



Tourism in indigenous territories: the impact of public policies and tourism value of indigenous culture

Francisca de la Maza

To cite this article: Francisca de la Maza (2017): Tourism in indigenous territories: the impact of public policies and tourism value of indigenous culture, Latin American and Caribbean Ethnic Studies, DOI: [10.1080/17442222.2018.1416894](https://doi.org/10.1080/17442222.2018.1416894)

To link to this article: <https://doi.org/10.1080/17442222.2018.1416894>



Published online: 28 Dec 2017.



Submit your article to this journal [↗](#)



Article views: 5



View related articles [↗](#)



View Crossmark data [↗](#)

ARTICLE



Tourism in indigenous territories: the impact of public policies and tourism value of indigenous culture

Francisca de la Maza

Campus Villarrica, Pontificia Universidad Católica de Chile, Villarrica, Chile

ABSTRACT

The article addresses tourism development in three indigenous territories in Chile, characterized not only by their natural and cultural attractions but because indigenous culture is considered a tourism asset. It discusses and compares the role of public policies in the promotion and 'touristification' of these territories, and the tensions generated when culture is considered from an objectivized perspective to have tourism value. Mapuche tourism in the Araucanía Region is discussed in depth and compared with tourism in San Pedro de Atacama and Easter Island, where this activity has a longer history and is more developed. In contexts marked by neoliberalism and the weak recognition of indigenous peoples such as Chile, analysis of the role of tourism from a comparative, contextualized perspective of state construction of the value of indigenous culture reveals the contradictions and synergies that the commercialization of culture produces among state agents, indigenous individuals and other actors present in indigenous territories.

KEYWORDS

Chile; indigenous peoples; indigenous culture; public policies; state; tourism

Introduction

This article contributes to discussion on the relationship between the state and indigenous peoples in Chile, based on comparative analysis of tourism development in three indigenous territories. Although characterized by different political processes, demands and ways of practicing tourism, taken together, the cases reveal the implications of weak forms of political recognition as seen in neoliberal public policies that promote the value of indigenous culture through tourism but do not consider structural and political transformation of relations between indigenous peoples and the state. Nevertheless, in certain contexts, we do observe processes of greater indigenous territorial control associated with tourism.

Despite the widespread rise of multicultural policies throughout Latin America over the past two decades, Chile is one of the few countries in the region in which there is still no constitutional recognition of indigenous peoples. The law currently in force is the Indigenous Law 19.253 of 1993, which recognizes the existence of the country's 'ethnic groups'. Chile was one of the last signatories of the International Labor Organization Convention 169 in 2008. Under the Indigenous Law, Chile recognizes nine different

CONTACT Francisca de la Maza  fcadelamaza@uc.cl  Pontificia Universidad Católica de Chile, Bernardo O'Higgins 501, Villarrica, Chile

© 2017 Informa UK Limited, trading as Taylor & Francis Group

indigenous groups in various parts of the country, accounting for approximately nine per cent of the total population in 2013 (CASEN 2016).¹

Since the 1990s, a number of programs have been introduced to help in the development of the indigenous peoples; the most noteworthy was the Programa Orígenes, or Origins Program, a Multiphase Program for the Integrated Development of Indigenous Peoples, which ran from 2001 to 2012 and was financed by the Inter-American Development Bank and the Chilean government. The program was directed toward different areas such as institutional strengthening, productive development, and intercultural health and education. Such state actions were intended to improve the material and social conditions of indigenous communities that, subject to colonial processes of displacement or dispossession of their original territories, have historically faced political, economic and cultural inequality compared to the dominant society.

In 2003, the Origins Program published a document that promoted tourism as a development option for indigenous communities to address such inequality, stressing that it presented an opportunity for indigenous communities to strengthen management and leadership within their local organizations (Castro Paillalef 2003). The document drew from notions of sustainable development based on private initiatives of indigenous tourism strengthened in the 1990s.

At the same time, tourism was becoming an important economic activity in Chile as a whole. This was evident in the increase in tourism and by the government's plans and projections to increase the role of tourism in the country's development. For example, one of the strategic aims of the National Tourism Plan of 2012–2020 was to double the direct contribution of tourism to the gross domestic product from 3.2 per cent in 2011 to 6 per cent by 2020 (SERNATUR 2012). Special interests tourism is one of Chile's strong points, as the country offers places of unique cultural and natural interest. Like other Latin American governments, the Chilean government considers tourism to be coherent with its neoliberal economic development agenda (Baud and Ypeij 2009).

This article mainly focuses on tourism in the Araucanía Region. We also present two other comparative cases in the well-consolidated international tourist destinations of San Pedro de Atacama and Easter Island. Each region has indigenous territories in which a variety of actors – indigenous individuals, state agents and private entrepreneurs – promote indigenous culture as a value that forms part of the tourist attraction. The prevailing neoliberal economic system in Chile, imposed by force during the military dictatorship (1973–1990) and perfected by the various democratic governments of the last few decades, forms part of the 'touristification,' or tourism development of indigenous territories. Yet, the *modus operandi* of the Chilean state has also had an impact on the difficulties faced by indigenous peoples in obtaining political and constitutional recognition and in the implementation of ILO 169. Due this context, it is necessary to advances toward international standards of consultation and participation to protect indigenous peoples' rights. Touristification is complemented by – and at times conflicts with – other economic activities, many of which are extractive in character or are mega-development projects that have an impact on the cultural and natural characteristics of the multiple spaces promoted as tourist attractions. Such has been the case with mining in northern Chile and forestry and hydroelectric projects in the south of the country, under the Chilean neoliberal economic model. Regarding tourism, their impacts not only

entail tensions over the way in which authentic indigenous elements are appropriated and marketed for tourism, but also on the political and economic control of the territory.

The Araucanía Region, which we will discuss in greater depth, contains a total of 32 *comunas* (municipalities)² and is part of the historical territory of the Mapuche indigenous people. Today, 32 per cent of the region's population is indigenous, mostly Mapuche (CASEN 2016). The Mapuche constitute the largest ethnic population in Chile and have been the focus of ethnic conflict in the country, with tensions and outbreaks of violence associated with territorial and political claims. At the same time, an image of nature-based tourism has been promoted within the region in recent years since it contains a variety of scenery, national parks, lakes set in the Andes, a coastal lake, volcanoes, hot springs, native forest and rivers as well as a pleasant summer climate. Ski resorts have been developed on some of the volcanoes for winter tourism. Together with these natural attractions, Mapuche culture has been incorporated as a tourist attraction and a source of development. In particular, indigenous tourism has been promoted by public institutions as a development strategy in various *comunas* in the Araucanía Region, many of which have high levels of poverty. In such initiatives, visible Mapuche cultural practices are associated with natural landscapes that have strong potential as tourist attractions.

