



Kent Academic Repository

Hodges, Matt (2011) *Disciplinary Anthropology? Amateur Ethnography and the Production of 'Heritage' in Rural France*. *Ethnos: Journal of Anthropology*, 76 (3). pp. 348-374. ISSN 0014-1844.

Downloaded from

<https://kar.kent.ac.uk/28223/> The University of Kent's Academic Repository KAR

The version of record is available from

<https://doi.org/10.1080/00141844.2011.577228>

This document version

Author's Accepted Manuscript

DOI for this version

Licence for this version

UNSPECIFIED

Additional information

Versions of research works

Versions of Record

If this version is the version of record, it is the same as the published version available on the publisher's web site. Cite as the published version.

Author Accepted Manuscripts

If this document is identified as the Author Accepted Manuscript it is the version after peer review but before type setting, copy editing or publisher branding. Cite as Surname, Initial. (Year) 'Title of article'. To be published in *Title of Journal*, Volume and issue numbers [peer-reviewed accepted version]. Available at: DOI or URL (Accessed: date).

Enquiries

If you have questions about this document contact ResearchSupport@kent.ac.uk. Please include the URL of the record in KAR. If you believe that your, or a third party's rights have been compromised through this document please see our [Take Down policy](https://www.kent.ac.uk/guides/kar-the-kent-academic-repository#policies) (available from <https://www.kent.ac.uk/guides/kar-the-kent-academic-repository#policies>).

**DISCIPLINARY ANTHROPOLOGY? AMATEUR ETHNOGRAPHY AND THE
PRODUCTION OF 'HERITAGE' IN RURAL FRANCE**

DR MATT HODGES

POSTPRINT

Published in Ethnos: Journal of Anthropology, 76(3): 348-374, 2011

<http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/00141844.2011.577228#.VG9UNYusWSo>

Contact Details:

School of Anthropology and Conservation, University of Kent, Canterbury, Kent, CT2
7NZ, UK ; email: m.hodges@kent.ac.uk; tel: + 44 (0)1227 823835.

Biographical Note:

Research has addressed the temporalities of social change in Southern France; time and sustainability in Euskadi; and the political economy of agricultural biotechnology development. Publications have addressed temporality, historical consciousness, modernity, cultural rupture, heritage tourism, most recently: 'The Time of the Interval: Historicity, Modernity, and Epoch in Rural France', *American Ethnologist* 37(1), 2010.

ABSTRACT:

‘Amateur’ anthropology and ethnography are utopian categories proposed by anthropologists seeking to critique a perceived culture of ‘professionalism’ within the discipline (e.g. Grimshaw & Hart 1993). Yet they have arguably been practised extensively by local intellectuals oblivious to such debates. In rural Europe, this has often involved ‘pastoral’ conservation of ‘local history’, ‘traditions’ and ‘folk customs’, in the context of identity politics. Recent manifestations, however, have enabled the disciplining of cultural practices of indigenous populations by local entrepreneurs for use in heritage tourism. Building on Foucault’s concept of a ‘disciplinary programme’, this paper analyses projects from a French Mediterranean village that have ‘borrowed’ discursive forms from French ethnology and historiography to convert local heritages into disciplined archives and booklets, predominantly for use in tourism. It then analyses their approximation to the discipline of anthropology; assesses their problematic distinction from anthropology’s own disciplinary programmes; and explores the implications.

KEY WORDS:

amateur ethnography, disciplinary programme, heritage, intellectuals, salvage ethnography, cultural rupture, France

BOUNDARIES AND HYBRIDS

This article explores some of the complex ways in which the recent development of heritage, ethnographic, and historiographical discourses concerning the French village of Monadières, on the Mediterranean coast of Languedoc, has taken place through the implementation of overlapping ‘disciplinary programmes’ (Foucault 1977, 1980). Disciplinary programmes ‘define a domain of social reality to be turned into an object of rational knowledge, intervened in and made functional’ (Gledhill 1994:148). This knowledge is then implemented through *technologies* of power (appropriately designed practices), according to contingent, improvised *strategies* Foucault defines such programmes as pervasive in, and key to the reshaping of power relations in Western societies over the past five centuries, and they can also be viewed as a wider sociological feature of modernity. As a social template, they are malleable, highly productive of social transformation, and travel well, in space *and* time.

In Monadières, such programmes were already in evidence in the 1830s, when the national census began. Names, dates and places of birth, relationships, trades, and physical locations of each household have been tracked every six years – bar war or natural catastrophe – until the present day. A more recent wave of disciplinary innovation took place during the late 1990s, prompted by tourism development. In part, this enabled the municipal authorities to ‘co-opt’ and direct local memory practices involving material culture, to fashion a built environment for tourist consumption that resonated with the aura of a modernist myth of traditional rural communities (cf. Williams 1973). The development has parallels elsewhere in France, and no doubt farther afield where rural heritage tourism has taken hold. Additionally, it formed part of a wider disciplinary process whereby the cultural practices, or ‘intangible cultural heritage’¹ of ‘indigenous’ villagers was being documented and rationalised, as part of

tourism development and at times related conservation initiatives – which was a source of local conflict. This process of rationalisation has involved a ‘deworlding’ (Feenberg 2004) of past-related ‘materials’ from the sociality of the Monadiérois (long-term residents), which was intrinsically entwined with them; and their ‘disclosure’ into a body of cultural capital (Bourdieu 1992) for use by middle classes and predominantly recent immigrants engaged in tourism development.² In the case of ‘intangible heritages’ such as oral history, it has involved a process of disciplinary inscription and objectification. Those inscription practices which exhibit ‘amateur’ ethnographic qualities can be further qualified as examples of ‘para-ethnography’, that sensibility embedded in multiple cultural settings, forms and practices whose goal is to represent social life via a typically ethnographic process of knowledge creation for tailored ends (Holmes & Marcus 2005, 2006).³ The term ‘amateur ethnography’ therefore refers to the integration of para-ethnography within cultural practices which are not located in an academic or other professional context, rather than implying a value judgment. Theoretically, this conceptualisation provides an equivalent to what has been termed ‘cultural commodification’ (e.g. Greenwood 1989).

My own interest in Monadières, as I have presented it to my informants, has also been related to the village past, and how life has subsequently changed. And it was clear from the early stages of my work that parallels could and were soon drawn between my activities, and those of villagers disciplining local ‘intangible heritages’. Not all of those involved were doing so for the purpose of heritage tourism development. One prominent figure in the locality is a professional historian, Jean Guiffan, who has published two accounts of the history of the village (Guiffan 1979, 2007). Most frequently, when people wished to locate me in terms of familiar stereotypes, I was identified with Jean as a type of historian. My incongruous activities were thereby

normalised and even welcomed. Village residents producing other forms of local historical or para-ethnographic discourse – often for heritage tourism ends – were also keen to connect my work with their interests. Indeed, to an extent, there were parallels to be drawn – and at times, my activities and data were viewed as a source of inspiration or even a resource for their projects. In this regard, interview tapes or photos were directly sought. This was a process I resisted, given the ire these residents’ activities produced among Monadiérois – although my research did find its way into Jean’s revised village history (Guiffan 2007).

How might this ‘confusion’ over the boundaries between our activities – ‘local’ historiography, ethnography, the production of local archives for pastoral conservation and heritage tourism – be resolved? How might our activities be differentiated? What might they share in common? Ethnographically speaking, what forms of discursive hybridisation are in existence? Is there any moral high ground to be had, or are we each disciplining the cultural heritage of the Monadiérois for our own ends (and in my case, that of ‘amateur ethnographers’ as well)? For while it seems clear that in some contexts, the boundaries between anthropological and such discourses are self-evident, at other times the processes of translation and differentiation between them are less clear; and their exploration can be enlightening.

