THE ETHICS OF TOURIST PHOTOGRAPHY: Tourists’ Experiences of Photographing Locals in Peru

ABSTRACT

Despite references to photography as a tool for consuming and constructing in the tourist experience, little attention has been afforded to the effects of such practice. This paper therefore seeks to unpack the ethics of the seemingly fleeting relationships between tourists and host communities that emerge during photographic encounters. Focusing on the emergent interactions between tourists and locals who are photographed, it explores the social and cultural values that underpin tourists’ ethical considerations of whether or not to photograph local people. In doing so, it first contends that tourist draw upon a range of photographic strategies as they negotiate the moral maze (Prosser, 2000) of ethical considerations during photographic encounters and engagement with locals at destinations. Secondly, the paper suggests that the ethical considerations of tourist photographic practice finds genesis in a web of partial knowledges, subjective interpretation and reflexive performances of self and others. In doing so, it proposes that tourist practice is driven by subjective interpretations of that which is appropriate, acceptable or responsible with regard to photographing. Thus, as the paper finally contends, an immanence of ethical consideration arises in the immediacy of the moment of photographing as photography emerges as a complex fusion of both predictable and reactionary practices that align general ethical viewpoints with unpredictable ethical responses.

KEY WORDS: photography, tourist, visual, ethics, self, other
INTRODUCTION

Tourism is inherently influenced by and reflects current lifestyle and consumption practices. As Goodwin & Francis (2003) realise: “responsible tourism is emerging as a significant market trend in the UK as wider consumer market trends towards lifestyle marketing and ethical consumption spread to tourism” (p. 271). Research offers insights into the ethics of sustainable production, management and consumption of the tourist experience (see Fennell, 2006; Miller & Twinning-Ward, 2005; Mowforth & Munt, 2009; Weeden, 2001), debates conceptualisations of ethics within tourism in general (see Fennell, 2006; Fleckenstein & Huebsch, 1999; MacBeth, 2005, Smith & Duffy, 2004), or explores opportunities for stakeholder empowerment (see Joppe, 1996; Ladkin & Bertramini, 2002; Li, 2006). Yet, despite the ubiquitous relationship between tourism and photography (see for example: Bæderholdt et al, 2004; Chalfern, 1979; Crang, 1997; Crouch & Lübren, 2003; Haldrup & Larsen, 2003; x, 2009; Sontag, 1976; Urry, 2002), surprisingly little attention is afforded to the ethics of tourist photography.

As Human (1999) suggests: “photography has an ambivalent relationship with tourism. Many destinations visited...have a strong identity and sense of place, which is embodied in the history, physical form and social activity. However, photography selectively extracts from this multifaceted expression” (p. 80). The inherent selectivity of photographing arises as tourists search for and construct subjects to fulfil anticipatory imaginings and preferred narratives of place as experientially encountered (see: Ateljevic & Doorne, 2002; Crawshaw & Urry, 1997; MacDonald, 2002; Said, 1994). Nevertheless, a gap persists in unpacking the ethical complexities that underpin tourists’ photographic practices and, as a tool for consuming and constructing the tourist experience, it is imperative to understand the ethics of such central practices.
as they directly affect tourist experiences, the lives and well-being of those photographed at destination.

Photography is not an end in itself (Teymour, 2003). Rather, drawing upon work that outlines the difficult ethical calculations that occur in the moment of photography more generally (see Prosser, 1998), and also the work by Cohen et al (1992), Gillespie (2006), Maoz (2006) and x (2012), who address tourist-local photographic interaction, my concern is to unpack the ethical complexities of the seemingly fleeting relationships between tourists and host communities as local residents become photographed subjects and often, objects of the tourist gaze (Palmer & Lester, 2007; Urry & Larsen, 2011). Photography does not simply emerge through single and coherent ethical frameworks that underpin practice (Prosser, 1998). Rather, the ethics of tourist photography emerges as a more nuanced and complex understanding of the power relations that are produced between self and other. This paper adds to these wider debates by illustrating the ethical negotiations tourists enact with themselves, each other and the local subjects in the moment of photographing. Using empirical evidence of tourists’ experiences of photographing locals in Peru, this illustration advances understanding of the ethics of tourist photography as it demonstrates a highly sophisticated mode of ethical reflection and negotiation rather than a single, immutable calculus of right or wrong. The paper does this by first, establishing a theoretical framework before introducing empirical data in order to unpack the range of photographic strategies tourists adopt as they negotiate performances of privacy, permission and payment during photographic encounters with others. The paper then attends to the negotiations of self and the other that arise as tourists transpose subjectivities onto those being photographed. Finally, it addresses the unpredictability of tourist photography as an emergent violence of ethics within the immediacy of encounter (see x, 2009).
THE ETHICAL MAZE OF TOURIST PHOTOGRAPHY

As photography facilitates touristic construction and consumption of places and cultures (Coleman & Crang, 2002; Human, 1999; Larsen & Urry, 2011; Sather-Wagstaff, 2008; Sontag, 1979; Urry, 1995), locals invariably (and often unwittingly) play a central role in such performances. As Larsen & Urry (2011) recognise: “complex places are consumed as lightweight pre-arranged photo-scenes and experiencing is akin to seeing, seeing reduced to glancing and picture-making to clicking” (: 187). Therefore, as actively produced and choreographed encounters with others, photographs become constructed materialities of encounter that: “alter and enlarge our notions of what is worth looking at and what we have a right to observe. They are a grammar and, even more importantly, an ethics of seeing” (Sontag, 1979: 3). Photography allows tourists to make the world present (Best, 2004); actively searching, exposing and constructing subjects as they fix appearances of the other as encountered. Thus, an ethics of seeing elevates visibility of others as tourists assume photographic control of subjects. As Sontag (1979) suggests: “even when photographers are most concerned with mirroring reality, they are still haunted by tacit imperatives of taste and conscience…in deciding how a picture should look, in preferring one exposure to another, photographers are always imposing standards on their subjects” (: 6).

Authorship and aesthetics imply ‘value’ through framing subjects (Butler, 2007; Lury, 1998); validating culture and tradition (Gillespie, 2006; Lury, 1998) and selectively photographing encounters as experienced. Photographing becomes inherently selfish; acts by which tourists appropriate the object being photographed as they emphasise or restrict visibility to satisfy subjective, ideological purpose (Sontag, 1979; x, 2009).