The Araucanía Region will then be compared with tourism in an indigenous territory in San Pedro de Atacama. This is a *comuna* located in the Atacama Desert in northern Chile, the historical home of the Atacameño or Likan Antay people. Its interest for tourism is based both on a main town that contains Andean architecture and on the cultural and natural attractions of the surrounding area. The area maintains a strong tourist demand year round and is consolidated in the national and international tourism markets. Based on 2002 census data, the Sistema Nacional de Información Municipal estimated the population of the *comuna* in 2016 to be 7626, 60.9 per cent of which were indigenous. The region boasts more than 80 tourist attractions that include highland lakes, archeological sites, hot springs, volcanoes, geysers and villages with traditional Andean architecture (SERNATUR ANTOFAGASTA 2014). Large tourism companies have become established there, which offer a full range of services.

Araucanía and San Pedro will then be compared with a third territory, Easter Island (Rapa Nui), which lies in the middle of the Pacific Ocean, 3700 km from South America. Easter Island is inhabited by the Rapa Nui, indigenous peoples of Polynesian origin. The estimated population of the island in 2016 was 6600, 60.7 per cent of which are Rapa Nui. Easter Island is both a *comuna* and a province – the only case in Chile where these two administrative units coincide. It is one of Chile's greatest tourist attractions, with cultural heritage, scenery and natural resources that draw international visitors (Ramírez 2004). The island is largely known for the moais, or ancient monolithic human figures carved by the Rapa Nui, followed by performances of Polynesian dance and culture such as the Tapati celebration (Acuña 2012). Sixty-six per cent of the island's attractions are of ethnic-cultural origin (CODESSER 2014).

This study forms part of a wider research project started in March 2013 to examine the implementation of public policy in intercultural and indigenous contexts in five territories across the country and also specific research about tourism and indigenous people. It involves an ethnographic study of the progress of public policies in the territories, including those on tourism, based on in-depth interviews, participant

observation of state practices and participation in local events connected with state practice. An interdisciplinary team of social science researchers carried out the investigation. The project revealed various forms of state construction associated with indigenous peoples, identifying differences such as the importance of state and private agents in each territory, intercultural relations, forms of containment, indigenous claims, etc. Although there is no space in this article to go into these aspects in depth, we can say that the behavior of the state and the indigenous peoples differed in each context, and that these differences are evident in an analysis of the development of tourism in the three territories.

Tourism, indigenous culture and the state in indigenous contexts

We understand tourism to be a complex phenomenon that has a range of implications in the local space and which forms part of a wider process occurring in indigenous territories. It is not seen as the only or even the most important driver of change; however, it involves multiple relations between the local and the global and requires the active participation of the communities (Pereiro 2013). Indigenous tourism is conceived as a type of tourism that explicitly involves the presence of indigenous communities, either in controlling tourism activities or because their culture forms the essence of the attraction (Grünewald 2006; Notzke 2006; Pereiro 2013, 2015). Various authors have explicitly incorporated the dimension of power in studies of tourism, emphasizing its role in shaping tourist encounters and contributing to the construction of ethnic cultures and identities (Babb 2011; Macleod and Carrier 2010; Van der Berghe 1994; Wood 1998). Pereiro (2015) highlights the relationship between indigenous tourism and ethnicity, since the latter is reconstructed for tourists, who consume indigenous culture under a mercantilist vision, transferring indigenous identities and places to the global tourism market. This may give rise to various processes of exploitation and subordination, but it may also generate new economic conditions and territorial control that would have been unthinkable without the arrival of tourism.

Consideration of the relation between the state and indigenous peoples in tourism initiatives is therefore relevant to understanding the various expressions of weak forms of political recognition given to these peoples within the neoliberal economy in the Chilean context. This relationship can be observed in the particular histories of different indigenous peoples in Chile, manifest in aspects such as the agency of indigenous peoples, state actions and specific developmentalist and/or extractivist demands. We take an anthropological approach to tourism, considering both public policies and the processes by which indigenous culture becomes a tourism value, articulating elements of authenticity, indigenous identity and territorial control. We propose that, from a perception of the state as a cultural construct, we can analyze the ways in which this occurs through focus on state actions and the promotion of economic development through touristification, to which indigenous peoples relate in different ways – based on their particular cultural and historical forms – but nevertheless participate in and confront in their territories. Indigenous tourism thus forms part of a neoliberal economic model that transcends the local and is played out according to particular histories and local conditions. Tourism as a public and private action, in which indigenous agents also

play a leading role, thus allows us to distinguish the modes of containment and political projects of indigenous peoples related to their own spaces of action.

In this context, indigenous territories are not exempted from the expansion of tourism, which is often strengthened by the value and difference given not only by a landscape but also by a so-called indigenous culture. It is important to note that, although we understand indigenous territories to be the space in which traditional habits, customs, memory, rituals and different forms of social organization have been inscribed over time (Barabas 2010), more recently, such elements have been fragmented by historical processes of occupation and movement. Territorial limits are diffuse: they are reconstructed and deconstructed on the basis of historical sources and memory; recreated and claimed through discourses promoted by the indigenous people themselves, state actions and other actors. Furthermore, indigenous territories are not inhabited exclusively by indigenous peoples but are home to people of a variety of cultural origins as a result of colonization, boundaries imposed by nation states and various kinds of mobility. For this reason, these spaces are not exempt from conflicts and problems associated with political recognition, identity and power struggles among various agents operating within the territory in the context of neoliberal development. It must also be stressed that much of what is considered and presented today as indigenous is part of dynamic processes of change and transformation; however, even as they are contemporary in the context of tourism, they are often considered to be vestiges of the past (Baud and Ypeij 2009).

The touristification of these historically indigenous spaces generates a range of transformations and disputes among those who are traditionally associated with safeguarding indigenous heritage, as it produces local economic and demographic changes, contamination and land use pressures. In such contexts, a concept of indigenous culture emerges that distinguishes indigenous peoples from the rest of society according to objective, external notions of 'Otherness'.

Although these elements are subjectively constructed by individuals, in the context of tourism development they tend to be objectivized when converted into a marketable good, tourist attraction or oriented toward outsiders (Cole 2007). This economic exchange creates value that is contained in the goods traded (Appadurai 1986; Anta 2007). This is particularly the case when aspects of everyday life – food, clothing, family histories, dances and medicine – are adapted or re-invented for the tourist market. Such processes of commercialization are more than a simple economic exchange, actively involving various actors and allowing cultural forms to be appropriated by those who develop and participate in the tourism business, not just indigenous individuals (Zúñiga 2014). In this view, the concept of authenticity is fundamental to the value of indigenous tourism, as many scholars have discussed (Banks 2013; Cohen 1988; Theodossopoulos 2013; Wang 1999). Authenticity is typically a modern value defined by notions of pristine, natural or untouched culture sought out by tourists (Cohen 1988). Thus, tourists view elements as authentic not because they are real or original, but because they are perceived as signs or symbols of authenticity. In this sense, tourism may be a factor in the reification, standardization and objectification of culture, which may in turn shape processes of cultural revival (Condevaux 2011).