Consider the analytical description of the ‘deworlding’ of ‘intangible cultural heritages’ which appears above. Arguably, to conceive of such a process, I have performed a corresponding action of ‘deworlding’. Meanwhile, my anthropological conception of ‘indigenous’ cultural practices or ‘living traditions’ which I utilise to conceptualise the social reality of my informants are tools in a disciplinary process of rationalisation analogous, in certain ways, to those para-ethnographic disciplinary programmes which form part of my ethnographic analysis, as we will see. Ultimately, I

argue, such junctures also have implications for the anthropologist's status as a social intellectual. Do the sometimes vaguely-defined end users and justificatory goals of anthropological research merit our distinction from other rationalisers of social reality we encounter in this paper (which it should be added, are relatively innocuous)? Perhaps we need to better discipline ourselves, better define our contextually-dependent ends and goals – and by implication the discursive forms and accessibility of our outputs – to ensure our research can be transparently differentiated from such initiatives? Or might we seek zones of encounter, dialogue and where appropriate, collaboration, 'para-sites' in Marcus's (2000) terminology, where our activities can assume novel, locally productive social forms? This enquiry constitutes the deeper meditation which informs this article.

The paper addresses two areas of disciplinary, heritage-related activity in Monadières. The first involves *l'Association pour la conservation du patrimoine* (the 'Heritage Preservation Association', a local heritage association), largely run by enterprising incomers, which was arguably a 'front' for assembling information about local cultural traditions to be mobilised in heritage tourism. The second was the initiative of a resident of a nearby commune and director of a small 'conservation' centre, Eugène Cassan, who was interested in the 'pastoral' conservation (Clifford 1986) of local cultural heritages which he perceived to be disintegrating, or to have already done so. The activities of the two overlapped, as Cassan was a member of the heritage association, although he did not see eye-to-eye with their goals. In my commentary, I subject these projects to analysis. On one level, we encounter the subtle ways in which ethnographic traditions are invoked in, and lend legitimacy to such practices, and are thereby hybridised with them in novel para-ethnographic forms. But the ethnography, of course, suggests a further frame: critically assessing anthropology's

relationship to indigenous cultural practices *comparatively* alongside these heritage discourses. For in Monadières, anthropological discourse is being produced alongside heritage, conservation, and historiographical discourse about a common topic – the cultural practices of Monadiérois – and to a degree, via common discursive means. Any suggestion that the para-ethnographic enterprise, in its local multiplicity, is distinct from the ethnographic projects of professional anthropologists is undermined via the analytical framing of anthropology and these projects as disciplinary programmes. A comparative epilogue analyses the disciplinary character of these practices; the wider social fields (Bourdieu 1992)⁴ through which they differentiate their identities; and fleshes out implications for anthropology.

PLACING HERITAGE IN HISTORY

Monadières lies on a lagoon bordering the Mediterranean Sea, some 10 kilometres from the city of Narbonne in the Aude *département* of the Languedoc *région* of France. The administrative centre of the *commune* that bears its name, with some 600 permanent inhabitants, it is clustered around an outcrop of rock that juts out into the lake's northern half. The lake supports one of the two economic activities for which the village is renowned: it is still fished by a handful of remaining artisanal fishermen for eels. As for the other, much of Monadières' arid, stony earth, crossed by the motorway that leads to Montpellier and Toulouse in the north and Barcelona in the south, is covered with vines whose grapes are used to produce the local variety of Corbières wine.

The village population, however, is far from constituting an integrated community living off fishing and agriculture. While 60% of permanent residents do claim to be from the village, the other 40% are recent immigrants, and 25% of the houses in the

village belong to second-home owners, of predominantly urban, north European origin. Briefly, inhabitants comprised ‘long-term residents’, or ‘Monadiérois’ (those of indigenous heritage, of at least second generation descent, or sometimes claiming parental or more distant relatives in the village, who effectively comprise a ‘kindred’); ‘recent immigrants’, ‘second-home owners’, and ‘tourists’. These social groups as perceived by the anthropologist are viewed as such by local people as well. Any sense of community is thus fragmented, and tensions exist between long-term residents and recent arrivals – who are seen by many Monadiérois to be ‘colonising’ the village in a pejorative sense, driving up house prices, and contributing to their marginalisation and dispersal. Viticulture and fishing are also no longer the predominant sources of employment: only 13% of the village now live off them, as opposed to 75% in 1946, and people who grow grapes do so to supplement an income derived principally from other jobs, more than 60% of the active population working in the shops, service industries, and factories of Narbonne.⁵ The decreasing importance of Monadières as a site of economic activity, however, has recently been countered. Since the 1980s many individuals and the *conseil municipal* have begun to cash in on the growing numbers of visitors that come seeking heritage tourism experiences. Indeed, since 2000 this industry has experienced modest growth.

Historical change in France in the last 40 years has been substantially influenced by the growth of the tourist industry. In Languedoc, this took the form of a series of state-inspired coastal developments during the 1960s and 1970s, which resulted in the building of tourism infrastructure along all parts of the region’s coastline. Monadières, due to environmental obstacles, remains one of the few settlements to escape restructuring. These developments diversified, towards the end of the 1970s, into a state-led initiative to develop a decentralised tourism industry to satisfy the desire of

holiday-makers for diverse experiences, while diverting capital into rural areas adversely affected by agricultural modernisation. The objective was to mobilise the historic diversity of the French state just as it was popularly perceived to be threatened by the spectre of homogenisation. Regional ways of life, many transformed beyond recognition by the upheavals of the post-war period, were symbolically codified in museum exhibits; the idiosyncrasies of local produce and the built environment repackaged for visitors; the burgeoning narratives of local and professional historians drawn upon to provide depth to this differentiation of identities that would render each region distinctive, and attractive.

The story is that of the conflictive emergence of rural tourism under European modernity, concordant with the wider development of heritage and cultural tourism (Abram *et al.* 1997, Boissevain 1996, cf. Graham *et al.* 2000, Hewison 1987, Samuel 1994). The earliest incidence of heritage tourism in Monadières can be traced to the activities of Pierre Cadassus, an entrepreneur and fisherman. In the late 1970s he began to offer hospitality services at his restaurant incorporating symbolisations of local cuisine as products of historic local traditions, and fish dishes in particular as the product of historic artisanal fishing practices, via menu texts and decorative wall-displays (Hodges 2001). This first disembedding of local practices in terms of a distinctive local heritage, and their commodification for tourists, was followed by projects focused on the production and consumption of ‘traditional’ local products and the past-infused ambiance of the built environment, integrated with enjoyment of the ‘natural’ heritage of the area. The *conseil municipal* has taken a leading role in this process. The heritage tourism involved is of that modest, unspectacular kind characteristic of so many parts of rural Western Europe, essentially involving consumption of ‘traditional’ local produce and the local ‘historic sights’; but which

often provides an income for residents (cf. Timothy & Boyd 2003:45–6). In terms of turn-over, approximately thirty-five individuals earn their principal income off tourism at present during the summer, not including dependents; of which about thirty are recent immigrants.

How can the political economic relationships for tourism development in Monadières be characterized? Residents occupied similar positions with respect to productive means in the Narbonnais, even if their positions in the labour hierarchy varied. On the whole they worked as wage labourers, petty commodity producers, or small business-people – i.e. recent immigrants cannot be viewed as a unified class that was in a direct exploitative relationship with long-term residents. Hence a class-based political economic analysis is not necessarily enlightening. The potential evidently existed, however, for immigrants to develop heritage tourism within the village, drawing on Monadiérois ‘intangible heritages’ and cultural capital, and also employing them, predominantly in restaurants. This has begun to take place.

