THIS IS A <u>VERY</u> ROUGH FIRST DRAFT. PLEASE DO NOT QUOTE WITHOUT PERMISSION.

SUPPING WITH THE DEVIL? REFLECTIONS ON THE ANTHROPOLOGIST AS CONSULTANT

David Harrison

International Institute for Culture, Tourism and Development

London Metropolitan University

SUPPING WITH THE DEVIL? REFLECTIONS ON THE ANTHROPOLOGIST AS CONSULTANT

<u>Introduction: problems of 'the eighties'</u>

In 1983, at the third Decennial Conference of the Association of Social Anthropologists, held in Cambridge, there was a selection of papers on 'Anthropology in the Eighties.' Within this, there was a sub-theme, addressed by some of the most notable anthropologists of the time, entitled 'applied anthropology'. What I want to do in this presentation is, first, to summarise those 'problems' that were then noted for anthropologists working in (broadly stated) the 'field of development', secondly, to link these issues to the role of current anthropologists/sociologists especially interested in the role of tourism as a development 'tool' and then, finally, focus on some apparently minor encounters when working, albeit infrequently, as a consultant in the field of tourism and development. And at this stage, I should note that while I am aware of the ASA Network of Applied Anthropologists, I want to restrict the later discussion to anthropology and tourism, though I hope some of my comments will be more generally relevant.

The publication that resulted from the 1983 discussion on applied anthropology (Grillo and Rew, 1985) is historically situated by Grillo (1985), who notes that although anthropologists in the colonial period were often interested in the practical relevance of their discipline, after the second World War applied anthropology was considered marginal and it was not until the late 1960s and 1970s, when more anthropology graduates were being produced and (as a result) were seeking employment opportunities, that contrasts between anthropology in academe and outside resurfaced. At the same time, though, as he also notes, the (then) British Overseas Development Administration showed very little interest in

tourism as a development tool, a situation repeated at its modern equivalent, the Department for International Development.

In the book, eleven anthropologists, with highly respectable pedigrees, discuss their role, and that of anthropology, across a wide range of contexts. Most were academics - e.g. from Cambridge, Sussex, London and Toronto - but there was also a specialist consultant and an aid agency official. Several had been involved to a greater or lesser extent with colonial administrations (especially Gulliver), and/or in providing advice to 'native peoples' (Layton in Northern Australia, Cheater in independent Zimbabwe, Whisson in apartheid-governed South Africa, and Strathern in Papua New Guinea). Notably, too, in much of the discussion, but especially in Grillo's introduction, there are periodic references to the attitudes and practices of previous generations of anthropologists, including such notables as Malinowski, Mair and Firth, and to the establishment in 1926 and subsequent activities of anthropologists in what was to become the International African Institute (Grillo, 1985: 10-13). There was no mention here, but there might have been, of the direct involvement of anthropologists in some independence movements. Hilda Kuper, for example, who studied the Swazi, and was much associated with King Sobhuza II (Kuper 1978), helped the Swazi hierarchy articulate the nature of Swazi tradition (especially highlighting the importance of the king) when the constitution for independent Swaziland was being formulated (finally implemented, after a British-imposed constitution was imposed in 1968, in 1972). However, as Grillo makes clear (1985: 9-16), the anthropologist's role in the colonial 'experience' was then (as it still is) highly contested.

The debates were clearly animated, even as presented in conventional academic prose, and two linked issues emerge which seem still to retain their relevance. The first is, quite simply, a series of polarised stereotypes of (apparently) different kinds of anthropology, accompanied by numerous but implied value judgements, while the second is a categorisation

of anthropologists' attitudes to (and indeed definitions of) applied anthropology which also continues to be significant.

Table 1: Pure vs Applied Anthropology

PURE ANTHROPOLOGY	APPLIED ANTHROPOLOGY
Abstract and Theoretical	Practical and empirical
Disinterested	Interested, engaged and action-orientated
Objective	Subjective
Moral	Immoral
Academic	Non-academic
Discipline-based	Client-based (e.g. government, aid agencies, NGOs)
Intellectual	Policy-orientated
Comprehensive	Half-baked
Exponents are wise	Exponents are 'experts'
Additionally: Paid by the state in *universities* - not polytechnics!	Paid by government in aid agencies or (worse??) by the private sector?