Analysis of the state and public policy is also fundamental for understanding the implications of tourism based on indigenous culture as a value, as we shall see in these Chilean ethnographic cases. The state is a political project and a historically situated

cultural construct (Corrigan and Sayer 2007; Hansen and Stepputat 2001; Mitchell 2006). The various forms that the state takes show that the limits between state and society are not clear or defined; it is a heterogeneous and ambiguous institution and its institutional and structural aspects need to be analyzed in depth (Ferguson and Gupta 2002; Mitchell 2006; Mussetta 2009). Hence, the concept of governmentality (Foucault 1991) is important for analyzing the state's role in the construction of the cultural value of tourism (see also Li 2007; Mussetta 2009). Public policies, as an expression of the state, are productive, performative and contested, and affect how people navigate their daily lives (Shore and Wright 2011). Thus, state actions cannot be separated from people's everyday lives or from development processes promoted or supported by the state itself, as occurs under the Chilean neoliberal economic model.

State actions in indigenous territories

In Chile, there are a number of institutions that promote tourism and play an important part in its development. They include the National Corporation for Indigenous Development (CONADI), which works on programs directly linked with indigenous peoples and has funded or supported some indigenous tourism initiatives; the National Council for Culture and the Arts, which is independently funded and supports culture and heritage initiatives; the Agricultural Development Institute (INDAP), which supports productive development, particularly small-scale farming with a focus on indigenous individuals and the role of tourism in promote farming-related activities; the National Tourism Service (SERNATUR), which works directly to develop national and regional tourism policies; the Economic Development Corporation (CORFO), which is one of the main sources of funding for economic development projects like tourism; the National Forestry Corporation (CONAF), which is responsible for state protected areas; and the Ministry of National Assets which administers state-owned land. These institutions act at the national and regional levels, entering the local space through another key actor, the town hall or municipality.

As the organ of local government, the municipal government generally implements policies dictated by each of these institutions, but it can also generate its own actions locally. In the case of tourism, this may be done through a municipal tourism office or a tourism officer who has a number of functions that may include preparing and applying a Tourism Development Plan, organizing tourism-related activities, developing an image for the *comuna*, encouraging local initiatives, coordination with other offices in the municipality, etc.

We have found a variety of institutions involved in different aspects of tourism, which does not necessarily mean that their actions are coordinated or that they present a homogeneous vision of tourism in indigenous territories (de la Maza 2016). Depending on the place, its history and situation, some institutions will be more or less effective; however, they commonly share a role in generating, strengthening and promoting an image of tourism in each of the territories based on the cultural, ethnic and natural attractions that it has to offer.

Mapuche tourism in the araucanía region

Tourism in the Araucanía Region has been developed mostly in connection with protected natural areas, many of which incorporate elements of Mapuche culture in

their names, iconography and gastronomy, without necessarily involving the participation of indigenous individuals. Yet, tourism development with the explicit participation of the Mapuche population and organizations has been observed since the 1990s, with the support of many non-governmental organizations. As mentioned, various state institutions have increasingly promoted tourism in a Mapuche context as a means of development. Since 2007, CONADI and SERNATUR have worked together to define a development strategy for tourism in the Mapuche context, identifying local possibilities and barriers to development in the region. One of the benefits of the project has been a redefinition this kind of tourism as *Mapuche tourism*, rather than in more general terms as ethnic tourism, ethno-tourism or indigenous tourism. In recent years, touristification has occurred in rural zones with a predominant Mapuche population, the result of public institutions promoting Mapuche culture as one of the principal symbolic attractions.

Mapuche tourism is distinguished from other entrepreneurial activities by an emphasis on Mapuche community participation and culture (SERNATUR 2011). The principal point of reference of Mapuche tourism is the *ruka*, or traditional Mapuche house with a rounded shape and hearth at the center that makes it an ideal space for intercultural encounters. Today, *rukas* constructed for tourism and cultural purposes are found in various parts of the region. Since early 2015, there has been a coordinated effort between the offices of various Regional Ministerial Secretaries (ministry representatives at regional level) and public institutions to promote the construction of *ruka*. These and other institutions consider certain aspects of Mapuche tourism to be of key importance, particularly the value of indigenous culture, spaces for cultural encounters, and the status of culture as complementary economic activity (de la Maza 2016).

The Araucanía as a region has the lowest socio-economic levels in the country, which largely coincides with a large proportion of rural and Mapuche communities that reside within its *comunas* (MDS 2016). Since the end of the nineteenth century, Mapuche communities have been distributed throughout the region through the differentiated allocation of land, which left a concentration of land in the hands of foreign or Chilean colonists and their descendants, and large areas of state-owned land being auctioned off to private buyers or converted into national parks. Mapuche communities, in comparison, were left with small, communal properties that were later subdivided into small-holdings, many of which have shrunk further or disappeared. It is the descendants of these families who remained in the communities that today are the beneficiaries of state programs that encourage rural development and indigenous tourism. Such processes have made economic development – and particularly tourism activities – difficult for the Mapuche in the Araucanía Region. Although many of them live in unique scenery, particularly in the Coastal Range and along the coast, the material conditions of such places hamper development. These conditions include shortage of land and water and the proximity to mega-projects such as hydroelectric power plants, high voltage power lines, municipal dumps, fish farms and monoculture forest plantations. Thus, while the state has played a key role in promoting a discourse of Mapuche tourism as a possible sustainable alternative for indigenous communities, with both municipal employees and users adopting the programs, in practice such programs runs in contraction to other economic development policies.

One part of the Region where the development of Mapuche tourism has been focused is in the coastal zone, due to the presence of Mapuche cultural practices and the natural landscape. Cultural practices are associated with Mapuche ways of life, particularly their language, religion, health, medicine and food practices, and artisanal and farm products, which are distinguished from non-indigenous Chilean culture. The landscape is marked by native flora and fauna, which overlooks the ocean and coastal lake. The difficulties of developing Mapuche tourism are apparent in one of the *comunas* located in the región, Saavedra, which it has a population of approximately to 13,000 inhabitants, 47.14 per cent of whom live in poverty (according to the latest CASEN survey of 2015) and 64.3 per cent are Mapuche (according to the 2002 CENSUS). Since the early 1990s, indigenous tourism has been promoted as a means to address local poverty and promote rural development, particularly by institutions such as INDAP. These programs have sought to strengthen the productivity of small-scale farmers by supporting local economies with technical assistance – especially tourism as an economic supplement. While implementation of these programs has been slow, no doubt they have broadened appreciation of Mapuche culture and the natural setting, possibly generating a source of additional income. Local promotion of Mapuche tourism is consistent with actions at the regional level as stated in the Regional Tourism Strategy, which seek to promote and diversify tourism experiences beyond the traditional beaches and lakes by emphasizing the region's historic-cultural heritage.

