Performances

Introduction

We have argued for understanding tourism through the lens of the tourist gaze. The previous chapters have examined the tourist gaze in relation to service work, the ‘sign economy’, contemporary mediatised culture, the built environment and the history of vision and photography. In this chapter we explore some contemporary practices of gazing, and we do so by considering the tourist gaze as performance. We believe that our loosely Foucault-inspired notion of the tourist gaze can be enlivened, made more bodily and theatrical, by incorporating Goffman’s bottom-up approach to interaction. Here we follow Hacking’s position that the top-down approach of Foucault and the bottom-up approach of Goffman are both necessary when analysing social interaction (2004).

In Chapter 1 we noted that a ‘performance turn’ examining the ‘production of tourism, as a series of staged events and spaces and as an array of performative techniques and dispositions’ (Edensor, 2001a: 61, 2001b), can be traced from the late 1990s within tourism theory, a move to which we contributed (Bærenholdt et al., 2004; Haldrup and Larsen, 2010). Goffman’s dramaturgical metaphor inspired this turn. Franklin and Crang suggest that ‘the cultural competencies and acquired skills that make up touristic culture themselves suggest a Goffmanesque world where all the world is indeed a stage’ (2001: 17–18). This chapter rethinks the tourist gaze in the light of this performance turn and of a broader Goffmanian dramaturgical sociology. There are many similarities between the paradigms of the gaze and performance and they should ‘dance together’ rather than stare at each other at distance. We develop this further by examining the embodied and multi-sensuous nature of gazing as well as the complex social relations and fluid power geometries comprising performances of gazing. We end by illustrating the performative, embodied and relational gaze through the ‘doing’ of tourist photography.

In this sense, we respond to various authors who criticised the ‘tourist gaze’ thesis. It is said to neglect that most holiday experiences are physical or corporeal and not merely visual (Veijola and Jokinen, 1994). Female tourist writers argue that there is a male basis with the gaze and flâneur, signifying men’s visual and voyeuristic mastery of women (Veijola and Jokinen, 1994; Wearing and Wearing, 1996; Pritchard and Morgan, 2000a, 2000b; Johnston, 2001). Some claim that female tourists derive pleasure from social interaction and from touching (Wearing and Wearing, 1996). Relatedly, it is argued that the notion of the gaze is too static and passive and ignores performance and adventure (Perkins and Thorns, 2001). Moreover, it is said to neglect some of the complex social relations of gazing, especially that by hosts (Maoz, 2006). MacCannell also argues that The Tourist Gaze fails to identify a kind of ‘second gaze’, which knows that looks deceive, that there are things unseen and unsaid, and that each gaze generates its own ‘beyond’ (2001).

We begin by outlining the ‘performance turn’ and how Goffman’s sociology has influenced and shares commonalities with the gaze, and then clarify some elements of what the idea of the ‘gaze’ is meant to achieve (see Larsen, 2009, for more detail).

Performance Turn

First, the performance turn argues that ‘tourism demands new metaphors based more on being, doing, touching and seeing rather than just “seeing”’ (Perkins and Thorns, 2001: 189; Edensor, 2006). The performance turn highlights how tourists experience places in multi-sensuous ways that involve bodily sensations and affect. It is said that tourists have become bored of being mere spectators and that many tourism activities – adventure tourism – explicitly provide active, multi-sensuous bodily sensations, affect and actions (Cloke and
Perkins, 1998; Franklin and Crang, 2001: 12; Bell and Lyall, 2002; Franklin, 2003). Some tourism spaces are ‘playgrounds’ where disciplined ‘work-bodies’, through engaging actively with humans, objects and places, transform into vibrant, playing and juvenile ones. Pons, for instance, discusses the ludic and haptic geographies of beach life in ethnographies of nude bathing and of the communal, processual and performative work of building a sandcastle with sculpturing hands, fine-grained sand, water, spades, buckets and so on (2007; on building a ‘sandcastle’, see Bærenholdt et al., 2004: ch. 1).

Second, the performance turn employs Goffmanian performative metaphors to conceptualise the themed and staged nature of tourist places as well as the scripted and theatrical corporealities and embodied actions of tourist bodies. It speaks of improvising performers, actors, cast members, sites as stages, guides as directors, stage management and so on (Edensor, 1998, 2000, 2001a). This is a perspective where situations, processes and performances are everything; there are no performances without doings. Through the lens of the performance turn, tourism is a doing, something accomplished through performances. By turning to ontologies of doing and acting (Franklin and Crang, 2001), Goffman lurks in the background, Goffman provides painstaking detail as to the embodied as well as the performed nature of interaction and social life in general within his micro-sociology of enacting, expressive, emotional and responsive bodies. These are bodies which pose, gesticulate, converse, apologise, blush, avoid eye contact and so on. The performance turn is Goffmanian in its portrayal of the tourist body as psychobiological, expressive and socialised.

Third, following on from Goffman's observation that teams are the basic unit, the performance turn discusses the many agents that make up particular tourism stages. There is a body of literature exploring the ‘production-side’ (similarly to the analysis in Chapter 4), examining how places are materially and symbolically staged and how key personnel perform the tourist product and maintain scripts. Edensor shows how tour guides choreograph tourists’ spatial movements, their interpretation of places and appropriate behaviour. He says: ‘The stage-management of tourist space, the directing of tourists and the choreographing of their movement can reveal the spatial and social controls that assist and regulate performance’ (Edensor, 2001: 69). This turn, though, moves beyond Goffman in addressing the ‘interaction order’ in relation to power. As Weaver says in his ethnography of ‘interactive service work’ in the cruise industry: ‘the importance of power, control and conflict is underestimated in Goffman's research’ (2005: 8).

