" here is used in order to make reference to Eric Hobsbawm's theorizing traditions as constructed or "invented." This important insight is left in the footnote here with the intention to indicate my unawareness of Hobsbawm's theory at the moment I made the journey, experience of which thus having been structured differently from what would have been the case should I had already read the following lines: "The term 'invented tradition' is used in a broad, but not imprecise sense. It includes both 'tradition' actually invented, constructed and formally instituted and those emerging in a less traceable manner with a brief and datable period – a matter of few years perhaps – and establishing them with great rapidity. Invented tradition is taken to mean *a set of practices, normally governed by overtly or tacitly accepted rules and of a ritual and symbolic nature, which seek to inculcate certain values and norms of behavior by repetition, which automatically implies continuity with past.* In fact, they normally attempt to establish continuity with a historic

that my slides-taking task would prove to be more difficult than I thought, provided that the temple and its surroundings were packed with what I starting classifying as "believers" or "pilgrims," "local tourists," "peddlers," "food and souvenir-vendors," and the "Mendut village-inhabitants" (whom I casually labeled as "non-believers" on account of the presence of numerous head-covered women among them), as well as occasional foreign "tourists," recognizable by their facial features. Monumental government-sponsored billboard (Figure 1) just outside the entrance-gate to the temple yard on behalf of the "Ministry of Religious Affairs" (Menteri Agama) wished a "Happy Waisak Holiday" (Selamat Hari Raya Waisak 2551/2007) to the "Buddhist congregation" (Bagi Umat Buddha). It was also inviting "all of us to raise the level of tolerance and harmony among different religious communities for the sake of the peace and reconciliation in the world" (Mari Kita Tingkatkan Toleransi dan Kerukunan Umat Beragama Demi Perdamaian Dunia). What struck me as odd at the moment was the call for the "world peace and reconciliation," obviously intended to be read only by Indonesian-speaking visitors. I thought of it as a strategic move within the image-making politics of representing Indonesia as an already peaceful and tolerant nation—despite, or perhaps *because of*, its religious diversity—achieved by placing the inter-religious conflict in the outer world, thus imagined as a spatial and social abstraction.

At first, I persisted in taking photos of the sculpture on the outer walls of the temple, even though the activity was being constantly disturbed by incessant flow of the people which I unconsciously kept classifying, consciously keeping myself outside these hierarchized categories under the veil of my "pure" academic interest in the Buddhist art. Gradually, though, I realized that I had never seen an art-historical Buddhist monument enlivened through a "real" religious ritual, which just added up to my excitement about attending the event surrounding me; hence I unconsciously started to take photos of everything I was seeing.

The religious procession, to my great surprise, did not solely consist of groups of (a majority of) Buddhist monks, nuns, and believers coming from various parts of Asia and Indonesia—all carefully separated into groups by their common geographies—and local and foreign tourists. At one point, the procession almost imperceptibly turned into a parade with what I perceived as overwhelmingly popular overtones, and I found myself thinking how the whole thing was becoming vulgar. At a more informed level, I now realize that the terms "populism" and "vulgarity" were what I used as disguising labels for my inability to understand and interpret the multitude of representational politics

past." Eric Hobsbawm, *Introduction: Inventing Traditions* in *The Invention of Tradition*. [eds] Eric Hobsbawm and Terence Ranger. 1988 [1983]. Cambridge, New York, Melbourne, New Rochelle, Sydney: Cambridge University Press, p. 1 [italics added]

unfolding before my eyes as part of singularly pre-structured and pre-imag(in)ed event, in which "secular," "popular," and "religious" overtones were being mixed in shifting proportions.

The five-kilometer-long walk of the crowd to Borobudur was to mark the final stage of the event. As I trod and sweated in the blazing sun, I realized that my re-enactment of pilgrim's journey—which, I believed, was quite appropriate for an informed researcher, such as myself—was constantly disturbed by those who chose to speed their way by riding motorbikes, bicycles, *becaks* and even horse-carriages. Still, my discontent with their "disrespect to the event"—as I labeled it then—was smoothed by the contagious excitement of the smiling and giggling crowd surrounding me while we all slowly paced our way to the biggest Buddhist stupa in the world....

While the excitement of the mass might have initially had stimulated my mood, what kept me positively energized throughout the walk was neither the crowd, nor my reiteration of a pilgrim's journey, but both of them, and more. It were the multifarious possibilities to self-position myself within (or without) the event that kept me so elated despite the heat and the dust. As I could not realize back then, but am aware of now, I was sliding on the scale stretching from tourist, to pilgrim, to traveler, to art-historian, and to ethnographer in a wave of different moods that were constantly (re)negotiating my position within and without the event. It was the blurred boundaries between me and the bodies around me that kept me going until the end of my "reconstructing road" which, in turn, broadened my self-positioning from tourist *or* ethnographer, or tourist-ethnographer, to a multitude of possible positionings which the presence within the event offered.