THE LOCAL FIELDS OF HERITAGE AND CONSERVATION

(i) L’Association pour la conservation du patrimoine

Given the extent of ‘popular’ interest in the past in Europe, and local interest in heritage tourism, it was unsurprising that a ‘heritage association’ should exist in Monadières. Its activities are best introduced in the words of one of its founders – Carla Ludwig, who lived in Monadières for several years but has now returned to Germany – in a ‘manifesto’ published in the village journal:

The association for the conservation of the cultural and maritime heritage of Monadières was created in January 1993 by a group of people passionate about the village past. Its objectives are to safeguard and develop the riches of the village and to help reconstruct the past using documents and objects.⁶

The association was in existence until the early 2000s, although it was predominantly active from 1993-1999. Officially unrelated to the influential French *ecomusée* movement, which was not acknowledged as an influence by those involved, its goals nevertheless chimed with such broader cultural aspirations, as did other conservation initiatives in the locality.⁷ In legal terms, it was initially registered with the *mairie*, which entitled it to a modest degree of financial assistance from the *commune*, before being registered in 1998 as an *association loi 1901*.⁸ One of its goals was the collection of documents and oral history about the village past, and the organisation of an exhibition, *Monadières – Lieux de mémoires* ('Monadières – Sites of Memories') during the mid-1990s. This title echoes Nora's (1989) thesis on 'lieux de mémoire', but apparently was not chosen for that reason, as the plural form of *mémoire* might suggest. Nora proposes that *lieux de mémoire* are sites where a presence of historical continuity remains, once 'traditional' cultural formations where collective memory resides (*milieux de mémoire*) have been vanquished by modernity. The exhibition's title, by contrast, was selected to raise public awareness of the village as a site of *enduring* collective memory. This marks an attempt, arguably, to safeguard or redeem the village as a *milieu de mémoire*. That said, the exhibition was well-attended out of curiosity, but derided as 'just a few old photos, nothing more' by most Monadiérois, who did not feel, perhaps, that they needed any help in remembering.

L'Association also sought to conserve 'pre-modern' artefacts, such as an outmoded fishing *cabane* at the entrance to the village.⁹ It worked with the *Service maritime*, the *Centre d'ethnologie des pays narbonnais*, the *conseil régional*, the *conseil municipal*, and the *Direction régionale des affaires culturelles*.¹⁰ That said, it is reasonable to classify it as 'amateur', in that only Eugène Cassan was associated with a recognised 'professional' social field specialising in heritage and conservation, and he took a marginal role. Its goals were expressed as follows:

The association will bring to light the life of our forebears, so as to recover the roots of the village and its inhabitants, putting its results at the disposition of future generations. Every man and woman can contribute, because everyone possesses memories, whether written, oral, photographed, or in the form of objects.

In the manifesto, another project was mentioned: 'a continuation of the collection of documents and photos ... to revive the conviviality of the village'. The manifesto also makes a pledge for the future: to make 'our knowledge and resources available to help with the development of the village, albeit with respect for the decisions of your elected representatives'. It likewise mentions a tourism initiative: the exploration of 'an approach towards economic development which will render the village heritage a tool to discover and perhaps exploit its authenticity'. Other interests during its years of activity included: the everyday life of women in the past; the life of fishermen; viticultural life; everyday life in the defunct, small-scale salt works; and the range of artisanal crafts once practised in the village.

An Interview with a Participant

Excerpts from an interview with Martine Cadassus, another founder, provide further detail ... ‘How are things going these days?’ I ask Martine.

MARTINE: We had plans to restore a fisherman’s *cabane*, a bit like this one [*she points to a photo*] with a channel running out towards the lagoon like that ... and we wanted to restore it so people could see how the older fishermen used to work. But it’s the maritime zone there ...

HODGES: Right.

MARTINE: It doesn’t belong to the *conseil municipal*, it belongs to the *Ponts et Chaussées*.¹¹ Before, the *mairie* was in charge of all the land bordering the lagoon that fell within the *commune* of Monadières ... But the last *conseil* didn’t want responsibility, so management is now undertaken by the *Ponts et Chaussées*. So progress is *very* slow ... Look, that’s an old view of the lagoon ... And we wanted to create a replica so people could see what fishing was like at the turn of the century. Because everything was demolished.

HODGES: So how many were there in *l’Association*?

MARTINE: We were about fifteen at the start. Well, there were about three or four of us who *really* worked ... So we would work on these photographs, for example. And the *conseil municipal* could do some work on the photos too ... You see, there’s another possibility I haven’t mentioned. The *conseil municipal* wants to redo the façades of the old houses in the village, and we have photos of the façades ... Now if you really want to give Monadières some *style*, you could do them up. There’s plenty of examples ... And you could do new research because I’m sure there’s other photos ... We really

worked hard with people, we made reproductions, made interviews about individual photographs ...

* *

A description of the archive will round off this vignette. The photos were generally quality amateur reproductions. The archive contained photographs of twenty-four original postcards, and nineteen photographs of the village. It contained a contact sheet of sixteen photographs of photos not yet printed up for the archive; and nine photos of original postcards – five of which had been printed and inserted in the archive. So it was work-in-progress.

All the photos and postcards dated from 1900–1960. Thirty-three were accompanied by printed catalogue sheets, which had been filled in by hand. These lent an official air to the archive, although their state of completion varied considerably. Each sheet contained standard information, detailing the name and address of the photo's owner, and assigning a catalogue number. In a section marked 'description', content varied from a brief entry – a description of the photograph – to a detailed entry that provided names of people, and transcribed oral recollections of the context. Eleven photographs of the postcards were also accompanied by photos of the reverse, which reproduced hand-written messages dating from when the postcard was sent. The archive was presented in a large A4 lever-arch file, and each photograph and catalogue sheet was inserted in a transparent, plastic pocket.

(ii) Eugène Cassan: Salvaging the Memory of the Past

When I was interviewing Cadassus, Eugène Cassan's name came up. Each photo in the archive was accompanied by a cataloguing form which read: 'Centre d'ethnologie des pays narbonnais, C.P.I.E. – Le Grand Pujol – 11100 Narbonne'. Cassan is apparently the C.P.I.E.'s director. What is the *Centre permanent d'initiation à l'environnement*?

... for twenty years, the C.P.I.E.s have acted as mediators among those working with the environment. Their work promotes a new vision of our everyday surroundings, integrating cultural and natural heritages, and drawing on the arts, traditions, crafts ...

Forty C.P.I.E. are now joined in a National Union that certifies their status, thus guaranteeing the quality of their work. The Union is associated with several National Ministries: Environment, Education, and Agriculture.¹²

Another goal of the C.P.I.E. is to 'help local people and visitors – young or old – to understand the local environment, with the aim of transforming them into true citizens of the environment.' It receives state funding, although enjoys a measure of directorial independence. Cassan's C.P.I.E. ran different projects: a nature club for local schools, the restoration of a *Catalane* sailing boat; the restoration of a barge which offers trips to tourists; and the collection of 'local history', his ethnographic project. His objective was 'to seek out, develop, and pass on the heritage of the Narbonne region'.

Cassan's office is on the first floor of a landowner's house on the flatlands across the lagoon from Monadières, where the following encounter took place. He is a frowning, gray-haired man of medium height, with a bushy moustache, and once inside it is me who is questioned. 'Who are you working for?' 'Where are you from?' 'What are you

working on?’ ‘I don’t like academics,’ Cassan tells me, ‘they belittle the work I’m doing ... I am working on my own ethnographic project,’ he says. But the title of his programme, *Centre d’ethnologie des pays narbonnais*? ‘It’s a bit of a front. The intention’s serious enough, but the name of the project? It’s partially a joke.’ He is making fun of the academics. ‘With a name like that, I can be just as important,’ he says, and laughs.

