

*Excerpted from Tourism and Representations of Morocco: The Mediation of Authenticity through Language, Interaction, and Video
Masters Thesis submitted in August 2004 to the
University of Texas at Austin, Department of Anthropology*

ASPECTS OF REPRESENTATIONAL PRACTICE

Arguably, as recorded materials, the products that the crew and I produced present an image of a 'real' place, in this case Morocco, that is evinced and experienced through the images and sounds magnetized on tape. To some extent, simply through the act of recording, the claim to authenticity is made: things can only be recorded if they exist in a tangible, 'real' form. Of course, the theoretical 'realness' or 'accuracy' of this representation has been problematized and questioned a great deal in social science theory (Clifford and Marcus 1986; Foucault 1994; Said 1979). Despite any criticism about their genesis or accuracy, representational fragments eventually emerge into a public space and are absorbed by some audience, with or without a reflexively critical eye. Representations are constantly produced and reproduced, exercising an influence on public impressions whether or not their substance has been discredited by theorists. Because of the inevitable publication of the final product, the process of recording is eternally under a microscope, especially in cases where accuracy or 'realness' is an explicit part of the ideological grounding. The sensory 'realness' of filmic representation, whatever its relationship to local 'realities', forces the responsible producer to question his or her methods and assumptions. Yet the paradox of representation remains: even the most responsible producer is forced to make choices about what to record, therefore limiting the range of reality that is preserved on his or her medium.

Instead of approaching representation as accurate or false, prejudiced or sympathetic, external or native, I would rather frame it as 1) an emergent interaction between the producer and the performer in which 2) the producer wishes to create something of a particular value suitable for a particular market. In considering representation in this light, I wish to keep in mind two aspects of the process that are key to understanding it as emergent and negotiated: the agency of both the 'producer' and the 'performer' as contributors to the final product, and the type of value framework that drives its creation.

FILM PRACTICE x TOURISM PRACTICE

This intersection of film production practices and tourism infrastructures points to their inter-reliance as producers of representation. The crews of both the large-scale and small-scale productions are reliant on the existence of beaten tracks, so to speak, to make their expeditions into international locations possible. The technology for cinematic production requires resources, especially electricity, and a crew of skilled laborers (who also often demand Western resources), making filming a difficult task to undertake without the Westernized environments created by tourism.

Likewise, the tourism industry relies directly and indirectly on the revenue generated by film production. Besides the dirhams spent during their stay, the representations that are mass distributed by film production reverberate as income generators for tourist sites. The site enters the public domain as spectacle, blurring lines between images and realities that reflect on this particular space. In narrative films, the

landscape is often reinscribed as another locality—in *Le Boulet*, it served as stand-in for Mali—but the spectacle builds on generic understandings of ‘desert’, no matter what specific locality. For the audience, this spectacle becomes one more way to understand ‘desert’ and the experience of being there, claiming some grain of realness by dint of the camera (and crew) having once been present in the place, “as a product of real activity” (Debord 1995:14).

Through image production, expectations about social relations are also created and layered: “The spectacle is not a collection of images; rather it is a social relationship between people that is mediated by images” (Debord 1995: 12). The mediation of social relationships through the spectacle takes place at the schematic, typic, macro level in the publication of images as tokens of representation with some claim to embody a ‘culture’ or ‘identity’. That mediation begins at the micro level, in interactions between individuals in the process of creating representations. The practice of film production comes with its own rules and limits that integrate into the finished product along with the subject matter.

In this presentation, I will be addressing the process of production itself in this short encounter between Baba, the headwaiter at a mid-range hotel in the Moroccan desert, and a visiting film crew. Keeping in mind that Baba, as a tourism agent, has his own motivations for participating in the production, I will pull out some aspects of the practice of shooting for narrative film as they relate to Baba’s potential to add authentic value to the film. As an agentive producer and performer of authenticity, Baba’s participation is not naïve, but his control over the finished product only reaches so far. The event of Baba’s participation in the practice of film production helps us understand how filmmakers ‘do’ authenticity in a foreign environment, how Baba ‘does’ authenticity for a receptive audience, and how the interaction of these interpretations emerges as a filmic representation into a regenerating discursive field.