However, local populations often find it difficult to meet the necessary state regulations and market demands to fully carryout such projects. Tourism initiatives must comply with certain health requirements to be registered in the SERNATUR. Under the Tourism Law No. 20.243 of 2010, this largely implies having services such as drinking water and sewage, electricity, trash collection, etc. The shortage of economic resources, complex bureaucratic procedures and rigid health measures have meant that the few communities that are able to obtain formal approval of a tourist initiative are only able to do so following a long and expensive process. Moreover, local communities are often pressed to adapt their cultural practices to meet such regulations. The *ruka*, the principal icon of Mapuche tourism, for example, generally has an earth floor where the family (or tourists) gather round the hearth and share food cooked there over the fire. This practice, which is a Mapuche custom, is a barrier to sanitary certification. Yet, some initiatives have worked around it by building a kitchen beside the *ruka*, almost hidden, which complies with regulation standards.

Mapuche inhabitants who work in tourism noted that the lack of economic recourses was one of the greatest hindrances to the development of tourism in their territory. Liberal discourses of health and 'hygiene' – reproduced in this context through the implementation of state policy in favor of indigenous tourism – shaped how some Mapuche entrepreneurs framed such limitations. As one Mapuche woman involved in the tourism initiative explained,

Well firstly I am not prepared because of the lack of hygiene; that is essential for a tourist who comes in and asks 'Where is the toilet?' – you can't say 'No, I haven't got a toilet.' Then if he stays he asks 'Where is the shower?' I haven't got a toilet or a shower, I have a chemical toilet, so I need to improve(personal communication, 21 January 2016)

Despite these difficulties, Mapuche tourism has generated some benefits for Mapuche individuals and families, thanks to a value added to cultural difference and strengthening of cultural practices by the Mapuche themselves, public institutions and tourists.

Tourism in indigenous territories of San Pedro de Atacama and Easter Island

The touristification of Mapuche territory is very different from that of San Pedro de Atacama and Easter Island. In San Pedro de Atacama, tourism is a consolidated industry that continues to expand alongside mining. Tourism businesses in the town have benefited from relatively low tax burden and rudimentary tourism policy (Bolados 2014b). As has been stated in various reports, there is no clear policy on tourism control and planning. The municipality has only recently taken an interest, introducing byelaws to regulate areas like construction and signposting. In 2013, the municipal government established the Production Promotion Program, which created an institutional framework to help organize, plan and execute tourism activities in the town. The main objective of the program was to strengthen cooperation between public and business sectors and indigenous communities, and improve the town's capacity to receive tourists.

Municipal employees noted that an initial problem was the private sector that, largely driven by economic interest, took little responsibility for social development or strengthening local community institutions. Furthermore, property laws have allowed hotels and other external agents to purchase certain indigenous lands that were not regularized under the Indigenous Law of 1993. As a result, the invasion of indigenous territories by tourist companies as been largely unchecked, displacing a large portion of the local population.

As mentioned, indigenous communities also face the effects of mining activities in their territories, which also competes with demands for land, water and other resources associated with tourism (Yáñez and Molina 2008). This has led to unstable relations between local organizations and mining companies (Bolados 2014a, 2014b; Bustos 2005; Yeckting and Ramírez 2012). In addition, mining has various effects on the lives of communities and their natural attractions and scenery, shaping local working conditions, immigration flows and social relations. Companies position themselves in the territory in a variety of ways. Particularly in the Likan Antay communities that are native to the Atacama region, companies hire special employees to charged with overseeing relations with the community and the municipality through the financing of socially oriented micro-projects that support community initiatives and infrastructure development and education. In reference to tourism, one mining executive noted,

We have a training program for tourism services that teaches tour guides about our operations. Obviously our operations are not what brings tourists here, but if you take a tour, one of the tours to a lagoon in the *altiplano*, you can see that there is something there, down below you ... because there is no information [on the mine], as a result the information given is wrong, biased, or bears no relation to reality. (personal communication, 26 September 2013)

The mining executive's comments highlight another aspect of the coexistence of mining and tourism (Bolados 2014b), where the corporate image of the mining company in the context of tourism development shapes the relationship between the two industries.

Despite the various factors affecting tourism in indigenous territories, some Likan Antay communities have taken the lead in running and managing natural and heritage tourist initiatives in the region. One of such cases was the result of an associative model developed in the Los Flamencos National Reserve, where tourism was administered by the CONAF in cooperation with the CONADI. One of these areas is the Valley of the Moon that is located nearby the town of San Pedro, which is administered by an association of six communities that were formed in 2004 to protect and conserve the site. One Likan Antay leader noted,

We do not demand the territory to “make money.” We do it because it is a natural sanctuary with a great historical legacy. It is an energy point for certain dates in the indigenous calendar. We have guardian hills and energy points ... we saw that all this was being massively destroyed by tourism ... tourism arrived and it was only then that planning began. (personal communication, 24 September 2013)

Indigenous communities' control over areas considered tourist attractions has resulted in greater restrictions for tourism companies, which now have to adapt to the demands of local communities to develop tourism in certain places. For example, the well-known Cejar lagoon, a salt-water lagoon that attracts tourist attraction for its beauty and the experience of floating in the highly saline water, is now administered by an Atacameño community, which has placed restrictions on where bathing is permitted and the number of visitors who can enter free of charge.

While the municipal government has recently become involved in tourism development in the region, other state bodies have largely shifted the role of managing tourist attractions to Atacameño communities. Without doubt, this has led to greater indigenous control of tourism. Yet this kind of control and management of tourist attractions requires a certain degree of social cohesion that can be difficult in the context of the demands and benefits of the tourist market. As scholars have observed in other parts of Latin America, tourism in indigenous territories can generate new contradictions and confrontations both among community members and between them and other interested parties (see Vargas and Brenner 2013).

In comparison to San Pedro de Atacama, tourism development in Easter Island has had a different trajectory, largely due to the national importance of this tourist destination. The state has carried out a number of projects to improve the planning of tourism on Easter Island. Some notable projects are the CONAF Park Management Plan that began in 1997, the Heritage Site Master Plan that began in 2013 and the 2014 Plan for Public Use of the Park.