Some indication of the stereotypes prevailing in the mid-1980s is given above in table 1, which contrasts perceptions of 'pure' and 'applied' anthropology, here defined as the activities of anthropologists that are non-theoretical and goal-oriented. The adjectives are really self-explanatory, but it is especially noteworthy that those who (allegedly) pursue anthropology for anthropology's sake (whatever that might mean) are contrasted with those of a more practical, empirical bent and, certainly if it is the former who are doing the classifying, not to the latter's advantage.

One might wish to add a more recent distinction, not raised in the Grillo/Rew book, between anthropologists paid by the state but who work in educational institutions and those who, although paid by government, are paid by aid agencies or NGOS or *even* (the horror of it) the private sector.

Even in 1985, as Grillo pointed out, such polarisation was unjustified. There was no reason, for example, to suppose that applied anthropology was less intellectually demanding than 'pure' anthropology, and applied research can produce data and ideas of great relevance to the corpus of disciplinary knowledge, including theory. Nevertheless:

> (W)e must face the fact that an applied/theoretical opposition persists in anthropology and affects both 'sides': one abjuring practice, the other theory. Why does anthropology, more than any other social science, appear to make such heavy weather of this distinction? What, one wonders, would Keynes have made of it? If, then, the meaning of applied anthropology is to be found in its rejection by those in the mainstream of the subject, we have to ask why this rejection has occurred (Grillo 1985: 9).

The second issue, which really follows from the first, is that it was possible to categorise anthropologists according to where they stood on the pure versus applied debate. Grillo suggests they can be placed in one of three camps: principled rejectionists, monitorists and activists (1985: 28-31).

- Principled rejectionists are those who might suggest anthropologists are not qualified to intervene in social matters, that those with whom they would have to deal make the effort dirty and unworthwhile, and/or that they should resist incorporation into a system they dislike and even despise.

- Monitorists are those who assess what is going on and carry out research 'to investigate specific plans, policies or projects and their implementation' (Grillo 1985:

29), thus pursuing the anthropology *of* development without actually being *in* development, so to speak. Like St. Paul, they are *of* but not *in* the world.

- Finally, activists 'are actively engaged in customer-contractor relationships in which they are called upon to devise and review development policies' (Grillo 1985: 29-30). They are at the opposite end of the spectrum to the rejectionists, and (unlike the latter) believe at least in the possibility that their actions can improve the existing situation. Quoting Belshaw, Grillo suggests that such a view is characterised by the belief or hope that 'the application of anthropological knowledge will moderate the bad and enhance the good' (1985: 30).

Moving on? Two decades later......

It is argued here that although there have been important changes in the 'development' context since the mid-1980s, much the same divisions can be found today among sociologists with an interest in tourism, whether as a series of inter-related phenomena worthy of academic study or, more specifically, as a 'tool' for development. If anything, changes that have occurred over the last two decades have crystallised positions even further. On the 'applied' front, we have had the disappearance of the 'Third World' and the subsequent merging of the 'First' and the 'Second,' the increased importance of transnational companies and (as indicated above) Non-governmental Organisations (NGOs) on the world economic stage, along with the increasing importance of unilateral and multilateral aid, and this has been accompanied by a further dilution of policy-makers' interest in (what they regard as) 'pure' academic subjects (including social anthropology), with a concomitant preference for 'useful' qualifications. Over the same period, though, there have been counter moves, including attempts by universities to increase student numbers in all subjects

(including social anthropology) and, in the UK, a Research Assessment Exercise that (depending on the *subject*) frequently prioritises published research in peer-reviewed academic journals over applied studies and consultancies. If anything, over this period the divide between 'applied' and 'functional' and 'pure' or 'theoretical'- across or within subjects - has become more marked than ever. It certainly has not decreased.