AUTHENTICITY

The concept of authenticity belongs, to some extent, with the cohort of concepts that reach towards an imaginary ideal. Nationalism, purism, and other nostalgic projects depend on a system of authority to create their basic framework, to justify their existences. That discursive framework provides a platform from which to make claims, to create hierarchies, and to make a border between authentic and spurious. In the realm of tourism, this border becomes particularly important. As a more recently emerging kind of tourist encounter, cultural tourism is characterized by the role of symbolic or cultural capital as the product rather than material goods.

Crang defines cultural tourism as a search not for authenticity, but for the semblance of it: “Although tourists think they want authenticity, most want some degree of negotiated experiences which provide a tourist ‘bubble’ (a safe, controlled environment) out of which they can selectively step to ‘sample’ predictable forms of experiences”(1997:115). The project for the cultural tourism industry then is to create this non-existent idealized entity in a believable and absorbable form, emergent and negotiated as part of the tourist-agent interaction. Presented with an object, person, or place described as authentic, the tourist must a) find credible the idea that it is so, and b) be able to make sense of it in his or her own systems of ideas in a ‘safe’ form.

The cultural tourism market hinges on the selling of a version of history by a tourist agent that makes present-day existing objects, spaces, and practices make sense and have value in a believable way. The value of a landscape, a landmark, or a 'culture' to the tourist lies in their scarceness in the world at large, to the extent that they may be only located in the particular local, identifiable space. To believe in this rarity, the consumer must also believe in the system that claims it, the framework of authenticity surrounding the object that makes it an integrated piece of a context. This framework distinguishes between the 'genuine' object, as judged by its localness and its purity, and the 'false' object, discredited by exposure to a spurious influence, taint, or its status as a reproduction. Without the border between the authentic and the false, the rarity of the object has no value. A 'real' artifact or experience cannot be distinguished from a 'fake' one unless there is an authorizing framework within which they can be judged. Salamone (1997), in his article on the San Angel Inns of Mexico, reminds us that the value of authenticity is primarily contextual. He visited informally both the San Angel Inn in Mexico City, and its sister restaurant in the Mexican Pavilion at the Epcot Center in Florida. They are both owned by the same family and staffed from the same pool of employees, but each creates a different sense of Mexican culture and cuisine as 'authentic'. Each presents a separate rhetoric appealing to ideas of the original Mexico—one as the flourishing Spanish colony, the other as the ancient civilizations before colonization. Either can be considered authentically Mexican in the "dialectical-contextual' communication between the host community and its tourist guests" (Roche 1992 in Salamone 1997:312); the acceptance thereof emerges in the process of host-visitor interaction.

Like many other terms in this realm, authenticity needs to be examined as a process. For my purposes, I will define it as the maintenance of a believable connection between an object, place, or person and the dominant version of history, where that object, place, or person is in danger of being discredited as inauthentic. In other words, it is the process of maintaining the perception of oneself as excluded from the 'fake' or 'tainted' category, thereby justifying one's actions or existence as necessary and essential to the environment. Furthermore, a claim to authenticity is not self-evident or universal; it is a process that is negotiated between agents, according to emerging indicators of authenticity specific to the expectations of both parties.

In the literature on tourism, authenticity has been theorized and contemplated in relation to the lack of authenticity (in the sense of original and indigenous) of locally-produced representations of localness, specifically because they are produced for tourist consumption (MacCannell 1973; Silver 1993). Alternately, it has been approached as an emergent process (Cohen 1988) instead of a "primitive" one, where the necessary production of authenticity is connected to the expectations of the tourist consumer based on his or her desired experience of the Other. In other words, some tourists expect an intimate level of association with the locals in order to get a 'real' picture of local life. Those with less rigorous expectations for authenticity are satisfied with a presentation of the local 'culture' in a less intimate format, with a less strident claim to be 'real' (1988:377). In that it is a process, it becomes a resource for producers of representations to validate and endow market value to their products. The question here is not whether or not a representation is authentic in the sense of pure, original, or unaltered, but how its formulation as such serves to imbue it with value as distinctive,

rare, unique, genuine, indigenous or original. It is not the essential quality of authenticity that the tourism agents at this hotel are accessing, but the emergent signs of it that matter to tourists, so that they can maintain the value linked with and implied by the label 'authentic'.

