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INTRODUCTION:
RETHINKING ASIAN TOURISM

VICTOR T. KING AND PLOYSRI PORANANOND

In recent years and for obvious reasons, given the rapid expansion in tourism outside Western Europe and the Americas, there has been an increasing number of contributions to the study and understanding of the characteristics, development and transformation of tourism in Asia and sub-regions within Asia, particularly Southeast Asia and the western Pacific Rim. Since the appearance of the co-edited book *Tourism in South-East Asia* (Hitchcock, King and Parnwell, 1993), now two decades ago, the study of Asian tourism has come of age. Victor King and his co-editors have developed this work further, and particularly in the field of heritage, with *Tourism and Heritage in South-East Asia* (Hitchcock and King, 2003, a special issue of *Indonesia and the Malay World*), *Tourism in Southeast Asia: Challenges and New Directions* (Hitchcock, King and Parnwell, 2009) and *Heritage Tourism in Southeast Asia* (Hitchcock, King and Parnwell, 2010). This current volume from Victor King and Ploysri Porananond is the latest development of on-going research on tourism in Southeast Asia and the wider Asia (in geographical terms there are chapters on Thailand, Vietnam, Indonesia, the Philippines, Malaysia, Hong Kong, Japan, Korea, but there are also chapters which examine cross-national encounters in Asia, including those between Japan and Thailand).

Moreover, during the past two decades several volumes on tourism in Asia, Southeast Asia, the Pacific and China have appeared which have focused on particular issues such as ethnicity and the state, cross-national interconnections, policy and management issues, heritage and cultural development, and domestic or local tourism within Asia; and there are those which constitute general multidisciplinary collections or surveys of the scope and scale of tourism, as well as issues, problems, prospects and policies related to tourism development.
An early contribution to the political dimension of Asian-wide tourism was Linda Richter’s *The Politics of Tourism in Asia* (1989), an issue which has become particularly important in an Asian context with the invariable intervention of national governments in the development of tourism and in determining the ways in which tourism is used for purposes of national identity formation, national status and projection and for legitimising political regimes.


Of the most recent contributions there has been a clear shift to the concern with Asian travel, leisure and tourism within Asia itself, which raises all kinds of new and emerging issues in the field of tourism studies, as well as strong evidence of a continuing interest in such matters as cultural and heritage tourism. Among important recent volumes there are Tim Winter, Peggy Teo and T.C. Chang, *Asia on Tour: Exploring the Rise of Asian Tourism* (2007); Bruce Prideaux, Dallen J. Timothy and K[aye] S. Chon, *Cultural and Heritage Tourism in Asia and the Pacific* (2008); Janet Cochrane, *Asian Tourism: Growth and Change* (2008); and Shalini Singh, *Domestic Tourism in Asia: Diversity and Divergence* (2009/2011). There is also the recent *Routledge Handbook of Heritage in Asia* edited by
Patrick Daly and Tim Winter, and their introductory overview (Winter and Daly, 2012), which covers issues of tourism and heritage as well as intra-Asian tourism (2012); the volume also contains the important chapter by William Logan (2012).

Our present volume addresses some of the emerging as well as established themes and issues in Asian tourism, building on this substantial literature, with a particular focus on culture and heritage. It also pursues and provides case study material on a range of conceptual and empirical matters which have been raised in eloquent and searching terms by Tim Winter in his paper ‘Rethinking Tourism in Asia’ in Annals of Tourism Research when he says ‘Despite the recent surge in the number of tourists originating from countries across Asia, the literature on tourism on the region, published in English, remains dominated by encounters between Westerners and their Asian hosts. As yet, little attention has been given to either the motivations and values of tourists from Asia, or the broader social, cultural, and political implications arising from this fast-growing industry’ (2006: 27). The issues he raises were then further elaborated in his co-edited book Asia on Tour and particularly his concluding chapter entitled ‘Recasting Tourism Theory towards an Asian Future’ (2007: 315-325). In a subsequent article he urges a rethinking of the theoretical and analytical apparatus of tourism studies in that ‘the ongoing rise of Asian tourism’ has rendered this field of research ‘institutionally and intellectually ill equipped to understand and interpret the new era we are now entering’. One solution, he suggests, is ‘the cultivation of critical scholarship within the region itself [which] will not only help overcome the field’s Anglo-Western centrism but also help us better comprehend the profound societal changes now occurring through Asian mobility’ (Winter, 2009: 21). In a further contribution to these debates and reflections, King has also addressed the emerging agenda for future research in his review article ‘Tourism in Asia: a Review of the Achievements and Challenges’ in the journal Sojourn (2008: 104-136), which was a review article which addressed Janet Cochrane’s 2008 book, followed by his reviews of Winter et al (2010) and Shalini Singh (2012).