‘If you’ve been recording interviews, that could help me ...’ He leans over his desk. ‘Will you turn over copies of all your tapes?’ Now I laugh. I explain how I have pledged confidentiality ... Cassan leans back and eyes me for a long moment. Then he begins to talk. He has a clear vision of the recent history of the Narbonnais, and Monadières in particular. ‘In this area there has been an acceleration of history,’ he says.

... on the lagoons in particular, there has been a very rapid acceleration of change. Here, in *Monadières*, there has been a rupture with the past, a clear rift ... In the recent past, life has changed enormously for the inhabitants. Whole cultures have disappeared. And traditions too ... There’s been a massive break.

On several occasions he speaks of the ‘disappearance of tradition’. He goes on:

Not long ago, the world of the fishermen in Monadières was very different. When old people came to the exhibition we put on in the old presbytery, for example, for many it was the first time they had been in the building since it had become the Youth Club, and then the *Maison des Arts* (‘Arts Centre’). Recently there has been an immense outside influence, and with the art galleries, an urban aesthetic

moving in.... As for the people who have bought second homes, which are often only used for two weeks a year, the new housing estates ... The original inhabitants have virtually been driven out. There's been a massive break ... It's my plan to create a memory bank for the cultures that have disappeared, so in the future others can learn from it. A memory of life before the break – before the people who can remember things as they were are dead.

How does this link up with your involvement with *l'Association*, I ask him:

I was secretary. Our motivations were very different. I wanted no commercial profit. The others? Madame Cadassus, for example? She wanted to use the old photos to make postcards, to sell in her restaurant. I disagreed strongly. *Very* strongly. I wanted to use *l'Association* to create a memory of how things were ...

Cassan pulls out a large folder. It's crammed with the photographs I have already seen in Cadassus' archive. 'We tried to gather as much information about the photographs as we could when we collected them ... Without that, the photo is meaningless ...' —He has also collected ethnography in Senegal, in a fishing village there. 'While I was there,' he says, 'I discovered that the local fishermen could navigate using the angle of the waves as they approached the coastal shelf. It was a revelation for me.' But when he went to Geneva, to talk to an anthropologist who had worked in the area, his lack of academic credentials hampered progress. 'The anthropologist was dismissive of my work,' he says, bitterly.¹³ We talk about the problems of communication between professionals and amateurs. Membership of the academic club,

he believes, has little meaning if the ability to communicate with those outside it, make the work count in a local context, is lost.

After a while, Cassan offers me a book. ‘Take it,’ he says. ‘It’s my own work, along with a fisherman from Gruissan, François Marty.’ *Mémoire des savoir-faire des pêcheurs de Monadières*, I read. ‘François Marty and I worked with the fishermen in the village.’ ‘It’ll certainly help me in my research,’ I say. But on what grounds does he base his claim to be the ‘curator’ of the village past?

* *

Mémoire is 124 pages long, and consists of a detailed appraisal of fishing techniques used on the lake. Each technique, identified by its local name (French and *Occitan*), is described at length – including details of placement on the lagoon, dates and duration of deployment, when and how the fish are caught, and their species. Indication is given of whether the technique is in use; and if not, when and why it was discontinued. This is accompanied by dimensions, details of mesh size, weights and floats, and illustrations.

The book is authoritative. It also includes notes on the fishing economy. Indeed, when I consult with an older fisherman – who helped Cassan and Marty – he says that the book is largely accurate. This is also my assessment, based on archival resources.

There is also a preface by Cassan:

As we progress little by little in the production of this series, ‘The Fisherman’s Craft’, we are both surprised and gratified.

Surprised at the richness and diversity of the fisherman’s arts and practices, the expert knowledge of the natural environment his profession requires, and the fine inheritance passed down to him by previous generations.

Gratified by the relations we have established with men firmly rooted in the region [*terroir*] and proud of their profession. They are the living memory and inheritors of a fragile set of skills, the true guarantors of the quality of an exceptional natural environment, and those who veritably ensure its management.

We hope that this group effort, intentionally technical in its expression, will reach out to the larger development community, and will help stimulate respect for this professional activity, and for the conditions of its proper exercise.

Let us hope that prudence will in the end produce a harmony between heritage, authenticity, and local development.¹⁴

As for the fishermen, reactions varied. Some, especially younger ones, did not appreciate the book. Knowledge of fishing techniques in Monadières is passed on within families, and there is competition for limited resources. As one fisherman said, ‘Now anyone can learn how to fish on the lagoon. And we don’t like that.’ Such anger was directed at the authors, and the older generation who collaborated. However, it was apparent that for retired fishermen, preservation of techniques for future generations was a novel and appealing idea. In this respect, the project contributed to a broader re-valuing of the past, and they felt new pride in these outmoded techniques. The book’s reception, then, was controversial.

DISCIPLINARY FIELDS: LEGITIMISATION AND DIFFERENTIATION

Amateur heritage associations have been identified by Samuel (1994) as part of a wave of intense popular interest in the past which has arisen in Western Europe since the 1970s. This has created an increase in ‘unofficial knowledge’ about the past alongside the ‘official knowledge’ of state and academic discourses. But exactly how is this divide

manifested, in particular with respect to novel, marginal practices unfolding in contexts such as Monadières? At issue here is how legitimacy is sought for novel ways of knowing the past, which is predicated on their differentiation in relation to established social fields (Bourdieu 1992). With respect to the disciplinary practices of *l'Association* and Cassan, an analysis guided by such insights provides an enlightening perspective, in a context where differing fields of discourse about the past co-existed and were being reformulated – including anthropology and historiography.

(i) Legitimising *patrimoine*

L'Association was focused on the disciplinary creation of cultural capital for actualising the past of Monadières. This was conceived in terms of *patrimoine*, a ‘heritage’ that was variously interpreted as under threat, forgotten, or simply dispersed; although it was also evoked through possessive metaphors, as an object (commodity) that belonged to the ‘community’. One encounters a composite of outlooks that incorporate both a sense of the past as a thing to be possessed, and that ‘belongs’ to the organic community of the village; a sense of the past’s identification with a ‘place’ separated by historical rupture and the passing of *chronological* time from the present; and a notion that its traces (ruins) are still accessible via local memories and associated artefacts, but are threatened with disappearance. The members thus conceive of the past as ‘completed’, set off as a ‘foreign country’ from a ‘present’ that is qualitatively different, in a modernist vision of ruptured history.¹⁵ It is nevertheless objectifiable as cultural capital, and of value for innovation precisely through the qualities of its otherness: as a potentially redemptive model for lived experience; as an aesthetic experience; and in terms of its exchange value in the field of heritage tourism.

The name of the group is a rhetorical claim to official institutional authority. It also suggests taking responsibility for a *communal* resource, which in France usually falls to

the state and locally, the *conseil municipal* – although the group was throughout most of its active existence an unelected *association*, with recognition and modest financial sponsorship from the *conseil*. In name alone, one can therefore note a metaphorical pretension to membership of the ‘state institutional’ field. This was encouraged by the professed overlap of members’ concerns with those of the *conseil municipal*, historiographers, and university scholars (including myself), and the modest capital some could invoke in terms of networks with these fields. It was reinforced by the fact that *l’état* was willing to supply projects like *l’Association* with financial support through grants, although the group did not take advantage of the social and economic capital afforded through the status of *association loi 1901* until 1998.