In such interpretation, locals can become reduced to icons or objects; uncontroversial and readily recognisable (Human, 1999). The “aggression” and “aestheticising tendency” (Sontag, 1979) of photographic performances holds the potential to position locals as
victims of the camera; compartmentalised articles of consumption promoted for aesthetic appreciation. Such elevated primacy of authorship risks facilitating the destruction and commodification of place (Andereck et al, 2005; Brunt & Courtney, 1999; Greenwood, 1978); objectifying locals through performances of flâneur that actively remove tourists from the ‘reality’ (Human, 1999). Locals, as photographed subjects, are denied life beyond the tourist gaze (Urry, 2002) as they conform to that which is deemed authentic (see also Greenwood, 1978; x, 2012). Thus, as Human (1999) suggests, ethics can become reducible to the process of commodification with photography as a potentially destructive practice driven only by tourists incessant desire to consume and objectify those being photographed. However, as Gillespie (2006) realises, the photographed relationship is a complex interaction. Therefore, to confine ethics to commodification denies the plurality of ethical sensitivities during photographic encounters. As such, building upon the work by authors such as Prosser (2000), I propose tourists-as-photographers do not, and cannot, apply a single and coherent ethical framework (see also Butchart, 2006).

For Harrison (2004), the ethics of photography arise through moral reasoning based on deontology, that is simultaneously exposed, and subject to, the complexities of ‘real life’. Indeed, it is the nature of tourist photography as embedded within a series of lived encounters that demands a multiplicity of ethical possibilities. Thus, as Prosser (2000) suggests, the first concern of this paper is to investigate the practices through which tourists negotiate the moral maze of visual subjectivities. Such negotiation demands securing confidence of those involved in the supporting processes in ways that ensure “they will not be ‘damaged’, misrepresented, or prejudiced in any way” (: 1). Such tendency towards consideration of others, is further developed using the work of Cloke (2002), and subsequently MacDowell (2004), on the ethics of care. In mobilising an ethics of care,
space exists for guiding principles, yet as Cloke (2002) suggests a simultaneous sensitivity of and for the other reflects the immanence within the immediacy of encounter. Negotiating the moral maze of tourist photography demands an emotional and committed sense of the other to ensure responsiveness to the complexity of human plurality. The confidence proposed by Prosser (2000), is conjoined with mutuality, collectiveness and an empathy towards those being photographed as tourists enter their own ethical maze; negotiating desires to capture the ‘real’, understand cultural difference and create memories, alongside ensuring permission, rights to privacy, (mis)representation and stereotyping (see also Gross, Katz & Ruby, 1989; Henderson, 1988; Lester, 1996; Papademas, 2004) and/or payment. Thus, photography manifests as a strategic practice; a series of often confusing, uncertain or even competing subjective discourses as to “what constitutes an appropriate ethical practice” (Prosser, 2000: 1) as tourists simultaneously negotiate ethical reflections with a desire to secure place as imagined and experienced. Photography therefore moves beyond appropriation as suggested by Sontag (1979); existing as an interactive process “affecting the constitution of subjectivity and identity of all involved” (Best, 2004: 74).

Secondly, attention turns to tourists’ reliance upon transposed subjectivities as a mechanism for negotiating through such ethical mazes (Prosser, 2000). Photographic encounters are replete with ambiguities as parties engage in potentially awkward performances (Cohen et al, 1992). The photograph, and likewise the camera, has “no magical moral agency” (Butler, 2007: 963. See also Prosser, 2000). Rather, the reception of a photograph and hence, the act of photographing, demands tourists’ subjective response (Butler, 2007; Lury, 1998). Tourists’ photographic behaviour does not rely solely upon a predetermined set of generic, prescribed behaviours: a coherent ethical framework of a distinct right and wrong. Rather, practice emerges as an amalgam of subjective reflection
and third party knowledge (e.g. tour operators, tour guides, guidebooks as well as locals themselves). Ethical responses also emerge through the reverse gaze (Gillespie, 2006), as tourists consider their own practice in response to that of tourists around them. Indeed, such consideration of others acknowledges the active role that locals play within tourists’ photographic encounters as they “negotiate the complexities of performing amongst larger, third party forces that exist within the wider, global political economies and western tourist mythologies” (x, 2012: 929). Locals, as social agents, are not simply reduced to “mindless dupes or automatons that are gazed upon” (ibid: 930). Rather, they can play to tourists’ interpretations of the authentic by inscribing and directing performances to reap the benefits of the tourist imagination (see Cohen, 1979, x, 2012).

While tourists draw upon subjective and third-party knowledges, it is the power of photographic practices to mobilise a range of feelings, emotions and embodied responses (Barthes, 1981; Lester, 1996; x, 2009) that demands tourists commit their ethical self, not only to the act of photographing and the final photograph, but also to those being photographed. Indeed, it is the capacity of photographs to affect us that instigates the need for their being (Crang, 1997; x, 2009) and by their very nature, demands ethical response in the construction process. Photography emerges as a combination of precepts and affects; a series of complex, intricate and wide-reaching negotiations between tourist and the other as our bodies and minds become entirely relational (Deleuze, 1988; Lisle, 2009; Spinoza, 1996). Indeed, it is the inevitable partiality of knowledge that fuels the existence of the moral maze (Prosser, 2000); creating gaps, uncertainty and confusion of the effects of photographing locals as: “the conditions under which we know things are conscious of ourselves condemn us to have only inadequate ideas, ideas that are confused and mutilated” (Deleuze, 1998: 19).
Thirdly, photographs do not render the world dislocated and static, nor do they emerge through dislocated practices that isolate photographer from photographee. Indeed, “to suggest that a viewing subject is arrested in the moment of perception…is to mistakenly understand the act of looking as a static behaviour” (Lisle, 2009: 3). Rather, subjects, photographers and photographs are in a constant state of flux as no universal ethical truth exists (Thrift, 2004). Photography emerges as a complex fusion of both predictable and reactionary practices that align general ethical viewpoints with unpredictable responses that arise in the immediacy of moment of photographing that recognises photography as affective performance (see for example: Haldrup & Larsen, 2003, Bæderholdt et al, 2004, x, 2009). As Best (2004) suggests “the contingency of ethical discourse is a dilemma best addressed by a series of immanent and self-reflexive ethical issues” (: 67).