Our current edited volume Rethinking Asian Tourism picks up on some of Winter’s observations and those of other researchers who have focused on Asian tourists in Asia (see Cochrane, 2008; Shalini Singh, 2009/2011; and also Daly and Winter, 2012) concerning the need to address and develop our conceptual understanding of the character, experiences, encounters, perceptions and motivations of local, national and intra-regional tourism rather than to continue to base our concepts, perspectives, emphases and
analyses on Western-Asian interactions and on transformations in the West (and see Lew, Hall and Williams, 2014). An important corollary of this shift in emphasis is to encourage the development of Asian scholarship on Asian tourism, which should not confine itself primarily to matters of policy, marketing, management, organisation and training in the tourism and hospitality industry (which is exemplified especially well in K.S. Chon’s book, 2000) but should embrace multi- and interdisciplinary approaches and perspectives on critical issues to do with power and marginality, representation and imaging, and local community involvement. However, we are conscious of the problematical distinction which is still made between domestic and international tourism (or Asian and non-Asian) when the patterns of mobility, residence and work are increasingly shifting and unstable and the frequency and ease of movement have increased dramatically in the fast-moving post-modern world. Indeed, the categorisation of tourists into domestic (or local) and international (or foreign), though we use it as a short-hand in this volume, throws up a number of problems in a globalising, inter-connected world.

Not only is a clear-cut distinction difficult to make in that the categorical boundaries between domestic and international tourists are fuzzy and overlap, but the two categories themselves need to be unpacked and differentiated into a range of more subtly and finely tuned sub-categories. For example, there is now a rapidly expanding group of foreign, retired senior citizens who have settled in such countries as Malaysia and Thailand, and who come from other parts of Asia, from Australia and the West; with the considerable leisure time that they have at their disposal, they also undertake activities and pursuits which are tourist-like. There are in addition foreign sojourners who continue to reside in their home country but who will spend extended periods in another country; often they will have their own accommodation there (a holiday home, an apartment, or regular lodgings). On the other hand there are citizens of a particular country who now live and work abroad and return periodically to see family and friends, or they are part of Southeast Asian diasporas in Western Europe, North America, Australia and New Zealand, as well as increasingly in other parts of the world who return home for extended breaks from time to time. They may or may not retain citizenship in their country of origin. There are also now large numbers, and increasing numbers of expatriate workers in Southeast Asia, again residing there for extended periods of time, and who, during their leisure time, often do what tourists do.
Much has also been written about the different categories of international tourists: short-stay, long-stay, package (high-end) tourists, budget travellers, back-packers and independents, informed heritage and eco-tourists, relatively uninformed pleasure-seekers (the sun, sea, sand, shopping [and sometimes sex] syndrome), pilgrims, businesspeople with leisure time, those in search of themselves and hoping to find some meaning in their lives in cross-cultural encounters, those who remain untroubled about authenticity and meaning and are in search of new experiences and usually just plain fun, and then there are the further complications concerning those tourists who are from different ethnic, national, and social class backgrounds, of different gender and so on.

Wikipedia now presents us with 83 different categories of types of tourism (http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Category:Types_of_tourism), and the number of publications devoted exclusively or in part to the classification of tourists and tourism, and of course the range of tourist experiences is truly substantial (see, for example, Cohen, 1972, 1979a, 1979b, 1984; Ning Wang, 1999, 2000). Von Egmond has revealed just how complex the category of ‘Western tourists’ is, let alone tourists from other parts of the world (2007). And then take any category of tourist and tourism – cultural tourists, for example – and complexity abounds (McKercher, 2002). This complexity is intimately interconnected with the expansion and differentiation of the experience and contexts of personal mobility; many more of us are now on the move so that tourism becomes part of wider social, cultural, economic and political processes of movement and should increasingly be thought about within the sociological and geographical study of mobility. A significant voice in this field of research has been John Urry who has more recently moved on from his seminal concerns with the ‘tourist gaze’ (2000, 2007), and, in association with Kevin Hannam and Mimi Sheller, has been concerned to develop our understanding of what he refers to as the ‘sociology of mobilities’ (and see Hannam, Sheller and Urry, 2006; and Hannam, 2014). Erik Cohen and Scott Cohen have recently begun to build on Urry’s work in the field of ‘mobilities’ to attempt a ‘paradigm shift’ in tourism studies (see, for example, 2012a).

