Tourism in the Mundo Maya: Inventions and (Mis)Representations of Maya Identities and Heritage

Aline Magnoni, Anthropology Department, Tulane University, 1326 Audubon St., New Orleans, LA 70118, USA
E-mail: amagnon@tulane.edu

Traci Ardren, University of Miami, Coral Gables, FL, USA

Scott Hutson, University of Kentucky, Lexington, KY, USA

ABSTRACT

In this paper we explore how Maya identities have been (mis)represented in the context of heritage tourism across the Mundo Maya and underscore the cultural heterogeneity and historical diversity of Maya speaking people. Our focus is the Yucatán peninsula, where we look at terms used to define social categories and ethnic groups through time. We then examine how tourism can affect notions of self-identify and self-ascription, by presenting our first-hand experience as archaeologists dealing with issues of Maya identity and heritage claims in the context of archaeological tourism development at the sites of Chunchucmil and Yaxuna, Yucatán. We propose the use of a 'relational approach' to identify formation processes in contrast to the more common genealogical approach. In addition, we believe that with the help of applied anthropologists archaeologists can be advocates for local communities and mediators among multiple stakeholders in situations where these communities are poised to benefit from tourism.

Résumé: Dans cet article nous explorons comment les identités mayas ont été (mal) interprétées dans le contexte du patrimoine touristique, à travers le monde maya, et nous soulignons l'hétérogénéité culturelle ainsi que la diversité historique des gens qui parle les langues mayas. Nous nous intéressons particulièrement à la péninsule du Yucatán, où nous examinons la terminologie utilisée pour définir les catégories sociales et les groupes ethniques à travers le temps. Nous examinons ensuite comment le tourisme a affecté les notions identitaires et l'image qu'ils ont d'eux-mêmes, en présentant notre expérience de première main comme archéologues interagissant avec les questions de l'identité maya et des revendications du patrimoine dans le contexte du développement touristique aux sites de

Chunchucmil et de Yaxuna au Yucatán. Nous proposons une 'approche relationelle' pour comprendre les procesus de la formation de l'identité en contraste de l'approche plus commune de la généalogie. En outre, nous croyons qu'avec l'aide des anthropologues appliqués, les archéologues peuvent être des défenseurs des communautés locales et des médiateurs, en ce qui concerne les enjeux multiples impliquant des situations où ces communautés ont la possibilité de tirer bénéfice du tourisme.

Resumen: En esta artículo exploramos la manera en la cual las identidades mayas han sido (mal)interpretadas en el contexto del turismo en sitios de patrimonio cultural a través del Mundo Maya y enfatizamos la heterogeneidad cultural y la diversidad histórica de los pueblos que hablan Maya. Estamos interesados en particular en la península de Yucatán, donde investigamos los términos usados para definir categorías sociales y grupos étnicos a través del tiempo. Luego examinamos como el turismo afecta las nociones de identidad propia y adscripción propia, presentando nuestra experiencia de primera mano como arqueólogos que tratan asuntos de identidad Maya y reclamos de patrimonio en el contexto del desarrollo de turismo arqueológico en los sitios de Chunchucmil y Yaxuna, Yucatán. Proponemos el uso del 'enfoque relacional' para los procesos de formación de identidad en contraste con el mas comúnmente usado enfoque genealógico. Además, creemos que los arqueólogos/as con la asistencia de los/las antropólogos/as aplicados/as pueden ser los defensores de las comunidades locales y mediadores entre múltiples interesados en situaciones en las que esas comunidades tienen que poner en la balanza los beneficios del turismo.

Introduction

The Mundo Maya, a popular tourist route travelled by people from all over the world, links diverse archaeological, cultural, ecological, and recreational places of the Maya World. The Maya region covers an area of almost five hundred thousand square kilometers across four Central American countries, Guatemala, Belize, Honduras, and El Salvador and

five Mexican states, Chiapas, Tabasco, Campeche, Yucatán, and Quintana Roo. Featured in a 1989 issue of National Geographic and originally called the Ruta Maya, it was heralded as a major international and collaborative project that would protect the environment and provide economic alternatives to Maya people through the promotion of tourism. Mundo Maya is an ''ambitious regional project designed to showcase and preserve the shared cultural, historical and environmental heritage'' of the five countries that make up the Maya region (Garrett 1989:133). Archaeological ruins of the 'mysterious' ancient Maya, tropical jungles with exotic animals and plants, idyllic Caribbean beaches, and the living Maya are the major attractions used to draw tourists to the region. In advertisements at both a government level and for private tourism operators, emphasis is placed on adventure, exoticism, and a long history of cultural development that spans millennia. Cultural continuity between the living Maya and the prehispanic people who built the magnificent pyramids is often tacitly, or in some cases overtly, suggested in these advertisements.