Such divergent currents can be seen clearly in the emergence of tourism as a fit topic for academic discourse and, at the same time, as a tool for 'development'. Merely a passing mention of those initially involved in establishing tourism as an academic subject in the 1970s highlights some of the tensions. In 1989, for example, MacCannell, who was so influential in establishing tourism as a proper subject of anthropological enquiry (1976), and who is situated firmly at the academic end of the continuum, was to reflect as follows:

> Perhaps this is an appropriate place to note that while I may seem to have overlooked or neglected to report the sources of support for my research on tourism and travel, this is not the case. I have never received any institutional funding for this work. This was certainly my intention at first....Now I admit to a certain perverse pleasure in the knowledge that none of this work is on anyone else's balance sheet or ledger....Nor have I taken any fees for consultation on matters of travel and tourism....(1989: xiv-xx).

While MacCannell was quite willing to accept institutional funding for other research projects (1992: xi-xii), and presumably felt obliged to accept his university salary, towards tourism at least, he apparently held a rejectionist position. It is echoed by many others. Sometimes this rejection of any involvement with policy-making goes further, and comes close to opposition to tourism as a system and to tourists as a category. MacCannell was thus led to ask: 'What is an expeditionary force without guns? Tourists' (1989: xviii). Similarly, Nash was clear, in the 1970s, that tourism 'is a form of imperialism' (1978), and Graburn

likens tourism in less developed countries to a form of prostitution, penetration and rape (1983).

Not all tourism anthropologists are hostile towards tourism - Smith, for example, has long been a tour guide, and contributors to the first edition of her volume *Hosts and Guests* (1978) adopt a variety of stances, as do those of de Kadt's similar collection, which soon followed (1979). It is also the case that some have changed their views over time. By 1996, for example, Nash was arguing that while anthropologists should become more involved in applied work, they 'still have a way to go towards scientific maturity' (1996: 169). However, most social scientists working on tourism write from a perspective which, at best, can be described as monitorist, tending to be decidedly ambivalent to tourism and indicating little respect for the tourists they study. They prefer, instead, to 'side' with destination communities (as if they somehow constitute a homogenous unit), thus raising, yet again, the question long ago posed by Howard Becker: 'whose side are we on?' (Becker 1967; Liebling 2001).

Such attitudes can possibly be explained in several ways. First, as Kit Jenkins, one of the few to have combined successful academic work with consultancy, points out, this 'great divide' between tourism academics and tourism practitioners arises, in part, because they 'occupy very different work situations, and those academics who do become involved in tourism projects tend to be approached only *after* strategies and methods have been agreed' (1999: **?**). However, this is not the only reason.   The second is that because tourism academics were mainly educated in the 1960s and 1970s, some (like MacCannell) have been opposed to capitalism from the outset, which would help explain why consultancy work, especially for the private sector, is considered to compromise academic independence (Mowforth and Munt 1998: 214). More, it is sometimes seen as an out and out betrayal and loss of intellectual integrity.

True, there is continued advocacy of stakeholder partnership; environmentalists and economists often contribute to applied and policy-oriented research, and there seems to be little objection to an involvement in ecotourism, perhaps because it is considered more 'politically correct' (Rowe 2003: 131). By contrast, though, academics tend to distrust such major development agencies as the U.N. World Tourism Organisation, the World Bank and the Asian Development Bank, and are quick to voice their disapproval of mass tourism and the role of transnational companies in it, especially in less developed countries (Rowe 2003: 131). In particular, as I have indicated elsewhere (Harrison, 2004: 9), direct co-operation with the private sector is rare, and those who *do* manage to cross this 'great divide' find that institutions in which they work, especially in the traditional university sector, give them little credit for doing so (Mars 2004: 2). Most anthropologists will have received unwelcome reviews for papers, but the following comments, a response to a paper based on some (unpaid) consultancy work I carried out for a resort in Fiji, by someone who had little or no knowledge of tourism in Fiji, and had not read the report on the resort, was perhaps over the top:

> The notion of a cultural audit is overblown and simply rejigs well established research methods [Quite why this should be seen as a problem was not clear]. Turtle Island is a rich man's plaything; a millionaire toying at being lord of the manor and [the journal in question] should not condone this neo-colonialism by publishing this weak, ill-described and ethically flawed attempt at research (Harrison 2004: 21).