The need to identify, name, delimit, and categorise particular phenomena is part-and-parcel of the sustained attempts not merely to handle complexity, but it is also part of the package of crucial analytical devices in much of tourism studies to objectify tourism ‘as a thing, a product, a behavior….and] in particular an economic thing’ (Franklin and Crang, 2001:6). One major result of this tendency has been the impulse to classify types of tourist and to formulate different categories and sub-
categories of tourism. As Franklin and Crang argue persuasively in explaining how research in tourism has attempted to address a rapidly expanding field of studies, we have witnessed the construction of ‘ever finer subdivisions and more elaborate typologies as though these might eventually form a classificatory grid in which tourism could be defined and regulated’ (ibid). Of course, as they (and we) recognise typologies do play a role in this research; they also tend to appear during the early stages of the development of a field of studies in order to arrange findings and data into some sort of graspable and comprehensible form. But in citing Löfgren (1999: 267), Franklin and Crang remark that ‘the obsession with taxonomies and “craze for classification” seems often to produce lists that “represent a tradition of flatfooted sociology and psychology” which is often driven by “an unhappy marriage between marketing research and positivist ambitions of scientific labelling”’ (ibid). Perhaps this observation is a little harsh, and one wonders about the relation which is posited between marketing research and positivist ambitions, nonetheless, Franklin’s and Crang’s criticism of the classifying impulse is well taken.

We have decided in this volume not to contribute to this substantial literature on classification and the devising of templates, categories and lists, but instead and quite simply to draw attention to the diversity of tourism types and experiences and of the motivations, characteristics and behaviour of tourists of all kinds. This exercise also involves us in taking more serious account of the work of Asian researchers on Asian tourism and to consider some of the ways in which this shift in interest and perspective can contribute to embellishing and embroidering the trajectories, changing characteristics and understandings of the cultural context of tourism experiences, encounters and local responses.

In pursuing the project to help ‘Asianise’ the field of Asian tourism studies most of the chapters in our volume give expression to Asian scholarship; 16 of the 17 chapters are written or part-written by Asian scholars working in Asia, and 15 of the 18 contributors are from the region. Several of the chapters also address the importance of understanding touristic encounters between Asians. One of the purposes of the international conference from which these papers emerged on ‘Tourism and Culture in Asia’, at Chiang Mai University, Thailand, 17-18 November, 2013, was also to establish a network of programmes, departments, and institutions involved in tourism studies and training across Asia to underpin the future development of cross-national collaboration in multidisciplinary research.
A focus on ‘Asians on tour’ also interrelates with certain issues which have been raised by recent theoretical developments in tourism studies. A paper by Erik Cohen and Scott A. Cohen in the journal *Annals of Tourism Research* (2012a: 2177-2202) entitled ‘Current Sociological Theories and Issues in Tourism’ captures much of what has been going on in the recent re-thinking of concepts, approaches, themes and issues in research on tourism (in Asia and beyond). The article addresses a very wide range of literature indeed, but what it draws attention to in particular is the movement away from earlier discourses and concepts to do with ‘authenticity’ (Cohen, 2007) and ‘the tourist gaze’ (MacCannell, 2001; Perkins, 2001; Sherlock, 2001; Urry, 1990 [2002]; Urry and Larsen, 2012) as well as with the too simple classification between ‘hosts’ and ‘guests’ (Smith, 1979 [1989]) towards what Erik and Scott Cohen refer to as ‘three novel theoretical approaches’ which are interrelated and which can be deployed analytically in tandem, viz. (1) the mobilities paradigm; (2) the performativity approach; and (3) actor-network theory (ANT) (2012a: 2180-2189).

What this paradigm shift throws into question is the problematical nature of ‘tourism’ as a defined and delimited field of studies, and the realisation that there is now a range of phenomena and activities which are included (or becoming increasingly so) within the category ‘tourism’, but which previously were considered within other forms of scholarly enquiry, or at least have been seen as partaking of or implicated in other areas of social, cultural, economic and political life. In this regard they are often referred to as ‘new’ or ‘emergent’ tourisms. As Franklin and Crang propose ‘tourism is now such a significant dimension to global social life that it can no longer be conceived of as merely what happens at self-styled tourist sites and encounters involving tourists away from home’ (2001: 7).