Such immediacy creates fragility in photographing (see also Hopkins, 2003), as vulnerability and an ethics of self infiltrates tourists’ ethical negotiations as they reflect upon the potential consequences of their actions. Embracing the potentiality of situational ethics (Roberts, 1993), photography emerges through unpredictability as each performance commands attention and forces tourists to confront a multiplicity of potential practices; a series of negotiations and movements (Marks, 1998). Thus, tourists rely upon a moral pause (Gross et al, 1989) within the immediacy of the photographic encounter, or in moments superseding the act of photographing, as they establish spaces of comfort for both self and others by justifying behaviours or identifying a range of possible strategies for photographing. Uncertainties infuse tourists’ photography as they reflect upon collective and individual moral frameworks (Prosser, 2000; Prosser, Clark & Wiles, 2008) and make ethical decisions based upon the context of actions and ethical orientation based on instilled personal values (e.g. integrity, truthfulness, trustworthiness), belief systems and past experiences. As such, the ethics of tourist
photography exists within a plane of immanence and immanent modes of existence (Spinoza, 1996).

Having established the theoretical framework upon which empirical data will be critiqued, it is necessary to establish the case study context within which research was conducted. In addressing the non-Western lens that is so often missing in research (Bruner, 2005), findings are taken from a wider study on the effects of tourist photography on host communities in and around Cusco, Peru (see x, 2012). In addition to a prolonged period of fieldwork researching alongside community members who receive income from being photographed by tourists, research also extended to the photographic practices of tourists and it is this aspect of the wider research this paper presents. A three-stage methodology was adopted with 20 in-depth interviews conducted with UK tourists before, during and after their holiday. Of these, 6 were longitudinal and 14 were semi-longitudinal (interviewed before and after travel), with 14 mid-travel interviews conducted on an ad-hoc basis in Cusco. The sample exhibited even distribution between males and females and across a wide age range (from mid 20’s to mid-late 60’s), all travelling on 2-3 week organised tours. Photo-elicitation was used to incorporate photographs of local people tourists had taken on both previous holidays and their holiday in Peru within interviews. Thus, pre-travel interviews explored the predicted ethical stances and photographic behaviours as well as perceived effects of photography on local communities. Mid-travel interviews unpacked the ethical considerations tourists faced during the immediacy of photographic encounters. Finally, post-travel interviews explored tourists’ reflections of their experiences.

Drawing together theory and empirical data, the paper now explores the complexities of tourists’ photographic preferences, tendencies and practice as they become manifest
through negotiation and power relations within the Global South. To confirm, my aim is
not to examine the structure of ethical conduct in a normative manner. Rather, in
drawing upon a range of tourist experiences, I adopt a critical approach that advocates a
multiplicity of ethical possibilities exist within the practices, strategies and responses
tourists mobilise during photographic encounters.

STRATEGIES FOR PHOTOGRAPHING

(2008) suggest, image ethics attends primarily to ensuring: permission to photograph,
rights to privacy, (mis)representation and stereotyping. Photography becomes infused
with a constellation of moral intentions regarding rights and responsibilities as
encounters are no longer shielded by the objectivity of ocularcentrism. Photography is
driven by a plethora of motivations and desires, as some like Claire “try and understand
different cultures” (pre1), while others become immersed in “capturing the memory” (John: pre).
However, while some like Ben, Claire and Mick anticipated shying away from
photographing people, the majority recognised locals play a central role in their
photographic performances: “I just really like photographing people…they are so fascinating”
(Lynsey: pre). However, it is the unpredictability of photographing that demands plurality
of ethical response. As Janice commented: “there were times when you could quite freely take
photographs and there were other times where…you were, not restricted as such, but…you…didn’t do it
blatantly” (post). Respondents therefore negotiated responsibilities of self and others;
adopting a range of photographic strategies to obtain image they desire. Such strategies
themselves are not bound by universal ethical principles and moral behaviours, as

1 The inclusion of ‘Pre’, ‘Mid’ or ‘Post’ indicates where interview extracts are taken from pre-travel, mid-
travel or post-travel interviews with respondents.
ultimately “we are all aligned with different principles and paradigms, ask different questions” (Prosser et al, 2008: 21).

**Privacy & Permission**

In unpacking the nuances and complexities of tourists’ photographic strategies, attention first turns to ethics of consent and obtaining permission. As Gross et al (1988) suggest, privacy laws exist to protect against intrusion into an individual’s personal space, yet it remains legal to photograph someone in a public space. Nevertheless, the ambiguity of such legality compounds uncertainty over rights of privacy; where and whom it is appropriate to photograph. This manifests as respondents negotiate the desire to photograph with the potential threat to locals’ rights to privacy: “(if) you take a photo…you…intrude a bit in their privacy and I think…its not…a right for me to take photos of other people” (Ben: pre). Others, like Jo, went so far as actively refraining from photographing locals to avoid uncertainty and potential offense: “I would probably rather not have the photographs…because…even asking, it must be the same…annoyance” (mid).

**General Scenes & Public Spaces**

Seeking to minimise intrusion, the majority of respondents engaged in photographing general street scenes or festivals in order to “capture the culture” (Bryony: pre). Maintaining focus on the overall scene, tourists become “placed in a milieu rather than engaging with an individual” (John: pre, see Figure 1). For Kate, such generality provided reassurance as “if you’re taking a…general scene, you have as much right to photograph a scene as she has to be in it” (post), thus minimising potential confrontation. Beyond a possible turn of head or body if locals become aware of their inclusion in a photograph, there is no interaction. Locals
remain “anonymous” (Joan: post) as “you are not singling individuals out…it is just a general snapshot (Tristan)…it’s more impersonal (Elma)” (Tristan & Elma: mid). For some the colours, clothes and vitality of festival performances take precedent over the individual: “the colours were just incredible…their skirts. That is what I wanted to get, a picture of…the skirt…not the person” (Sophie: post, see Figure 2). Such subjective anonymity mobilises a sense of security for tourists as they remain physically distanced, thus ensuring minimal intrusion yet securing the image they desire.