Some literature examines how tourists are not only audiences but also performers. Edensor explores how tourists at the Taj Mahal perform walking, gazing, photographing and remembering (1998), while Bærenholdt et al. examine performances of strolling, beach life and photography (2004). The performance turn builds upon Adler's 'Travel as a Performed Art', where she argues that 'the traveller's body, as the literal vehicle of travel art, has been subject to historical construction and stylistic constraint. The very senses through which the traveller receives culturally valued experience have been moulded by differing degrees of cultivation and, indeed, discipline' (1989: 8). Tourists are not only choreographed by guides and visible signs, but also by absent or invisible cultural codes, norms and etiquettes for how to perceive and value tourist objects (Edensor, 2001a: 71). Just like Goffman, who stressed how styles of bodily idiom and self-presentation are specific to, learned through and regulated by ‘cultural membership’, the performance turn makes the case that tourist performances are in part preformed. Performances are never for the first time because they require rehearsal, imitation of other performances and adjustment to norms and expectations to such extent that they appear natural and become taken-for-granted rituals. Performances are largely habitual and unplanned. As Goffman states:

The legitimate performances of everyday life are not ‘acted’ or ‘put on’ in the sense that the performer knows in advance just what he is going to do, and does this solely because of the effect it is likely to have. The expressions it is felt he is giving off will be especially ‘inaccessible’ to him. … The incapacity of the ordinary individual to formulate in advance the movements of his eyes and body does not mean that he will not express himself through these devices in a way that is dramatized and pre-formed in his repertoire of actions. In short, we all act better than we know how. (1959: 79–80; this prefigures aspects of Thrift's arguments in 2008)
Along the same lines, Edensor argues against the idea that tourism represents a break from the everyday: '
[R]ather than transcending the mundane, most forms of tourism are fashioned by culturally coded escape attempts. Moreover, although suffused with notions of escape from normativity, tourists carry quotidian habits and responses with them: they are part of their baggage’ (2001a: 61). Tourists never just travel to places: their mindsets, habitual practices and social relations travel unreflexively along with them (Larsen, 2008b; Haldrup and Larsen, 2010). Culturally coded patterns of tourist behaviour revolve around class, gender, ethnicity and sexuality, and they generate shared conventions about what should be seen and which actions are appropriate (Edensor, 2001a: 60).

Fourth, while performances are taught, learned and regulated, they are never completely predetermined. Goffman maintains that ‘for interactants, rules are matters to be taken into consideration, whether as something to follow or carefully circumvent’ (1963: 42). In contrast to studies portraying tourism as an overdetermined stage where tourists passively follow prescribed routes and scripts, the performance turn also uncovers creativity, detours and productive practices. Löfgren reminds us ‘that standardized marketing does not have to standardize tourists. Studies of staging of tourist experience in mass tourism often reduce or overlook the uniqueness of all personal travel experience’ (1999: 8). Tourists are not just written upon, they also enact and inscribe places with their own stories and can follow their own paths. Performances are never simply determined by their choreography (Larsen, 2005). Tourist performance is embodied practice and, therefore, as with ‘any performance (indeed any performative activity), is inherently a contingent process’ (Schieffelin, 1998: 197). Performative metaphors challenge ideas of complete standardisation and control and stress fluidity and malleability of human activity as well as the manifold roles that can be played. Edensor states that ‘[n]otions of tourism as performance indicate that a range of roles can be selected and enacted through experience, from disciplined rituals, to partially improvised performances to completely improvised enactions in unbounded spaces. Thus, the same tourist may act out a medley of roles during a single tour or holiday’ (2000: 341). This allows space for tourist agency, struggle and resistance.

Fifth, tourist places are often presumed to be relatively fixed, given, passive and separate from those touring them. The performance turn destabilises such static and fixed conceptions of places and sites. Places and performances are conceived as non-stable and contingent enactments. As Edensor argues:

The nature of the stage is dependent on the kinds of performance enacted upon it. For even carefully stage-managed spaces may be transformed by the presence of tourists who adhere to different norms. Thus, stages can continually change, can expand and contract. For most stages are ambiguous, sites for different performances. (2001a: 64)

Tourist places are continually reproduced and contested through being used and performed. Places only emerge as tourist places, stages of tourism, when and as they are performed (Bærenholdt et al., 2004).

Sixth, the performance turn emphasises how objects and technologies, such as cameras, tour buses and cars, are crucial for making tourism performances happen. They enhance the physicality of the body beyond its capabilities and enable it to do new things and sense other realities. And without material surfaces such as lawns, sand beaches and dance floors, which afford croquet, barbecuing, tanning, beach volleyball, dancing and countless other performances, tourism would be ‘lifeless’ (Haldrup and Larsen, 2006, 2010: ch. 4). Crucial to analysing performances is the concept of ‘affordance’ (Gibson, 1986). Different surfaces and different objects, relative to the particular human organism and its technologies, provide affordances. These are objective and subjective, both part of the environment and of the organism. Affordances stem from their reciprocity through people's kinaesthetic movement within their particular world. Affordances constrain behaviour along certain possibilities: ‘there are a range of options … implicit within a physical milieu and this implicitness is directly connected to the bodily capacities and limits of the [human] organism’ (Michael, 1996: 149). Given certain past and present social relations, then, particular ‘objects’ in the environment afford possibilities and resistances, given that humans are sensuous, corporeal, technologically extended and mobile beings.
Seventh, the performance turn does not see tourism as an isolated island but explores connections between tourism, the everyday and significant others, such as family members and friends. Performing Tourist Places (Bærenholdt et al., 2004) opens with a private photograph of two families posing with spades and buckets on a beach in front of their sandcastle. The communal performances of building a sandcastle and taking photographs show how people perform with other bodies as well. Most tourism performances are performed within teams, and this sociality is in part what makes them pleasurable and annoying. Tourism is not only a way of consuming (new) places, but also an emotional geography of sociability, of being together with close friends and family members from home (Haldrup and Larsen, 2010: ch. 2).

Lastly, the performance turn challenges representational and textual readings of tourism by making ethnographies of what humans and institutions enact and stage to make tourism and performances happen. It refuses ‘to write or read off the feeling, style or atmosphere of a particular place as the ‘effect’ of some already determined relations’ (Degen et al., 2008: 1909) and examines the ‘tactics’ (De Certeau, 1984) through which tourists perform out of tune with the officially inscribed signs, objects and places (Edensor, 1998; Cloke and Perkins, 2005).

Having outlined the main components of the performance turn, we now discuss it in relation to the tourist gaze per se. We begin with clarifying the relationship between the senses and the gaze and then we develop an embodied and multi-sensuous approach to gazing.