> It might have been bad, but it was not *that* bad!

> Thirdly (and perhaps related to the previous point), even if they *want* to become

involved in policy- orientated research, they are often unable to do so. A brief examination, for example, of the lists of consultants in the UK's Tourism Society in 2003 reveals that a mere six from 139 were based in academic institutions, and this is no indication that the

'lucky' six obtained many (even any) consultancy contracts! Consultancies are awarded on the basis of prior consultancy experience which, by definition, most academics lack. And the attitude of many consultants and contract-awarding bodies towards academics, justified or not, is hardly encouraging. On being shown a copy of the *Annals of Tourism Research,* for example, one leading British tourism consultant exclaimed: 'Who writes this stuff? And who reads it?' The obvious answer to this partly rhetorical question is that academics write it, because that is what they are paid to do, and academics read it (for the same reason). Meanwhile, consultants and policy-makers are *not* paid to read journals, rarely have the time, and usually lack the inclination. By the same token, the reverse is also the case, as academics are at least as unlikely to read non-academic material that *should* be of interest to us.

I can illustrate this point with an example from quite close to home, though I am unable, as yet, to give the full details. A review of tourism's impacts on poverty is currently being prepared for the World Bank, and I have access to the first draft. It is a truly excellent piece of work: detailed, analytical, well written, and apparently comprehensive with, at the last count, 306 references. Of these, however, only 37 (12%) were from peer reviewed academic journals, and absent from this short list were most of the major academic contributions to the study of the economics of tourism. And, I am ashamed to admit, I had encountered only a *very* few of the publications listed in the report, which were mainly from international aid and other organisations.

Finally, the tendency of anthropologists, especially, to distance themselves from tourists may partly arise from the fact that there is considerable overlap in the two sets of roles, and that residents in at least some destination areas might find it difficult to distinguish one from the other (Berno, 1999; Crick 1994; Errington and Gewertz 1989; Lacy and Douglass 2002; MacCannell 1976: 174-178; Mintz 1977; Nash 2001). Faced with such a situation, and with due regard to the low opinion they might already have of tourists, it is

perhaps no surprise that anthropologists act somewhat defensively to protect their reputation. To adapt the well-known saying by Keith Waterhouse: I'm an anthropologist, my friends are travellers, people in our class are tourists and the rest are trippers.

The situation I am describing may be slightly different in Australia and New Zealand, where links between academic studies and consultancy work seem closer, simply because of the way higher education (especially applied studies) has emerged. However, in the UK and, I suspect, in other parts of Europe and North America, partly because of the trends I have described, the divide between practitioners and academics continues to be deep and wide.

Academics and practitioners

I somewhat self-consciously move now to a more personal view of the relationship between academic studies and consultancy and applied tourism studies in general. As background: I first worked on tourism from 1974 to 1975, carrying out a policy-related pilot study on the impacts of tourism in the Eastern Caribbean for the (then) Overseas Development Administration of the UK (Harrison 1975). I did not then work on tourism again until 1987, but from this time virtually all my research has been on tourism and its various impacts in less developed countries. Until 1996, when I commenced a three-year appointment at the University of the South Pacific, most of this research was 'academic' in nature. In Fiji, though, I worked with government on tourism policy, and also carried out the study of a resort's impacts on the surrounding islands, to which I have already referred. In 2002, back in the UK, I worked as consultant with the Asian Development Bank on their tourism programme for South-east Asia,), and later became involved in an inter-university cross-cultural project on assessing tourism's contribution to poverty alleviation in South-east Asia. Then followed a year in the Tourism programme at the Overseas Development

Institute in London, a policy-orientated think-tank, during which period I became involved in a Scandinavian-financed study for the Mekong River Commission, looking at the impact of tourism in the Lower Mekong Basin. In summary, then: considerable academic experience has recently been supplemented by policy-related consultancy work, most of which has involved collaborating with consultants from the UK and colleagues from either the South Pacific or South-east Asia.