The group’s primary sources were the oral history and photographic images possessed by Monadiérois, which were normally put to use in their cultural practices, as part of their ‘intangible cultural heritage’. Members aimed to discipline ‘oral history’ in a tape-recorded and written archive, and create reproductions of photographs. This process of objectification and collation was giving rise to a modest new archival resource – which one can gloss as the transformation of oral practices into durable material culture and cultural capital), and in the *longue durée*, as local effects of literacy on memory practices (cf. Goody 1987, Le Goff 1992:92). A further consequence of such activities was to render aspects of the past which had previously been associated with Monadiérois practices accessible to anyone who might use this archive.

L’Association’s motivations for carrying out these projects were complex, and reflected divisions within the group. Nevertheless, for several members, the creation of archival resources for actualisation of the past was preparatory research for the development and symbolisation of products for consumption by heritage tourists – a

wider phenomenon (Abram, Waldren & Macleod 1997, Boissevain 1996, Urry 1995). The objective, then, was eventual deployment via technologies of power associated with the regional heritage tourism industry. Which leads us to consider local attitudes towards *l'Association*. Some people had been willing to co-operate with their work; others had refused, or not come forward. Some were cynical about the whole enterprise, such as Guy Cadas:

You know, Matt, those people, I can't stand them. All they want to do is destroy the old Monadières ... They're out to turn it into a nice theme park for the tourists. *L'Association* is the same as the *conseil municipal*. They're all after the same thing. They just want to make money ... Call me cynical, but I'm suspicious of the lot of them.

Such reactions confirm that the idealism of *l'Association* regarding the altruistic value of their activities for the *commune* clashed with how they were viewed by many villagers – with good reason, as they were not their only motivations.

Finally, let us comment further on the social field in which they were operating. Historiography in France is a prestigious activity, as is the long tradition of 'scholarly local history' that is a cousin to this field – with which Guiffan's and my own work were associated. 'Amateur' local history is an unstable and, in academic terms, less well-defined field of practice. But it is widely established in France, and enjoys a presence in bookshops and the local media. Through positioning themselves at the 'authoritative' edge of this field – partly through the acquisition of social capital mentioned above – *l'Association* was rendered identifiable by local people and the authorities. Such was the context which legitimated their disciplinary practices – even if

their motivations were in question. As such, their work comprises a local manifestation of the overlap between ‘amateur local history’ and the field of heritage tourism – that is also documented in the ethnographic record (e.g. Boissevain 1996).

(ii) Legitimising Salvage

Cassan’s projects regarding the village past were *primarily* concerned with salvage. His objectives were to preserve ‘intangible heritage’ (i.e. objectify cultural capital via disciplinary inscription) for future actualisation, before this became impossible due to the deaths of those who remembered it. Those most adversely affected by such changes, in his eyes, were those who lived through them – the Monadiérois.

How did Cassan see his role? ‘It’s my intention to create a memory bank for these cultures that have disappeared.’ There is no suggestion that descendants of older people will be able to invoke these memories within ‘living traditions’. Cassan’s view of the agency of villagers is a negative one, as passive victims of historical change. The task of conservation was his own, enabling the redemption of cultural identity through exhibitions such as *Monadières – Lieux de Mémoires*; and the creation of archival memory. For whose benefit? ‘[S]o that in the future others can work with it, learn from it’. Unspecified others, presumably both Monadiérois, and other parties.

Such motivations also drove the project for *Mémoire*, although in his introduction Cassan is less conclusive about the break with previous fishing practices. With respect to extinct practices gleaned from older fishermen, Cassan’s role nevertheless remains one of salvage; and a wider remit for his work is apparent: ‘We hope that this group effort ... will reach out to the larger community of developers, and help stimulate the respect due to this professional activity, and to the conditions of its proper exercise ...

Let us hope that prudence will in the end produce a harmony between heritage, authenticity, and local development' (Marty & Cassan 1993:6).

Like *l'Association*, Cassan's activities were thus aimed at disciplinary creation of an archive from oral sources. What was his basis for legitimacy? He could claim a degree of legitimacy through the C.P.I.E., which was networked, state-funded and recognised, with links to environmental and cultural institutions. This also funded his activities, and was the basis for recognition from institutions such as the *Parc*. Cassan's activities thus possessed greater symbolic and social capital than those of *l'Association*. Cassan also exhibited thoroughness and attention to detail, even if his encounter with an anthropologist in Geneva did not go according to plan. If in terms of established social fields, this appears to be an 'amateur' form of ethnographic practice, it was underpinned by a complex rationale and Cassan's professional status with the C.P.I.E.. In this sense, it was a hybrid, as it also bore resemblance to what might be termed the field of 'amateur ethnography' – those para-ethnographic discourses on rural life produced by local intellectuals and enthusiasts which enjoy significant legitimacy in the Midi in the context of regionalist interest in local 'cultures' and related identity politics. It was on this borderline, and in awareness of his 'exclusion' from the academic social field, that Cassan seemed to classify himself.

If Cassan's goal, however, was in some way to act as an organic intellectual (Gramsci 1971), his ambitions were not realised. For despite some outside recognition for his projects, his legitimacy within Monadières was in fact widely questioned – given his alienation from the Monadiérois; his involvement with *l'Association*; his status as an outsider; and perhaps most importantly, his goals, which did not cohere with those 'living traditions' of Monadiérois wherein the pasts he was 'salvaging' were *still*

actualised. In this respect, his work bears comparison with that of some professional anthropologists. As Clifford (1986:112) observes:

The theme of the vanishing primitive, of the end of traditional society (the very act of naming it 'traditional' implies a rupture), is pervasive in ethnographic writing ... But the persistent and repetitious disappearance of social forms at the moment of their ethnographic representation demands analysis as a narrative structure.

Clifford acknowledges the value of creating a record of vanishing customs. But he queries the narrative that what has disappeared constitutes a transcendent, holistic way of life, and that what remains is not worthy of recognition. At the same time, Clifford questions 'the mode of scientific and moral authority associated with "salvage" ethnography. It is assumed that the other society is weak and "needs" to be represented by an outsider (and that what matters in its life is its past, not present or future)' (1986:113). These critiques also apply to Cassan's para-ethnographic projects. Cassan's modernist outlook is more revealing about his values than informative about local attitudes. On a number of levels, Cassan had also failed to significantly establish his credentials in the village, or develop his projects in negotiation with residents. If he had, perhaps via creating an effective 'para-site' for his activities (Marcus 2000), he would have found his assumptions challenged – and ultimately, perhaps, some sympathetic collaborators among the Monadièrois, in the current climate of polarisation over heritage tourism.¹⁶

DISCIPLINARY ANTHROPOLOGY

In this paper I have mapped ('disciplined'?) two distinct, if related sets of practices in Monadières, which were identified with my activities as an anthropologist. I have located them in relation to social fields of practice in France associated with heritage tourism, local history, French historiography, and amateur ethnography. The location of anthropology among these fields will complete the frame for a comparative analysis.

The anthropological tradition in France, as is well-known, is markedly different in its historical trajectory from social anthropology in the United Kingdom, or indeed cultural anthropology in the United States (see Abeles 1999; Poirier 1984; Rogers 2001; Segalen and Zonabend 1987). The long-term association of French ethnology with museums is notable, which initially impelled a focus on material culture and its collection. This distinctive trajectory, and related interdisciplinary links with intellectual movements such as Surrealism, have also contributed to a greater engagement among French ethnologists with public discourses such as critical journalism than is evident in the Anglo-Saxon world, and greater public visibility

The discipline is currently populated by a large cohort of tenured researchers at elite institutions such as the CNRS, alongside a smaller (c.150) number of teachers based in university departments (Rogers 2001). Anthropological study of rural France was extensively pursued by French researchers during the 1980s, although this has subsequently declined, as has study by UK and US anthropologists, which peaked in the 1990s. At a regional level, the work of Fabre and Lacroix (1973) is notable for its anthropological orientation, and has some visibility in local bookshops in the context of regionalist politics. That said, Monadières and environs have not been a subject of field study, and much of the local population have little or no knowledge of the discipline. In

sum, *les ethnologues français* can be viewed as a professional social field, alongside other relevant social fields noted in this article, with strong links, one can argue, with French historiography and particularly those more ‘anthropological’ historians with a regionalist focus (see Le Roy Ladurie 1975). Their professional cousins in North America and the United Kingdom arguably join them in comprising that composite, international social field, the international anthropological community. But in ethnographic terms, they have no explicit presence in Monadières beyond my own work, which was viewed as a form of ‘scholarly local history’, as I have explained.