**Insert figures 1 & 2 here**

Figure 1: Photographing in a milieu, Respondent’s Photograph  
Figure 2: Local dancers, Respondent’s Photograph

However, where individuals are identified and photographed in public spaces, obtaining permission becomes contingent upon a perceived expectation that photographs would be taken (Fiona). Reflecting upon her experience of a Cusco festival, Natalie commented, “They are putting themselves there to be photographed. They are doing a show, they are actually performing and so…I don’t think there is any problem with that” (mid). Such public spaces of exhibition and display of culture and identity also extended to the organised tourist sites where locals would wait to be photographed. Cathy reflected that: “they’re there…selling their wares….and I felt…they accepted that we could take photographs” (post, see Figure 3).

**Insert figures 3 & 4 here**

Figure 3: Locals Selling Wares, Respondent’s Photograph  
Figure 4: Sneaky Shot of Local, Respondent’s Photograph

Yet, often where respondents photographed individuals or groups in public spaces, strategies of gaining permission were still employed. Despite language limitations,
respondents engaged in fleeting conversations either directly or via tour guides, or relied upon gestural clues to communicate their intention, thus reassuring locals intentions are honest or benign (Henderson, 1988). As Cathy comments: “I just got the camera and…you know, by hand signals, and smiling, (asked) whether it was okay to take their photograph” (post). Such practice assures confidence and communicates respect as openness and honesty minimises uncertainty and confirms permission. Indeed, where locals convey their discomfort or unwillingness to be photographed, respondents generally refrained: “there has been one time when I went to take a photograph and…the lady…covered her face, so I didn’t take the photograph….it is just respect really isn’t it?” (Sarah: mid). A shake of the head, a glance or turn away from the camera clear indicates locals’ feelings.

*Sneaky Shots*

Despite a general desire to obtain permission before photographing, many respondents expressed a duplicitous preference for photographing individuals or small groups from a distance without the permission so valued previously: “if they see me I would make a gesture…but, if I can catch them without them seeing me…I feel better about that” (Brenda: pre). Yet, like many others, she also commented: “it is just rude to assume that it would be alright just to take their picture” (pre). Confusion of ethics creates spaces of concession in practice as tourists strive to minimise intrusion by adopting pseudo-documentary behaviours to become a “fly on the wall” (Mick: pre). Reflecting tourists’ desire to capture that which encapsulates the tourist imagination (see Urry, 2002), the inherent irony of such practice is that while respondents seek to minimise intrusion and maximise privacy, such preferred covert practice of the ‘sneaky shot’ becomes acceptable for some like Greg and Maggie (see Figure 4). Tourists remain physically distanced; photographing from afar (e.g. cafes or balconies) or using physical objects (e.g. pillars) as ‘cover’. Alternatively,
travelling companions become decoys as: “I stand there and he…takes one of me and just slightly moves the camera so they don’t feel as if they are being exploited” (George: mid), or tourists themselves become anonymous within the tourist group as “there was a whole line of people (photographing) and I just took” (Brenda: mid). Alternatively, some shoot from the hip (Mick), set cameras on ‘auto’ or pretend to fiddle with the camera (Angela).

Yet, such practice is not without conscience. For some, guilt and regret intensify as they reflect upon moments where despite expressing a hesitation to photograph without permission, when permission was refused but they photographed regardless. As Brenda commented: “the women still covered their heads, they didn’t want their picture taken…I felt a bit bad because…I went on and took it…I shouldn’t probably have done that” (post). Reflecting such discomfort and subjective complexity, some respondents echo Sontag’s (1979) conceptualisation of photography as synonymous with voyeurism in that: “I object to the fact that I am insulated and separated off…you feel you are almost invisible…it is voyeuristic” (Angela: pre). Thus, while tourists remain physically distanced, the camera lens mobilises spatial compression that brings locals into reach. For some, this creates discomfort and as Ross suggests: “there is a…notion of space around you that you don’t want to invade, but these long lens paparazzi type things actually breach this, don’t they?” (pre). Some respondents likened such practice to potentially disrespecting local values and customs (Rory), thus objectifying locals by “encroaching in their space” (Kate: pre).

Nevertheless, for the majority of respondents, such covert practice, underpins tourists’ desires to capture “real” (Tina: pre) or “natural” (Natalie: pre), exemplifying the despite to experience the ‘real’ or ‘authentic’ as such shots become synonymous with engaging with communities, respecting culture and minimising impacts on locals. Indeed, to become exposed as a photographer threatens to compromise the desired image as: “I think once the
people know that you are taking the photograph then we have got smiles or we have got the pose and I just want it as it is” (Eilidh: pre). Such practices are replete with irony as tourists continue to actively choreograph, stage and select elements of place in order to avoid “something that is cheesy and totally predictable” (Pam: mid). Ironically, to be responsible therefore becomes synonymous with remaining elusive and disengaged from those being photographed. Rather, photographs are taken to reflect the authenticity of place as experienced through intersubjective, personal encounters with other (see Wang, 1999) where “the cute and…embarrassingly sort of touristy is not of interest” (Pam: mid) (see Albers & James, 1984; Urry, 2002).

**PAYMENT FOR PHOTOGRAPHS**

Such concerns are echoed in strategies of payment and commercial exchange. For some, photographing locals in exchange for money provides “a good opportunity for…taking…more cultural pictures which you wouldn’t be able to otherwise” (Larry: mid). However, as Lester (1996) suggests, photographing can infuse stereotypes with ignorance. Indeed, underpinned by the desire to move away from commodified encounters of staged authenticity (see Greenwood, 1978; MacCannell, 1979), the majority of respondents preferred not to photograph locals who stood dressed in traditional clothing with llamas as this was felt to be “staged” (Jamie: post) or “gimmicky” (Alison: post). Thus, locals become icons of a tourist imagination that, ironically, respondents doubt exists: “all these colourful costumes and things that they wear, are they their normal everyday wear, or are they just for the tourists?” (Claire: pre). Respondents therefore echoed concerns that photography stereotypes, commodifies and objectifies locals as they become repositioned as tourees (see for example: Andereck et al, 2005; Brunt & Courtney, 1999; Greenwood, 1978). Thus, photographing via commercial exchange perpetuates a false sense of subjects (Roberts,
1993) according to tourists’ perceptions of that which is ‘real’. For Ben, “I would rather not take the photo…it’s too much (of) an industry…too much kitsch. It’s like everything is made so that all the tourists can take their photo, give a bit of money and go away” (post). Confronted with such cultural displays, respondents expressed an uncertainty in the authenticity of the experience as:

“commercialism at its purest…he would have posed endlessly for people…its not something that I particularly got enjoyment from…and this is what we are talking about, this is the decline of the culture…how they are changing and how they are seeing the exploitation” (Kate: pre).