In addition, from 1997 to 2014, more than 16 tourism studies were published on topics ranging from heritage elements and their conservation to load capacity, how to formulate strategic management plans for sustainable tourism, how to capitalize on historical, natural and heritage sites, the conservation of archeological sites and the environmental impacts of tourism development (CODESSER 2014). In 2014, a new tourism project financed by CORFO was carried out to as part of the Strategic Tourism Development Plan, which aims to strengthen Easter Island's positioning as an ethnic and cultural destination recognized in the international and Chilean markets by the year 2020.³

Yet, the geographical isolation of the island and the historical relationship between the Rapa Nui people and the Chilean state has also played an important role in defining various actors' different roles in the tourist industry (Foerster 2015; Foerster, Ramírez, and Moreno 2014). The Rapa Nui National Park, created in 1935 and administered by CONAF since 1973, covers 42 per cent of the island. The Commission for the Development of Easter Island (Comisión de Desarrollo de la Isla de Pascua), which was created by the Indigenous Law of 1993 and includes six elected representatives from the Rapa Nui community, has served as an important institutional platform to make various political demands, such as the recognition of Rapa Nui's legal rights to the national park territory, an immigration control law to regulate visitors' entry to and residence on the island and political autonomy from the state. While state and Rapa Nui organizations have negotiated these demands for several years, there has yet to be significant results. In 2007, for example, the park was declared a special territory under a statute that allowed for certain administrative modifications but that failed to advance a regulatory framework for how they would be implemented. Because of the slow progress, in 2015 members of Rapa Nui Parliament, a local Rapa Nui organization, took over the national park and drove out CONAF officers (Moreno 2015). The park was occupied for five months, and in October 2015 a plebiscite was held on joint administration of the park and to advance planning and management mechanisms. Only 319 people voted in the plebiscite, yet 87 per cent of which agreed to joint administration by Rapa Nui and CONAF⁴. A former employee of SERNATUR aptly framed the stakes involved in such negotiations:

This conflict will be repeated in all national parks that indigenous territory is located on or near, because this is the story of the creation of national parks – not just in Chile but also all over the world. For this reason, the Tourism Department, is trying to keep other indigenous groups in the dark so they do not realize what is happening and make similar demands. Aside from this joint administration works, it is working, although obviously there are problems. In San Pedro de Atacama there is joint administration of Los Flamencos National Reserve. But the Rapa Nui do not want joint administration. They want their own direct administration – that's the difference. (personal communication, 11 December 2015)

As we can see, even as Easter Island has been the subject of a great deal of studies and development initiatives, around tourism, its implications for indigenous inhabitants and issues around their participation in the development of the industry have not been solved. Moreover, tourism more broadly may not offer a sustainable means of development, as there is a risk of collapse in its demand (Calderón and O'Ryan 2011). Nonetheless, demands for administrative control over the park by the Rapa Nui is a clear expression of their territorial and political claims to autonomy. The fact that Easter Island is an international tourism destination gave weight to actions such as the occupation of the park and the expulsion of park officials, providing Rapa Nui leverage in negotiations over their demands. It also opened the way for full transfer of administrative control over the territory in the future, setting a precedent for indigenous management of tourist activities in other protected areas linked to indigenous territories.

Indigenous culture in the context of tourism

The three examples analyzed earlier show different ways in which public institutions have participated in encouraging tourism in areas where indigenous culture is incorporated as a tourist attraction. This has occurred in a context shaped by ethnic claims and demands associated with indigenous rights, territorial and economic control, and historical forms of inequality linked to various manifestations of the relationship between indigenous peoples, the state, and national society.

In the case of the Araucanía Region, which contains several *comunas* with a relatively large Mapuche population and high levels of poverty, the value of indigenous culture has been promoted as a means to consolidate the local tourist industry and, in turn, offer a source of sustainable development to improve the material conditions facing many Mapuche communities in the region. Specifically, tourism has developed through programs that promote the construction of *ruka*, traditional handicrafts, and the recovery of certain aspects of culture that emphasize and distinguish Mapuche culture. From the perspective of many public institutions, tourism is a potential driver of development that complements other economic activities, but that should articulate the value of indigenous cultural practices and identity to be more viable. Indeed, various institutions are involved in processes to revitalize and recognize the value indigenous culture, such as town halls and development programs. The fact that since 2002 one of the coastal *comunas* referred to, the Saavedra Comuna, has had a Mapuche mayor illustrates significant advancements as a result of such shifts.

However, policies designed to promote the tourism value of indigenous culture can also create new barriers for Mapuche communities. As noted earlier, program workers often encourage the Mapuche to change and adapt their cultural practices to meet policy regulations and market demands. Ironically, notions of cultural authenticity are often based on Mapuche traditional practices that have been adapted to meet tourist's expectations. In contexts marked by structural poverty, the promotion of 'Otherness' as a tourist attraction risks obscuring the very material conditions that authenticity, as a product for consumption, seeks to address (Cole 2007). While the lack of land, water and basic services is evident in many of the spaces frequented by tour companies, they rarely acknowledge the precarious conditions facing contemporary Mapuche communities, emphasizing instead the tourism value of cultural practices that represent remnants of a past of abundance and well-being.

For Mapuche communities, promoting the value of indigenous culture in tourism contexts can also produce internal tensions over the pragmatic value of asserting their cultural identity, on the one hand, and the importance of defining the terms under which it is sold or disseminated. As a municipal employee of Mapuche tourism in Araucanía explained,

We have to teach visitors from foreign societies that this is Mapuche territory and that there are sacred places that cannot be touched; that there are sacred places that must be protected. Saying that this is sacred for such and such a reason, and that we should be respected is also a form of education. The idea is to show that the Mapuche and their culture are alive; that they are not dead. (personal communication, 18 December 2015)

Emphasis on the tourism value of culture generates dilemmas for many indigenous community members who must mediate between their own ways of life and the

demands of tourism. Mapuche practices are associated with an earlier way of life that has historically been denied by state institutions but today is valued by public policy, even as it is highly regulated by state. Thus, the terms for recovering what is conceived of as traditional Mapuche culture are set by both state policy and market values of authentic set by tourist's demands. In such contexts, cultural practices are appropriated by an array of actors involved in the touristification of the region.

In San Pedro de Atacama, tourism companies have drawn from archeological, natural and historical elements of Atacameño or Likan Antay culture to establish the area as a well-know tourist destination. While operating on a smaller scale, the exploitation of archeological and cultural heritage in San Pedro resembles that of internationally renowned destinations such as Machu Picchu in Peru (Simon 2009) and the ancient Mayan ruins in Mexico (Kroshus 2003).⁵ When a territory undergoes touristification, tourism starts to be a defining part of the culture itself (Anta 2007), revitalized and defined by elements often external to the community (Bolados 2014b; Bushell and Salazar 2009; Bustos 2005; Morales 2006).