**Embodied Gazing**

We have brought out the crucially visual nature of tourist experiences. Yet it has never been the intention to argue that vision is the only sense through which tourists encounter places and that the tourist gaze can explain all aspects of tourism encounters. That would certainly be a one-sided and indeed perverse claim (see Urry, 1992). Tourists encounter places through a variety of senses. Saldanha asks: ‘Don’t tourists swim, climb, stroll, ski, relax, become bored perhaps, or all; don’t they go to other places to taste, smell, listen, dance, get drunk, have sex?’ (2002: 9). Yes, they do. Tourists eat exotic food, smell new odours, touch each other, are touched by the sun, dance to pulsating ‘soundscapes’, talk with friends and occasionally get drunk. Flavours, touches, smells and sounds, and doing and acting can also produce difference and the extraordinary (Franklin and Crang, 2001: 14). Kinaesthetic pleasures are omnipresent in tourism: walking a mountain, cycling in nature, diving in the sea, playing on the beach, skiing down the Alps, raving through the night. And tourists are not fixed but alternate between different roles. ‘A main attraction of being on holiday’, as Löfgren says more generally, ‘is that there is a possibility to choose among a great many activities or mental states, between sightseeing, shopping, dozing on the beach, going for a walk, reading a novel, or having too many Tequila Sunrises’ (1999: 267).

But many tourist buildings, objects, technologies and practices (as opposed to tourist motivations) are structured around visualism, as discussed in relation to cameras, photographs, advertising and themed spaces in previous chapters. While the visual sense is not the only sense, it is the organising sense. It organises the place, role and effect of the other senses. The unusualness of the visual sensations places these within a different frame (Rodaway, 1994). The distinctiveness of the visual is crucial for giving all sorts of practices and performances a special or unique character: the palm trees by the beach, the charming restaurant, the themed resort, the bedroom with a view, the sight of tropical birds, the colours of the exotic plants and so on. The most mundane of activities, such as shopping, strolling, having a drink, or swimming or river rafting appear extraordinary and become ‘touristic’ when conducted against a striking or unusual visual backcloth. As Bell and Lyall say with regard to adventure tourism: ‘Nature tourism as kinaesthetic experience – paddled through, jumped into, trekked across – is still dependent on the glorious vista’ (2002: 27).

While many tourist places are designed according to the logic of visualism, and in that process suppress or
control the other senses, and the visual sense is normally the organising sense within tourist experiences, we now put forward a relational approach that acknowledges the complex intersections of the senses in people’s encounters with places. We argue for a sensuous analysis of tourism and look at the relationship between the normally dominant visualism and other senses, including various kinds of movement. Gazing needs to be examined ‘in relation to the moving, multi-sensuous bodies because this provide us with a scope for looking at the body that senses – sees, touches, smells, hears and tastes – and how all these senses are integrated by the way in which the living body moves’ (Lund, 2006: 41).

In almost all situations different senses are interconnected with each other to produce a sensed environment of people and objects distributed across time and space. There are not only landscapes (and visual townscape) but also associated soundscapes, as in Cuban tourism, especially following the film Buena Vista Social Club; ‘smellscape’, as experienced in walking through particular woods (see Macnaghten and Urry, 2002a) or heterogeneous tourist places in the third world (see Edensor, 1998; Dann and Jacobsen, 2003); ‘tastescapes’, especially following the late eighteenth-century invention of the restaurant (see Spang, 2000) and so-called food tourism (see Boniface, 2003; Everett, 2008); and geographies of touch, as with the hand of the climber: (see Lewis, 2000), the feet of mountaineers (see Lund, 2006), bronzing of the ‘white’ skin (see Ahmed, 2000) and building sandcastles (see Pons, 2009). As Lund says in her study of walking the Scottish hills, ‘the sense of vision and the mountaineer's gaze cannot be separated from examining the body that moves and touches the ground’ (2006: 40).

Bodies perform themselves in-between direct sensation of the ‘other’ and various sensescapes (Rodaway, 1994). Bodies navigate backwards and forwards between directly sensing the external world as they move bodily in and through it (or lie inertly waiting to be bronzed), and discursively mediated sensescapes that signify social taste and distinction, ideology and meaning. Such sensed and sensing bodies are concerned with various performativities. Bodies are not fixed and given but involve performances, especially to fold notions of movement, nature, taste and desire, into and through the body. There are thus complex connections between bodily sensations and socio-cultural ‘sensescapes’ mediated by discourse and language (see Crouch, 2000, and Macnaghten and Urry, 2000b, on embodied leisure-scapes). This can be seen in the case of much of tropical travel, such as to the Caribbean, where early visitors were able to taste new fruits, to smell the flowers, to feel the heat of the sun, to immerse one's body in the moist greenery of the rainforest, as well as to see astonishing new sights (Sheller, 2003).

There are also complex connections between bodily sensations and senses and various technologies (Ingold and Kurttila, 2000; Michael, 2000; Sheller and Urry, 2004). Michael brings out the ‘agency’ of walking boots in affording leisurely country walks and gazing (2000). They afford more pleasant walking and they make certain surfaces walk-able that would be painful if not impossible to traverse barefooted or even with ordinary shoes. Various technologies afford increased bodily capabilities, and as such they expand the affordances that nature permits the otherwise ‘pure’ body. While designed to be intangible, sometimes they are painful and therefore very tangible. Take the sightseeing bus. While on the move, eyes are stimulated and bodies relax in the ‘comfort’ of the seat. But because of the cramped and immobile viewing-position hindering proper blood circulation, the bus-chair is potentially ‘a pain in the butt’. Just as it is difficult to experience nature as aweinspiring if one's walking boots are aching, the ‘cinematic shows’ of the bus are ruined if one's legs or back are in pain. While places and the weather are experienced in a disembodied fashion, the experience of being in the bus is embodied. Whether they like it or not, people inescapably bring their long-suffering bodies into the bus.

Moreover, at times there is conflict between the visual sense or visualism, which may be the organising sense of a particular place and the specific ways tourists perform that particular place. They can resist the place, walk around in a way contrary to what the signs say and they can go to a place of visual beauty and make a lot of noise or come up with all sorts of protests. One example is Stonehenge. It is choreographed and represented through a ‘preservation ethos’ that privileges a swift visual museum-like engagement with the ‘archaeological’ stones. Yet some tourists try to touch them and undertake longer visits to connect physically and
spiritually with the stones and its ‘atmosphere’ (Letcher et al., 2009). The systems of discourse, scripting and planning involved in the tourist gaze generate modes of resistance (as discussed below). We argue that there is a multiplicity of tourist gazes, and one way to approach this multiplicity is by examining the tastescapes, smellscapes, soundscapes, touchscapes involved in performances of the gaze.