For the majority this became a “very murky area” (Brenda: post) or synonymous with “prostituting their appearances” (Sophie: post) as concerns were expressed over zooification (Mowforth & Munt, 2009) and the objectification of locals (see Palmer & Lester, 2007; Sontag, 1979), as photographing positioned locals as “its like being in a goldfish bowl. Me being a…tourist, rich by all comparisons, starting in, saying I am going to capture you and take you back as a trophy” (Lynsey: pre). Such concerns of commodification and exploitation deepened as respondents witness ‘inappropriate’ behaviour of fellow tourists as: “I guess for some people the possession of the camera in their eyes legitimates their use of it almost in any context” (Brenda: mid). As Ruth recalled, “one woman, she was absolutely shameless about taking pictures of people…I just cringed sometimes because…she was taking pictures willy-nilly…in places we had been specifically told….not to” (post). Likewise, during fieldwork, the author witnessed a tourist:

“(he) holds up his large digital SLR…again, (Tula) raises her arm…(Marlena) & (Tula) request a (tip) but he ignores them…he…stretches out his arm so the camera is physically nearing her face…another man does the same and as he ignores their requests, the ladies ‘tut’ loudly and make their disgust known” (Authors field notes).

However, uncertainty further persists as respondents negotiate the multiple possibilities of potential exploitation through payment; not only of locals, but also of tourists
themselves. As Jake commented: “I know they…are all here to exploit the tourists, of course they are, that is what they are here for...that is what we are here for. Exploitation” (mid). Encounters become infused with uncertainty of mutual exploitation as both tourist and locals seek a desirable outcome; a photograph for the tourist, or a sol or dollar for those being photographed. Such encounters became akin to engaging in a business exchange: “they have seen a business opportunity. Who is exploiting who? They are exploiting us and we are exploiting them…mutual exploitation…they have got something…we want, we want their photograph and why shouldn’t we contribute….so it’s very, very difficult” (Alison: pre). Locals therefore become active agents within the photographic encounter; approaching tourists, requesting photographs are taken and tips received: “they completely choreographed that. They made sure we took photographs” (Mark: mid). Likewise, Sophie reflected: “we stopped at another one of these really high points and there was a woman sat under the sign with the altitude on with a llama. So you couldn’t take a picture of the sign without taking her. They are not stupid are they?” (post).

As such, both locals and tourists “exercise power, performing and picturing against or bending the ‘scripts’ of those of tourism organisations….Tourists’ practices are never completely determined by their ‘framing’ since there are, on occasions…unpredictability, creativity and embodied performances (Elk et al, 2008; Haldrup and Larsen, 2010)” (Urry & Larsen, 2011: 188). Tourists therefore enter a negotiation as they secure the desired photographs that capture anticipatory imaginings of place (see Albers & James, 1984; x, 2009; Urry, 2002), while simultaneously supporting the opportunities afforded by the entrepreneurial, commercial activity of those being photographed. Reflecting upon rights to privacy and image, Alison commented: “it is a person’s right…to ask for or to be given something in return for taking their picture” (pre). Thus, monetary exchange becomes a means of supporting the “informal economy” (John: post); facilitating the empowerment of locals as they “engage” and “interact” (Shaun: post) in the
process: “it’s a job isn’t it?…it’s no different from actually having a tool that you use to perform an action which is then paid for” (Mick: mid).

Nevertheless, some felt they “would resent paying to take a picture of someone…if they said, yes if you pay me, I wouldn’t take the photograph” (Val: pre). Alternatively, the issue of (not) paying was further compounded by uncertainty over the correct amount to pay (Rory) and the hassle, obligation and pressure from locals to photograph (Sophie). Indeed, some respondents actively removed themselves from such situations (Julian & George). Nevertheless, while the majority of respondents experienced little pressure to pay for photographs, resistance to such requests becomes symptomatic of tourists’ desire to retain control during photographic encounters. For Sophie, such desire is evident as: “it’s nothing personal, I just don’t want a photograph of you. I don’t want to be put in a position whereby you’re…making me feel uncomfortable about the fact that you are desperate for my money” (post).

Alternatively, where respondents preferred not to engage in direct financial exchange, alternative forms of payment arose by purchasing products on sale: “I want to put money into the economy, so I am happy to buy things off them and then say can I take your photograph” (Ewan: mid). Such alternatives were felt to alleviate the rawness of commodification through the commercial exchange of money and image-of-self-as-sold.

Yet, the uncertainty of appropriate contexts of payment is immediately apparent as perceived negative effects of photographing locals for money are immediately countered with positive outcomes. As Evans-Pritchard (1989), Maoz (2006) and x (2012) realise, space for independence emerges as locals become active, knowing agents and co-performers in the photographic encounter. Thus, despite concerns of commodification, alternative possibilities of photography as profitable interaction exists (Bruner & Kirschchenblatt, 2005; McCool & Martin, 1994). Being photographed creates “opportunity”
(Grant: pre) and holds the potential to empower locals and create a source of employment and entrepreneurship (Cole, 2007; x, 2012). As Eilidh commented: “I think it’s quite enterprising to actually say, well the fishing’s not very good, we need to make a living, we want to maintain our way of live, so OK how do we do that? To me, it is quite enterprising” (post). Such active performance of self not only ensures locals reap the social, culture and economic benefits of being photographed, but provides further reassurance for tourists as: “you still got the faces and the…general demeanour…laid on for you without having to sort of sneak around” (Fiona: post).

