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ABSTRACT

This paper seeks to renegotiate the role of visuals and visual practice within the tourist experience. Embracing recent developments in tourist studies, I seek to move from understanding tourism as a series of predetermined, linear and static stages through which we pass to be a tourist. In doing so, I explore the ways in which visuals in particular photography and subsequent visualities, enliven tourists’ becoming through a multiplicity of fluid and dynamic performances, practices and processes. Influenced by research by authors such as Crang (1997, 1999), I suggest photography is not merely an empty practice, but rather lights up the tourist experience. The emerging dynamics of visual practice renegotiate new understandings between tourists and place to establish a series of conceptual moments that outline photography as: political artefacts, reflexive performances, the imagination of space, embodied visualities and ethical prompts. Such conceptualisations and practices of tourist photography are by no means arbitrary, but are situated in a framework of visuality that highlights key moments of anticipation, rewriting and remembrance and reliving. Thus, moving beyond notions of the hermeneutic cycle of travel, photographs and photography are understood as complex performative spaces that extend beyond divisible boundaries of the before, during and after travel experiences and infiltrate the entire tourist experience.
INTRODUCTION

Photography and the visual have long been understood as fundamental to tourism and over the past few decades, the visual and visual practice in tourism has received steady attention from a range of disciplines. Yet, while research addresses conceptualisations of the visual in tourism (see amongst others: Adler, 1989; Crang, 1999; Meltzer, 2002; Ritzer & Liska, 1997; Urry, 1990), there continues to be relatively limited direct, theoretical application and empirical attention to the practices through which photographs both produce and are produced by tourists. While some like Crang (1997), Edensor (1998) and Jokinen & Veijola (2003) have attended to photography in tourism, their research remains adhoc and sits alongside discussions of visual practice via an eclectic array of other media such as postcards (see Edwards (1996), Waitt & Head (2002) and Moors (2002; 2003), television, video and cinema (see Crouch & Grassick, 2005; Edensor 2005; Davin, 2005, Fish, 2005, Pollock, 2003), art (Lai, 2004) and monuments (Mills, 2003). Indeed, as Baerenholdt et al (2007) suggest: “although photography is perhaps the emblematic tourist practice and tourist studies have been dominated by a visual paradigm, tourist studies have produced little knowledge of how and why tourists are busy producing photographic images” (: 69).

This paper therefore aims to further contribute to existing knowledge of photography and photographic practice in tourism. First, I draw upon recent shifts in understanding tourism and tourist practice that have emerged in the last decade. Being a tourist is no longer a series of discrete, isolate moments (Franklin & Crang, 2001; Coleman & Crang, 2002; Franklin, 2003). Tourists do not simply, as Albers & James (1984) and Urry (1990) suggest, exist in a hermeneutic cycle driven by a set of predetermined knowledges and behaviours with a distinct beginning and end. Rather, tourism emerges as intersubjective connection to and accommodation of other, through which a multiplicity of subjectivities are performed (Coleman & Crang, 2001). There is no beginning and no end, but a series of rhythms, flows and fluxes, in-between points and stages that tourists move in and around. I therefore propose visuals and visual practice are not mere aides in the tourist experience, but emerge through fluid interplays that light up the process of becoming by instilling life and mobilising deeper affiliations between self and other.

Second, to explore the role of photographs and photography in such encounter, it is necessary to embrace tourism as a series of active doings through performative engagement (for example Bell & Lyall, 2002; Coleman & Crang, 2002; Crang, 1997; Edensor, 1998, 2001). Photographs and photography facilitate the enlivening and creation of place and experience and as Crang (1997a) supposes, allow tourists to take part in rather than reflect upon the world. As co-performers, photographs frame place and allow experiences to be created, encountered and preserved via physical, intellectual and cognitive activity (Perkins and Thorns, 2001). However, as Edensor (2001) and Franklin & Crang (2001) realise, reflexive awareness demands inherent difference. Thus, visual practice emerges as a series of intersubjective negotiations. It is an arena for negotiation and play as photographs and photography offer opportunity to explore place (Sontag, 1979) and access previously hidden behaviours, senses and engagements. My concern therefore is to unpack the integral role of visuals and the diversity of visual practice and identify the opportunities through which tourists both produce and are produced by photographs and photography.
Furthermore, this paper contributes to current debate on the multisensuality of tourism. Prompted by the need to rebalance the domination of the visual, research has embraced the plurality of sensual interplays of tourist practice and the subjective, reflexive positioning of the tourist via lay knowledges (see Crang, 1999; Crouch, 2000a/b, 2002; Franklin & Crang, 2001; Veijola & Jokinen, 1994; Wylie, 2002). Some, like Game (1991) go so far as to emphasise the body over sight. While such an approach is fundamental to understanding tourists’ experiences, following Harraway’s (1991) call for the embodied nature of all vision, I propose visuals and visual practice exist through the fusion of all senses as tourists move through place imaginatively and experientially. The visual exists as a series of embodied practices as tourists encounter the world multisensually and multidimensionally (Crouch & Lübbren, 2003). Moving beyond perceptions through which photographs and photography are “portrayed as a static, distanced and disembodied encounter with the world” (Baerenholdt et al, 2007: 101), I embrace the sensual poesis of visual practice as it emerges via the materiality and corporeality of the body. In doing so, I aim to offer further insight into the practices through which photographs and photography become implicit in producing experiences, concrete bodily performances and tangible memories.

Finally, as embodied practice and performance, I suggest photographs and photography become imbued in tourism as the practice of self in everyday life (see Chaney, 1993; Crang, 1997, 1999, Coleman & Crang, 2002; Edensor, 2001; Franklin, 2003). The everydayness of photography emerges as the repetition of habitual and polydimensional nature of non-habitual practices fuse to mobilise new possibilities (Edensor, 2001). Thus, I suggest, it is this very union of habitual and non-habitual, the expected and unexpected that positions photographs and photography as fundamental to the ways in which tourists are able to explore and accommodate other. Secondly, everydayness emerges as the materiality of photographs mobilise a ‘touring’ (Bell & Lyall, 2002; Lury, 1997; Rojek, 1997; Rojek & Urry, 1997) in which photographed subjects transcend spatial and temporal boundaries to infiltrate domestic and work spaces (see Rose, 2003). Whether inferring potential experiences, capturing encounters or providing spaces for reflexive performance, as Franklin & Crang (2001) suggest, it is the role of the visual and the transitional spaces of visualities as transcending physical boundaries that interest lies.