We have already referred to the turn in sociology and in the multidisciplinary study of tourism to ‘mobilities’ in the work of John Urry, and his collaboration with Mimi Sheller (and see, Sheller and Urry, 2004, 2006; and Sheller, 2011) and Kevin Hannam (Hannam, Sheller and Urry, 2006; and see Hannam and Knox, 2010). As Sheller indicates in a recent paper, citing Urry, the concept of ‘mobilities’, which, in our view, does not comprise a coherent theoretical model, but rather captures the coming together of disparate fields of study, ‘encompasses not only corporeal travel of people and the physical movement of objects, but also imaginative travel, virtual travel and communicative travel’ (2011: 3; and see Urry, 2007). Over a decade ago at the launch of the journal *Tourist Studies* Franklin and Chang had already presented a strong case for the
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location or relocation of the study of tourism within a broader conceptual and theoretical field because even then they perceived tourism as ‘no longer a specialist consumer product or mode of consumption’, as no longer an event, process or phenomenon of minor or marginally eccentric importance in post-modern life but as ‘a significant modality’ which was contributing to the organisation and transformation of people’s everyday lives (2001: 6-7). In other words ‘The majority of people are now part of the market aimed initially at visiting outsiders’, indeed ‘more or less everyone now lives in a world rendered or reconfigured as interesting, entertaining and attractive – for tourists’ (ibid: 9). In this observation they refer to ‘transnational’ lives, but of course in the way in which tourism and leisure activities have been increasingly inserted into ‘the everyday’ these touristic experiences are enacted within as well as across national boundaries.

In turn they refer back to the important work of Chris Rojek (1995; Rojek and Urry, 1997) and Fred Inglis (2000) which had already argued that tourism could no longer be seen as a separable, discrete, exotic, extraordinary part of post-modern life, but as a set of activities, experiences, behaviours and processes which was intimately intertwined with other dimensions of people’s everyday lives, and indeed their increasingly globalised lives. Franklin and Crang refer specifically in this context to the need to investigate ‘the wider ramifications of tourism mobilities and sensibilities’ (2001: 6), and, in capturing the importance of the characters and consequences of movements, to address such issues as ‘migration’, ‘nomadism’, ‘travellings’, ‘homelessness’, ‘flight’, ‘circulation’ and the ‘flows’ of goods, information, culture and people (ibid: 6-10). Indeed, they suggest tourism studies might seek relations with ‘other mobilities such as commuting, mobile labour markets, migration and Diasporas’ (ibid: 11). More than this ‘[i]n these highly mobile times, structured by the language and practice of tourism, is that they generate new social relations, new ways of living, new ties to space, new places, new forms of consumption and leisure and new aesthetic sensibilities’ (ibid: 12).

The ‘performativity’ approach is perhaps not as ‘novel’ as the Cohens want to suggest (2012a), and it seems to us to be a somewhat loose and slippery umbrella concept: it embraces a range of expressions and actions which include well established and familiar sociological concepts (behaviour and meaningful bodily movement, identity, symbolic and self-representation and -expression, staging, imaging). But importantly what this approach draws attention to are the ways in which performance is
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connected to the creation of places and identities (both for those living and working in the location and those who are visiting) and to the structuring and changing of relationships and meanings through an increasingly ‘reflexive awareness’ in tourist sites (Edensor, 2001, 2007; Franklin and Crang, 2001: 10). In other words, ‘performativity’ does not refer solely to the staging of tourist-related events, but to tourist or visitor behaviour and reflections as well (see, for example, Bruner, 2005). It also comprises the translation of symbolic categories and representations into concrete, observable acts which often form part of a repetitive cultural repertoire presented to and in interaction with tourists (who themselves perform), but which can also be subject to modification and change depending on consumer and market demands and on the reflections and perceptions of those involved in the staging of their cultures in tourist contexts. These concerns with ‘performativity’ can however be profitably brought into relationship with earlier concerns in tourism studies, exemplified in the stimulating work of Tom Selwyn on symbolism, images, myths, representations and semiotics (1996).

Similarly with regard to the Cohens’ notion of actor-network-theory (2012a) we do not detect anything here that is especially original, although we accept that any analysis of tourist experiences will of necessity have to engage in the examination of relations between people/actors/translator-and between people and things/objects (‘thing-ness’ and the role of objects are becoming increasingly important in tourism studies [Franklin and Crang, 2001: 15]); in this regard networks are usefully seen as project-specific, fluid, in flux, hybrid, and heterogeneous (and see van der Duim, 2007).