As an open-ended negotiation of identity and authenticity (Coleman & Crang, 2002; Medina, 2003), respondents perceived that commodification also mobilises a sense of self-worth as: “if I am taking a picture of someone by definition that means I am finding them interesting; an interest that is not necessarily negative” (Hugh: pre). Thus, as commodification revitalises and preserves culture and identity (Besculides et al, 2002; Lankford, 1994), photographing “helps them feel that their way of life is worthwhile to other people and not just to them” (Alison: post). Such confidence is further perceived as locals adopt a series of habitual practices and behaviours within the highly ordered, often regulated spaces of tourist sites. Such confidence is reinforced as locals actively encourage tourists, gesturing for them to photograph (or be photographed with) them (see Figure 5). Such apparent transference of control from tourists to locals manifests a sense of empowerment of locals as: “they were…much more confidence, they were quite a cohesive group and they seemed very happy and content…that’s the big difference…they almost were proud of and wanted to show you their way of life” (Kate, post, see Figure 6). Relying upon a combination of advice from tour guides and gestures from locals, many respondents confirm locals willingness to be photographed as “they all seemed so…very happy…it seemed genuine smiles” (Cathy: post).
Therefore, while authors such as Palmer & Lester (2007) and Sontag (1979) may suggest photography mobilises distanciation between tourists and locals, the potential anonymity of a milieu or group tour should not assume objectivity. It is no longer an abstracted activity choreographed by tourists, but exists as a social process. Photographing becomes a means of sharing culture as “photographers are usually among other spectators, making their presence and attention unexceptional and in many cases a welcome and flattering sign of appreciation” (Henderson, 1988). Hence, as Sophie realised: “you are using the camera…to build on your relationship as opposed to…just taking a photograph” (pre). Whether asking permission or enquiring about the llamas or traditional dress or conversing via tour guides, photographing mobilises fleeting moments of togetherness as “it gives you an opening to talk to the people” (Claire: pre) and brings people together (Jim: pre). Therefore, despite language limitations, cultural difference and time, photography offers moments of fleeting togetherness through brief conversation and gestural clues (see x, 2009).

TRANSPOSING SUBJECTIVITIES: UNCERTAINTY & AFFECTIVE ETHICS OF TOURIST PHOTOGRAPHY
Having explored the strategies and behaviours tourists perform, it is clear the moral maze of tourist photography (Prosser, 2000) is inherently imbued with subjective interpretations and it is to this attention now turns. As Brenda suggests:

“I think you have stolen a little of something from them. Now sometimes they give it willingly, sometimes you pay them for it, sometimes they don’t know you’ve taken it, but...every time a photograph is taken, in some...tiny way you’re making a change” (post).

However, despite such awareness, respondents remained confused regarding the effects of photographic performances on locals. Thus, photographing becomes infused with uncertainty and contradiction as “it gets terribly confusing, because you (question) what our motives (are) from our point of view and as well as their point of view” (Cathy: pre). In considering such complexities of commodification (Brunt & Courtney, 1999; Greenwood, 1978) and the potential for empowerment of locals (see Cole, 2007; x, 2012), respondents engaged in subjective reflection; piecing together snippets of information, opinion, past experience and third party knowledge from which an ethical response emerges. Thus, partial (and often conflicting) knowledges serve as the vehicles through which tourists exercise power as they construct an inevitably Western, subjective platform from which decide how to photograph others.

While, as aforementioned, Gillespie (2006) suggests tourists reflect upon the behaviours of others, I suggest the ethics of tourist photography also invariably emerges through reflexive performances of self as tourists negotiate potential effects by confronting and considering their own subjectivities: “A lot of it is our characters, we are not people who go up to someone and say ‘oh wow! You have an amazing face can we please take a photograph?’” (Sophie: mid). For Mick, such tendency creates frustration as disparity persists between the shots he would like to take and those actually achieved because: “I can’t do it you see because I am too British” (pre). Such self-consciousness and reserve becomes manifest in a range of
practices as some like Maggie express discomfort at being photographed therefore defaulting similar feelings onto those being photographed: “I absolutely loathe having my photograph taken and I just...feel that possibly other people might feel the same way” (pre). Likewise, imaginatively repositioning himself as the other, Ben felt: “if there were a tourist in front of me, like with all his lenses taking, like a minute to have all (the) settings done for the camera...personally, I would feel uncomfortable” (pre).

Yet, such interpretation is bound not only by consideration of the other, but also by an ethic of care for self (see Prosser, 2000; Cloke, 2004; MacDowell, 2004): the feelings and emotions that underpin the vulnerability of the photographer during the fleeting moments of the photographic encounter. For many respondents, self-consciousness and unease permeate photographic performances in that “you feel a bit conscious of taking pictures of people” (Martin: pre). Fearful of making “some sort of social gaffe” (post), Mick was “always worried in case somebody would come and tap me on the shoulder and give me a thump” (post). For many respondents the apprehension of causing offence manifests through “cowardness” (Shaun: pre) as they attempt to avoid the potential consequences of confrontation while photographing. Such apprehension mobilises tensions of perception of ownership and boundaries of privacy (Prosser, 2000) as both tourists and locals establish acceptable territory within which to photograph.

Photography therefore provides the opportunity for tourists to mobilise ‘contact spaces’ (Cloke, 2004). As they negotiate uncertainties and seek to engage with others, the ethics of tourist photography becomes entirely relational (Deleuze, 1988; Lisle, 2009; Spinoza, 1996) and context-specific as tourists strive to make sense of partial knowledges and ethical interstices and photograph appropriately. As Diane realises: “you can’t say...that everybody in Peru is quite happy if you give them fifty cents and you can take their photo...that does not
take into account individuals feelings” (pre). Such uncertainty becomes akin to “arriving on a planet and suddenly not knowing how anybody does anything or why people do things and then suddenly find yourself doing these actions and hoping that it is ok” (Mick: mid). Lack of contextual and situated knowledge demands tourists’ reliance on subjective and third party knowledge as they pre-empt reactions and responses of those being photographed. However, such is the intensity of confusion that photographing can become redundant as: “you are only giving the money to one. Is he going to share it?...it’s not going to go necessarily to the right one? So, I would rather just not deal with a situation because I can’t cope with it” (Bryony: pre).