The genealogical links between French ethnology and the folklorist movement which developed from the mid-19th Century, however, *are* worthy of comment. The folklorists were responsible for the collection of a rich body of knowledge and artefacts pertaining to ‘disappearing’ traditions, of predominantly rural origins, a ‘salvage’ ethic which was also at work in anthropological circles farther afield (Clifford 1986). Their concern with documenting and preserving the vestiges of a pre-modern France in the face of industrialisation also influenced the study of rural France by French anthropologists during the 1980s (Abeles 1999, Rogers 2001), with its focus on vanishing ‘peasant societies’, and bear resemblance to the activities of Cassan and *l’Association*. To the extent that the ‘popular’, nostalgic modernist impulse of the folklorist tradition has diffused into wider society, and hybridised into conservation and heritage-related projects, including that underwriting heritage tourism and its justification, French ethnology could thus be said to share an intellectual genealogy with the activities of those such as Cassan and *l’Association* (cf. Graburn 1994). Such practices today are of course differentiated into distinct fields of knowledge production and cultural practice, but their linkages in the *longue durée* should be noted. Indeed, the diffusion of an ethnographic sensibility and procedures of disciplinary inscription in wider society via

this route clearly informed the work of *l'association*, whose members were aware of the folklore tradition and para-ethnographic elements of regionalist literatures. A shared genealogy thus generated one nexus of 'borrowing' between these social fields. Cassan, of course, was better acquainted with the anthropological project itself, as we have seen.

Returning to the contemporary epoch, the notion of 'disciplinary programmes' will enable a sharper comparative focus. As stated, disciplinary programmes 'define a domain of social reality to be turned into an object of rational knowledge, intervened in and made functional' (Gledhill 1994:148) which is then implemented through *technologies* of power (appropriately designed practices), according to contingent *strategies*. Let us now use this concept to draw some parallels and distinctions between these ostensibly distinct social fields.

The ways in which disciplinary programmes involving heritage and conservation (*l'Association* and Cassan) can be approximated to historiographical and anthropological practices (e.g. Guiffan and myself), is primarily through their common focus on the 'intangible cultural heritage' of Monadiérois; and the inscription techniques (written, oral and visual cataloguing) and archiving used to rationalise ('make functional') this heritage. Indeed, as I have noted, analytical terms such as 'intangible cultural heritage', indigeneity, and indeed 'cultural practices' are themselves emergent from such processes. Essentially, then, there are commonalities at the level of 'programmes of power', i.e. codifying practices. These could be analysed at length, although given the limitations of space, suffice it to say that historiography and anthropology exhibit more rigorous and sophisticated techniques of rationalisation and inscription than Cassan and *l'Association*. The hybridisation of these different discursive practices thus remains partly at the level of desire: my output was requested, but not delivered. However, there was 'borrowing' at a general level, in terms of the

legitimacy that historiographical and ethnological discourse enjoy in France and that can be imparted to local heritage discourses by association. This was consolidated in both cases through prominent foregrounding of discursive forms and research practices common to ethnology, although these have been rendered hybridised, or ‘amateur’, in the process. Finally, to the extent that these fields are descended from the French 19th century folklorist movement, such hybridisation was also informed by genealogical linkage and inheritance between these social fields. Similarities, in this respect, were more notable for Cassan’s activities than for those of *l’Association*.

To the extent that we all mobilise our disciplined resources through technologies of power, historiography and anthropology certainly have extensive apparatuses, which reach beyond the academy, for example, to public and private sector agents who utilise social scientific and historical materials. The state-sponsored *Pays Cathare* network, through which heritage tourism was operationalised, also constitutes a formidable apparatus for mobilisation. Analysing the impact of such technologies on political economic relations within the *commune* is therefore key. In the case of *l’Association*, with respect to heritage tourism, their work has had a modest impact since the early 2000s, due to deficiencies in the ‘technologies’ required for development – i.e. the tourism infrastructure requires greater investment. Indeed, the housing market has become the serious issue in the locality in recent years, facilitated by the increase in visitors, and driven by members of *l’Association* who have become estate agents in the quest for a more lucrative income.¹⁷ Ultimately, then, this suggests that historiography and anthropology, in terms of their social and financial benefits to practitioners, have been marginally more productive, although they have not adversely impacted on political economic relations.

A further frame for comparison is that of strategies of power. In this regard, to the extent that the historiographer's and anthropologist's commonly-professed goals of 'contribution to knowledge' are shadowed by the personal and economic returns of professional practice, they share a commonality with heritage tourism stakeholders, who highlight the benefits of conserving the past for future generations, above and beyond their modest personal remuneration to date. Cassan, meanwhile, emerges as an altruistic idealist, whatever the status of 'salvage ethnography' among professional anthropologists – whose reward is effectively the accomplishment of his self-conceived work of redemption.

The analysis suggests, therefore, that the anthropologist, historian, and advocate of heritage tourism all share a problematic disciplinary relationship to the indigenous inhabitants of Monadières and their 'intangible cultural heritage', which ultimately, they mobilise for modest personal ends. In the case of heritage tourism, this is often characterised by Monadièrois in explicit terms as being 'exploited'. In the case of Guiffan and myself, this has not been the case, to such an extent. It is probably fair to say that our activities have been viewed by most as legitimate discursive practice and contributions to the prestige and heritage of the village, as a result of the established social fields with which they are associated. This might also be linked to our more rigorous and developed disciplinary techniques, which were respected by some, though certainly not all informants as productive of socially valuable knowledge and as symbols of valued and legitimate expertise. That said, some Monadièrois view all our activities as self-interested, a charge which none are immune from. Whatever idealistic motivations I might have had for conducting fieldwork on what I initially perceived to be the ongoing integration of rural Europeans into exploitative political economic networks, these aims did not easily concord with multiple local views on social change

in Monadières and environs. And whether or not such research can be viewed as a contribution to the public good – which is clearly a problematic category – it is inevitably a reflection of personal motivations, which in my case arose from family experience of the dismantling of former mining communities in rural Lancashire during the 1960s and 1970s.

However, we should also note that the ‘intangible heritage’ of Monadiérois were, of course, not unchanging. Self-awareness of ‘heritage’ produced among Monadiérois by recent social change was part of a long-term process of interaction and integration with wider social and political economic realities, and to a degree, a resistance to this process. Likewise, their ‘intangible heritage’ was by no means undifferentiated, free from hierarchies, or devolved from their own desire to lay claim to the village as an inalienable resource (see Hodges 2010). So it would be fallacious to view Monadiérois cultural practices as a transcendent, holistic way of life (cf. Clifford 1986), or exempt the Monadiérois themselves from the frame of self-interest. Indeed, some of the more ethnographically-minded informants I worked with among them had clearly undertaken their own disciplinary reviews of Monadiérois cultural practices and history, particularly those influential figures who had served in the socialist *mairie* during the late 1970s and 1980s. ‘Being Monadiérois’ was thus itself partly the product of a disciplinary self-accounting.