As a result of these experiences, such as they were, I'd like to note, at the risk of sounding banal, the kind of adjustments that, as an academic, I had to make.

1. Get to the point! Clients do not want to read tortuous *Annals-style* arguments, long literature reviews, and endless caveats about the research. They want brief and understandable presentations of the data, cogent analyses, and clear and considered conclusions and recommendations. Everything else goes into the appendices, where it may or may not be read.

2. Do this quickly. Anthropologists, in particular, still have a fond attachment to spending a long time in the field, becoming absorbed in the local culture, emphasising the value of methods related to participant observation, and priding themselves on speaking the local language. In consultancy and most applied anthropology in tourism, little of this is possible. In the ADB project, we sometimes (ludicrously) had two days, a day - even less - in a place to assess the possible consequences of (say) the increases in tourism that would result from a new road, an airport extension, or a river jetty. This might involve obtaining an idea of the local economy and social structure, the nature of poverty in the area, the links of tourism with agriculture and other occupations, and the interests that would be served - and not served - by more tourism. Of *course* this flies against all our anthropological instincts, but (as Kit Jenkins notes) it is usual to find that the project and the terms of reference are already

fixed by the time social issues are considered. Take it or leave it: the budget and the time-scale have been agreed.

3. Learn from consultant colleagues. Most consultants are not academics, but they have a wealth of practical experience relative to the academic newcomer, and considerable experience 'on the job'. Much of this is extremely valuable: they know where to go to obtain data, whom to ask, how to put a report together at speed, how to work together as a team, *and* how to meet deadlines.

This is not to suggest that academics are necessarily at a disadvantage when working with other consultants. There are spin-offs from consultancy work which feed into the academic side, and advantages in our training which, in turn, feed into the consultancy.

1. Collecting much of the necessary data is easier than for a lone academic, especially official material. Whereas someone involved in an academic study has to work really hard at prising data from officials, consultants often have only to ask, and they normally receive.

2. Similarly, access to the officials themselves, to transport, to other informants, and sometimes to entire communities, is also facilitated for consultants. Whereas the academic might be kept hanging around for days, even weeks, before he/she can finally meet someone, the consultant frequently has a much more privileged access.

3. Research skills which anthropologists take for granted, and perhaps teach their students on Research Methods modules, are highly useful in consultancy work. It is not so much a case of 'rejigging' familiar skills as utilising them in slightly different situations. Whereas there may be a tendency, for example, for some consultants to rely on published material, on what NGO representatives or government officials, or what is in *Lonely Planet*, or even on what they did on a prior project, the need of the anthropologist to get out, to talk to people, find different informants, or just simply to

listen to what local people say, can pay immediate dividends. The value of these skills, even this mind set, should not be under-rated. Indeed, it is contended here that the skills required of a competent academic researcher are *highly* transferable to applied tourism research.

4. Ultimately, much of these data are valuable background material for publishing academic papers. This is a significant gain. At a time when research grants are hard to find, where else can we be paid for carrying out research and collecting data, which can then be used not only to make recommendations to clients, but also as material for academic publications? By way of illustration, it was initially through working for the ADB that material was obtained for two co-authored papers on the role of tourism and poverty reduction in Lao PDR (Harrison and Schipani 2007a and 2007b)

Problems from the Field

It is argued here that there are substantial advantages for academics in carrying out applied work, where the clients may be national or international aid agencies, but this does not mean an absence of problems. Some are simply the downside of the points raised above, *viz* the need to engage in whistle-stop tours, knowing that a longer stay would inevitably bring more (and more reliable) data, or the need to arrive at clear decisions, often based on little hard evidence, without the possibility of numerous caveats and qualification.

There are also other problems, some of a more inter-personal nature, which can become pressing.

1. Issues of confidentiality can arise, involving, for example, the identity of informants or, somewhat differently, the use of material apparently obtained through privileged access and not available in the public domain. In my experience, these are unusual,

but there have been some cases where publication of research results has been threatened or delayed as a consequence.