The 'authentic' value that tourism agents can possess or produce is one of the many factors determining their value on the tourism market. In Morocco, where many of the tourists are seeking the 'authentic' ethnic tourism experience that Van den Berghe describes in Mexico, this indicator might be a particularly important one to achieve success on the market. There is something attractive about the 'local' to the modern Western traveller. MacCannell (1973) argues this point, claiming that leisure tourism is a product of modernity both financially and culturally because, as a result of modernizing processes, the Western capitalist has the means and impetus to 'know' the Other. Paraphrasing MacCannell, Van den Berghe claims that "[m]odernity produces homogenization, instability, and inauthenticity, and thus generates in the most modernized among us a quest for the opposite of these things" (1994:8). The essence of the 'local' becomes something indefinable and always unreachable, a quality that the modern traveller can desire but never fully possess. That quality then becomes the source of authority for the ethnic tourism market in Morocco: economic viability depends on the ability to convince the tourist that one possesses or has access to those who possess this 'authentic' substance that is unavailable in the modern world. Like the guides who perform as conversants and musicians, their 'localness' adds to the 'authenticity' of the environment because it imbues them with an authority the tourists do not have. They are connected by birth (and language) to the landscape, which makes them ostensibly experts on it and representatives of it.

MacCannell frames this division between authentic and inauthentic in Goffman's terms as front and back arenas. He does not claim, however, that 'authentic' events occur in only one arena; more that the division between the two interacts with emergent perceptions of authenticity. That is, the more a visitor is familiar with the stagedness of the front regions, the further "back" he or she desires to go in order to maintain belief in the 'authenticity' of his or her experience. With increased exposure to the stagedness, the viewer becomes increasingly critical of all performances. MacCannell imagines the spectrum of front to back with absolute poles—a front region that is purely show and a back region that is purely back. I would argue that the back region as such does not exist except as an ideal-type, a zone that, following the observer's paradox, ceases to exist as soon as it is entered. Nevertheless, it is a zone that requires protection by the local agents as a source of mythical authenticity that should not be violated by allowing access to a visitor.

EXCHANGE

Looking through literature on authenticity, Cohen (1988) finds that it is often connected with a *lack* of commodification, in that, once commodified, a 'local' object loses its value as unique and original, becoming alienated from its source. Through this process, tourism is seen as the bane and the boon to 'local' cultures: by creating a market through which a community can sustain themselves with foreign capital, it simultaneously destroys the authenticity of the place as it becomes commodified. This process seems to inspire fear among curators and specialists of the salvage

anthropology variety, characterizing tourism spaces as the beginning of the end of these cultures. For governments of non-Western nations in need of a productive income, they constitute a promising arena of advancement. One vision emerging out of the 1998 World Bank and UNESCO joint conference on Culture in Sustainable Development was the imperative for developing nations to invest in culture as a means of preserving national spaces (Ali and Rieker n.d.) while securing a place in the international economy. The supranational emphasis on culture as sustainable development presents an interesting twist to the tourism economy. It would seem that tourism development is now encouraged as a means of reinforcing historical 'cultural' preservation while simultaneously bolstering the national economy with foreign capital. As an alternative to providing factory labor, the non-Western nation sells its own native, indigenous, organic image in the form of the Western tourism experience. This would seem, in some ways, to be a profitable situation for both parties, but the development of 'culture' will of course have unanticipated consequences. Cohen (1988) refers to the 'freezing' of cultural production for tourist consumption by accessing historic nostalgic forms as the commodity. In this sense, the 'development' created by Western tourism is thought to result in stasis, reinforcing and replicating essentialized images of the non-Western other even as the inter-cultural contact is facilitated. To the contrary, I would argue that, as a site where authenticity is *emergent* and *produced*, not one where it simply lives, "stasis" is not an accurate description. The pressure to produce authentic forms encourages the reification of nostalgic objects, but it is a changing field of objects that agents draw from, so that the "authentic" Moroccan experience of 2000 is not the same "authentic" Moroccan experience of 2003. Tourism agents are, in this respect, *producers of authentic representations*, not simply temporary embodiments of them; they are *agents* in the tourism economy.