My concern is therefore to address the multiplicity of ways in which photographs both produce and are produced by tourists. The next section develops my argument as I propose a series of conceptual moments of photography. Following that, I propose a framework of visuality that identifies the moments at which such conceptualisations arise in the temporal and spatial diversity of photographic practices of both industry and tourists. However, before proceeding, it is necessary to outline the case study on which analysis is based, as to discuss the “visual practices” of the tourist experience risks potential overgeneralisation. Research was conducted in the context of Peru, with 16 semi-structured interviews conducted with British tourists at three stages of their experience: pre-travel, mid-travel and post-travel. Of these, 6 were longitudinal. Tourists ranged in age from early 20’s to late 70’s and were a balance of male and female. All were first-time visitors to Peru and travelled as part of a 2-week organised tour. Pre-travel interviews explored anticipatory practices using tourist brochures. Mid-travel interviews were conducted during respondents’ holidays in Peru and focused on postcards. Post-travel interviews were conducted on tourists return home and addressed tourists’ own photographs. In addition, 10 semi-structured interviews were conducted with UK-based tour operators and used tourist brochures to unpack practices of brochure construction and 8 semi-structured interviews were conducted with postcard
producers in Peru. Interviews aimed to provide rich insights into practice and access to the multiplicity of tacit knowledges and non-representable intricacies of tourists’ visual practice. However, in order to access the nuances of photographic practice, interviews were supported with autoethnography as I embarked on my own two-week trip around the “tourist trail” of Peru. Autoethnography emerged as a fusion of observation and first-hand experience. It provides an avenue through which researcher subjectivity is embraced within the research setting (see for example: Church, 1995; Morgan & Pritchard, 2005; Sparkes, 2000; Westwood et al, 2006). As Krieger (1996) suggests, autoethnography explicitly discusses the experiences and presence of the researcher in the research context. Thus, the ‘I’ becomes resituated in research and generates a series of affiliations and insights to develop a fuller sense of self so that our understanding of others will not become fractured or artificial. Autoethnography therefore goes beyond subjectivities (Coffey, 2005). Subjectivities are balanced through a flexible, shared responsibility as both researcher and respondent reveal their inner selves to the research. As such, a kinaesthetic, embodied approach to understanding tourist practices emerges via a process of self-witnessing, thus generating what some tourist respondents like Martin, referred to as a “travel connection” as we anticipated, travelled through and remembered our experiences of Peru. Thus, moving from “researcher” to “researcher-as-fellow-tourist”, I established common ground and discussed differences in practice with respondents. Interviews became rich negotiations via sharing, trust and mutual understanding of tacit knowledges and experiences that would perhaps otherwise remain hidden. Yet, despite such rich insights, I later suggest that the place specificity of Peru may result in particular aspects of visual practice being exclusive to this location.

CONCEPTUAL MOMENTS OF THE VISUAL

As aforementioned, interest lies in the multiplicity of photographic practices performed throughout tourists’ experiences. Such practices are imbued with complex relations of politics, space, agency, embodiment and ethics and it is to this that attention now turns. In thinking through such issues, I propose a framework of conceptual moments that positions photography as: political artefacts, reflexive performances, the imagination of space, embodied visualities and ethical prompts. While delineated for discussion, conceptualisations are not mutually exclusive, but exist within permeable boundaries that arise at varying intensities throughout tourists’ experiences. They offer a foundation to explore visual practice as tourists engage with place via imagined and experiential encounters. However, it is important to emphasise that tourists are not heroic, autonomous creatures. Rather, they are inherently intersubjective and visual practices emerge through a fusion of collective and individual, staged and immanent, imaginings and experiential performances in a fluid negotiation of landscape (Wylie, 2003).

Firstly, photographs are political artefacts. As Rose (2003) suggests, they are objects; things to which other things are done. They are given purpose in accordance with use as they are constituted, materialised and endowed with meaning. Visuals become analogous to multiple “space odysseys” (Lash & Urry, 1994: 15). They are continually de- and re-contextualised as a range of social forms and individuals influence tourists’ encounters with place (Halfacree, forthcoming). Such politicisation is embedded in tourism as we are surrounded by a proliferation of actors and media (e.g. tour operators, tour guides, postcard producers, television and films) that frame destinations according to preferred discourses. Thus, practices of staging and scripting (see Edensor, 1998) mobilise a “directed gazing” (Urry, 1990) of place as destinations become
choreographed with “cultural scripts and material regulations” (Baerenholdt et al., 2007: 71). Visuals therefore become established as signs that guide tourists’ interpretations. They are never simple representations, but are constructed as mediated discursive spaces (Scarles, 2004). Thus, tourists become partially locked within collective considerations that enframe destinations using distinctive icons that minimise possibilities of articulating alternative narratives (Meethan, 1996; Morgan & Pritchard, 1998). For Peru, such narratives centre on Machu Picchu (see figure 1) as “that is why most people want to go…to visit Machu Picchu” (Julia, tour operator). Discursive frameworks reinforce familiar narratives of lost cities, ancient civilisations and spirituality. Thus, visual practices reinforce the collective gaze; facilitating tourists’ partial understandings of that which may be encountered.

Once at destinations, politicised discourses continue to direct tourists’ practice as they are guided by both human (e.g. tour guide) and non-human agents (e.g. brochures, signs) (Baerenholdt et al., 2007). Whether driven by compulsion or obligation, tourists engage in practices of ‘hunting’ and ‘capturing’ as they fulfil anticipations of destinations. As Abby said: “I wanted to take…photos of Machu Picchu because I had seen so many photos…and it looked exactly like I thought it was going to look like”. Thus, tourists perform place in response to the collective gaze (Baerenholdt et al., 2007). Like Abby and Jim (see figure 2), I too felt the compulsion to capture the classic view.

Figure 1-3 (left to right): Machu Picchu, Steppes Latin America, 2003: 22; Recreating the Classic View, Respondent’s Photograph; Personalising Machu Picchu, Author’s Own Collection.