In San Pedro, Atacameño communities have appropriated such elements to assert the value of their culture in, signs, clothing and cuisine. It is also taken up by local organizations as a strategy to negotiate with external agents such as mining and tourism companies and state agencies for political and territorial control in the region. Thus, discourses and symbols of cultural difference mobilized by Atacameño communities have served as a useful tool to advance their territorial and autonomy demands in a context of weak recognition (Fuentes and de Cea 2017) and neoliberal economic policies.

In Easter Island, the value of Rapa Nui culture has been influenced by geographic and cultural factors specific to the island's isolation and the Rapa Nui's links with Polynesian heritage. The unique characteristics of the island with its natural and cultural-archeological attractions make it an extraordinary place for scientists – archeologists, anthropologists, historians and geologists alike – and tourists or other visitors with a variety of interests. As access to the island becomes easier with more frequent flights and lower travel costs, the island becomes increasingly attractive. This attractiveness is compounded by Polynesian stereotypes with dance performances and festivities, additional intrinsic attractions exploited by tourism companies. Like San Pedro de Atacama, Easter Island is an established tourist destination, visited all year round, which risks visitor saturation and associated consequences for the management of heritage sites.

As an asset to tourism, Rapa Nui culture, with its iconic moais, handicrafts, dances and food, is fundamental for the touristification of the island. However, there are other ways in which the Rapa Nui play a role in the tourist industry, for example, as tour guides who talk about their ancestors, social relationships, the everyday use of the Rapa Nui language and particular ways of life that increases the attractiveness of the commercialized culture offered by travel agencies. The fact that it is an island together with the survival of Rapa Nui cultural practices which are kept alive and strengthened in a tourism context allow the tourist to experience authentic everyday life enhanced by performances in the form of Polynesian dances, use of the language and traditional gastronomy, satisfying his desire for extreme otherness.

In the three indigenous territories discussed, we can identify actors at different levels who move between the local and the global (Babb 2011). These actors generate tourism

encounters in which both indigenous and non-indigenous inhabitants are as much the protagonists as the visitors, shaping different notions of indigenous culture and generating new dynamics in indigenous peoples' political demands for legal recognition and the pursuit of economic development.

Conclusion

In this article, we analyze different forms of tourism in indigenous territories in Chile. We have focused on two aspects: first, the ways in which the state, through its institutions, plays an active role in touristification processes, acting jointly with other agents in different ways according to the specific context; and second, the ways in which indigenous culture becomes a product of tourism that is appropriated and disputed by various actors. Our research highlights that state actions are different in each territory. In the Araucanía Region, the main focus of this article, regional and municipal policies implemented through social programs were fundamental in the development of Mapuche tourism. These programs have produced a variety of effects, by contributing financing but also by imposing regulations on how tourism should be practiced, which were at times contradictory to the essence of Mapuche tourism. Thus, at the same time, tourism programs generate expectations of development for actors involved in such initiatives, they can also create barriers in their implementation, due to historical economic inequalities that face many indigenous communities. Nonetheless, state interest in developing Mapuche tourism has strengthened ethnic identity and supported a positive view (in contrast to the much-publicized negative image of conflict) of Mapuche culture as part of the Region's identity.

In San Pedro de Atacama, tourism development was established rather spontaneously and largely unregulated. While the region's heritage and landscape have been the source of an expanding market in the region, tourism has also developed in the context of mining operations in the territory. Indigenous culture is largely associated with the region's archeological heritage and landscape and located in the past. However, contemporary Atacameño peoples have successfully appropriated such notions to take control of tourism sites and impose new conditions on tourism companies. In doing so, externally imposed value of indigenous culture can be subjectivized by indigenous people themselves.

In Easter Island, the state has had a strong presence in planning and organizing tourism but has yet to fully respond to Rapa Nui demands or promote sustainable, long-term visions of tourism on the island. Tourism has become part of the Rapa Nui way of life, and in some cases provided a means for political organizations to further their demands and maintain greater control over the terms of marketing the value of their culture. Joint administration of the park is a step toward reconciling their long-standing demands with the development of tourism, in conjunction with other laws that might regulate tourist traffic and other aspects important to Rapa Nui life.

In San Pedro de Atacama as in Easter Island, there is a demand for appropriation and political and economic control of tourist attractions, which are part of the archeological and cultural heritage of the indigenous peoples. Their value is associated with continuity with the past, transformed into objective markers of identity in support of territorial

demands. This coincides with the development of tourism that has had a strong impact in each of the two territories.

In the Araucanía Region, in contrast, despite the fact that political conflicts associated with ethnic claims are more visible at the national level, territorial demands of the Mapuche are related with the loss of land and the threats of external companies and investments in their territory that affect their quality of life. Tourism does not fall into this category. Demands associated with territorial control of tourism initiatives in Mapuche territories have yet to have significant impact. Rather, claims to control tourism thus far have tended to question the use of Mapuche names to identify tourist sites and Mapuche peoples' calls for respect for their sacred spaces. For the moment, tourism is dissociated from significant political claims in coastal *comunas*.

Drawing from these cases, we can say that, while the promotion of indigenous tourism by state institutions and private sector agents does recognize indigenous culture as an asset that strengthens economic development, this does not imply political recognition of Chile's indigenous peoples. On the contrary, emphasis on the tourism value of indigenous culture opens the question of authenticity to a range of interests, resulting in its appropriation not only the indigenous peoples but by other non-indigenous agents. This appropriation includes features like the use of names, images, forms, land, water and ways of life in general, resulting in the progressive touristification of indigenous territories, and often in the absence of indigenous participation.

Local and regional identities that place value on indigenous culture are heavily promoted by external actors in the context of tourism, often with a limited role for indigenous peoples in defining notions about their own culture or setting the terms of tourists' consumption of their spaces. However, such contradictions can produce leverage for some indigenous organizations, evident in the different strategies of negotiation and local, regional and national claims in each context. In the two indigenous territories with established tourist industries, we found stronger demands and claims for territorial control associated with tourism. This was not the case in the territory where tourism was just starting to develop.

In terms of the state's role, contradictions were most evident in the forms of value which the state itself assigned. The implication of such contradictions is most apparent in the relative proportion of economic and political projects in the territory in relation to indigenous peoples' demands and strategies for negotiation in different contexts of tourism. Such a dynamic calls attention to increasingly complex and hidden relations of domination that are accompanied by weak forms of political recognition. Finally, we note the importance of a comparative perspective of the touristification of indigenous territories within nation-state boundaries, since this allows us to observe the way in which a single state and economic model can manifest in different ways in various contexts. This shapes the states' relations with indigenous peoples, who in turn generate different forms of political and cultural resistance based on their own local political contexts.