Visitors come for varying amounts of time but often travel across large portions of the Maya region, by land or air, to visit archaeological sites that span thousands of years and 'traditional' villages, where people dress and speak a variety of Maya languages, all immersed in an incredible variety of ecological zones. Through popular, and sometimes even academic, presentations of the Maya, tourists are led to assume that the Maya were and are an ancient culture that developed over a vast area, who, despite the arrival of the Spaniards and the dramatic consequences of European colonization, had and maintained a homogeneous indigenous Maya identity. But in fact, not all people referred to as Maya think of themselves or call themselves 'Maya', 'indigenous', or 'Indian'. In this article we want to explore the question of Maya identity across the Mundo Maya by highlighting the cultural heterogeneity and historical diversity of the so-called Maya people. Our focus is the Yucatán peninsula, where we look at terms used to define social categories and ethnic groups through time. We propose the use of a 'relational approach' to identity formation processes in contrast to the more common genealogical approach (Hutson n.d.; Ingold 2000). Moreover, we investigate how Maya identity has been represented and misrepresented in the context of heritage tourism promotion and how tourism affects notions of self-identity and self-ascription. Finally, we also present our first-hand experience as archaeologists with issues of Maya identity and heritage claims in the context of archaeological tourism development at the sites of Chunchucmil and Yaxuna in western and central Yucatán respectively.

Maya Identities

The term Maya is used to refer to the speakers of 31 languages of the Maya family,[1] which are found in southeastern Mexico, Guatemala, Belize, and parts of El Salvador and Honduras (Gabbert 2001a, b; Schackt 2001). There are 1.87 million speakers of the Maya family languages in Mexico (INEGI 2005c), and 4.4 million in Guatemala (INE 2002; Watanabe 2000),[2] the two countries with the largest number of Maya people. These people are considered the descendants of the ancient Maya civilization that flourished in the region in prehispanic times. A general assumption is that present day Maya-speaking people are a specific ethnic group with a shared ethnic consciousness, but as we will illustrate here there is considerable cultural heterogeneity, in part as a result of specific prehistoric and historic trajectories and the incorporation into different nation states. Moreover, the use of the term Maya is quite recent, both on the part of social scientists as well as modern 'Indians'. The first application of the term Maya to the remains of the ancient civilization (which were located in the region where Yucatec Maya is presently spoken) occurred in the middle of the 19th century, and only in the 1880s was it extended to the family of related languages and its modern speakers (Schackt 2001).

In the last decades, indigenous and non-indigenous cultural activists have been trying to promote a pan-Maya identity across the 22 languages present in Guatemala, grounded in an ethnic consciousness that traces its roots back to prehispanic times (Cojtí Cuxil 1991, 1994, 1996; Fischer and Brown 1996; Montejo 2002; Warren 1998; Watanabe 1995). In Chiapas, the Zapatista movement has fought against neoliberal corporate globalisation by promoting alternative forms of globalisation that have their roots in indigenous Maya culture. The worldwide media attention and the international support garnered by Subcomandante Marcos and the Zapatista Army of National Liberation (EZLN) have promoted the notion of a unified Maya indigenous movement, despite the fact that the Mayas in Chiapas self-identify within their language group or town (there are seven Maya languages in Chiapas) and not all of them support the Zapatistas (Collier and Quaratiello 2005; Gossen 1997; Rus et al. 2003).

In the Yucatán peninsula (Mexico), Yucatec Maya speakers generally do not consider themselves Maya or indigenous (Castañeda 2004; Hervik 1999, 2003; Sullivan 2000), and they do not identify with the demands for indigenous rights of the Zapatista movement. Originally the term Maya was taken from the native designation of the indigenous language of the Yucatán peninsula, *maya t'an*, also referred to as Yucatec Maya (Gabbert 2001a). Today there are 760,000 Yucatec Maya speakers (INEGI 2005c) in the Mexican states of Campeche, Yucatán, and Quintana Roo (ca. 6,000

thousand are also in Belize (Sullivan 2000)). Yucatec Maya, simply known as Maya, is the second most commonly spoken indigenous language in Mexico, after Nahuatl (INEGI 2005c) and the concentration of Maya speakers in the Yucatán peninsula (ca. 21%)[3] (INEGI 2005b) is much higher than the concentration of those who speak an indigenous language in the nation as whole (6.7%) (INEGI 2005a).