2. The need to collaborate with other stakeholders who do not necessarily share your aims and objectives. Of course, this may be universally true but perhaps it applies particularly to government officials - especially in societies highly dependent on international aid - who have become accustomed to lining their own pockets at the expense of either the aid agency or the intended recipient, or both. Such corruption can be a real problem. It might also be reflected in the efficiency or otherwise of some tourism departments and other government offices, where some officials have been employed less because of their ability and more because of what they could afford.

3. At a different level entirely, people employed by NGOs may have a very different perspective on tourism to the visiting consultant (or academic). At one time, NGOs tended to express great contempt for tourists and tourism; nowadays they are more inclined to run their own tourist projects, under the umbrella of 'Community-based Tourism.' Nevertheless, the 'success' rate for many tourism projects funded by aid agencies and run by NGOs is generally recognised as low, in so far as features of sustainability are criteria for success, and yet there is a tendency for the NGOs to be seen to (or claim to) occupy the highest moral ground.

4. Similar problems can emerge when collaborating with local consultants. As Heba Aziz points out (2003), international consultants may not understand local contexts and, as indicated above, often lack the time to do so. Not surprisingly, this can lead to suspicion or scepticism among local residents (something I have seen and felt first-hand in the South Pacific). At the same time, other issues can arise when co-operating with local consultants. In Cambodia, Viet Nam and Lao PDR, for instance,

university lecturers and government officials receive what, by any standards, is a derisory salary. For them, consultancies on international projects are often their major source of income, and a *per diem* of (say) US $80.00 is likely to be more than twice their monthly salary. In such cases, the more consultancies one can accumulate the better. Similar ambitions may indeed be held by Western consultants, but other differences emerge.

At this point, it is necessary to be both diplomatic and clear: at local level, consultancy may attract prestige and lead to the accumulation of considerable cultural and/or political capital as well as a greatly enhanced income. The local consultant might *also* be expected (in a modern equivalent of the potlatch) to contract out all or some of the work involved in the project to less qualified colleagues (or even students). There might also be an expectation that, if fieldwork involves traipsing across muddy fields in the monsoon season to isolated villages, it is more appropriate for the junior consultant to go than the person who was actually awarded the contract.

In such circumstances, it is easy for Western consultants to be critical of their local counterpart's 'commitment' to the research. This applies especially to anthropologists, who want to spend as long as possible 'on site', whereas the non-anthropologist local might prefer a quick survey before moving on to the next destination and sees no reason to spend more than a day or two in a small and apparently uninteresting tourist town. Similarly, while Western anthropologists might try to eke out their own *per diem* (usually a *supplement* to their home salary) to enable a longer period in the field, local colleagues, with very different research training and other priorities, and different calls on their time, can insist they work *only* for the allocated days, or receive further remuneration. In such circumstances, revealing debates can ensue.

<u>Who Benefits? And What about the Locals?</u>

A question commonly asked of academic anthropologists, especially those fortunate enough to embark on extended periods of fieldwork, is 'who is going to benefit from your research?' The degree of embarrassment experienced, and the responses, vary, and could be the subject of a very different paper. What about the work, though, of applied anthropologist, e.g. as consultants for the private sector, for government or for aid agencies? Who does *their* work benefit? In fact, this is easier to answer. First, as I have already indicated, *they* benefit, not only in their remuneration (which they may share with their university employer), but also in obtaining data for their papers and, as a consequence, furthering their careers. Secondly, though, applied research in tourism has the potential to benefit destination communities. In the case of the much-maligned cultural audit I carried out on Turtle Island, in Fiji (Harrison 1999), one direct result was that the workers received an increase in their basic pay. Another was the appointment of a Community Relations Officer at the resort to liaise with nearby villages over the communal benefits they wanted the resort to provide. By contrast, work carried out on the ecotourism strategy for the Fijian Government (Harrison 2003) ensured that, at least in principle, clear criteria were laid down for the development of, and supporting organisation for, small-scale tourism projects in that country. Whereas no payment was requested or received for these projects, this was not so for the first phase of the ADB project on tourism in the Greater Mekong. Here, team members were employed to suggest appropriate sites for infrastructural development (roads, airports and jetties) in the region, and their decisions - in so far as they were accepted - led to further economic benefits for local people, e.g. giving them better and faster access to markets for their products and, where new or upgraded roads were the result, reducing their exposure to the suffocating dust from unsurfaced roads in the dry season.