As a representative in the field of culture as sustainable development, Baba becomes a participant in this reduplication. Because of his personal stake in the hotel's reputation and success, I would argue that Baba is invested in the maintenance of the hotel's image to the broader Western audience. Although I'm certain that many factors personal and professional contributed to his decision to participate in these two video projects, I would contend that some part of his motivation was related to the promotion of the hotel. As he himself is invested in its continued success, efforts on his part to maintain the image of authenticity outside of his normal duties would be potentially appealing to him as ways of ensuring the hotel's value as a tourist destination, as well as generating positive word of mouth advertising through his cooperation.

Along these lines, it is important to note that his participation in the film production was as the hotel's self-chosen representative. The crew did not ask him specifically to play the waiter, but asked him for any member of his staff that could be spared. His decision to perform himself surprised me: he had been working nearly two straight days without sleep because of the New Year holiday and had been complaining to me of his fatigue. The fact that he took the role himself, despite this, demonstrates potentially interesting motivations. His decision could have been an effort to have partial control over what image is presented of the hotel. If he had sent one of his staff to play the waiter, he would not have been able to control the performance, for which he may be later held responsible. Part of his motivation was, without a doubt, more directly self-promotional. Before he ascended to the roof to perform, he asked the director how

much he would be paid. After consulting with one of the crew members, she replied that there was no money for it, that it would be “pour la gloire” (for the glory), to which Baba did not verbally respond. Immediately after his part was finished, after the crew had applauded and thanked him, he privately asked me how he could feed his family on “merci.”

The issue of compensation also came up at the beginning of our working relationship. After I asked him to let me follow him, he asked me if he would be paid. My response was to ask if there was another way I could repay him, given that the exchange of cash would be inappropriate to my purposes and possibly negatively influence my relationships with others at the hotel. I offered to send him something from America as payment, which seemed to be an adequate substitution, but I cannot be certain that he does not consider me as remiss in fair exchange as he did the film crew.

Ultimately, Baba’s participation in both videos feeds back into the reputation of Morocco in Western representations. Baba’s role in this process is not, however, that of a passive subject. As an active producer of marketable authenticity for his employers, his participation is conscious and agentive. Salamone describes this give and take in relation to Bruner and Kirshenblatt-Gimblett’s analysis of Maasai performance on a Kenyan ranch: “They have seized sufficient power to use the performance to advance their own definition of reality. Although they must conform in sufficient fashion to please the tourists, the performance cannot take place without them” (1997:313). Baba may be characterized as a figure without power in the Western/non-Western dichotomy, or as an employee in the service economy where the consumer dictates his actions. His power stems from his position as the purveyor and producer of a “vernacular authenticity” (Coupland 2003) -- the quality that separates him as a member of the local community from the Western tourist. It is through the framework of tourism that we can approach Baba’s role for the two visiting producers: they would not be there and would not be able to meet him if the infrastructure of tourism, framed here as a quest for authenticity, had not created the space and circumstances for these encounters.