Our present ‘rethinking’ volume attempts to capture some of these concerns, particularly in relation to the theme of Asians on tour. There is first and foremost the issue of cultural expressions, performance and behaviour which are primarily designed to meet political, social, religious, and everyday economic objectives for a primarily local or national audience but which are also deployed in the interest of tourism development (as in the chapters by Ploysri Porananond and Mae Claire Jabines). Ploysri Porananond examines the context of the invention and political agendas in the Dum Hua procession in the Songkran Festival in Chiang Mai; this is an event which demonstrates the multi-vocal character of tourism and the ways in which public events are used politically. Originally it was a Northern Thai Lanna practice to pay respect to the elders. Subsequently it was introduced into the Songkran in 1964 and it became a political tool for the benefit of the city governor, who was
appointed from Bangkok. Additionally, it has been deployed as a strategy by the provincial officers as representatives of the central government in Bangkok to reduce the power of the traditional ruler of Chiang Mai. The high ranking officials at the provincial and district level who also participate in the Dum Hua procession use it to express their authority. Several ethnic groups in northern Thailand have also seized this processional opportunity to temporarily displace their marginality and invisibility and demonstrate their cultural heritage and ethnic identity.

Mae Claire Jabines examines the socio-cultural and spiritual expressions and images of honouring saints in the Philippine province of Bohol through the institution of the fiesta and its contribution to the development of local tourism. The province of Bohol is widely known for its fiesta celebrations in much of the month of May. People come home for the fiesta, bringing along their friends and family, an occasion which also serves to promote the local tourism industry. There is a substantial increase in the arrivals of local tourists and other visitors at ports and terminals as the fiesta season starts.

Fiestas are common to predominantly Catholic countries, and the Philippines, as a former colony of Spain, celebrates these based upon the ecclesiastical calendar of the feast days of saints. However, this practice is not solely Spanish in origin because prior to their arrival, the Filipinos practised similar celebrations during the harvest season, when festivities were held to pay tribute and give their appreciation to the gods and ancestral spirits (anitos). They sacrificed chickens, pigs, or water buffaloes (carabao) as a sign of gratitude for a successful harvest from the previous season. Importantly and intriguingly in an environment of globalising tourism, a cultural event of local significance becomes increasingly a tourism event of national and international interest.

In connection with the two studies above which address events of procession and celebration the study of Asian tourism in Asia also throws up issues to do with family-based travel where leisure time and the participation in religious events are experienced with family and friends rather than it being a purely touristic experience. Several chapters provide illustrations of these new and emerging activities in what are still usually conceptualised and analysed within the field of tourism studies rather than as being thought about in a more general field of ‘mobilities’ (see, for example, Hannam, 2014; Urry, 2007). One such chapter is that by Janianton Damanik which focuses on suburban family tourists from Yogyakarta. Increasing numbers of Indonesian people are becoming
involved in tourism and leisure activities. In a national survey in 2007-2008 it was found that 52 per cent of Indonesians travelled away from their home and this number has since increased considerably. The survey, however, only presents a general overview of individual tourist activities. As studies of family tourism are few and far between, it is difficult to formulate the map of tourism needs for this sector and, following on from this, the policies for its promotion despite its phenomenal development in Indonesia. The tourism activities of individuals and families are also very different, and Damanik’s chapter discusses the meanings of tourism for families and how these meanings are realised in destination choice and tourist activities, which include visiting natural landscapes and engaging in ecotourism as a break away from the densely populated urban areas of Java. The suburbs of Yogyakarta comprise residents with different economic, social and cultural backgrounds and most middle class families there visit other destinations in Java. Family tourism has three dimensions: enhancing the emotional ties and integration of family and relatives effectively; generating pleasure and entertainment, and giving gratitude to God.

There are other chapters which illustrate the diversification of phenomena which can legitimately fall within the field of tourism studies, but also lend strong support to the view that what has been commonly referred to as touristic activity is being increasingly incorporated into other fields of study (retirees and long stays in Chiang Mai, gastronomy in George Town, Penang, homestays in Java, popular culture in South Korea, and rural tourism and local branding of products in rural Japan). Furthermore, these diverse tourisms are primarily located within an intra-Asian arena of encounter and interaction. They are demonstrated very persuasively in Miwa Shibuya’s study of ‘long-stay tourism’ or the International Retirement Migration of Japanese senior citizens. In her chapter she explores the migration experiences of Japanese retired people to Chiang Mai in northern Thailand. The retirees come from different socio-economic groups and they experience asymmetric relations and ruptures which arise from the demands of cross-cultural encounters. Consequently, the economically less-fortunate Japanese are prone to being rendered more marginalised in transnational contexts. Nevertheless, in exploring a more discretionary life overseas, many of them go through a process of self-emancipation and a reshaping of self-identity in their extended touristic encounter with Thailand.