Ultimately, then, analysis of similarities and differences between these disciplinary practices problematises anthropology’s relationship to its subjects, and in the final analysis, the anthropologist’s status as a social intellectual. Anthropologists are engaged in their own programme of disciplinary power (cf. Rabinow 1989). One way, perhaps, in which the anthropologist might clarify this issue is to critically rethink the feedback loop from such ‘disciplinary’ fieldwork to its subjects. Grimshaw and Hart (1993)

identified a related ‘insularity’ in academic professionalism. They charged that ‘new patterns of social engagement, extending beyond academic boundaries’ (ibid.:44) were called for, that went beyond fashionable calls for formal innovation (e.g. Clifford & Marcus 1986). They endorsed ‘amateur’ practice as a utopian communitarian model – a project which was initially pursued via Hart’s ‘small triple-a’ discussion group, and may now have found fertile ground with the ‘Open Anthropology Cooperative’ social network.¹⁸ The formal question remains, however, in the sense that directed engagement with fieldwork contexts requires innovative, *locally-nuanced* discursive practice. In this sense, the ‘found imaginaries’ (Marcus 1998:3–30) of fieldwork might also give rise to emergent discursive forms, in relation to the specific local contexts in which anthropological research can acquire relevance – alongside professional output. Engagement with such non-academic technologies of public discourse, their hybridisation and incorporation into anthropological strategies, can enable productive feedback and critical engagement with fieldwork contexts, alongside ‘traditional’ roles such as advocacy (Ahmed & Shore 1994; MacClancy & McDonough 1996).¹⁹ Naturally, they would not supplant the comparable need for anthropologists to create authoritative, expert academic discourse, employing precisely those rigorous techniques of inscription and analysis that some individuals in places such as Monadières might view as enabling and validating their expertise. Only on the basis of such discourse, perhaps, can anthropologists speak the truth to disciplinary power, although the manner in which they represent such findings could equally be one of discursive disruption (cf. Taussig 2010).

What would the content of such critically rethought engagement be? Perhaps a problematisation of the very categories of ‘indigenous’ and ‘heritage’, as the creation of local ‘para-sites’ might lead in turn to a reconceptualisation of relations between

researcher and informant among anthropologists. It might also lead to the creation of ‘para-ethnographies’ and ‘impact’ integrating local and academic views, established on common, dialogical ground. In 1986, Paul Rabinow suggested that academic tenure is a pre-requisite for such ‘experimental’ activity. With recent government and research council directives on the importance of ‘impact’, in the UK at least, it would appear that the tables have been turned, and that such engagement is now necessary for academic longevity. But ultimately, such an impact model must have its limits. For difference of viewpoint is of value in collaboration. Without the disciplinary processes intrinsic to the anthropological programme, aligned on the trajectory of scholarly differentiation rather than collaborative objectives or public accountability, no fertile distinction might exist from which impact – with its implication of an abrupt closure of distance – could be generated.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS:

Initial fieldwork was funded by the ESRC. I am grateful as ever to friends and associates in Monadières. This paper was originally presented at ASA 09, ‘Anthropological and Archaeological Imaginations: Past, Present and Future’, at the panel ‘Imagineering the Past: the (Mis)uses of Anthropology and Archaeology in Tourism’. My thanks to Noel Salazar for convening the panel, and to Nelson Graburn and others present for their insights and feedback.

¹ “‘Intangible cultural heritage’ means the practices, representations, expressions, knowledge, skills – as well as the instruments, objects, artefacts and cultural spaces associated therewith – that communities, groups and, in some cases, individuals recognize as part of their cultural heritage. This intangible cultural heritage, transmitted from generation to generation, is constantly recreated by communities and groups in response to their environment, their interaction with nature and their history, and provides them with a sense of identity and continuity, thus promoting respect for cultural diversity and human creativity’ (UNESCO 2003). My adoption of this terminology is not unproblematic, as it can be analysed as the product of a similar process to that which is under analysis here. But it offers a shorthand for the ‘living traditions’ under discussion and, arguably, introduces a ‘distancing effect’ (*Verfremdungseffekt*) into the article that anthropological terms would not (cf. Brecht 1964). This is of value as terms such as ‘indigenous’, ‘living tradition’, ‘cultural practices’ etc. can be viewed as products of an analogous process of disciplinary objectification and rationalisation by the anthropological project, which it is my intention to problematize.

² As Feenberg (2004:97) writes: ‘Deworlding is a salient feature of modern societies, which are constantly engaged in disassembling natural objects and traditional ways of doing things and substituting technically rational ways ... Deworlding consists of a process of functionalisation in which objects are torn out of their original contexts and exposed to analysis and manipulation ... Disclosure ... qualifies functionalisation by orienting it toward a new world containing those same objects and subjects.’ These concepts form central components of Feenberg’s ‘Instrumentalisation Theory’.

³ ‘The para-ethnographic is that side of diverse discourses and practices that represents the social ground for specific purposes and goals and is done thickly or thinly with considerable consequences for events and actions. This is an ethnographic process of knowledge creation, what anthropologists do, albeit in a more explicit and committed way’ (Holmes and Marcus 2006:54). This ‘pre-existing ethnographic consciousness’ is found in a range of contexts, from expert cultures of banking and NGOs, to art practices, the military, the experimental systems of

scientists, to youth cultures, theatre groups, and so on (Holmes and Marcus 2008). It can also be credited with varying degrees of accuracy, from the systematic cultural account, to subversive and fragmentary social discourses, to thinly disguised ideology.

⁴ Jenkins (1992:85) glosses Bourdieu's concept of the social field: 'The boundaries of fields are imprecise and shifting ... although they include various institutionally constituted points of entry. The boundary of any given field, the point(s) at which the field ceases to have any impact on practice, is always at stake in the struggles which take place within the field. A field is, by definition, "a field of struggles" in which agents' strategies are concerned with the preservation or improvement of their positions with respect to the defining capital of the field.'

⁵ Censuses of 1946 & 1999.

⁶ Lou ***, 1995: 11—12.

⁷ The French *ecomusée* movement emerged in the 1970s with the aim of conserving the cultural and material heritage of distinctive regions. It was also concerned to promote interaction and debate with the general public about heritage-related topics, and its influence has subsequently spread overseas. (See <http://www.fems.asso.fr/index2.html>, accessed 6/1/2011.)

⁸ An *association loi 1901* is authorised by the Waldeck-Rousseau law of 1 July 1901, which remains the principal statute underwriting the foundation of non-profit associations in France. It grants non-commercial status to them for tax purposes, among other things, while also imposing certain requirements, such as annual meetings, and a registered name and purpose. More than a million such associations currently exist in France, ranging from small village 'clubs' to larger associations with salaried employees.

⁹ A fishing 'cabin' in English, this particular one being of an older style and hence worth preserving (*sic.*).

¹⁰ The *Service maritime* ('Maritime Service') is the state coastal authority; the *conseil régional* ('regional council') is the regional elected body; the *Direction régional des affaires culturelles* ('Regional Ministry for Cultural Affairs') is in charge of regional cultural affairs.

¹¹ The government department responsible for roads and other such public areas.

¹² Translated from a C.P.I.E. pamphlet.

¹³ Such navigation methods have been commented on in the regional literature.

¹⁴ Marty & Cassan 1993:5–6; my translation.

¹⁵ Let us recall Harris's (1996:3) analysis: 'In temporal terms the modernist moment is constituted by the idea of rupture ... The identification of the modern is first and foremost a question of temporality, the *Neuzeit* or *le moderne* was new with respect to what came before, thus registering a break with the past.' This perspective is often linked with nostalgia for an organic community, as it has been in social theory.