THE SEQUENCE

Particularly emblematic of Moroccan ‘culture’ and hospitality is the ubiquitous mint tea served by every host or hostess and at every café, predominantly in the same style teapot and glasses. The sequence that Baba was asked to perform involved a waiter serving mint tea to two characters seated at a table. I believe this sequence was a portion of a longer conversation between the two characters, as the crew had been shooting in this location since earlier that morning. One of the actors travelled with the crew—he lives in Belgium and is of North African descent. The other was a Moroccan actor hired locally for the film. The three performers were, to my knowledge, the only people of Moroccan origin working on this particular scene, judging by the linguistic participation in Moroccan Arabic conversations. Baba’s participation in it began towards end of their morning’s shoot, just before they planned to break for lunch.

I had the opportunity to show the beginning part of the video data in Elizabeth Keating’s Conversation Analysis and Narrative seminar in the spring of 2004. She instructed me to play the video without any introduction, which produced some interesting reactions among my classmates.

The opening frames of this sequence show Baba standing by the ledge on the roof of the hotel. There are movement and voices audible from others in the vicinity but not visible within the frame. He is wearing his typical clothing—pants, shirt, and turban all dyed blue, the color of all the hotel uniforms, referencing a local ‘tribe’ called Tuareg. In addition to his usual clothing, he is wearing a plastic string of flowers around his neck, a leftover party favor from the New Year’s Eve celebration. A man approaches him; Baba lifts the flowers slightly off of his chest, miming the action of taking them off. The man reaches for the ornament and says, “Too much New Year.” Baba replies, “C’est, c’est trop tard” (It’s, it’s too late). The man removes them from Baba’s neck.

A number of my classmates remarked that this event was arresting at first—who was this man, this stranger, somewhat forcibly exercising control over Baba’s clothing? A few moments later, when he is revealed to be the cinematographer on a film crew, his behavior was seen as acceptable and appropriate.

This particular reaction is informative for a number of reasons. First, it underscores the logic behind the removal of Baba’s lei: the viewers were looking for an explanation for behavior that seemed inappropriate, and the context of ‘film shoot’ provided a circumstance for this audience in which one person would be allowed to remove another’s adornments. Thus, it would seem that the assumed mode of behavior in this context is for the members of the crew to instruct Baba the actor on his performance of the character ‘Baba the Waiter,’ both in his actions and his physical presentation. This exchange sets the precedent for the further interactions between Baba and the crew as the character of ‘Baba the Waiter’ is realized in video. The class as audience accepted this power dynamic as appropriate to the context, which begs the question: why would a foreign film crew know how to perform ‘Baba the Waiter’ better than Baba, the waiter, would?

During the twenty-two minutes of interaction I recorded, members of the crew instruct Baba 34 times, discuss his actions with each other 18 times, and give him positive feedback on his performance once. His participation is mostly in the form of agreements and acknowledgements of instructions (13 times). In addition to those exchanges, he asks questions three times: once to have permission to move the sprig of mint from the spout to the inside of the teapot, as he says “c’est ça qu’on fait” (that is how we do it); once, after two failed takes, he confirms that his own actions were not at fault (and is given his one positive feedback from the director of photography); and once he clarifies into which cup he should pour first, and how much he should fill each cup.

The crew instructions are generally regarding his blocking—from which direction he should move, and what movements in specific he should perform in this shot. Their meta-performative talk concerns how the scene will be constructed as a cinematic representation of this event, not his performance as an actor. In the final setup, when Baba asks which cup he should pour into first and how much, the instructions he is given by the crew reference his earlier performance of this action; their instructions are not aesthetically or stylistically oriented, but cinematically, in that they need him to replicate his previous action as closely as possible so that the two shots can be edited together. During the twenty-two minutes, the director does give one instruction on performance, but it is to one of the professional actors, not Baba.