Suet Leng Khoo provides us with an excursion into ‘gastronomy’ in Penang as a potential cultural strategy in tourism promotion. The chapter
draws attention to the ‘UNESCO Creative Cities’ flagship comprising cities around the world which are formulating strategies to become creative cities in order to regenerate their urban spaces. Under this flagship, cities are branded accordingly based on their niche economic activities and the attractions that best promote and present their city to the globalised world. As a result, innovative and creative place-branding labels have emerged such as City of Fashion, City of Literature, City of Design and even an accolade bestowed on the gastronomic function of a city, thus, City of Gastronomy. Khoo argues that George Town’s unique gastronomic prowess provides a strategy which can contribute towards the authenticity of the place, enhance tourism sustainability as well as strengthen the local economy. Yet this raises the question of what a World Heritage Site should embody and express, and should a UNESCO site be promoted in this way?

In relation to homestays in the community of Banjarnegara, located on the Dieng Plateau near Wonosobo in Central Java, Destha Titi Raharjana proposes that there are economic benefits for local people in developing homestay opportunities which host local as well as international visitors. Of course, homestays generate income for the local economy; they provide an environment within which there are positive interactions between hosts and guests; homestays also encourage the development of expertise and skills (including acquisition of other languages), as well as a mindset which is much more open to the reception and hosting of visitors. If their organisation and promotion depend on external agencies then they do not deliver the level of benefit for local people; ideally the services should be organised by the local community.

Continuing the theme of the Asianisation of Asian tourism Eoin Joseph Trolan examines the internationalisation of popular culture in the Republic of Korea which has served to make it a vibrant tourist destination for both regional and international tourists. He argues that Korean success in developing its tourism market has been based primarily on the concept of the ‘Korean wave or hallyu’. The promotion of Korean drama, pop-stars and athletes has implanted the idea of Korea as a vibrant and significant tourist destination. The global infusion of K-drama, K-pop, and Korean sport (K-culture) has led to an increased desire to travel to Korea, and the increased attention to Korean culture and hallyu has led to the Korean government’s encouragement of it in its tourism promotion strategies (Han and Lee, 2008). Trolan demonstrates that the impact of K-culture has changed the image of Korea. Whether it is in Vietnam, Thailand, Japan, or Singapore, K-culture stars are in high demand and as such the Korean
government through its Ministry of Tourism and Culture has attempted to promote the stars’ image as a positive element of Korean culture. This can be seen from the popularity of such performers as Girl’s Generation, Super Junior, Beast, Big Bang, Rain, 2N1, and Psy. The image of these performers has changed the social and cultural image of Korea – it is now viewed as a place of wealth and opportunity and as such, a place where many want to visit to experience the concept of *hallyu*.

Finally in our excursion into new tourisms Yasuo Ohe has examined the complementary relationships among the direct economic effects of local branded farm products in agricultural cooperatives in Japan on income, employment and the social effects on the local community, as well as the development of tourism. A major finding is that local branding is a significant element in the diversification of farm and rural economies, and it provides opportunities for tourism.

These case-studies demonstrate above all that ‘tourism’ is an open-ended, shifting, fluid and complex category of phenomena just as is ‘culture’ and the related concept of ‘heritage’. We suggest that these three crucial concepts need to be deconstructed and reviewed critically. So let us now move on to the problematical matter of the relationships between ‘culture’ and ‘tourism’ which includes the politics of identity construction and transformation, modes of cultural and ethnic representation, the role of the state and its policies in relation to cultural and ethnic processes, and the responses of local communities to tourism and national level policies and practices. There is also the need to return to the long-running issues of authenticity and what has been referred to more recently and more satisfactorily as the process of ‘authentication’ in relation to heritage (Cohen and Cohen, 2012b). Thi Hong Hai Nguyen and Catherine Cheung investigate tourists’ perceptions of and the factors influencing perceived authenticity within the context of heritage tourism in Hong Kong. The question of authenticity in Hong Kong heritage tourism has particular moment because of the rapid transformation of this cosmopolitan city. This study discovered that about half of the respondents claimed not to have authentic heritage experiences. Nonetheless, authenticity is not always a major concern, but rather the study finds that aesthetics, novelty and relaxation play an important role for some tourists. This is a finding which is supported in many other studies of authenticity and the motivations of tourists.