Even though at the time unaware of possible overlaps in one's identity, I took a photo which, I thought, would recapture the "contradicting images" of the event and keep them live for me (Figure 6). After having conducted the presented research, I realized there was nothing contradictory about the images. The exclusion came from within, as the expression of my inability to recognize and reconcile all the images and politics of representations as telling their respective stories of "authenticity" and "truth," mistakenly, if not nostalgically, searching for singular (thus exclusive) point of view which would subjugate the multitude into singularity thus rendering modernism triumphant in (both scholarly and social) spaces and times in which such bipolarity is but obsolete, if not misleading, theoretical residue.

Indeed, as a closing remark to this essay, I will recall a recent article published in the country's most influential newspaper in English language, *The Jakarta Post*³⁶. This text reveals that contemporary Indonesian public discour-

³⁶ "Integrated spiritual tourism at Mt. Selok, Srandil" by Agus Maryono in The Jakarta Post (15 November 2008) p. 20.

ses and policies have already leaped beyond the pilgrim-tourist dichotomy into the postmodern(ist) transgressions. Although it could be argued that the underpinning ideology behind conceptual conflation was (at least until recently) dubiously grounded in the necessity to incite the country's economic development through ushering in modernist scholarly approaches to studying tourism, contemporary (foreign and national) practices of "pilgrimage" and "site-seeing" seem to have already reached the point when they need to be reformulated in more inclusive (inter)disciplinary terms. Be that as it may, the article reveals that the postmodernist cognitive shift has already taken place at the level of public discourses, where boundaries between tourism, travel, and pilgrimage appear to have entered the cognitive spaces of postmodernity within which their respective interconnectedness becomes legitimately institutionalized in the (hybrid and widespread) phenomenon of "integrated spiritual tourism."



Figure 1. The Billboard



Figure 2. The "Tourist" and the "Pilgrim"

BIBLIOGRAPHY:

- Sears, Laurie J. 1996. *Introduction. Fragile Identities: Deconstructing Women in Indonesia*, in **Fantasizing the Feminine in Indonesia**, [ed] Laurie J. Sears. Durham & London: Duke University Press. pp. 1-44;
- Abdurrahman, Moeslim. 1996. "Ritual Divided: Hajj Tours in Capitalist Era Indonesia." [ed.] Mark Woodward. 1996. *Toward a New Paradigm: Recent Developments in Indonesian Islamic Thought*. Tempe (Arizona): Arizona State University. pp. 117-132;
- Volf, Miroslav. 1996. *Exclusion and Embrace: A Theological Exploration of Identity, Otherness, and Reconciliation*. Nashville: Abingdon Press;
- Butler, Richard W. 1996. *The Role of Tourism in Cultural Transformation in Developing Countries*; Urry, John. *Post Modern Society and Contemporary Tourism*. In **Proceeding of the Indonesian-Swiss Forum on Culture and International Tourism (1995) Tourism and Culture: Global Civilization in Change?** 1996. [ed] W. Nuryanti. Yogyakarta: Gadjah Mada University Press;
- Barnes, Michael, and Hoose, Jayne. 1999. *Tourists or Travelers? Rediscovering Pilgrimage*; Philip Sheldrake, *Travelling through Life? Subversive Journeys*. In [gen. ed] Michael Barnes **The Way: Contemporary Christian Spirituality: Spirituality and Travel**. January 1999;
- Pigram, John J., and Wahab, Salah. 1997. *The Challenge of Sustainable Tourism Growth in Tourism, Development and Growth: The Challenge of Sustainability*. 1997. [eds.] Salah Wahab and John J. Pigram. London and New York: Routledge;
- Tourism and Sustainability: New Tourism in the Third World**. 1998. [eds.] Mowforth, Martin, and Munt, Ian. London and New York: Routledge;
- Graburn, Nelson. 1977. *Tourism: The Sacred Journey*; Nunez, T. 1977. *The Touristic Studies in Anthropological Perspective*; [ed] Valene L. Smith. 1978 [1977]. **Hosts and Guests: The Anthropology of Tourism**. Oxford: Basil Blackwell;
- Taylor, Charles. 1994. *The Politics of Recognition*. In **Multiculturalism: Examining the Politics of Recognition**. [ed] Amy Gutmann. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press;
- Cantwell, Robert. 1993. *Ethnomimesis: Folklife and the Representation of Culture*. Chapel Hill and London: The University of North Carolina Press;
- Waliggo, John Mary. 1999. *Tourism as Blessing or Curse? The Host's View*. In **The Way: Contemporary Christian Spirituality** (April 1999): **Images of Asia**. [gen. ed.] Michael Barnes. London: Editorial **The Way**;
- Antier, Jean-Jacques. 1984. *Pilgrimage in France, Religious Tourism or Faith in Action?* In **Lumen Vitae: International Review of Religious Educa-**