Other than his determination to put the sprig of mint in the teapot, Baba’s expertise as waiter was not explicitly involved in his cinematic performance. The crew

did not instruct him on the aspects of the role he was familiar with as a waiter, nor did he ask them. For instance, they told him to pour, but not how to pour. In fact, the manner in which he poured the tea was distinctive to the place, as it is an action performed for guests in an explicitly and deliberately embellished style. They did instruct him numerous times on how to perform cinematically: to place the tea tray in the center of the table, not to speak, to enter from one side and exit to the other. Baba's questions and input are usually directed more towards content, like ensuring that he performs pouring the tea in the same way that he does "normalement" (normally). In the end, Baba is not simply performing 'Baba the Waiter'—he is doing so in an unfamiliar format, as a *cinematic* presence not just a touristic one. In this context, Baba defers to the judgment of the crew on how he should execute the movement of serving tea, but he gives his input on the stylistic configuration, like putting in the sprig of mint. His construction as an actor will emerge in the final cut as Baba's locally 'authentic' body, attire, and identity under the direction of the cinematically-minded film crew, who ultimately have control over Baba's cinematic actions. Most of these instructions have little to do with the role of 'waiter' and more to do with the dynamics of montage construction and adjusting pro-filmic action to suit the limited frame of the camera-eye. As a non-actor, Baba may not be practiced in performing actions in exactly the same way more than once; telling him to place the tray in the center not only suits the aesthetic framing desired by the cinematographer but also gives Baba a target that he can repeat with precision, so that multiple takes can be edited together. When the assistant director tried to instruct Baba on another aspect of cinematic performance having to do with the orientation of the body to the camera, the cinematographer dismissed her directions (in English, a language that Baba did not speak with the crew) as being "too complicated." Thus, Baba's instructions were limited to the essentials for him to function as an on-camera presence, stopping short of making him an actor conscious of the camera-eye in every shot.

It could be said that the film crew failed for some time to execute their role as cinematic authorities because of their extended failure to complete the "one shot" for which they asked Baba to participate. After a successful rehearsal, they executed one take of Baba's planned action—approach the table, set down the tray, and pour the tea. However, part way through this take, the cinematographer adjusted his position in such a way that the take itself would not be usable as a complete action. His readjustment necessitated at least one more shot in a different position. This next shot was blocked and executed three times, each one flawed for some reason or another. After one failed take, Baba commented in Moroccan Arabic (a language in which none of the crew demonstrated any competence) to the other actors: "It didn't come? (Pause) How is one [take] going to come?" He further expressed his desire to finish to the director by miming his hunger to her, to which she replied apologetically, that they were also hungry and anxious to finish. When the second shot was finished with a clean fourth take, the director and cinematographer decided (in Flemish, another language Baba did not speak with the crew) to add another shot for editing purposes. In all, Baba performed for seven filmed takes of three different shots, plus two rehearsals and two sound takes, much more than the "one shot" to which he initially agreed. Baba's exasperation and waning enthusiasm will most likely not be evident in the final cut, calling into question its 'authentic' accuracy to the circumstances during filming.

As we can see, the representation resulting from Baba's participation on this film is an accumulation of decisions leading him to perform certain actions on camera, in certain camera framings. This series of decisions extends past Baba's immediate association with the film into how his role will be constructed in the final edit. Given the time length of footage I witnessed being shot with Baba, and the standard shooting ratio (time of raw footage: screen time in final film) of 6:1, a conservative estimate for digital productions, I would estimate that Baba's total screen time is no more than 17 seconds. His presence in the film will be fleeting, and is most likely as a functional tool to move the story cinematically, not as relevant to the narrative itself. Nevertheless, his image on tape pulls *Retour des Hirondelles* into the ranks of cinema that uses local non-actors to augment its claim to 'authenticity' as a realist narrative, endorsed by dint of his participation, whether it was compensated and enthusiastic, or unpaid and reluctant.