However, I suggest the intersubjectivity of touristic practice extends beyond collective understandings as tourists embark on a personal politicisation of place. For Angela, Machu Picchu became synonymous with tranquillity: “I am a great lover of total quiet and I am hoping I will get that”, while Paula anticipated feelings of spirituality: “it’s a sacred site, so you expect it to have something spiritual about it”. Thus, collective understandings become infused with subjective reflexive engagement as tourists situate their self alongside other. Following Barthes (1981), I suggest as objects photographs are invisible and are not only what is seen. Rather, they become inexhaustible invitations to subjective interpretation. They offer enigmatic spaces through which tourists personalise place as they connect the materiality of experiential encounters with ideological imaginings and perform that which may not be directly seen, or even exist.

Finally, such politicising and personalising of the collective gaze embraces not only ideological, but also experiential encounter as photography corporealises encounter and transforms distanced spectators into active directors who produce new realities (Baerenholdt et al., 2007; Crang, 1997). Through visual practice tourists socialise destinations; selectively acting out place and creating co-presences between self and other. Photography provides opportunities to selectively author destinations. It becomes a performance in itself as tourists search to ‘be’ in place. As Maggie said: “it’s a (Maggie)-eyed view…its more personal…it’s like what I was doing…what I was seeing at the time”. Indeed, at Machu Picchu, photography facilitated my appreciation of place: the workmanship, the texture of the stones and the enormity of the surrounding landscape (see figure 3). For others, it mobilised deeper political narratives, as icons of brightly clothed, smiling children gave way to experiences of poverty: “she was filthy…I (photographed)…because I wanted to…remember what this child was like…the poverty she was living in” (Les, see figure 4).
Related to photographs as political artefact, is their position as **reflexive performance**. As Phelan (1997) suggests, photographs create “blind images” as selectivity in their production creates presences and absences that divert attention from less desirable place elements. Thus, the pleasures of looking embrace a sense of forgetting and concealing parts of the world that we do not wish to preserve (Mulvey, 1986). While some tourists accommodate issues such as political protest, others like Angela, photograph only desirable or aesthetically pleasing experiences that reinforce desired experience and place narratives: “if something is not pretty, it’s not worthy of being photographed”. Likewise, I photographed the festival in Cusco (see figure 5), simultaneously preserving pleasant memories of music, dancing and excitement while eclipsing those of barking dogs and feelings of altitude sickness. Visual practice therefore emerges as a series of negotiations and compromises as tourists merge ideological imaginings with the unfolding realities of place. It becomes an endless proprioception of fragments of reality. Photographs and photography facilitate the authoring and creation of extensions of self in place; simultaneously capturing moments as lived and securing projected memories. Thus, photographs become catalysts (Leslie, 2000. cit. Franklin & Crang, 2001); bridging moments and providing selective pathways for reflexive performances in another place and time.

As Barthes (1977) suggests, interpreting photographs is to lend them a past and future and insert them into a narrative through the suggestion of “having been there”. Spatial immediacy and temporal anteriority arise as the “here-now” and “there-then” combine into “that-which-has-been”. Yet, I argue memory does not conform to linear conception of time, but as Berger (1978) suggests, is ‘radial’ with concern for desire, contradiction and self-reflexivity. Memories do not repeat encounters mimetically. Rather, they work radially with “an enormous number of associations…leading to the same event” (ibid: 46). Thus, the subjectivities of reflexive performance infiltrate the entire tourist experience and emerge through a variety of practices. For example, as Donna anticipated place she related her experience of Tunisian sooks to understand possible experiences at Peruvian Indian markets, while Angela hoped Machu Picchu would “recreate the feeling that I felt standing on the Serengeti”. I therefore suggest, photographs are not memories in themselves for that would indicate a misconstrued interpretation of photography as a replacement for memory (see Sontag, 1979). Rather, they offer “fractured pasts” (Nora, 1996) that emerge as “memorial sites” upon which theatres of memory are constructed (Crang & Travlou, 2001). They become co-performers in the creation and subsistence of memories; a series of guiding structures upon which remembrances are inscribed as places are produced and consumed via ideology-fuelled stories (Hirsch, 1981, 1997; Rose, 2003).

As reflexive performance, photographs are also “beacons of personal, floating, meaningful memory” (Cloke & Pawson, forthcoming: 16). They ignite embodied reflections that extent beyond the materiality of the photograph. For Tom, photographs reminded him of “how dynamic the landscape was, the cloud…surging backwards and forwards”, while Olivia relived the “total isolation” she felt standing on the Altiplano. However, despite the intensity of embodied reflexivity, photographs provide closure as experiences become compartmentalised. They become concretised as history and (generally) stored out of sight as there comes the point “where you just leave it to rest and it stays in an album” (Gillian). Yet, the role of photographs as memorial sites and the radial nature of memory demands such closure is never absolute. Rather, photography and
photographs become building blocks as memories fuse in an amalgam of reflective performances of experiences that-have-been with those that-may-be in the future. The dynamics of memory and memorialisation call forth moments of sporadic reencounter as tourists advise friends on destinations, reflect on past experiences in times of boredom, or make sense of forthcoming experiences (Franklin & Crang, 2001, Crang & Travlou, 2001): “to think about having another holiday…what was china really like? Did we enjoy that?” (Alison). Nevertheless, it is inevitable that memories transform and fade. They are chameleon-like; morphing and camouflaging as they are called upon to serve purpose as we constantly revise our memories to suit our current identities (Gillis, 1994). Such morphing mobilises an impersonal popularisation of memory (Edensor, 1998) as intimate memories fade into memoryscapes. ‘True’ memories are gradually replaced and are left in the shadow of ambiguity between the past and our present day reading of it (Johnson, 1999). Over time, reflexive performances call forth idealised imaginings as realities are replaced and tourists building affinities with place as imaged (Travlou, 2002). The intricacies of beacons of personal experience become eroded and contain experiences to dominant, well-rehearsed narratives.