Notes

1. CASEN is the National Survey of Socioeconomic Characterization (*Encuesta de Caracterización Socioeconómica Nacional*), which produces housing and population data, particularly in areas of high poverty or inequality rates. The last survey was published in 2015. See, http://observatorio.ministeriodesarrollosocial.gob.cl/casen/casen_obj.php.

2. Chile is divided into 15 administrative Regions. Each of these consists of provinces broken down into *comunas* (municipalities).
3. See <http://bienpublicoturismorapanui.cl/origen-del-proyecto/> (Accessed July, 14 2015).
4. During November of 2017, under the admisnitracion of Michelle Bachelet, the government of Chile signed a 50-year historical concession to the Rapa Nui community of the Rapa Nui National.
5. Archeological knowledge on ancient civilizations can act as a form of domination in the sense that academic research tends to exclude the naturalize the culture of the past to the detriment of indigenous peoples (Cárdenas 1999; Nielsen, Calcina, and Quispe 2006; Ayala 2007, 2008).

Acknowledgement

I'm grateful for the collaboration and contributions of different people involved in this research, especially the people who shared their experience and knowledge with me as well as the institutions that made this work possible.

Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the author.

Funding

This work was supported by the CIIR-Center for Intercultural an Indigenous Research, Grant CONICYT/FONDAP/15110006] UC-Puente No. 17/2015; Fondecyt Regular No. 1170236.

References

- Acuña, Á. 2012. "Tapati Rapa Nui: la reconstrucción de un espacio mítico en contexto turístico." In *El turismo es cosa de pobres? Patrimonio cultural, pueblos indígenas y nevas formas de turismo en América Latina*, edited by R. Asensio and B. P. Galán, 73–84. Tenerife: Colección PASOS.
- Anta, J. L. 2007. "Desarrollo y turismo en Atacama (Chile). De la precariedad a la necesidad." In *Antropología y Turismo*, edited by D. Lagunas, 153–163. México: Universidad Autónoma del Estado de Hidalgo/Plaza y Valdés.
- Appadurai, A. 1986. "Introducción: Las mercancías y la política del valor." In *La vida social de las cosas-:Perspectiva cultural de las mercancías*, edited by A. Appadurai, 17–87. México: Editorial Grijalbo.
- Ayala, P. 2007. "Relaciones entre atacameños, arqueólogos y Estado en Atacama (norte de Chile)." *Estudios Atacameños*, no. 33: 133–157. doi:10.4067/S0718-10432007000100009.
- Ayala, P. 2008. *Políticas del pasado: Indígenas, arqueólogos y estado en Atacama*. San Pedro de Atacama: Universidad Católica del Norte-IIAM.
- Babb, F. 2011. *The Tourism Encounter: Fashioning Latin American Nations and Histories*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Banks, M. 2013. "Post-Authenticity: Dilemmas of Identity in the 20th and 21st Centuries." *Anthropological Quarterly* 86 (2): 481–500. doi:10.1353/anq.2013.0018.
- Barabas, A. 2010. "El pensamiento sobre eel territorio en las cultura indígenas de México." *Avá Revista de Antropología* 17: 1–15.
- Baud, M., and A. Ypeij. 2009. "Cultural Tourism in Latin America: An Introduction." In *Cultural Tourism in Latin America. The Politics of Space and Imagery*, edited by M. Baud and A. Ypeij, 1–20. Leiden: BRILL.

- Bolados, P. 2014a. "Los conflictos etnoambientales 'Pampa Colorada' y 'El Tatio' en el salar de Atacama, Norte de Chile. Procesos étnicos en un contexto minero y turístico transnacional." *Estudios Atacameños*, no. 48: 229–248. doi:10.4067/S0718-10432014000200015.
- Bolados, P. 2014b. "Procesos transnacionales en el salar de Atacama-norte de Chile. Los impactos de la minería y el turismo en las comunidades indígenas atacameñas." *Intersecciones En Antropología* 15: 431–443.
- Bushell, R., and J. Salazar. 2009. *Estudio de prefactibilidad: Turismo indígena en San Pedro de Atacama*. Antofagasta: Fundación Minera Escondida-University of Western Sydney.
- Bustos, A. 2005. "Hacia un turismo Intercultural: El caso Atacameño." *Revista LIDER* 13 (10): 134–150.
- Calderón, C., and P. O'Ryan. 2011. "Desafío y oportunidades de desarrollo sostenible para Isla de Pascua basadas en el turismo." In *Rapa Nui Pasado y Presente*, edited by P. Marambio, 1–16. Santiago: UNES.
- Cárdenas, U. 1999. "Percepciones de las comunidades atacameñas sobre el tratamiento del patrimonio cultural de la zona." Accessed July 5, 2013. <http://www.mendeley.com/research/percepciones-las-comunidades-atacamepercentC3%B1as-sobre-su-patrimonio-cultural/-page-1>.
- CASEN [Caracterización Socioeconómica Nacional]. 2016. *Pueblos Indígenas. Síntesis de Resultados. Encuesta de Caracterización Socioeconómica Nacional*. Santiago: Ministerio de Desarrollo Social.
- Castro Paillalef, K. 2003. *Turismo: Una apuesta al Desarrollo de las Comunidades Indígenas de Chile*. Santiago: Programa Orígenes MIDEPLAN-BID.
- CODESSER [Corporación de Desarrollo Social del Sector Rural]. 2014. *Dirección Técnica para la Formulación del Plan Estratégico de Turismo*. Santiago: CODESSER.
- Cohen, E. 1988. "Authenticity and Commoditization in Tourism." *Annals of Tourism Research* 15: 371–386. doi:10.1016/0160-7383(88)90028-X.
- Cole, S. 2007. "Beyond Authenticity and Commodification." *Annals of Tourism Research* 34 (4): 943–960. doi:10.1016/j.annals.2007.05.004.
- Condevaux, A. 2011. "Gender and Power in Togan Tourist Performances." *Ethnology* 50 (3): 223–244.
- Corrigan, P., and D. Sayer. 2007. "El gran arco. La formación del Estado inglés como revolución cultural." In *Antropología del Estado. Dominación y prácticas contestatarias en América Latina. Cuaderno de Futuro 23*, edited by M. Lagos and P. Callas, 36–116. La Paz: INDH/PNUD.
- de la Maza, F. 2016. "State Conceptions of Indigenous Tourism in Chile." *Annals of Tourism Research* 56: 96–111. doi:10.1016/j.annals.2015.11.008.
- Ferguson, J., and A. Gupta. 2002. "Spatializing States: Toward an Ethnography of Neoliberal Governmentality." *American Ethnologist* 29 (4): 981–1002. doi:10.1525/ae.2002.29.4.981.
- Foerster, R., ed. 2015. *Rapa Nui. El colonialismo republicano chileno cuestionado (1902-1905)*. Santiago: Catalonia.
- Foerster, R., J. Ramírez, and C. Moreno. 2014. *Cartografía y Conflicto en Rapa Nui 1888-2014*. Rapa Nui: Rapanui Press.
- Foucault, M. 1991. "Governmentality." In *The Foucault Effect. Studies in Governmentality with Two Lectures by and an Interview with Michel Foucault*, edited by G. Burcell, C. Gordon, and P. Miller, 87–104. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Fuentes, C., and M. de Cea. 2017. "Reconocimiento débil: derechos de pueblos indígenas en Chile." *Perfiles Latinoamericanos* 25 (49): 55–75. doi:10.18504/pl2549-003-2017.
- Grünewald, R. D. A. 2006. "Tourism and Ethnicity." *Horiz.Antropol.* 1: 1–12.
- Hansen, T., and F. Stepputat. 2001. *States of Imagination. Ethnographic Explorations of the Postcolonial State*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Kroshus, L. 2003. "Commoditizing Culture. Tourism and Maya Identity." *Annals of Tourism Research* 30 (2): 353–368. doi:10.1016/S0160-7383(02)00099-3.
- Li, T. M. 2007. "Governmentality." *Anthropologica* 49 (2): 275–281.
- Macleod, D., and J. Carrier. 2010. *Tourism, Power, and Culture. Anthropological Insights*. Bristol: Channel View Publications.
- MDS [Ministerio de Desarrollo Social]. 2016. *Informe de resultados regionales sobre la medición de pobreza multidimensional (2009-2013)*. Santiago: Ministerio de Desarrollo Social.