SOCIAL RELATIONSHIPS MEDIATED BY IMAGES

In this sense, the social relationships Debord refers to as "mediated by images" are not limited to the relationships an audience forms with regards to the spectacle, but involve the entire process of its creation and all the untraceable influences since its inception. The impressions of an audience in watching this scene reflect on their own experiences with similar representations or encounters, with their own repertoires of significances that interact with the presentation onscreen. Usually, this is as far as an audience can go, having been denied access to the event that produces their object of inspection. Along these lines, it has been the tendency of Western social sciences to focus on the product that can be dissected as an artifact through detachment and fragmentation (Kirshenblatt-Gimblett 1998) rather than its coming into being, its process. By presenting here the practice of fiction filmmaking, along with its rhetoric and limitations, I intend to redistribute attention paid to the "quasi-sacred" permanent and tangible product created by professional spectators (Lutz and Collins 1994:364) as a slice of the interaction, not necessarily representative of its impact and reverberations. The image of the Other created by Western producers, so often read as part of colonialist discourse and typification, emerges from interactions that cannot be so easily flattened. Whatever image is presented by it, the representation is a result of a face-to-face interaction between 'local' and 'foreign', between Baba and the crew, each contributing their own knowledges and practices to produce the resulting minutes of footage.

In fact, the twenty-two minute interaction between Baba and the crew may create more lasting effects than the few seconds of screen time that may result. The image Baba presents onscreen would not be emphasized enough to noticeably uproot or degrade the pre-existing impressions an audience member might have of Moroccan waiters, but his interactions and shared confidences with the crew might. As is evident, the process of creating this filmic representation becomes one of negotiating the performer's role-specific input and expertise into the producer's knowledge of cinematic representation. How the scene plays out emerges as a nest of decisions: Baba's decision to play the role, the cinematographer's decision to remove his flower necklace, the director's decision that he should serve the tea, and so on. The dynamics of it shift depending on what knowledge each participant brings to the table: Baba has much experience as a waiter, but little, if any, experience as an actor; the crew knows 'being a

Moroccan waiter' only through the actions of Baba and others they have encountered in Morocco, but they know much more, especially as the ostensible producers of this representation, about the construction of cinematic action through abstracted montage. His position as non-actor becomes key to the crew because it counterbalances their own position as neophytes in Morocco, adding an element of 'localness' to the film that increases its value as an authorized, 'authentic' representation. Yet, at the same time, he is enacting an 'authentic' characterization that reflects on his surroundings as representative of them. Thus, the social relationship mediated by images is not only at the discourse end of the spectrum; it is embedded into the process and practice of filmmaking itself.

Bibliography

- Ali, Kamran Asdar, and Martina Rieker
n.d. Introduction: Reading the New Cultural Economy: unpublished.
- Clifford, James, and George E. Marcus (eds.)
1986 *Writing Culture: The Poetics and Politics of Ethnography*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Cohen, Erik
1988 Authenticity and Commoditization in Tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research* 15: 371-386.
- Coupland, Nikolas
2003 Sociolinguistic authenticities. *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 7: 417-431.
- Crang, Philip
1997 Performing the Tourist Product. In: Chris Rojek and John Urry (eds.), *Touring Cultures*; pp. 137-154. London, New York: Routledge.
- Debord, Guy
1995 *The Society of the Spectacle*. New York: Zone Books.
- Foucault, Michel
1994 *The Order of Things*. New York: Vintage Books.
- Kirshenblatt-Gimblett, Barbara
1998 *Destination Culture: Tourism, Museums, and Heritage*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Lutz, Catherine, and Jane Collins
1994 The Photograph as an Intersection of Gazes: The Example of *National Geographic*. In: Lucien Taylor (ed.), *Visualizing Theory: Selected Essays from V.A.R. 1990-1994*; pp. 363-384. New York: Routledge.
- MacCannell, Dean
1973 Staged Authenticity: Arrangements of Social Space in Tourist Settings. *The American Journal of Sociology* 79: 589-603.
- Salamone, Frank
1997 Authenticity in Tourism: The San Angles Inns. *Annals of Tourism Research* 24: 305-321.
- Silver, Ira
1993 Marketing Authenticity in Third World Countries. *Annals of Tourism Research* 20: 302-318.
- Van den Berghe, Pierre L.
1994 *The Quest for the Other: Ethnic Tourism in San Cristobal, Mexico*. Seattle: University of Washington Press.