Thus, whether interpreting potential feelings and reactions of locals or determining personal responses to the ‘authenticity’ of encounters, photographing relies upon a series of “judgement calls” (Diane: pre). Tourists become acutely aware of the inherent subjectivity of performances as: “we must be picking up a bundle of clues really and analysing them, mustn’t we, in terms of our own value system” (Angela: post). Decisions of whom and when to photograph are fundamentally established by reflexively situating self as the other. However, as the ethical considerations of whether or not to photograph finds genesis in predominantly western-euro-centric interpretations of the feelings, emotions and gestures of encounter, potential exists for discrepancy and misunderstanding. As Paul realised, “there is our own sort of morals and everything else…when that is not necessarily the way people feel” (mid). Indeed, as Lynsey commented: “we are actually then imposing a whole other range of values on them, which may not be their values...it’s our kind of...western assumptions...we know it all and no-one else is ever going to live up to where we should be or where we think they should be” (pre).

Thus, irony exists in that the cultural disparity and difference that drives the compulsion to photograph also holds the potential to influence tourists’ decision whether or not to
photograph, ultimately removing the values, beliefs and needs of those being photographed from the decision-making process. Indeed, while driven by a subjective ethics of care that seeks to empathise with those being photographed, some like John realise that such practice risks “pitying them and patronising them” (pre). Therefore, despite good intention it is through the gaps in socio-cultural understandings and the potential for subsequent misinterpretation that tourists may fail to realise the potential benefits photographing and engaging in commercial exchange may hold for the locals being photographed (x, 2012).

IMMANENCE & THE ETHICS OF TOURIST PHOTOGRAPHY

The ethics of tourist photography emerges as a series of compromises of self and the other (Mick) as the situatedness and unpredictability of tourists’ photographic practices can mobilise deviation from habitual, or preferred ethical practice. As Paul explained: “at home…you don’t take photographs of people, strangers you just don’t…because it is an invasion of privacy…whereas over here suddenly it is like whoa look at that it is great” (mid). Likewise, Greg admitted that “sometimes I break my own rules” (post). Thus, potential discrepancy exists between intention and action as: “I just do things…on the spur of the moment without thinking too much…it’s just bang, bang and that’s it” (Julian: mid). Frustration and uncertainty also invariably infiltrate practice as: “I find it very hard to decide when it’s…even slightly not appropriate…and when quite obviously free range can be applied” (Mick: mid). Thus, the immediacy of photographing becomes a delicate balance between securing the desired shot and minimising intrusion to those being photographed. Consequently, tourists negotiate their general ethical standpoints as compulsion creates spontaneity in photographing and are consumed in the moment; composing, aiming and shooting, reflecting upon the potential consequences of such action only once subjects are
captured. As Jamie and Sophie commented: “you can’t because the moment is gone then hasn’t it? The thing that you saw has gone and you haven’t got time to think.” (Jamie) “Yeah, it is an afterthought isn’t it? Should I have taken that?” (Sophie) (pre).

The situated nature of tourist photography therefore demands an entirely relational experience itself fundamentally dependent upon the context within which tourists’ desire to photograph. In unpacking such multiplicity, it is vital to reflect upon the immanence and unpredictability of ethical response of Spinoza (1996) and Deleuze (1995) as photography emerges as a fusion of anticipatory and reactionary practice. Thus, photographing becomes an entirely embodied practice conceived through affective relations with the other. Borrowing from Barthes’ conceptualisation of the violence of photography (1981), photography also displays a fragility and unpredictability in ethical response. As Barthes suggests: “the photograph is violent: not because it shows violent things, but because on each occasion it fills the sight by force, and because in it nothing can be refused or transformed” (ibid: 91: original emphasis). Likewise, to photograph is to confront and negotiate self and the other within the context of encounter as: “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” (x, 2009: 476).

Thus, in the immediacy of the moment, the decision whether or not to photograph invariably relies upon tourists’ subjectivity and intuitive ‘knowing’ as ethical responses to photographing become situated in the realm of the immanent: “you would probably see it or...feel it or...know that (it’s) appropriate to do it”...“I don’t really actively think about it probably a lot of the time...(it’s) sub consciousness” (Ben: pre). Such intuition combines with personal experience and third-party advice as tourists become increasingly familiar with cultural sensitivities: “it is not a thought through process...(but) if you are taking a lot of photographs it
becomes more natural. So it is almost instantaneous” (Ewan: mid). Indeed, while the majority of respondents like Grant, firmly emphasise the responsibility of tourists to understand the basic social and cultural nuances of a destination, many rely upon tour guides to impart insight of place-, socially- and culturally-specific nuances of locals attitudes. As Kirsty reflected: “through a guide you would say is it ok to take photographs of people?...and they say yes or no and then you just…respect that…they tend to be local, they tend to know as well sort of yes, it will be fine, they don’t mind” (pre). Thus, the responsibility of decision making shifts away from tourists as the advice provided by tour guides becomes absolute; validating and justifying practice as “Pedro said, take pictures” (Val: post).

**Justifying Behaviours**

Tourists are therefore forced to confront their subjective interpretation and affective response to situational ethics (Roberts, 1993). In a constant state of flux, they negotiate the ethical platforms from which practices emerge; justifying their actions, alleviating guilt and suppressing unease. For some, alleviation arises as locals remain unaware photographs are taken: “whether it is right or not I really don’t know…what do I tell myself? That if they don’t know they can’t be offended” (Alison: pre). Likewise, Claire recalled her experience of photographing and not paying when it was expected:

“That’s the purpose of them making money and they were all dressed up, and they’ve got their llama and all that, in order to make money, and I took a picture when they weren’t aware…in my sort of defence at the time, my reasoning at the time was that they weren’t actually working at the time….It’s no defence at all, but that’s it” (post).

For others, the transience of their relationship with locals minimises potential impacts as “we can justify because….its only a picture and then you have got twenty million other people (but) its just one to us” (Lynsey: pre). Justification further extends to embrace posterity and
aesthetic as: “I clearly knew she didn’t want to be photographed. She wasn’t aware I was taking it, but it’s a really good picture…she’s captured for posterity too, you know, so, um…yes, I mean…I am justifying it to myself in saying that yes, it’s a good picture, therefore it’s alright” (Greg: post).