¹⁶ The 'para-site' is a staged, collaborative zone of encounter and dialogue between anthropologists and their informants, sometimes involving a return to the university from the field with selected interlocutors to generate new insights before resuming fieldwork (Marcus 2000). It might be further extended to refer to encounters between para-ethnographers such as Cassan, and the subjects of their work.

¹⁷ There is not so great a difference between these practices, perhaps. Heritage tourism 'deworlds' (Feenberg 2004) the cultural capital of the village, real estate its material resources, often glossed by heritage-informed publicity and sold to visitors attracted by this image. The price boom has directly increased social inequality in the locality, as young Monadiérois can no longer afford to live there.

¹⁸ See Hart 1997, <http://openanthcoop.ning.com/> (accessed 6/1/2011). The 'snall triple-a' was the 'amateur anthropological association', a mocking cousin to the American Anthropological Association. It was founded by Hart and Grimshaw in the early 1990s, although in social terms it existed primarily as an email discussion list.

¹⁹ To these ends, for several years I have been engaged in a public anthropology project with the objective of producing a literary novel based on fieldwork in France that casts anthropological insights in accessible local form. Several novels set on the coast of Languedoc were widely read in Monadières – more so than Guiffan's histories, which were purchased but not always read.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Abélès, Marc (1999) 'How the Anthropology of France has changed Anthropology in France: New Directions in the Field', *Cultural Anthropology* 14(3): 404–408.

Abram, Simone, Waldren Jackie, & Macleod Donald (eds.) (1997) *Tourists and Tourism. Identifying with People and Places*. Oxford & New York: Berg.

Ahmed, Akbar & Cris Shore (eds.) (1994) *The Future of Anthropology: Its Relevance to the Contemporary World*. London: Athlone.

Boissevain, Jeremy (1996) 'Introduction', in Boissevain Jeremy (ed.), *Coping With Tourists. European Reactions to Mass Tourism*. Providence & Oxford: Berghahn Books, pp.1–26.

Bourdieu, Pierre (1992) *Distinction. A Social Critique of the Judgement of Taste*. London: Routledge.

Brecht, Bertolt (1964) *Brecht on Theatre: The Development of an Aesthetic*. London: Methuen.

Clifford, James (1986) 'On Ethnographic Allegory', in James Clifford & George Marcus (eds.), *Writing Culture: The Poetics and Politics of Ethnography*. Berkeley & Los Angeles: University of California Press.

Fabre, D. & J. Lacroix (1991 [1973]) *La vie quotidien des paysans du Languedoc au*

XIXe siècle. Paris: Hachette.

Feenberg, Andrew (2004) 'Modernity Theory and Technology Studies: Reflections on Bridging the Gap', in T.J. Misa, P. Bray & A. Feenberg (eds.), *Modernity and Technology*, Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, pp.73–104.

Foucault, Michel (1977) *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*. London: Allen Lane.

Foucault, Michel (1980) *Power/Knowledge. Selected Interviews and Other Writings, 1972–1977*. London: Harvester Wheatsheaf.

Gledhill, John (1994) *Power and its Disguises. Anthropological Perspectives on Politics*. London: Pluto Press.

Goody, Jack (1987) *The Interface between the Written and the Oral*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Graburn, Nelson (1994) 'Tourism, Modernity and Nostalgia', in Akbar Ahmed & Cris Shore (eds.), *The Future of Anthropology: Its Relevance to the Contemporary World*. London: Athlone, pp.158–178.

Graham, B., Ashworth, G., & Tunbridge, J. (2000) *A Geography of Heritage: Power, Culture and Economy*. London: Hodder Arnold.

Gramsci, Antonio (1971) *Selections from the Prison Notebooks*. London: Lawrence &

Wishart.

Greenwood, Davydd (1989) 'Culture by the Pound: An Anthropological Perspective on Tourism as Cultural Commodification', in Valerie Smith (ed.), *Hosts and Guests: The Anthropology of Tourism*. Philadelphia: University of Philadelphia Press.

Grimshaw, Anna & Keith Hart (1993) *Anthropology and the Crisis of the Intellectuals*. Cambridge: Prickly Pear Pamphlet No.1.

Guiffan, Jean (1979) *Bages et son étang*. Salles d'Aude: Service Occitan d'imprimerie.

Guiffan, Jean (2007) *Histoire de Bages et des ses habitants*. Bages: Editions Elysiques.

Harris, Olivia (1996) 'The Temporalities of Tradition. Reflections on a Changing Anthropology', in Victor Hubinger (ed.), *Grasping the Changing World*. London: Routledge.

Hart, Keith (1997) 'Prickly Pear Polemics: Anthropology beyond the University', *Critique of Anthropology* 17(1): 99–102.

Hewison, Robert (1987) *The Heritage Industry*. London: Methuen.

Hodges, Matt (2001) 'Food, Time and Heritage Tourism in Languedoc, France', *History and Anthropology* 12(2): 179-212.

Hodges, Matt (2010) 'The Time of the Interval: Historicity, Modernity, and Epoch in Rural France', *American Ethnologist* 37(1): 115–131.

Holmes, Douglas R. & George E. Marcus (2005) 'Cultures of Expertise and the Management of Globalization: Toward the Re-Functioning of Ethnography', in Aihwa Ong & Stephen J. Collier (eds.), *Global Assemblages: Technology, Politics, and Ethics as Anthropological Problems*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Holmes, Douglas R. & George E. Marcus (2006) 'Fast Capitalism: Para-Ethnography and the Rise of the Symbolic Analyst', in Melissa S. Fisher & Greg Downey (eds.), *Frontiers of Capital: Ethnographic Reflections on the New Economy*. Durham: Duke University Press.

Holmes, Douglas R. & George E. Marcus (2008) 'Collaboration Today and the Re-Imagination of the Classic Scene of Fieldwork Encounter', *Collaborative Anthropologies* 1: 81–101.

Jenkins, Richard (1992) *Pierre Bourdieu*. London: Routledge.

Le Goff, Jacques (1992) *History and Memory*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Le Roy Ladurie, E. (1975) *Montaillou, village Occitan de 1294 à 1324*. Paris: Gallimard.

MacClancy, Jeremy & Chris McDonough (eds.) (1996) *Popularizing Anthropology*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Marcus, George (1998) *Ethnography through Thick and Thin*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Marcus, George E. (2000) *Para-Sites: A Casebook against Cynical Reason*. Chicago: Chicago University Press.

Poirier, Jean (1984) *Histoire de l'ethnologie*. Paris: PUF.

Rabinow, Paul (1986) 'Representations are Social Facts: Modernity and post-Modernity in Anthropology', in James Clifford & George Marcus (eds.), *Writing Culture: The Poetics and Politics of Ethnography*. Berkeley & Los Angeles: University of California Press.

Rabinow, Paul (1989) *French Modern: Norms and Forms of the Social Environment*. Cambridge: MIT Press.

Rogers, Susan Carol (2001) 'Anthropology in France', *Annual Review of Anthropology* 30: 481–504.

Samuel, Raphael (1994) *Theatres of Memory. Volume 1: Past and Present in Contemporary Culture*. London & New York: Verso.

Segalen, Martine & Françoise Zonabend (1987) 'Social Anthropology and the Ethnology of France: the Field of Kinship and the Family', in A. Jackson (ed.), *Anthropology at Home*. London: Tavistock.

Taussig, M.T. (2010) 'The Corn-Wolf: Writing Apotropaic Texts', *Critical Inquiry* 37: 26–33.

UNESCO (2003) *Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage*. <http://www.unesco.org/culture/ich/index.php?pg=00006> (Accessed 19/10/2009).

Urry, John (1990) *The Tourist Gaze. Leisure and Travel in Contemporary Societies*. London: Sage.