Degen et al. interestingly develop a multi-sensuous, performative approach to vision in their ethnography of how ‘designed urban environments’, such as a shopping mall in Milton Keynes in the UK, are visually consumed. Their approach contains three components:

The first is that experiences are theorised as performative. That is, visual experiences are generated through particular practices, at specific times and places, with constitutive consequences both for the object and for the subject involved. … Secondly, such experiences are relational: the interaction between spectator and object produces the qualities of the object, and vice versa. Thirdly, visuality is always multimodal: that is, visual experiences are almost always accompanied by aural, tactile, and oral experiences; and in the case of designed urban environments, by certain spatialities such as form, route, and volume. (2008: 1909, our italics)

Degen et al. unfold the ‘performative’, ‘relational’ and ‘multimodal’ nature of visual experiences through ethnographic vignettes of distinct ways of ‘gazing’ within the shopping centre. These include ‘manoeuvring’, the ‘shopping look’ and the ‘parenting look’. All entail sensory engagements other than vision and complex intersubjective relations between people and objects.

Thus ‘manoeuvring’ highlights the intersections between walking and gazing. It enables people to ‘manoeuvre and navigate a way through the mall. This is a broad, surveying gaze which is used to move around objects, which acknowledges objects but does not engage in any depth with them’ (Degen et al., 2008: 1919). Touch, smell and immobility are pivotal to the ‘shopping look’. ‘When shopping, one’s vision is more concentrated, actively searching for a desired product. As we look for it, we touch different materials. We sway from a “thinner”, unfocused gaze that helps us to navigate around the shop to a “thicker”, focused stare that involves touching and smelling, especially if the piece of clothing or perfume has a distinctive texture’ (Degen et al., 2008: 1919). The ‘parental look’ accentuates the relational, communal nature of gazing. Most people perform gazing in the company of significant others and the social composition of one’s ‘team’ affords some ways of seeing more than others. In particular, children influence the look of their parents:

When one is in the mall as a carer with children, eyes and bodies are responsively attuned to the bodies and movements of the children. The mall and its sensory stimuli (windows, music, street furniture) fall into the background as the children’s bodies are followed and the mall’s geography turns into a (sometimes dangerous, other times fun) playground …with two mobile kids, enjoying being with them, my eyes and ears and hands were tuned into them, focused on them, and not so much on the wider space. Where were they, what were they saying, what were they doing. This was in relation to many material objects, of course, and also to other people. Sometimes it is possible almost to see and sense through the eyes of the children. We attune our perceptions to those of a child and read anew the affordances of a place as we learn that a public sculpture becomes a skeleton to climb on, the edge of a fountain a running track. (Degen et al., 2008: 1911)

This reformulation of seeing has significant implications for the tourist gaze. Throughout this book we have emphasised different modes of gazing and that the same sight in can be consumed in different ways according to the habitus and dispositions of tourists. The ‘performed’ tourist gaze involves other sensescapes; gazing is multimodal. People are never disembodied travelling eyes. Gazing upon a particular sight or objects in a museum depends upon people’s bodily well-being. If a visitor is hung-over, hungry, thirsty, suffering from diarrhoea, or their shoes itch or the sun is too hot or the air-conditioning too cold, they may fail to be impressed. Similarly, impressive sight may be contradicted by inappropriate smells or noise. While sightseeing tours revolve around sights and seeing, tour guides provide ‘soundtracks’ to the passing scenery and attractions.
Most sightseeing involves some modes of listening, sometimes involving audio technologies (see Figure 8.1).

**Figure 8.1 Sightseeing and soundscapes**

Moreover, gazees often have a burning desire to touch, stroke, walk or climb upon and even collect the animals, plants, ruins, buildings and art objects that they lay their eyes upon. While most museums do not afford or permit such physical proximity between the gazer and the object of the gaze, in most other places gazing comprises seeing and touching. Lastly, tourists never just gaze upon places and things; they gaze upon them with known and/or unknown others. And who we gaze with is as important to the quality of the experience as is the object of the gaze. In the next section we discuss the multifaceted social relations of gazing, how they are tied up with relations between gazers, on the one hand, and hosts and guests, on the other.

**Social Relations of Gazing**

The ‘parental look’ specifies how children influence the rhythms and gazes of their parents. Their gaze lingers much on their children and they partly see an attraction through their eyes, with little time for sustained, contemplative gazing. And yet, from time to time, children are forced to follow in their parents’ footsteps and see ‘adult’ things. Our argument is that gazing is a relational practice involving subtle bodily and verbal negotiations and interactions between ‘team members’. Most tourists do not experience the world as a solitary flâneur but in ‘teams’ of colleagues, friends, family members and partners. Gazing almost always involves significant others. Gazing is an interactive, communal game where individual gazes are mediated and affected by the presence and gazes of others. Such social relations of gazing enable and constrain. As Crouch says more generally: ‘By our own presence we have an influence on others, on their space and on their practice of that space, and vice versa, often considered as negative, as source of conflicts, but such a position overlooks its positive potential’ (2005: 29).
Travelling with an affectionate partner makes it easy to fall in love with ‘romantic Paris’. And yet ‘romantic Paris’ can taunt the single traveller with feelings of loneliness and lost love as well as the troubled couple with realising that not even this place can re-establish their affection for one another. Perhaps they secretly dream of gazing on ‘romantic Paris’ with someone else next time. The tourist’s emotional and affective experiences with a given place depend as much upon the quality of their co-travelling social relations as upon the place itself.

Other tourists also influence and discipline the tourist gaze. Tourists spend much time gazing at fellow tourists. As Löfgren says more generally:

> tourists have ample time to observe other tourists and fellow travellers, while standing in line, sitting in a café or by the pool. Such situations may turn us into amateur sociologists, constantly observing and judging the behaviour of other tourists, but it also produces rich opportunities for daydreaming, fantasizing about the lives of the strangers surrounding you. What about the couple over there, the family down by the pool, the group of Japanese tourists crossing the piazza? We invent secret lives; compare our own situation with that of others. (2008: 94)

And we may also say that tourists turn into ‘critical sociologists’, complaining about and mocking other tourists for their superficial, snobbish or boring behaviour. This status and taste game engulfs everyone. Tourists flag identity through separating them from co-present others. Dionysian tourists mock cultural tourists for missing out on fun, while the latter scorn ‘lazy sun bathers’ for lacking cultural capital. While they try to avoid each other, they rub shoulders at hotels, airports, sights and beaches and can destroy the experience for the other (Edensor, 1998).