Thus, discrepancies invariably arise between tourists’ anticipated ethical performances and those enacted in the moment. Photographing becomes infused with the dilemma of justification; creating thin veneers of reflexivity that veil compromises in the ethics of tourist practice. Indeed, such is the fragility of the veneer that despite the spectrum of justifications, the majority of respondents shared an awareness of the active creation of ‘excuses’ to alleviate subsequent guilt and/or self-indulgence. Tourists adopt a chameleon-like guise as they change behaviours and practice according to their context of encounters. As Cathy comments: “we can justify it as well…that’s how fickle we are. We may stand very strongly on something, but put into a different…set of circumstances…then…we change” (: psot). Such disparities in ethics are further exemplified by Sophie and Jamie as: “we don’t want to face the truth because we are only holiday and that’s it. We’ve paid a lot of money to get here and we don’t really” (Sophie) “justify our own action” (Jamie) (post).

Such justification and negotiation reflects the immediacy of potentially compromising ethical considerations during the act of photographing as tourists experience a burning desire, or natural curiosity embedded within the context of the experience that drives the need to ‘capture’ the moment without consideration of the potential consequences. As the examples above illustrate, for some such ‘shoot now, think later’ performances infiltrated their experience. However, despite suggestion that tourists are perhaps more reflexive or ethical about their photographing practices retrospectively than during the encounter, many respondents expressed limited change in their photographic behaviour as a result of their experiences in Peru. Like Ella, some reflected upon the relative
increase in consideration of the effects of their action: “I always knew what I wanted from the photograph, and I don’t think I’ve particularly gone out and done anything different, like, but I think I did think a lot more about what I was doing” (post). Others, like Brenda reflected that their experiences have confirmed their anticipations as: “I still hold onto my fear that the ideal is to try and take pictures in a way that doesn’t intrude. I still think that is the best, the best way” (post). Likewise, Ben commented that: “it has more confirmed what…I thought before, that…I’m not really comfortable with (photographing locals)” (post) while John was more likely to ask permission to photograph: “I asked people to take their photographs, which…I don’t normally do because….it doesn’t give a very good image” (post). Nevertheless, confirming the importance of researching the ethics of tourist photography was the continued confusion and uncertainty that pervaded respondents’ reflections on their photographic behaviour. This is captured by Alison, who commented that she still had “the same feelings because I don’t have the answer and therefore I have to have the same mixed feelings” (post).

CONCLUSIONS

This paper has sought to address the ethics of tourist photography in the context of tourists’ experiences of photographing locals at destinations. Deconstructing perceptions of photography as bound within over-simplistic practices of abstraction, appropriation and replication (see Albers & James, 1984; Cannon Hunter, 2008), this paper has drawn upon the work by authors such as Prosser (2000) to argue that touristic encounters both mobilise and are mobilised by a complex web of active ethical considerations. Thus, photographic interactions between tourists and locals at destinations become bound by issues of ensuring permission, rights to privacy, (mis)representation, stereotyping and payment as tourists enter a game of strategic positioning and practice. Consequently, touristic encounters no longer emerge as a series of isolated, static moments within
which tourists occupy elevated platforms and gaze upon locals in an ‘alienating’ manner that positions them as objects of interest (see Albers & James, 1988; Palmer & Lester, 2007; Urry, 1990), guided by a single, coherent framework of ethics. Rather, the inherently fluid and dynamic nature of tourism and tourist photography mobilises a plurality of ethical sensitivities and responses as encounters emerge as a complex fusion of both predictable and immanent, reactionary practices.

In unpacking such complexities, Prosser’s (2000) concept of the moral maze provides the framework to explore how tourists negotiate their desire to not only reinforce the tourist imagination by photographing iconic sites and objects (see Urry, 1990, 2002) and emergent elements of place, yet simultaneously strive to minimise intrusion and maximise respect to the locals they choose to photograph. In doing so, photography emerges as an interactive process through which tourists negotiate responsibilities of and to self and others. Yet, the inherent multiplicity of ethical performances and strategy serves to highlight the uncertainty that underpins the multiplicity of performances in the tourist experience. Strategy, communication and subsequent action become inherently context specific; a fusion of partial, situated knowledges of self, of third-party agents as well as locals encountered. However, rather than assuming locals as passive agents within the tourist experience, and moving photography beyond a selfish act as one-way strategy of tourist appropriation, locals become empowered as agents within the tourist encounter as they actively influence tourist practice; providing reassurance or encouraging further interaction (see also: Cole, 2007; x, 2012).

However, such mutuality of interaction should not assume mutual understanding of the effects of such touristic practice, but rather remains imbued with ambiguity. Thus, tourists’ ethical considerations become bound in a web of partial knowledges, subjective
interpretation and reflexive performances of self and the other. Encounters culminate in the transposition of tourists’ subjective interpretations onto those encountered at destinations as tourists make sense of place and other through a range of feelings, emotions and responses that demands tourists commit their ethical self to that which is experienced. Tourist practices are never completely predetermined as they are often underpinned by embodied performances (see Edensor, 1998; Haldrup & Larsen, 2010; x, 2009; Urry & Larsen, 2013). Therefore, ethical response and subsequent practice becomes replete with interstices of uncertainty and emerges as a fusion of affects and precepts (Deleuze, 1988; Spinoza, 1996); entirely relational and embodied as they rely upon preferred tendencies, intuition, feelings and orientations to make sense of self as the other and the potential consequences of action.

However, in renegotiating the concept of universal ethics to that of a multiplicity of ethical response (Thrift, 1999), the tourist experience, can never be uniform or predictable. Indeed, in addressing the multiplicity of practice, tourists face an immanence of ethics; existing in a constant state of flux as practice emerges as a complex fusion of predicted and intuitive responses that arise during the immediacy of encounter with others. General ethical viewpoints are often compromised as tourists enter a process of justification and negotiation; entirely dynamic as ethics exist within a place of immanence and immanent modes of existence (Spinoza, 1996). Potential therefore arises for discrepancy between intention and action as tourists at times compromise predicted ethical stances; caught upon in the transient moments of encounter. Photographing and touristic encounters with locals becomes a delicate balance; a series of compromises that often rely upon intuitive moral judgement, reasoning and reflective justification. Indeed, with limited direct guidance or possibility of generic rules of practice, gaps and interstices, tourists’ practices invariably arise through complex, intricate and wide-
reaching ethical negotiations.
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