- tion English Edition VOL. XXXIX (1984) No. 4. International Centre for Studies in Religious Education, Brussels (Belgium);
- MacCannell, Dean. 1999 [1976]. *The Tourist: A New Theory of the Leisure Class*. Berkley, Los Angeles and London: University of California Press;
- Hitchcock, Michael, and King, Victor T. 2003. *Discourses with the Past: Tourism and Heritage in South-East Asia*; Adams, Kathleen M. 2003. *The Politics of Heritage in Tana Toraja, Indonesia: Interplaying the Local and the Global*. In *Indonesia and the Malay World*, Vol. 31, No. 89. March 2003 (Oxfordshire (UK), Cambridge (USA), Cammeray (AUS): Carfax Publishing Ltd. (Taylor and Francis Group));
- Adams, Kathleen M. 1998. *Domestic Tourism and Nation-building in South Sulawesi*. In *Indonesia and the Malay World*, Vol. 26, No. 75. 1998 (Oxfordshire (UK), Cambridge (USA), Cammeray (AUS): Carfax Publishing Ltd);
- Picard, Michel. 1996 [1992]. *Bali: Cultural Tourism and Touristic Culture* (English translation by Diana Darling). Singapore: Archipelago Press;
- Dahles, Heidi. 2001. *Tourism, Heritage and National Culture in Java: Dilemmas of a Local Community*. International Institute for Asian Studies, Leiden and Amsterdam: Curzon;
- George, Kenneth. 1996. *Showing Signs of Violence: The Cultural Politics of a Twentieth-Century Headhunting Ritual*. Berkeley, London, Los Angeles: University of California Press;
- Hobsbawm, Eric. 1988 [1983]. *Introduction: Inventing Traditions*. In **The Invention of Tradition**. 1988 [1983]. [eds.] Eric Hobsbawm and Terence Ranger. Cambridge, New York, Melbourne, New Rochelle, Sydney: Cambridge University Press.

OTHER SOURCES:

- www.unwto.org
- The Jakarta Post** (15 November 2008): www.thejakartapost.com;
- Rencana Induk Pengembangan Pariwisata Daerah Kabupaten Halmahera Utara (RIPPDA) (2006), available at the PUSPAR (Pusat Studi Pariwisata UGM: Kompleks Bulaksumur J-3, Yogyakarta);
- Booklet *Panduan Praktis: Menjadi Wisatawan Peduli* (printed for: Kementerian Koordinator Kesajehteraan Rakyat Republik Indonesia), available at the PUSPAR (Pusat Studi Pariwisata UGM: Kompleks Bulaksumur J-3, Yogyakarta);
- Profil: Pusat Studi Pariwisata Universitas Gadjag Mada; available at the PUSPAR (Pusat Studi Pariwisata UGM: Kompleks Bulaksumur J-3, Yogyakarta).

Ivana Pražić

**STUDIJE TURIZMA U INDONEZIJU:
POLITIKE, PRAKSE I DISKURSI**

Polazeći od kritičnog iščitavanja diskursa vezanih za proučavanje turizma generalno, a posebno u Indoneziji, sledeći članak prikazuje paradigme koje omogućavaju izučavanje pojma i pojave turizma ne samo kao društvenog fenomena, već pre svega kao obeležja identiteta. Izučavanje turizma kao kulturološke pojave i samo je bazirano na različitim pristupima proučavanju kulture uopšte, shvaćene (bilo) kao tekst i/ili proces. (Samo)pozicioniranje autorkine diskursivne analize svesno je uokvireno feminističko-poststrukturalističkim kako teoretskim, tako i metodološkim okvirima. Tekst se, dalje, koncentriše na kritičko preispitivanje (sada već istorijskih) diskursa koji su otvorili put inter-, ali i intra-disciplinarnom proučavanju turizma, kao što su Mekkenelov *Turista* (prvi put objavljen 1976.), ili Pikardov *Bali: Kulturni turizam ili turistička kultura* iz 1996., od kojih je potonji posebno značaj za studije ne samo turizma, već i kulture Balijske.

Put do postmodernističkih razmatranja pomeranja granica između turizma i etnografije autorka otvara razmatranjem nestabilnih barijera između fluidnih pojava, praksi/iskustava i pojmova "turizma", "putovanja" i "hodočašća" u trenutku uokvirenom diskursima o globalizaciji/lokalizaciji. Osim toga, autorka se osvrće i na (istorijsko-diskursivno) uobličavanje disciplinarnosti antropologije turizma, čiji se počeci vezuju za 1970-te godine i američku akademiju. Ono što autorka nastoji da učini vidljivim, odnosno prisutnim kroz čitav tekst jesu i njena iskustva vezana za internalizaciju, samokritično preispitivanje, ali i proživljavanje etiketa "turistkinja" ili "etnografkinja" kao identifikacionih markera koji uokviruju, ali ne fiksiraju ne samo njen boravak, već i svakodnevni život u Indoneziji.

Članak, konačno, nastoji da predstavi neke od trenutno aktuelnih paradigmi koje se vezuju za studije turizma u Indoneziji. Osim toga, tekst sadrži i prikaze više studija slučaja (case studies) za koje je materijal prikupljen u toku autorkinog dvomesečnog stažiranja u okviru Centra za studije turizma pri Univerzitetu Gađah Mada u Džogdžakarti (Centralna Java) krajem 2007. godine.

Ključne reči: Antropologija turizma; turizam kroz inter- i intra-disciplinarnost; turist(kinja)/etnograf(kinja) – identitetski "prestupi"; studije turizma u (post)modernizmu; turizam kao metafora postmodernog društva.