A further chapter also addresses the issue of heritage and authenticity. King and Hitchcock focus on the region’s 36 UNESCO World Heritage...
Sites (WHS) and argue that they make a significant contribution to national identity, prestige and tourism development. Yet we do not know much about them in comparative terms. Once UNESCO has inscribed a site then it becomes ‘a validation of quality’ and confirms its ‘authenticity’; these attributes provide significant attractions for the international tourism market, and governments use them for political and economic purposes. Moreover, they are both globally important but also local spaces for cultural encounters, social and political conflicts, and tensions and accommodations between competing interest groups and stakeholders. This chapter provides some findings on the first large-scale comparative research programme on UNESCO sites in Southeast Asia, and, among other issues, it considers how sites are being managed and how they are coping with conflicting pressures in a globalising heritage industry and in serving as symbols of national identity and prestige. In comparing sites within and beyond a particular country it is argued that we might be able to learn lessons for best practice to assist UNESCO and national governments in their planning and policies for heritage protection, conservation and tourism development.

The research interest in heritage tourism has focused primarily on the multivalent character of the concept of heritage, the development of ‘discourses of the past’, and the political uses and construction of heritage; these concerns overlap considerably with work on cultural invention, identity and authenticity. Apart from the comparative chapter on UNESCO sites two other chapters in the volume focus on World Heritage. And we have already drawn attention to Khoo’s chapter on George Town, Penang.

Tuan Phong Ly considers in detail various issues which need to be addressed in the UNESCO World Heritage Site of the Phong Nha-Ke Bang National Park in Vietnam. When a relatively remote area in a developing country is designated as a globally important site, as in the case of this Vietnamese park, tourism inevitably becomes the primary driving force of economic growth there. However, in the case of Phong Nha-Ke Bang, the Vietnamese government has been unable to relocate all local communities in the area because of its limited budget and resources. Moreover, an increasing number of tourists prefer to experience authentic local cultures and lifestyles, and keeping local tourists in the core zones of parks may become a trend in tourism development in developing countries. Although advantageous to the improvement of the rural economy, tourism development can also result in a number of complicated issues when local communities are allowed to reside in national parks.
Another on-going concern is the much more widely used concept of commoditisation or commodification of cultural and environmental assets, which in turn is obviously closely related to the concept of authenticity and its relational character. Amnaj Khaokhrueamuang’s chapter focuses on the commodification of ‘rurality’ in Mae Kam Pong village, Chiang Mai province, and its relationship to long-stay Japanese tourists, and proposes a conceptual model for other rural communities. The results reveal that a tourism strategy should incorporate various elements of modern ‘rurality’: rural recreational spaces including forest tea cultivating areas, residential and amenity areas; the development of health tourism commodities and facilities to support elderly Japanese long-stay tourists; and the provision of rural commodities and facilities such as organic food and health products which reflect the identity of the local Lanna culture.

In the chapter by Sasiwimon Khongmueang and Peter Hervik there is a further development of the concept of community-based tourism (CBT) in Mae Kam Pong this time with regard to Nordic tourists, particularly Danish visitors. The authors are concerned with the idea of building a foundation for CBT that besides providing income and helping the local economy can also contribute to less modernist and Eurocentric thinking and more cosmopolitan openness among the visiting tourists. Tourists from the Nordic countries who take part in CBT at Mae Kam Pong may arrive with significantly less Eurocentric attitudes than most other tourists, but to what extent does the CBT reproduce or counter the enduring presence of a Eurocentrism based on a perceived modern-traditional divide? In such a view the ‘traditional’ world is presented as timeless, outside of history and therefore authentic since it was there before ‘modernity’ emerged, which may be more a feature of the tourist imaginary world than a feature of local reality. Sasiwimon and Hervik argue that if CBT can counter this vision, it requires a more thorough understanding of the cultural baggage of the visiting tourists. The chapter focuses on the knowledge dynamics of predominantly Danish tourists who come to the Chiang Mai area with potential interests in enmeshing themselves in local activities, including spending time in homestays with families. Danish tourists arrive with varying degrees of prior knowledge, proficiency, openness and attitudes toward cultural difference.

Community-based tourism would also be a way forward for ethnic or cultural tourism among the hunting-gathering Mlabri or Phi Tong Luang ( Spirits of the Yellow Leaves) of Northern Thailand. The chapter by Shu Nimonjiya proposes that ethnic tourism has not yet had any marked influence on the Mlabri, neither has it brought much economic benefit to
them. The reason is not only that the market scale is small but also that their socio-cultural attitudes do not encourage a more positive approach to tourism and its opportunities. Nevertheless, the problems faced by a marginalised minority population in the face of more powerful and well-connected outsiders who organise tours and activities are rather more formidable obstacles than the socio-cultural attitudes of the Mlabri.