‘Collective gazers’ upon package holidays and guided tours are subject to the disciplinary gaze of co-participants. Others restrict possible performances and show up conventions about ‘appropriate’ ways of being a tourist. Other key brokers in this network of social relations of the collective gaze are guides and tour reps who direct and frame gazes at sights: they suggest photo opportunities, provide scripted commentary, choreograph movements along prescribed paths and define normalising behaviour (Edensor, 1998; Cheong and Miller, 2000). In part, such rigid guiding makes enclavic tourist places resemble Goffman’s ‘total institution’, where a group of people is ‘cut off from the wider society for an appreciable period of time, together lead an enclosed formally administered round of life’ (quoted in Ritzer and Liska, 1997: 106). The ‘total institutions’, or ‘enclavic spaces’, of modern tourism are typified by ‘team performance’, which is ‘a highly directed operation, with guides and tour managers acting as choreographers and directors, the performance is repetitive, specifiable in movement and highly constrained by time. Besides acting out there their own part in the drama by photographing, gazing and moving en masse according to well-worn precedent, the group also absorb the soliloquies of the central actor, the guides, who enact the same script at each performance’ (Edensor, 1998: 65).

Larsen (2004a) ethnographically explores how the collective gaze is socially and materially orchestrated by guides upon sightseeing tours, in his case the ‘Viking Land Tour’ in and around Copenhagen and Roskilde in Denmark. While the bus takes the fastest way out of Copenhagen, the guide sets the scene:

> The ‘Viking Land Tour’! This is an awful tour; it is a terrible tour. You won't see anything but tombs and graves and so on. But don't worry. At the end you'll love it. … We're taking you out in the beautiful Danish countryside showing you a bit around. Then we are going to the renowned Viking Ship Museum. That'll make you specialists in the Vikings. On the way to a 5000 years old dusky old passage-grave we're again taking you on a picturesque crosscutting tour through the countryside. … Before we're having a typical Danish buffet at an old charming inn we are visiting the stunning cathedral of Roskilde. (Larsen, 2004a: 148–9)

Discourses of the sublime, picturesque and authenticity frame the tour and its landscapes and sights. After
20 minutes, the guide announces: ‘Now we are going to be on the motorway for a couple of minutes. For the rest of the day we’re going to drive along nice small roads with a view.’ Then, with relief in his voice, the guide informs us that we have now reached our destination. Driving into the first village, the bus reduces speed while the guide’s choreography intensifies:

Now we’re in the village Sengeløse. Look left! Enjoy the old houses. Enjoy the village pond. Forget about the supermarket. Now please look in front of you! A typical country church again. It is about 800 years old. And look right! They’re putting a new roof on the house. Look there on the right! That’s the traditional way of doing it – old crafting skills. Now look to the left! Enjoy the neat churchyard. Each grave is like a small garden – well cared for and looked after. (Larsen, 2004a: 149)

By the means of verbal expression and body gestures, the guide – politely (please!) yet sternly – choreographs the consumption of what to see, how to see it and what not to see of the village. Everyone complies with his orchestrated choreography; upper-bodies and heads move from side to side as one social body. The visions of 30–40 individually seated people are synchronised and choreographed into one ‘collective gaze’.

Throughout the tour, but in particular when the guide instructs, the participants actively look – glancing out of the window with a concentrated fixed stare. When photography is intense or photo opportunities are around the corner, the bus slows down to give people time to focus and produce non-blurred images. Photography increases almost proportionally with the intensity of the guiding. When directing people to look to one or other side, the reaction is often a look and a ‘click’. Typical ‘time-killing’ travel activities such as reading and listening to music rarely take place and even travel talk is rare. Those on the bus appear captivated by the storytelling guide and the scenic landscapes slowly passing by.

While consumed through a collective gaze, the guide scripts the villages as objects of the ‘romantic gaze’. People are directed to look at the ‘old houses’, ‘typical church villages’, ‘old crafting skills’ and a ‘neat churchyard’. Places and objects are scripted as ‘typical’, ‘Danish’ and ‘ancient’, reflecting how ‘the rhetoric of tourism is full of manifestations of the importance of the authenticity of relationships between tourists and what they see’ (MacCannell, 1999: 14). The guide also performs in a ‘post-touristic’ fashion on occasions. Jokingly, people are told not to worry about entering the dusky burial mound because he will lead them, and that visitors should ‘forget about the supermarket’.

The guide provides an almost unending ‘soundtrack’ to the passing scenery. It is one-way communication (predominantly) that cannot be escaped at least while inside the bus. Since the guide constantly points out what to see and how to understand and value it, people are rarely left to draw their own interpretations. Outside the bus, they are also subject to ‘soft control’. They are implicitly advised against individual exploration and explicitly asked to follow in his footsteps. And travelling as a team, they are ‘monitored’ by their co-participants. Thus, the rhythms and choreographies of this tour are characterised by a specific sociality of simultaneous autonomy, communality and social control.

Having discussed some relations between teams of gazers and guides and gazers, we now turn to relationships between gazers and the gazees, or guests and hosts. In previous writings we argued that hosts also contribute to the place ballets that make up tourism performances and stages, although we emphasised the former over the latter (see Bærenholdt et al., 2004; Sheller and Urry, 2004). This is normally described as an asymmetrical power relationship where the gazer powerfully constructs and consumes the gazee, with little resistance from the powerless host. Similar to the performance turn that insists upon analysing resistance and creativity among tourists, we now discuss certain literature that brings out how gazees are not totally passive and powerless. Quinn argues: ‘locals are implicated in complex ways of encountering, negotiating, controlling, and contesting the presence of tourists is as important as understanding the roles played by the latter’ (2007: 461).

Maoz’s concept of the ‘mutual gaze’ brings out the resistance and power of hosts when interacting face-to-
face with tourists (2006). This notion is explicitly developed in relation to earlier formulations of the tourist gaze that mainly examined relations between the tourism industry and tourists while paying scant attention to the active, manipulating and resisting performances of ‘hosts’. In fact, it was stressed that tourists exercised much power over the places and locals become the ‘mad one’ behind bars, relentlessly gazed upon and photographed (Urry, 1992). ‘By contrast’, Maoz says, ‘the local gaze is based on a more complex, two-sided picture, where both the tourist and local gazes exist, affecting and feeding each other, resulting in what is termed “the mutual gaze”’ (2006: 222). According to Maoz, everyone gazes at each other in the spaces of tourism; locals return the gaze of tourists and consequently tourists too can turn into the mad ones behind bars. Yet ‘most tourists are hardly aware of this gaze, mainly because they arrogantly dismiss its presence. They rarely feel they are being watched, and thus act in what they perceive as a totally free and permissive environment’ (Maoz, 2006: 229).