The third conceptual moment is the imagination of space. As Crang (1997) suggests, visual practice mobilises the enworldment of place as tourists reach out to grasp the world. Photographs and photography create established realities; routes through which subjective worlds are created, apprehended and enframed. I propose such enworldment arises as tourists ‘step into’ the intangible spaces of photographs via reflexive practice. Moving through the vortex of the visual, tourists create spaces of dislocation as imagined and abstract spaces merge in a swirling connection of real and imaginary, self and other. Consequently, tourists become (re)positioned within the photographed subject as they are consumed by the visual, as it is consumed by them. They become imaginative voyagers; enlivening photographed subjects and making place legible. Indeed, it is the inherent instability of visuals (DeCerteau, 1997, cit. Crang, 2000) that leaves them vulnerable to intersubjective interpretation. Thus, space for creativity unfolds as tourists fill in gaps and come to know a place and their role within it. As Maggie said, she could: “almost feel like what I hope it will be like to be there…I could imagine one of these people as me” (see figure 6). Such practice becomes dependant on the interests and motivations of each tourist. Figure 7 ignited Sarah’s passion for walking: “I love walking…you know that would be brilliant, smelling all the fresh flowers and the herbs”. Alternatively, figure 8 fuelled Angela’s embodied memories of her time on the Ballestas Islands: “it’s the smells, it’s the sounds…the sensations of sitting on that bloody boat going up and down”. Therefore, while the frequency and intensity of (re)positioning self via the vortex of the visual inevitably varies amongst tourists, the imagination of space focuses on the relationship between self and other. Photographed subjects are mediated as tourists draw upon imaginings and experiential encounters to create an active, embodied engagement with the world (Crang, 1997). Thus, photographs become lived spaces as tourists overlay physical space with imagined space and create illusions of transparency and opacity (Lefebvre, 1991); creating relational views of space through intersubjective experience.

The fourth conceptual moment positions photographs as embodied visualities. Ultimately tourists
never understand anything from the click of a shutter button. Rather, encountering place is implicit in the materiality and corporeality of the body (see Crouch, 2000a/b, Edensor, 1998, Franklin & Crang, 2001, Jokinen & Veijola, 2003). As Walker & Chaplin (1997) suggest, vision and subsequent visual practices use not only our eyes, but our minds, bodies, genders, personalities and histories. Thus, tourists’ photography is inspired not only that which is seen, but touched, tasted, heard and smelt. Such multisensuality arises in many guises whether driven by Peter’s exhilaration of reaching a summit, Sarah’s reflection on the laughter of camp life while trekking, or Maggie’s escape from illness. Such practice offers pathways into understanding the immediacy of experience and mobilises “not just a physical setting, but an orientation, a feeling, a tendency” (Radley & Taylor: 24). Visual practice can therefore launch moments that express corporeal uniqueness as emotions exceed expression in language and erupt into gesture (Elkins, 1998; Mulvey, 1986). Thus, for many like Olivia, photography aids comprehension of the immersion of self into the landscape: “it just really captures what I am not able to put into words sometimes”…“it was a beautiful view, the sunlight...its utter silence…” (see figure 9). Experiences are no longer reducible to representation, but embrace bodily engagements that are re-vivified in the act of photography (Harrison, 2000) as tourists strive to make sense of, prolong and preserve the immediacy of moment: “I just thought, ‘wow I am up here’…this is mine because I am here and I can see it, wow’…I feel I have got to take it” (Paula).

Figure 9: The Peruvian Altiplano, Respondent

Embodied visualities also emerge as tourists (re)encounter photographs they, or others, have taken. As Sontag (1979) suggests, “the ultimate wisdom of the (photograph)...is to say: there is the surface. Now...feel, intuit – what is beyond it” (: 23). In encountering photographs, tourists can be transported optically, their bodies remaining immobile as pleasure arises from the experience of the simulacrum (Krauss, 1982). Barthes’ (1981) concept of studium and punctum allows us to explore such practice further. He suggests the studium presents the photographers intention; mobilising half-desires and creating general enthusiasm. Indeed, it is the studium that enables some to trigger initial imagined practices: “I mean its...what’s here, or what’s behind you?...you can imagine yourself standing on this spot and taking that photo yourself” (Peter).

However, through the shock of referentiality, the punctum is the element of the photograph that ‘pricks’ tourists’ subjectivity. It brings poignancy and the power of expansion by capturing attention and heightening intrigue. It is tourists’ personal addition to photographs. While Barthes proposes a redundancy of the image in such practice, I propose photographs continue to stimulate affiliations that influence tourists’ practice. Thus, photographs become reference points from which tourists can reignite imaginings via reflexive embodied performance. Drawing upon
Phelan’s (1997) notion of the “vanishing point”, tourists re-enliven place as they are sucked into the body of the image and ignite that which photographs cannot show and corporeal vision cannot see. The interior of the photograph opens through the ‘as if’ as tourists “penetrate its interiority” to sense what the subject feels like (: 35). For Cathy and Jim, figure 10 “always brings some music…the accordion and the band and the trumpeter really giving it beans”. Senses and emotions take over as some become orally illiterate but sensually alive.

Figure 10: Music, Respondents’ Photograph Figure 11: Children at a rest stop, Authors own collection

Finally, photographs are ethical prompts. Mirroring the inherent multiplicity of visual practices in tourism, Thrift (2004) suggests no absolute ethical truth exists. Rather, we practice through “manyness” as ethics should not exist to vacuum up difference. Ethics are not clear-cut binaries of right/wrong, good/bad as outlined in identity politics of moralistic geographies. Indeed, to attend solely to the collective denies the plurality and potential instability and unpredictability of ethical opinion. Yet, as Cloke (2004) suggests, space exists for guiding principles: a series of anchor points that facilitate conformity while generating sensitivity of and for other. As such, ethics in visual practice demands an emotional and committed sense of other to ensure responsiveness to the complexity of human plurality.