With regard to the chapters on Mae Kam Pong and on Phong Nha-Ke Bang National Park in Vietnam it is clear that we need to address both local and tourist responses to and involvement in the tourism experience, and this theme of encounters is also pursued in the chapters on ecotourism in Liled, Thailand and on homestays on the Dieng Plateau of Java. Rungrawee Jitpakdee, in her chapter on Liled, also examines, using both quantitative and qualitative data, community-based ecotourism in Surathani Province, Thailand focusing on the potential levels of community management in ecotourism, management planning, the local participation in ecotourism development and interactions between members of the local community and visitors. Rungrawee argues that the Liled community had a high level of potential attention for the development of ecotourism. According to the opinions of both Thai and foreign tourists, the Liled community managed ecotourism activities well, but the provision of souvenirs needed improvement. Ecotourism facilities, such as transportation networks within the community, parking lots and toilets also required further development. There was also a need to improve public relations, more general local awareness of conservation issues, codes of conduct, and rules and regulations for ecotourism management and monitoring. Importantly, a local community federation needed to be established for controlling and evaluating ecotourism management. The locals preferred to monitor and evaluate their activities by themselves and were reluctant for government or outside organisations to intervene and evaluate them.

Another dimension of local response to tourism is provided by Narong Sikhiram and Songsuda Poosawang. Their chapter was based on data gathered at Ban Pha Bong Village, Muang District, Mae Hong Sorn Province, Northern Thailand, close to the border with Myanmar. The Tai community there is being supported by the Thai Ministry of Public Health to develop their skills for health tourism development; currently they practise organic farming and food security based on self-sufficiency. The research focused on female residents who are involved in food preparation and management and assesses their willingness and collaboration in preparation of healthy food for tourists. Tai food is distinctive and it is
highly saturated with fat and sodium, as female residents did not have a basic knowledge of nutrition and healthy food. However, as the research continued, it was found that the Tai women were eager to learn how to prepare healthier food. They acknowledged that healthy food is a key factor in maintaining good health, and that some of the main problems in their cooking, was over-reliance on such ingredients as monosodium glutamate (MSG) as the major flavouring agent. Another significant issue was minimising the cost of food with no regard for nutritional value, quality and appropriate quantity. In this action research, the researchers held workshops and seminars and along with groups of women created standardised recipes in order to improve food management and nutritional value. They were able to offer healthy indigenous menus in catering for tourists.

This current volume, engaged in a rethinking exercise, therefore aims to address a wide range of emerging conceptual and empirical issues in tourism studies (and the deconstruction of tourism studies) in order to focus on processes and developments within tourism development in Asia (and the need to de-link them from Euro-American preoccupations). Above all we have wanted to engage with locally generated research across a range of Asian countries and with recent empirical research conducted by Asian researchers.
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Introductory Remarks

This critical analysis of UNESCO (United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization)-inscribed sites in Southeast Asia has emerged from a four-year (2009-2013) cross-national, multidisciplinary comparative programme of research on selected World Heritage Sites (WHS) across the region (see King, 2015, forthcoming). This chapter focuses on three countries: Thailand, Malaysia and Indonesia, though the research also encompassed Laos, Cambodia, Vietnam and the Philippines. Among other matters, the research examines the tensions between the often competing interests and understandings of the various stakeholders involved in these globally important sites and the various pressures brought to bear on them from the stakeholders involved: local communities, national governments and their agencies, international conservation organisations and associated experts and researchers, tourists (both domestic and international) and civil society institutions. Inscription as a World Heritage Site also generates new actors, institutions and regulations (Miura, 2011a: 23), and considerable challenges for those who manage these sites (Leask and Fyall, 2006; Esposito and Gaulis, 2010; and Miura, 2011a on Angkor).

International organisations like UNESCO and the World Heritage Centre in Paris, as well as their associated bodies including the International Council on Monuments and Sites (ICOMOS), the International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN), and the International Centre for the Study of the Preservation and Restoration of Cultural Property (ICCROM), impose a set of conservation and protection requirements on the sites inscribed on the World Heritage List. These requirements are designed to ensure that the characteristics of the site acknowledged as of ‘universal human value’ (UNESCO, 1972; Francioni, 2008; and see, UNESCO, 1983, 2003, 2012) are protected, and, if appropriate, enhanced. However,