Maoz thus proposes a more complex and reciprocal power relation between hosts and guests where power is omnipresent and fluid, a situated outcome of performative interactions (see also Ateljevic and Doorne, 2005). In line with Foucault's power/resistance duality, ‘the mutual gaze makes both sides seem like puppets on a string, since it regulates their behavior. It results in mutual avoidance, remoteness, and negative attitudes and behavior. There are no defined “dominators” and “dominated”, as both groups simultaneously undergo and exercise power’ (Maoz, 2006: 225).

Based upon ethnographic studies of interactions between backpackers from Israel and locals in India, Maoz outlines three modes of response to tourists that locals largely regard as ‘shallow, hedonistic, and rude people, who are badly educated and can be easily deceived’ (2006: 235). One mode is ‘cooperation’ where locals become the ‘powerless’ who always and unconditionally meet the needs of tourists, and they change their lifestyle and business according to satisfy these ‘desires’. Some internalise the tourist gaze to the point where it becomes their own. But she also identifies two forms of resistance. There is a low-key form of ‘veiled resistance’, where locals laugh at and gossip about tourists as well as exploit that ‘staged authenticity’ of goods, services, spirituality and so on that can easily seduce the visitors. The authenticity seekers are not aware of the local gaze and are unlikely to notice the staging. Finally, there is ‘open resistance’, where locals ‘strike back’ at ignorant or obnoxious tourists’ behaviour through verbal confrontations, written instructions about respectful behaviour, poor service to rude costumers and businesses banning tourists with signs saying ‘no Israelis’ (Maoz, 2006: 231). Maoz argues that the mutual gaze is complementary to the notion of the tourist gaze, which can be made more complex, performative and interactive by recognising that it is always a ‘mutual gaze’ with a multitude of intersecting, responsive gazes, between guests and guests, tourists and ‘brokers’ and between tourists themselves.

Gazes and Places

The performance turn brings forth how tourists are co-producers of tourist places and tourists can experience a given place through many different styles, senses and practices. While we have suggested that gazing is highly mediated and preformed through circulating representations and architectural theming, it has also been noted that gazing is never predetermined and fully predictable. In Chapter 1 we listed several distinct ways of gazing, legitimate through different discourses and practices, and we did so in part to illustrate that any tourist attraction can be visually consumed in different ways despite that most are designed and regulated according to specific historic discourse or logic. The presence of different ‘gazes’ at a sight may cause conflict and turn it into a contested space, haunted by other tourists. Edensor shows how western tourists at Taj Mahal can perceive Indians as ‘crappy tourists’ while backpackers may complain that guided tourists spoil their prolonged, romantic visual encounter with this iconic sight (1998: ch. 4).

Visitors to heritage sites and shopping malls are not simply taken in by such sites and sightseeing tourists are not passive consumers of guided narratives and tours. Tourists are not cultural dopes. Following on from
the performance turn, we need a circuit of performance model that blurs the distinction between production (choreographing) and consumption (acting) and instead see them as interrelated and overlapping in complex ways. ‘Bodies are not only written upon but also write their own meanings and feelings upon space in a continual process of continual remaking’ (Edensor, 2001a: 100). The act of ‘consumption’ is simultaneously one of production, of re-interpreting, re-forming, re-doing, of decoding the encoded in the present (Du Gay et al., 1997). Furthermore, tourists do not only decode past texts, but are part of creating new ones through ongoing interactions and performances with other tourists, guides, discourses, buildings and objects.

A key part of the argument against Hewison's *The Heritage Industry* (1987) was to show the diverse readings, responses and resistances to an imposed ‘heritage-isation’ (see Chapter 6). As Chronis concludes in his account of the co-construction of the Gettysburg storyscape of the American Civil War:

> the narrative of the Civil War is not a result of an individual producer who introduces its meaning into society. The Gettysburg storyscape illustrates the interactive process through which a Civil War battle becomes a meaningful story through performance at a tourism space. As an event of the past, the battle of Gettysburg is a historical fact. Yet, as a cultural product, Gettysburg is a fluid narrative text staged by marketers and presented in multiple, heterogeneous forms. The resulting narratives are contested by tourists and become subject to negotiation. During the performance of the story, tourists are not passive readers of the text. Rather, they are actively engaged by using their prior background, negotiating, filling gaps, and imagining. Hence, service providers do not simply teach history and tourists do not only learn about the past. Rather, through their interaction, marketers and tourists perform history by means of negotiation, narrative completion, and embodiment. (2005: 400)

While much tourism is choreographed and tourists need to submit to its ordering, this does not rule out moments of resistance and post-tourist irony. Even shopping malls attract their share of ‘post-shoppers’, people who play at being consumers in complex, self-conscious mockery. Users should not be seen simply as victims of consumerism, as ‘credit card junkies’, but as being able to assert their independence from the mall developers. This is achieved by a kind of tourist *flânerie*, by continuing to stroll, to gaze, and to be gazed upon, ‘[t]heir wandering footsteps, the modes of their crowd practice constitute that certain urban ambiance: a continuous reassertion of the rights and freedoms of the marketplace, the *communitas* of the carnival’ (Shields, 1989: 161). Fiske talks of a kind of sensuous consumption that does not create profit. The positive pleasure of parading up and down, of offending ‘real’ consumers and the gents of law and order, of asserting their difference within, and different use of, the cathedral of consumerism became an oppositional cultural practice (1989: 17).

Moreover, Edensor argues in relation to tours and enclavic spaces: ‘taking these metaphors too literally creates a spatial determinism, erroneously suggesting that tourists are fully compelled to act out specific conformist performances’ (2000: 330). Tucker’s ethnography reveals resistance by the young participants on a longer guided tour as they toured through the ‘natural wonderland’ of Australia. Given that many regard the tour as an opportunity to meet new people (friends, partners and sexual partners) and have fun, they gazed and paid more attention to desired others rather than to the passing landscape and the narratives of the guides, they pulled faces when the guide became overly enthusiastic and they took silly photographs of each other when visiting the supposed highlights of the tour (Tucker, 2007).