- Mitchell, T. 2006. "Society, Economy, and the State Effect." In *The Anthropology of the State*, edited by A. Sharma and A. Gupta, 169–186. Hoboken, NJ: Blackwell Publishing.
- Morales, H. 2006. "Turismo Comunitario: Una Nueva Alternativa De Desarrollo Indígena." *Revista De Antropología Iberoamericana* 1 (2): 249–264. doi:10.11156/aibr.010205.
- Moreno, C. 2015. "El caso Rapa Nui." Accessed April 20. <http://polinesia-chilena.blogspot.com/2015/04/el-caso-rapa-nui-cristian-moreno.html>.
- Mussetta, P. 2009. "Foucault y los anglofoucaultianos: una reseña del Estado y la gubernamentalidad." *Revista Mexicana de Ciencias Políticas y Sociales* LI 205: 37–55.
- Nielsen, A., J. Calcina, and B. Quispe. 2006. "Arqueología, turismo y comunidades originarias: Una experiencia en Nor Lípez (Potosí, Bolivia)." *Chungara, Revista de Antropología Chilena* 35 (2): 369–377. doi:10.4067/S0717-73562003000200018.
- Notzke, C. 2006. *The Stranger, the Native, and the Land. Perspectives on Indigenous Tourism*. Ontario: Captus Press.
- Pereiro, X. 2013. "Los efectos del turismo en las culturas indígenas de América Latina." *Revista Española de Antropología Americana* 43 (1): 155–174. doi:10.5209/rev_REAA.2013.v43.n1.42308.
- Pereiro, X. 2015. "Reflexión antropológica sobre el turismo indígena." *Desacatos* 47: 18–35.
- Ramírez, J. M. 2004. "Manejo del recurso arqueológico en Rapa Nui: Teoría y Realidad." *Chungara, Revista de Antropología Chilena* 36: 489–497. doi:10.4067/S0717-73562004000300049.
- SERNATUR [Servicio Nacional de Turismo]. 2011. *Fundamentos del turismo mapuche y orientaciones para su desarrollo, Región de la Araucanía*. Región de la Araucanía: SERNATUR/CONADI/PTI/Seremi de Salud.
- SERNATUR [Servicio Nacional de Turismo]. 2012. *Estrategia Nacional de Turismo 2012-2020*. Gobierno de Chile: SERNATUR.
- SERNATUR ANTOFAGASTA [Servicio Nacional de Turismo]. 2014. *Plan de Acción Región de Antofagasta Sector Turismo 2014-2018*. Gobierno de Chile: SERNATUR.
- Shore, C., and S. Wright. 2011. "Conceptualising Policy: Technologies of Governance and the Politics of Cibility." In *Policy Worlds. Anthropology and the Analysis of Contemporary Power*, edited by C. Shore, S. Wright, and D. Però, 1–25. New York: Berghahn Books.
- Simon, B. 2009. "Sacamefotos and Tejedoras: Fronstage Performance and Backstage Meaning in a Peruvian Conte." In *Cultural Tourism in Latin America: The Politics of Space and Imagery*, edited by M. Baud and A. Ypeij, 117–140. Leiden: BRILL.
- Theodossopoulos, D. 2013. "Emberá Indigenous Tourism and the Trap of Authenticity: Beyond Inauthenticity and Invention." *Anthropological Quarterly* 86 (2): 397–426. doi:10.1353/anq.2013.0023.
- Van der Berghe, P. L. 1994. *The Quest For The Other*. Seattle: University of Washington Press.
- Vargas, D., and L. Brenner. 2013. "Ecoturismo comunitario y conservación ambiental: La experiencia de La Ventanilla, Oaxaca, México." *Estudios Sociales XXI* (41): 32–63.
- Wang, N. 1999. "Rethinking Authenticity in Tourism Experience." *Annals of Tourism Research* 26 (2): 349–370. doi:10.1016/S0160-7383(98)00103-0.
- Wood, R. E. 1998. "Touristic Ethnicity: A Brief Itinerary." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 21 (2): 218–241. doi:10.1080/014198798329991.
- Yáñez, N., and R. Molina. 2008. *La gran minería y los derechos indígenas en el norte de Chile*. Santiago: LOM Ediciones.
- Yeckting, F., and I. Ramírez. 2012. "Antropología, ecología y minería en las comunidades del área andina." *Revista Española de Antropología Americana* 42 (1): 187–204. doi:10.5209/rev_REAA.2012.v42.n1.38643.
- Zúñiga, F. 2014. "Nuevos usos del patrimonio arqueológico de El Tajín, a través de los procesos de turistificación, mercantilización y espectacularización." *Anales de Antropología* 48 (II): 151–182. doi:10.1016/S0185-1225(14)70247-4.