First, photographs and photography are inherently imbued in a wealth of practices of searching, exposing, constructing and staging subjects as appearances are fixed and situations choreographed. Visual practice therefore mobilises an intense visibility of the subject (Pollard cit. Kinsman, 1995). Such selectivity creates an ethics of skill and expertise that questions who holds authority as to what is (not) desirable. Thus, photography becomes inherently selfish; emphasising or restricting visibility to satisfy ideological purpose. However, such ethical negotiation in practice is not uniform. Rather, I propose the dynamic, fluid nature of ethical consideration stimulates a profound confusion of ethics and ethical confusion. Photographs and photography emerge as a complex fusion of both predictable and reactionary practices that align general ethical viewpoints with unpredictable ethical response in the immediacy of moment of photographing. For example, Abby expressed that she “would never take a photo unless I’ve asked them first and if they said no, I wouldn’t do it”. Alternatively some, like Les, react in the moment as he sought to preserve the effect of his encounter with child in figure 4. Indeed, during my visit to the Peruvian Altiplano, tourists wandered around stalls at a rest-stop where several children played in traditional dress (see figure 11). Some asked directly if they could photograph, some photographed from a distance, while others perused the stalls before approaching for permission. Some children struck well-rehearsed poses and looked straight at the camera while others shuffled their feet, looking at the ground. Both tourists and children engaged in an awkward performance.

Such confusion of ethics creates fragility in photographing. To understand such negotiations further, Barthes’ (1981) ‘violence of photography’, can be reconsidered as a ‘violence of ethics’. Each performance commands attention, forcing tourists to confront a range of ethical consideration. Positioning is not always immediate or comfortable as subjective difference demands a spectrum of responses to negotiation and where some experience extreme discomfort and unease, others experience comfort in practice.
Having outlined the theoretical conceptualisations of visuals and visual practice as: political artefacts, reflexive performance, the imagination of space, embodied visualities and ethical prompts, attention now turns to the diversity practices and processes through which such conceptualisations are realised at a range of temporal and spatial intensities throughout tourists’ experience. I propose a framework of visuality comprised of key visual ‘moments’ and ‘devices’ (see figure 12). Tourists face a proliferation of visual artefacts from brochures, guidebooks, postcards and pamphlets to photographs from their own collections or those of friends/family. While, it is impossible to include the entire spectrum, I identify three ‘classic’ visual devices: tourist brochures, picture postcards and tourists’ own photographs. Though delineated for analysis, these are not contained entities that operate in isolation. Rather, they emerge at varying intensities throughout the tourist experience. Secondly, I propose practices emerge during three key ‘moments’. These are identified as: anticipation, rewriting and remembrance and reliving. Reflecting the dynamic nature tourists’ experiences, moments are not mutually exclusive, nor do they assume a linear process through which tourists pass. Rather, they are essentially interdependent and offer a multidimensional approach to understanding tourists’ experiences. Nevertheless, it is inevitable that some practices are more pertinent to some theoretical conceptualisations, ‘moments’ and ‘devices’ than others.

Figure 12: A Framework of Visuality for Visual Practice

The Moment of Anticipation
Past research (see Urry, 1990; Selwyn, 1996) advocates the highly visual nature of anticipation as a series of highly skewed place perceptions created and mobilised by industry (e.g. tour operators, tourist boards, etc). Thus, tourists absorb mediated ways of seeing and engage in day-dreaming or “mind travel” (Löfgren, 1999) via that which is seen. Yet, such understanding fails to address transitional spaces of visualities: the practices and processes that enable the material objectivity of destinations to transcend their physical boundaries (Franklin & Crang, 2001). Indeed, a multiplicity of visual and non-visual practices permeate visual devices as anticipation embraces not only that which is seen, but which is performed via political, embodied, ethical, reflexive and imaginative encounter. Such performances are neither uniform, nor are they entirely predictable. Rather, anticipation emerges as complex relations of guiding, projecting and repositioning via creative, fluid practices that are mobilised by both producers and tourists.

At this point it is necessary to distinguish between the practices employed industry and tourists. First, I attend to the practices of tour operators. As political artefacts, brochure images emerge as representations of space that abstract destinations according to recognisable icons. Photographs are inherently politically situated within prescribed narratives that are enforced through the conscious selection of subjects. Photographs therefore expose the interests they serve (Ateljevic &
Doorne, 2000). Working to stage a destination and mobilise a directed gaze, tour operators “hook” tourists by presenting that which is already known (Brian). Echoing all tour operators, Julia commented: “Machu Picchu definitely…that is why most people want to go”. The ubiquitous Machu Picchu is coupled with key icons of colourfully dressed, friendly people, the jungle, llamas and Inca ruins as destinations are choreographed according to collective understandings and mediated place narratives. Yet, despite frustrations of being confined to dominant narratives, intervention infiltrates practice as tour operators like Ewan parallel generality with specificity: “Machu Picchu, the people the colourful markets…then this is the fun way to do it, come with us”. Thus, visual practices not only serve to reinforce tourists’ perceptions, but gently expand imaginary horizons as tour operators introduce and mediate previously ‘hidden’ elements of place and directly infer their active role in providing the desired experience.

During anticipation, visuals become sites of struggle that are produced as ethically mobilised spaces of encounter. Production concentrates on “showcasing” (Jane) destinations; initiating curiosities, capturing the ‘feel’ of destinations and convincing tourists destinations are worth visiting. Thus, discourses are simultaneously controlled, selected and redistributed as tour operators mediate the conditions under which photographed subjects are presented. Enmeshed in discursive interpretations of responsibility and (mis)representation, visuals emerge as a balance of white lies and honesty. As Frasier surmised: “openness and honesty…is very important…do we tell porkies? Yah, all the time (laughs), it’s in my job description”. Yet, moral and ethical dilemma underpins the construction of desired truths as tour operators engage in “bending the truth” (Tom). Temporary or transitional place elements are routinely open to negotiation. Addressing delicate, political discourses, some like Fraser, actively distance themselves from “something that represents the sheer poverty, the sheer deprivation”, while others like Lucy reassure tourists of their safety by diverting attention from crime and drugs. Yet, bound by the legalities of due diligence, limits exist to the number of ‘white lies’ that can be told as “if the dream doesn’t match the reality, you get some very unhappy customers” (Leonard).

Finally, tour operators provide opportunity for reflexive performance, embodied visualities and imaginations of space as they socio-spatialise place; giving place character and enlivening destinations according to preferred discourse. Thus, tour operators present potential performances as already practised. Stages are set and roles cast as tour operators mobilise pathways of personal engagement that entice tourists to become “imagined actors” (Scarles, 2004). Tourists are encouraged to ‘step into’ destinations via the “3D-effect” (Carol) that deepens embodied performance of imagined practice. As Tom said, “they can almost smell the place…almost hear it, feel it, touch it, the whole thing. That’s the point”. Visuals facilitate the creation of intimacy, allowing both place and tourists to transcend their physical boundaries and enliven potential experiences. Connections are stimulated as tour operators actively audience destinations; presenting idealised ages, characteristics and environments “to give an idea of what the whole experience will be like” (Kate). Thus, visuals simultaneously ground anticipations in a reality that has-been while encouraging tourists to actively ‘step into’ encounters that-may-be by showing “people on their holiday…real, out there having fun” (Ewan) (see figure 8).