Having discussed the tourist gaze as embodied, the social relations of gaze and forms of ‘resistance’, we now return to photography and discuss its varied performances.

**Performing Tourist Photography**

Tourist photography is often seen as passive, superficial and disembodied, a discursively prefigured activity of ‘quotation’. Some formulations of the ‘hermeneutic circle’ turn the photographic performances of tourists into
a ritual of quotation by which tourists are framed and fixed by commercial images rather than framing and exploring themselves (Osborne 2000: 81). It is preformed rather than performed. This illustrates how analysing photography ‘without looking for practices can only produce a mortuary geography drained of the actual life that inhabits these places’ (Crang, 1999: 249). Writings about tourist photography have often produced life-less tourists, eventless events and dead geographies. We discuss now how the performance turn ‘enlivens’ the analysis of tourist photography.

Performance theorists state that performances contain rituals but also play (see Haldrup and Larsen, 2010: ch. 7). In Chapter 7 we discussed how photography is a ritualised ‘theatre’ that people enact to produce their desired and expected self-image and togetherness, wholeness and intimacy with partner, family and friends. There is also a significant play element to photography, but this is so often drowned in writings highlighting the ritualised nature of photography and what it represents. Normally, photography is seen as a means to an end (photographs), but the play-aspect turns things on its head: photography can now also be an end in itself. Without neglecting the value of photographs, the play-aspect shows how photography can be a source of pleasure, creativity and sociability in itself and this explains its performances. Writing before digital cameras, Löfgren states:

The critique of the urge to document misses an important point. The pleasure may not be in gathering up moments to display next winter but just in creating them: Letting the video roll … clicking through a roll of Kodachrome. However much energy goes into the production of these narratives and whatever their fate, producing them was an experience in its own right. … Here is an arena where nonartists …do not hesitate to try their hand at producing, a photo narrative … [or] video documentary. Here you may become your own director, scriptwriter or scenographer. (1999: 74)

Following on from this we shift from why to how, from studying functions of photography to doings and actions of photography (that might reproduce rituals and discourses of loving family life), and crucially, such performative actions are both representational (posing, self-representation and drawing on cultural discourses) and non-representational (involve interactions, work, sociability and so on). Photographic performances are always more-than-just representational.

We begin here with Said’s statement that ‘the very idea of representation is a theatrical one’ (1995: 63). Grasping tourist photography as performance can highlight the embodied practices and social relations and its dramas. Photographing is not a performance of a single eye but of an engaged and multi-sensuous body. The practice of taking photographs is often conceived of as a visual practice that is rapid and does not require much more than ‘clicking’ but a performance approach can highlight the busy, active and playful ‘bodies of photography’. When we conceive of photography as performance, it is a process over time. As Sather-Wagstaff says with regard to photographing the former World Trade Center: ‘Tourists at the WTC simply do not all “picture” the site in the same way. They both see and experience the site through the lenses of their individual subjectivities, selectively choosing engagement with the objects and activities at the site that resonate for them, making prosthetic memories through such engagement, and capturing these different experiences photographically’ (2008: 77). Or to cite Suonpää: ‘When you find that you are watching the midnight sun at Nordkapp with hundreds of tourists jostling behind your back, the conveying of romantic experience calls for skilful use of the camera’ (2008: 79).

Elsewhere we show how bodies of photographers are erect, or kneeling, or bending sideways, or forwards and backwards, leaning on ruins, lying on the ground and so on. Photographed tourists pose through composing their face and body as teams bond corporeally. Touch – body-to-body or what Goffman terms ‘shoulder hold’ and ‘hand-holding’ (1976: 55–6) – is an essential in relation to tourist photography enacted through the family gaze (see Figure 8.2). When cameras appear, people assume tender, desexualised postures such as holding hands, hugging and embracing. ‘Arms around shoulders’ or ‘shoulder hold’ is the common way of bonding friends and family members as one social body. Tourist photography simultaneously produces and displays bodily closeness. The proximity comes about because the camera event draws people together. To
produce signs of loving and intimate family life, families need to enact it physically, to touch each other. Such 'group bonding' through photography also characterises the collective gaze of guided tours (see Figure 8.3). Such staged intimacy tends to be put to an end when the shooting has finished (it would be rather inappropriate to carry on hugging even a good friend once the photo is taken!). This ties into Goffman's central idea that 'one of the most interesting times to observe impression management is the moment when a performer leaves the back region and enters the place where the audience is to be found, or when he returns therefrom, for at these moments one can detect a wonderful putting on and taking off of character' (1959: 123).

**Figure 8.2 Performing the family gaze**
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**Figure 8.3 The collective gaze performed on a guided tour**
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When faced by the camera-lens people become extraordinarily aware of their psychobiological and cultural body, its appearance and manner, and the setting they are part of, and they pose by reflex to ‘give’ an appropriate ‘personal front’. Being photographed is one social situation where dramaturgical awareness always seems to arise; it is a form of bodily communication concerned with expression. As Barthes states, ‘I have been photographed and I knew it. Now, once I feel myself observed by the lens, everything changes: I constitute myself in the process of “posing”, I instantly make another body for myself, I transform myself in advance into an image’ (2000: 10). Poses as one form of impression management are integral to photography. It seems to be a ‘law’ that people pose when the camera-face gazes at one. When being photographed, one cannot avoid ‘giving off’ information, but through posing one can try to convey a specific image for the future (Larsen, 2005). And yet this posing often goes unnoticed as ‘expressive messages’, as Goffman says, ‘must often preserve the fiction that they are uncalculated, spontaneous and involuntary’ (1963: 14).

In *Performing Tourist Places* we discuss the sustained efforts of two women to stage and photographically capture their children (Bærenholdt et al., 2004: ch. 7). First, there is the staging of the event. As if ill-clad for camera work, perhaps feeling too hot and stuffy, the camera-wearing woman takes off her jacket. Then, meticulously, one after another, she positions the boys. Next, the shooting begins. She squats so that the ‘camera eye’ is more level with the eyes of the children. Direct eye contact is established. Now the other woman joins in the action. Standing just behind the kneeling photographer with her eyes fixed on the boys, she waves vigorously with her arms in the air. Then a small break occurs and the photographer changes shooting position, straightening her body slightly. Now events intensify. For the next minute or so the photographer constantly frames and shoots, while the other woman’s arms make all sorts of disco-aerobic moves and shakes – all acted out with a big smile on her face. Although the boys’ arms are not ‘joining in’, their faces are probably laughing and a joyful holiday photo thankfully gets produced.