No doubt others who have worked in consultancies could produce similar and more impressive results. No doubt, too, they could point to mistakes they have made. The aim here, though, is to firmly reject the notion that anyone carrying out applied research in tourism must engage in a prolonged period of breast-beating and self-flagellation, or feel they have betrayed their anthropological 'calling'. I have produced one single-authored book, two edited books, three co-edited books, and numerous refereed papers in tourism journals, but if you ask me what affect they have had within, and certainly *beyond,* the academic community, I would be hard pressed to answer. By contrast, as I have indicated already, I can give at least a short account of how my consultancy work has helped, in a small way, to improve the lives of some people in tourism destination areas.

I am not entirely alone in feeling this way. Some years ago a close friend of mine, formerly Professor of Sociology at the University of Sussex, gave up his academic career and went to work in a high profile, privately-funded, policy-orientated research organisation in Australia. While preparing this paper, I asked him to compare his two careers:

> As an academic I used to spend years doing what I thought was really good and innovative research on practical questions which were self-evidently important for ordinary people- things like how home ownership empowers people, or whether there really are barriers to lower-class children succeeding in life. I used to think this work would have an impact, but outside of academia it was hardly read or noticed. In the end, I felt the whole thing was pointless. In my new job, I work much faster, and my work changes things. I have been told by senior politicians and bureaucrats, for example, that my book on welfare reform is required reading in the department and that my suggestions on sole parent benefits were directly implemented in recent changes. I also make direct contact with the public in a way that was never possible as an academic - I average one newspaper op ed every fortnight and do huge amounts

of radio. Academia gave me the skills to do all this - to write clearly, think analytically, speak and hold an audience - but the skills were wasted there. The great pity of all this is that academia would now never have me back, precisely because I have been writing on issues that impact on the public and the policy community, rather than arcane pieces in journals that nobody ever reads but which the RAE values. I think academic tenure (in the social sciences, if not in arts and science) should be limited to 5 year periods and academics should be expected to circulate out of universities and spend periods working in industry, government or the voluntary sector. If social science research and writing is not made relevant to public issues in some way, then it has no point (Peter Saunders, Centre for Independent Studies, Sydney, Australia: Personal Communication: 4th April 2007).

He and I do not always agree, and there are parts of this argument I do not accept, but I think he makes a strong case.

Conclusion

I have argued that debates over the role of anthropologists during the colonial period, which resurfaced in the 1960s and 1970s, continue to resonate today, and can be especially relevant to the work of sociologists and anthropologists of tourism. Principled rejectionists, monitorists and activists (*aka* collaborators!) continue to be found among us, and individual and institutional divisions still characterise relations between those who carry out 'pure' and 'applied' research. The division is as wide and as deep as in the past. It damages the study of tourism and puts back the role of tourism in the development process. Clearly, in consultancy, as in teaching and 'pure' research, ethical issues arise. However, applied research and consultancy, for the private sector, government, NGOs or other aid agencies,

can bring benefits to the consultant, to their 'clients', *and* to residents in tourist destination areas. Indeed, because academic skills and rigour are as necessary in applied research as in the 'ivory tower,' and because consultants can make a tangible difference to peoples' lives, there is much to be said for tourism academics becoming more involved in practical decision-making and policy formulation. *Quo Vadis?*

References

Aziz, H. (2003) From the consultant's couch. *Tourism in Focus* 46, Spring: 7.

Becker, H. (1967) Whose side are we on? *Social Problems* 14 (3): 234-247.

Berno, T. (1999) When a guest is a guest: Cook Islands view tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research* 26 (3): 656-675.

Crick, M. (1994) *Resplendent Sites, Discordant Voices: Sri Lankans and International Tourism.* Switzerland: Harwood.