Like tour operators, tourists actively engage in the politicisation of place. They are not naïve to tour operators’ primary goal of selling via “tourified” (Les) collective discourse. Rather, they become players in the game of directed viewing. Anticipation extends beyond the reach of pure
hedonistic pleasure-seeking as feelings of pleasure and excitement are paralleled with insecurity and doubt. While some like Angela are “quite happy just to wait and see”, many like Cathy and Peter continue to express concerns regarding ‘hidden’ elements such as political unrest, health issues, poverty and crime. Visual practice therefore results in spaces of uncertainty and ‘not knowing’ as tourists piece together mosaics of partial knowledges of intersubjective negotiations to understand what may occur.

Secondly, conceptualisations of the imagination of space, reflexive performances and embodied visualities emerge in anticipatory practice. The subjectivity of reflexive performance enables tourists to make sense of potential encounters via a fusion of collective discourse, personal interests and past experiences. For example, in anticipating Machu Picchu, Paula commented: “it’s like when we were in Australia…my sisters went to…Ayers Rock…and…said it was…just so wonderful to be in it…and I guess that is how we are about that”. Indeed, while few respondents consciously engage in prolonged reflexive imaginings, many experience fleeting moments of ‘stepping into’ place. For example, looking at figure 8, Sarah said: “she is looking at the person taking the photograph…shes looking back at you, so you are now taking the photograph…you are right in there”. Thus, tourists actively enliven destinations via imagined embodied practices. However, the prospect of disappointment and the desire to preserve the intensity of the immediacy of experience generates a deferment of such practice. Many like Gillian, actively avoid prolonged immersion into mediated discourses as “that is someone else’s holiday…I want to…give myself a clean slate so that I don’t have huge expectations”. Nevertheless, visuals also mobilise a series of non-visual practices as respondents are alerted to key details that trigger ‘real time’ preparation. Prompted by the like-minded tourists pictured, some like Gillian and Maggie are motivated to go to the gym, others like Sarah and Paula purchase appropriate clothing, or like Martin, refamiliarise themselves with the Spanish language as they anticipate engagement with local people. Anticipation therefore emerges via diverse visual and non-visual practices as tourists embark on a ‘getting-to-know-you” process and initiate the fusion of self and other.

The Moment of Rewriting

In the second moment of rewriting, attention shifts both towards practice as a fusion of imagined and experiential encounter and to postcards and tourists’ own photographs as the devices through which practices are primarily performed. By rewriting, I do not propose photography as merely a hunter-gatherer activity of voyeuristic participation (Sontag, 1979). Rather, as tourists move through place collective discourses merge with subjective experiential encounters that unfold as not only prescribed and anticipated but, immanent and personalised. Thus, rewriting embraces photographs and photography as a series of dynamic and active practices as tourists respond to and accommodate destinations as they continually unfold through experiential encounter.
As with anticipation, it is necessary to distinguish between industry and tourist practices. Rather than a distinct rewriting of place, practices of postcard production mirror that of tour operators as they politicise discursive spaces according to desired narratives. As Juan said: “you have the children with the llamas and the girls with traditional dresses…(postcards) show the place (tourists) want to see”. Likewise, political and ethical consideration emerges as postcards provide opportunity for producers to gently extend the tourist imagination: “you have to show what tourists are buying but we also…incorporate other things so…they…learn a bit more of our country” (Ursula). Thus, postcards producers encourage tourists to explore beyond icons: introducing new angles or local and regional characteristics that remain beyond the reach of brochures (see figures 13 & 14). While such practice parallels that of tour operators, place-specificity arises as producers enframe place to support deeper narratives of economic, social and political stability. Adopting an ambassadorial role, politicisation arises as many use postcards to promote the tourist image of Peru. As George surmised: “(we) do not reproduce poverty…a poor child crying in the street…tourists don’t come here to see poverty”…“we want to show that the horrific time of terrorism have been erased….that nowadays our country is completely quiet, you can find some places…to walk around with no problem at all”. Indeed, while some embrace alternative narratives and expose deeper political insights into the lives of other, the majority reinforce a synthesis of “other that is the same” (Cloke, 2004) as postcards offer a mediated and aestheticised encounter with place.

On arrival tourists are inevitably bound to anticipatory imaginings and many respondents express desire to use photographs and photography to capture key icons. Icons such as Machu Picchu remain a key priority: “I wanted to take some photos of Machu Picchu because I had seen so many photos…and it looked exactly like I thought it was going to” (Abby). Thus, photographing concretises experience and confirms the existence of anticipated place characteristics. Yet, such practices produce highly politicised sites of struggle as anticipatory imaginings become infiltrated and obscured by the immanent and unfolding realities of place. Visual practice can become fuelled by frustration as gaps emerge between desired and actual images: “I went to Peru trying to get…the kids…(but) it just never felt right, the backdrop wasn’t right, or what they were wearing wasn’t right, or they weren’t pretty enough” (Angela). Therefore, rewriting arises as tourists selectively produce place. (Not) photographing or buying postcards allows tourists to bestow visibility on more desirable experiences that convey the impression of the existence of desired imaginings and encounters. Such is the power of reproducing the collective gaze that tourists enunciate institutionalised roles (Edensor, 1998); taking ‘duty’ photographs; succumbing to tour-guided photography, or experiencing pressure to photograph from fellow tourists. As Martin said: “you feel that some places you are supposed to take”…“I do feel a bit of pressure…particularly if you have just got somewhere…if other people have got theirs (cameras) and they are taking a photo and you are ‘oh, I had better, hadn’t I?’”.