This ethnographic vignette illustrates some social relations of photography. Tourists enact photography bodily,
creatively and multi-sensuously in teams of significant others (one's family, partner, friends, co-travelling tourists and so on) and with a (future) audience at hand or in mind. The performed aspects of tourist photography relates to practices of taking photos, posing for cameras, choreographing posing bodies, watching photographing tourists and consuming photographs. That photographing often involves ‘teamwork’ and ‘audiences’ also indicate the usefulness of studying it as performance. Photographing is typified by complex social relations between photographers, posers and present, imagined and future audiences. It is common that posers are instructed by photographers or other members of the team to bring into being certain appropriate fronts (the most common being ‘Smile!’) or break off inappropriate activities.

This also illustrates how the camerawork of tourists is concerned not only with ‘consuming places’ (Urry, 1995a) or hegemonic ‘place-myths’ (Shields, 1990), but also with self-presentation and ‘strategic impression management’ enacted by teams of friends, couples and especially families through ‘the family gaze’ (Haldrup and Larsen, 2003; Larsen, 2005). Most tourists express a simultaneous desire to make pictures of and at destinations. They are looking out for ‘physical settings’ such as monuments, viewing-stations, beautiful spots and views within which to frame their team members.

The self is a ‘dramatic effect’ continuously created in public performances. Idealisation is a common dramaturgical practice (Goffman, 1959: 47). Much picturing amounts to a front-stage of encoded and enacted impression management. Frictions are almost automatically put on hold and even dull gatherings become full of life when the camera appears. Not all love for the camera is ‘sincere’ (Goffman, 1959: 28). Even families where little affection is shown can appear to perform affectionate family life for the camera (Kuhn, 1995). Goffman once said that: ‘we have party faces, funeral faces, and various kinds of institutional faces’ (1963: 28). And to this list of faces we may add tourist faces. Tourist photography is intimately tied up with ‘loving faces’. Stressed parents, bored teenagers and crying kids are instructed to put on a happy face and embrace one another before the camera begins to click. Careful impression management ensures returning home with photographic memories of apparently ‘loving’ family or friendship life. Many tourist teams co-produce one social body that is ceremoniously displayed. Everyone expresses respect for the photographic event by posing in a dignified way; gentle smiles are worn, bodies are straightened, hands are kept at sides. No one pokes fun or dominates (for ethnographic evidence of this, see Bærenholdt, et al., 2004: ch. 6). This is a solemn gaze celebrating both the social relation and the attraction. There may be mild contestations and what Goffman terms ‘role distance’ to such idealised family photography. Not everyone is always willing to ‘fit in’. There are conflicts between the team members about what poses are appropriate. Examples include teenagers resisting their parents’ instructions to look sweet because they desire to seem cool or blasé. Family members – especially fathers – can appear uncomfortable about staging the loving family at busy attractions.

There is also a ‘playful pose’ where tourists fool around and make humorous faces and obscene body gestures, playing to the camera. This anti-pose is particular widespread among youngish people and it has been popularised by digital cameras. Tucker shows the significance of this ‘pose’ on a guided tour where the young participants took silly photos of themselves and the places they visited so as to challenge the ‘seriousness’ that the guide tried to convey and inscribe the tour with (2007: 151). And somewhat similarly, there is the reflexive and mildly subversive ‘post-tourist pose’ where tourists playfully mock the conventional scripts of tourist photography. Edensor overheard a group of American tourists photographing and posing at the Taj Mahal:

TOURIST 1: OK guys, line up and look astonished

TOURIST 2: Yeah, but … it's great, I suppose – but what does it do?

TOURIST 3: Bob had the best line – ‘The Taj is amazing, but boring’

TOURIST 1: Come on, let's do the photo so we can get outta here (1998: 133).
Finally, we return to the complex power relations between guests and hosts. While this relation is asymmetrical in terms of power, Gillespie's notion of the 'reverse gaze', inspired by Maoz's notions of the 'mutual gaze', interestingly brings out the shame and discomfort that tourist photographers experience when the photographee takes notice and gazes back at the photographer. Gillespie's argument is that this 'reverse gaze' wounds because self-proclaimed travellers, with their anthropological gaze, feel that it turns them into mere tourists and performers of voyeuristic gazing, precisely because photographing is a mocked and question-able tourist activity. By being caught by the reverse gaze the photographer 'loses face', even when the photographee does not mind being 'snapped'. As Gillespie says:

The photographee, by a prolonged stare, a questioning look, or even just a raised eyebrow, can momentarily reverse the relationship between the photographer and photographee. In a glance the photographee can ... capture and objectify the tourist photographer as a particular type of tourist. That is to say, the reverse gaze, in its various forms, can mediate the emerging tourist self. (2006: 347)

Conclusion

We have thus seen many ways in which performances are central to tourism. We found Goffman a rich source of insight into the performative character of much tourism. We have also noted that social interaction in general is full of performances and that these will not easily go away or become less significant. This is very relevant to the final chapter when we examine some of the risks of tourism as an industry and as a core set of activities within the contemporary world, at least for those living in the rich North. And in that rich North it may turn out that the increasing scale and scope of leisurely travel under the regime of the tourist gaze actually turns out to be a somewhat limited period in human history. We consider the risks of that leisurely travel and note that it is destructive of the environments being visited, of long-term climates, and of the supplies of oil that ‘fuelled’ the tourist gaze over the mobile twentieth century.

And yet finding substitutions for such a modern mobile world is difficult to achieve for many reasons but partly because of this performative character. What kinds of performances we might ask could replace the performances of contemporary globalising tourism? Is it conceivable that performances could be re-localised? How can we imagine the tourist gaze being directed towards the very local and mundane? Is it necessary to travel long distances and to new places when we have seen that much tourism revolves around emotional geographies of performing family life and friendship with people that one is more or less proximate with on a daily basis? What indeed would digital photography be like if the objects photographed were all found within local neighbourhoods? Is it possible to imagine the performances of the tourist gaze being entirely based upon ‘virtual sights’ seen upon screens and never corporeally visited? Could the interactions of gazer and gaze be only virtual and never embodied and as such go against the whole thrust of argumentation derived from Goffman elaborated in this chapter? Or, will future tourist gazes be more ‘local’ and tied up with social relations rather than with long-distance travel and collecting faraway places?