Errington, F. and Gewertz, D. (1989) Tourism and Anthropology in a Post-modern World. *Oceania* 60 (1): 37-54.

Graburn, N. (1983) Tourism and Prostitution. *Annals of Tourism Research* 10 (3): 437-442.

Grillo, R. and Rew, A. eds (1985) *Social Anthropology and Development Policy.* ASA Monographs 23London: Tavistock.

Grillo, R. (1985) Applied Anthropology in the 1980s: retrospect and beyond. In R. Grillo and A. Rew, eds. *Social Anthropology and Development Policy.* ASA Monographs 23, London, Tavistock: 1-36.

Harkin, M. (1995) Modernist Anthropology and Tourism of the Authentic. *Annals of Tourism Research* 22 (3): 650-670.

Harrison, D. (1975) Pilot study of the impact of tourism in St. Vincent. London: Overseas Development Administration (unpublished report).

Harrison, D. (1999) A Cultural Audit of Turtle Island, Fiji. Unpublished manuscript.

Harrison, D. ed. with S. Saiwalu and M. Malani (2003) Ecotourism and Village-based tourism: a policy and strategy for Fiji. In D. Harrison, ed. *Pacific Island Tourism*. New York, Cognizant: 157-170.

Harrison, D. (2004) Working with the Tourism Industry: a case study from Fiji. *Social Responsibility* 1 (1): 1-39.
www.ansteduniversity.org/Ansted%20University%20Publication/Social_Responsibility.
Accessed 2nd April 2007.

Harrison, D. and Schipani, S. (2007a) Lao tourism and poverty alleviation: community-based tourism and the private sector. Current Issues in Tourism 10 (2):

Harrison, D. and Schipani, S. (2007b) Tourism in the Lao People's Republic. In M. Hitchcock, V.T.King and M. Parnwell, eds., Tourism in South East Asia Revisited. NIAS Press: Copenhagen.

Jenkins, C. (1999) Tourism academics and practitioners: bridging the great divide. In D.G. Pearce and R.W. Butler, eds., *Contemporary Issues in Tourism Development*. London: Routledge: 52-64.

de Kadt, E. (ed.) (1979) *Tourism: Passport to Development.* New York: Oxford University Press (for the World Bank).

Kuper, H. (1978) *Sobhuza II: Ngwenyama and King of Swaziland.* New York: Holmes and Meier.

Lacy, J.A. and Douglass, W.A. (2002) Beyond Authenticity: the meanings and uses of cultural tourism. *Tourist Studies* 2 (1): 5-21.

Liebling, A. (2001) Whose side are we on? *British Journal of Criminology* 41: 472-484.

MacCannell, D. (1976) *The Tourist: A New Theory of the Leisure Class.* London: Macmillan.

MacCannell, D. (1989: second edition) *The Tourist: A New Theory of the Leisure Class.* London: Macmillan.

MacCannell, D. (1992) *Empty Meeting Grounds.* London and New York: Routledge.

Mars, G. (2004) Refocusing with Applied Anthropology. *Anthropology Today* 20 (1): 1-2.

Mintz, S. (1977) Infant, Victim and Tourist: the anthropologist in the field. *John Hopkins Magazine.* 27: 54-60.

Mowforth, M. and Munt, I. (1998) *Tourism and Sustainability: New Tourism in the Third World.* London: Routledge.

Nash, D. (1978) Tourism as a Form of Imperialism. In V.L. Smith, V.L ed. *Hosts and Guests: The Anthropology of Tourism.* Oxford: Blackwell: 33-47.

Nash, D. (1996) *The Anthropology of Tourism.* Oxford: Pergamon Press.

Nash, D. (2001) On travellers, ethnographers and tourists, *Annals of Tourism Research*, 28 (2): 493-499.

Rowe, D. (2003) Some critical reflections on research and consultancy in cultural tourism planning. *Tourism, Culture and Communication* 5 (3): 127-137.

Smith, V.L ed. (1978) *Hosts and Guests: The Anthropology of Tourism.* Oxford: Blackwell.