However, the complexities of visual practice deepen as anticipatory imaginings are rewritten through experiential encounter. At this moment, political and ethical considerations of photographing come to the fore as tourists move beyond enclavic, themed environments (Edensor, 1998). Visual devices, in particular tourists’ own photography, mobilise a ‘getting-to-know-you’
process as tourists initiate their own contact spaces with place. Photography emerges as a series of active performances as tourists understanding and encounters of place move from the realm of imagination into experiential encounter. Place becomes infused with subjectivity as tourists actively situate their physical self alongside other. In doing so, they photographically construct places and experiences according to intersubjective encounter. Such practice ranges from absorbing inferences of everyday life, for example, Peter’s experience of the Uros Islands where “the people were out cutting the reed…you know, taking pictures of people about their everyday life”, to understanding the effects of relative poverty as Alison photographed “the school building and the little children…they walk one and a half to two hours to get to school everyday and …back again at night….there are people still living…in those sorts of circumstances”. In encountering place and opening new “contact spaces” (Cloke, 2004), tourists face a ‘violence of photography’ as they simultaneously consume and produce place through photographic practice. Places are negotiated via a fusion of intersubjective encounters as both imagined and experienced as tourists actively compose and construct the subjects and context within which they photograph.

Finally, rewriting becomes immersed in embodied visualities as tourists use their entire bodies to express the range of their experience: the excitement, fascination, boredom or even fear. Photography becomes infused with personal geographies of emotions as it is bound in constructing the event as concrete bodily performances and tangible memories (Haldrup & Larsen, 2004). Importance lies in the feelings, moods and sensations tourists experience as “taking a photograph isn’t just about capturing the image, it’s about capturing…a feeling” (Brian). The body becomes committed to the photograph as respondents, experienced an emotional and sensual intensity of being in place. Photographing provides structure and opportunity to capture the essence of self that transcends words and moves action into kinaesthetic sense and flow (Thrift, 1999). It concretises affectual connections between self and other that exist as moments of intense subjective reflection in corporeal/incorporeal union. Whether sudden, abrupt, fleeting or prolonged, such sensations of belonging envelope respondents’ entirely as they are no longer only driven by what is seen or by the actions of others, but by deep-rooted desire to ‘get that photo’ or ‘capture that feeling’. Whether acting immediately, or waiting to become absorbed by atmospheres and emotions, photographing, as Olivia said: “just really captures what I am not able to put into words”. Yet, photographing is not solely practised during pleasant encounters like Sarah’s experience of the porters’ laughter. It also offered isolation when Maggie suffered from altitude sickness, or distracted Abby from the pain in her feet as she trekked. Yet, despite compulsion to photograph, for some photography erodes the intensity of embodied connectedness. While, some seek moments of uninterrupted encounter and “didn’t want anything to mediate between you and that experience”, as Harrison (2000) suggests, for others photography provides an opportunity to embrace and re-vivify bodily engagements with place.

The Moment of Remembrance and Reliving

In the final moment of remembrance and reliving, both tour operators and postcard producers occupy a less prominent role as tourists’ emerge as primary producers of memories and reflexive performance. Nevertheless, postcards become souvenirs that offer a “remembrance…of that place” (Ursula); a series of stages as tourists become pseudo-authors and selectively stage place as their own. Yet, while postcards capture that which tourists cannot, their ultimate failure is their inability to secure the intense affectual connection to place that exists at the core of tourist photography. As Sharon said: “I do think of postcards as not being my own…I could have got
that image from anywhere whereas your own photos are you and that moment in time”. Therefore, the reflexive, embodied subjectivities of encounter between self and other are integral to performance of remembrance and reliving as tourists realise and collect memories as corporeal encounter through photographic practice (Edensor, 1998). Whether borne through wonder, shock, disgust, boredom or duty, photographing bridges experiential and reflexive encounters by not only constructing, but aiding and reinforcing memories.

Photographs and photography therefore become charged as political artefacts and ethical prompts as tourists become producers and bestow visibility upon preferred photographed subjects which best reflects their experience. As Angela said: “I can remember what Puno town looked like, but it’s not a memory I am particularly bothered about. If it did fade, then so be it”. The inherent selfishness of photography emerges respondents actively personalise place. For example, Martin photographed “the policemen you know…leaning on their riot shields…other people…would want a photograph of the church but not particularly the policemen” (see figure 15). Such practice elevates the importance of creating connections of self in place and while some seek the elusive “National Geographic” shot, for many, aesthetic qualities become superfluous. As Gillian said: “even though my photographs are not of professional quality, I made them…so it doesn’t matter if half of my thumb is in it”. Thus, photographs become memorial sites (Crang & Travlou, 2001). They are not taken in and for themselves, but facilitate the realisation of self in place and extend the moment of encounter into another space and time.

Yet, memories are not simply constructed in-situ and transported into domestic spaces. Rather, they are continually moulded as tourists construct spaces of reencounter on their return home (see Rose, 2003; Hirsch, 1981, 1997). Photograph albums, frames, fridges and noticeboards and such like, become platforms for re-enlivening experiences. While some like Peter, leave photographs in packets, for many, photograph albums become the principle space of reencounter. As such, photographs become “imagetexts” (Hirsch, 1997) as tourists create selective autobiographical reflections of their experiences via ideology-fuelled stories of place (Hirsch, 1981, 1997; Rose, 2003). Practices of filtering and rejecting emerge as tourists systematically analyse their images; comparing and contrasting as “they may be out of focus…they don’t really show the whole building, …or…we don’t want twenty photos of the one place” (Charlie). Yet, despite constructing mediated narratives of experience, some tourists are unwilling to destroy even the most technically imperfect photograph. Such is the embodied affiliation and connection to experience, ‘rejects’ are stored out of sight and exist in the space that occupies the moment between life through exhibition and death through rejection as tourists are unwilling to divulge content, yet are reluctant to break bonds entirely. Such practices mobilise ‘closure’ as experiences are compartmentalised and, for the most part, becomes stored out of sight. Nevertheless, closure is never absolute as many respondents talk of sporadic reencounters with photographs via either chance or to fulfil a purpose or need (Edensor, 1998).

Figures 15: Policemen at the Government Palace, Lima.           Figure 16: Cusco Cathedral, Respondent’s Photograph    Respondent’s Photograph;

Whether, used to make sense of forthcoming holidays or providing comfort in old age, the tangibility of photographs, as objects to touch, hold and feel is fundamental in reigniting
memories. As Rosie said: ‘if you weren’t looking at a photo it wouldn’t...inspire things in your brain...you need that something to sort of spark off a thought’. Following Cloke & Pawson (forthcoming), photographs therefore become beacons of memory that mobilise highly charged embodied, reflexive performances that prompt tourists’ relocation as they engage in the imagination of space and ‘step into’ place and become consumed once more by that which has been. Reflexive intimacy (Haldrup & Larsen, 2004) opens expressive freedom within the haptic spaces of reflexivity as subjects are enlivened and extends beyond that which is pictured. Many, like Charlie and Alison recalled experiences that extend beyond that which is seen. Looking at figure 16, they talked of walking “out one night and they had a service in there and you could walk inside and on this side there was a great big round stained glass window”. For Cathy, her photographs of the jungle allow her to reignite “the sound and the smell and the noise…the whole thing”. Photographs therefore allow tourist to reignite experiences via reflexive, embodied performances. They penetrate the interiority of the visual and once again bring life to the photographed subject.

Nevertheless, it is important to acknowledge the limitations of photography within such practice. For many, the failure of photography exists in its inability to capture and preserve the embodied intensity of encounters. They expressed frustration that even personal photographs of sites such as Machu Picchu did not ‘cut it’. Thus, despite photographing the site, the demands of the collective gaze restrict the intensity of reflexive engagement. As Angela said: “I think you need to be there because...these photographs are no different to anybody else’s”.

Such limitations of reflexive performance through photography bring me to practices of memorialisation. While photographs provide a means through which tourists are able to directly reconnect and reignite deep affectual affiliation to place, an inevitable fluidity and malleability of memory arises. The radial nature of memory creates a continual morphing and fading of memories as new knowledges mobilise changes in perceptions of self and other. As Gillis (1994) suggests, memories are called upon to serve purpose and exist as a series of fluid resurrections that generate memoryscapes of encounter. Thus, intricate details become eroded in favour of dominant remembrances as place is sporadically reconstructed through relational encounters (Cloke & Pawson, forthcoming). Such deviation does not deny the intensity of the original encounter, but as Johnson (1999) suggests, modern memories replace ‘true’ memories of experience as original encounters are increasingly translated via popular, collective narratives.

Likewise, temporal and spatial distanciation fuels the creation of alternative memories as tourists increasingly recall experiences as imaged (Bal, 2000; Travlou, 2002). As Martin surmised: “I know that my memory will fade…and I will increasingly see my holiday through this brochure, through this album”. Thus, photographs become short-hand remembrances of experience (Cohen, 1985); “condensation sites” (Edensor, 1998) of experiences that have been. They hold power over practices of memory construction (Markwick, 1997) as remembrances gradually narrow in focus until they are potentially eroded of detail beyond that which is displayed in albums. Indeed, even the intensity of affectual connections that maintain the bond between tourist and place gradually fall foul to the depths of memory as “a few years down the line you can look back and...remind yourself of that experience...probably more like how you explained it to them (family and friends)” (Cathy).
CONCLUSIONS

Influenced by recent developments in understanding tourism and what it is to be a tourist, my concern has been to unpack the diversity of practices through which photographs both produce and are produced by tourists. Moving beyond ideas of tourism as a series of predetermined, linear, static stages through which we pass, I have drawn upon work by authors such as Franklin & Crang (2001) and Coleman & Crang (2002) to highlight tourism as a process of becoming; embracing difference through a complex multiplicity of fluid, dynamic and continually unfolding practices and performances. I have argued that photographs and photography are fundamental to this process as they infiltrate the entire tourist experience. They ‘light up’ and invigorate becoming as they are produced and consumed as active, lived encounters with place; instilling life and mobilising deeper affiliations between self and other through a series of both imagined and experiential encounters.

I have sought to unpack the theoretical complexities of photographs and photographic practice by establishing a conceptual framework of photography. In doing so, five key moments have emerged that provide the foundation for exploring tourists’ renegotiation of self and other as they move through place via a series of imagined and experiential practices. Embracing issues of politics, space, agency, embodiment and ethics, the moments identify photography as: political artefacts, reflexive performances, the imagination of space, embodied visualities and finally, ethical prompts. Such conceptualisations expose the intersubjective nature of photographs and photography as practices through which respondents perform place are understood as a fusion of collective and individual discursive transformations. Thus, tourists enliven and perform place through photographs and photography as they emerge as a series of both staged and imminent performances. Indeed, photographs and photography are not a means to an end. Rather, as opportunities for exploration and discovery, accommodation and understanding, they are wholly immersed in a dynamic triangulation of the tourist experience as constructed via intersubjective negotiations between third-party producers (in this case tour operators and postcard producers), tourists and photographed subjects.

Mirroring the fluidity of the tourist experience, I have proposed that such conceptualisations of photographs and photography are not bound to static, isolated moments of production or consumption, but emerge at varying temporal and spatial intensities through a diversity of practices as tourists move in and through place. To understand the complexities of such practices, a dynamic framework of visuality that identifies three main visual moments and devices has been established. Focusing particularly on brochures, postcards and tourists’ own photographs, visual devices offer pathways into, around and through destinations. They become vehicles through which the performative spaces of tourism are activated and place is created, enlivened and (re)enacted. While, devices are generally situated within particular moments of tourists’ experiences (for example brochures are called upon primarily for anticipatory purposes), I argue that they are never mutually exclusive, but operate across permeable and blurred boundaries. They cross-over and merge at varying temporal and spatial intensities and it such mobility gives life to the tourist experience as tourists gather insights and experiences of place via an array of intersubjective exchanges. Such fluidity is echoed in the visual moments within which photographs and photography are situated. The moments of anticipation, rewriting, remembrance and reliving are inherently non-linear. They embrace becoming as a complex process that extends
beyond divisible boundaries of the before, during and after travel experiences. Each moment infiltrates the others in an essentially fluid and interdependent fusion that denies the existence of distinct spaces of becoming. Devices and moments 'light up' the tourist experience as meld as tourists both produce and are produced by photographs and photography via an amalgam of diverse practices. The result is a complex, fluid, ever-changing and evolving triangulation of relations between producers, tourists and place, as each ceaselessly become within the tourist experience.
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