The Maya of Yucatán have a dramatically different history of conquest, colonization, and incorporation into a nation-state than their neighbours in Chiapas or Guatemala. In Postclassic and early colonial Yucatán, the term Maya referred only to the inhabitants of the provinces of Mayapán. Colonial period documents show that the term Maya was not used to refer to the native inhabitants of the Yucatán peninsula, nor did they identify with this term or as members of a common ethnic group (Gabbert 2001a; Restall 2004). Instead, during colonial times in Yucatán self-identification was mainly at the level of the municipal community (*kah*) or patronym group (*ch'ibal*), rather than at the broader level of ethnic group across municipalities (Gabbert 2001a, b; Restall 2001, 2004). The colonial regime was established on a social order characterized by legally defined social categories based on biological criteria and descent: Spaniards, Indians, and *castas* (people of mixed ancestry, such as *mestizos* of Spanish and Indian ancestry and *mulattos* of Spanish and African ancestry), each of which had specific right and duties. The boundaries between these social categories were quite flexible (Farriss 1992). In partial recognition of precolonial stratification the Indian social category was divided into commoners or *macehuales* (also *masewalo'b*), and the native noblemen *almeheno'b*. The term macehual became a common collective designator for many Maya speakers as a result of subordination through colonial times. By the late 17th century, the term Maya started being used in reference to people, and not only to the language and material things as in earlier colonial times. Nevertheless, a clear sense of overt ethnic identity across the Yucatec Maya speakers was not present even at the end of the colonial period in the beginning of the 19th century (Restall 2004).

Even the Caste War (1847–1901), classified by many as a 'race war' or an ethnic-racial confrontation, failed to develop an overt sense of ethnic identity across all Yucatec Maya speakers (Gabbert 2004; Restall 2004). Historical analyses have shown that the ethnic divisions on the two opposing sides were not as clear-cut as portrayed at the time. Rather the composition of the warring parties was heterogeneous (Dumond 1997; Gabbert 2004; Rugeley 1996). Intermarriage between people with Spanish names and Maya names was relatively common in the Caste War era among the lower classes, indicating that social distance was not as marked, especially in rural areas (Dummond 1997; Gabbert 2004). Moreover, the Maya language was the common language among the people considered 'Indians'

and 'vecinos' (those of mixed descent), who also shared many cultural simi-larities (Gabbert 2001b). According to Gabbert (2004), as a result of the Caste War a sense of ethnic identity emerged among the rebels and their descendants out of a heterogeneous group of Indians and vecinos in south-ern Yucatán and Quintana Roo, while a "socially and culturally homoge-nous Maya-speaking lower class" developed among the residents of the western and northern regions whose primary loyalty remained to the haci-enda or village, but an overt sense of ethnic identity across all Yucatec Maya speakers did not emerge.

Today no clear cut-terms exist to denote contemporary Yucatec Maya speakers (Castañeda 2004; Gabbert 2001b; Sullivan 2000). Moreover, terms used to define Yucatecan social categories are not always exclusive: they can imply some overlap. Labels differ depending on local and historical context, who is speaking, and what language is being spoken. The most commonly used term is 'mestizo', also used for self-ascription. While in the rest of Latin America mestizo refers to people of mixed Spanish and indig-enous ancestry, in areas of Yucatán such as Oxkuztcab (Hervik 2003), 'mestizo' is used by Mayas and outsiders to refer to people who speak Yucatec Maya and dress in folk costumes (although it is mainly women who wear the traditional hipils, while men wear western clothes). The term mestizo started being used during the Caste War, when pacified Indians began adopting this term to distinguish themselves from the unpacified rebels of the southeastern peninsula, who called themselves macehuales. In Quintana Roo the term macehual is still commonly used (instead of 'mes-tizo') to refer to the descendants of those people that fought as rebels dur-ing the Caste War. The term mayero, speaker of Yucatec Maya (but not necessarily dressed in folk costumes), is also used. Sometimes the term campesino (farmer) is employed; this underscores the significance of one's occupation to define identity. Identity is also often expressed at the village or town level, similarly to colonial times, or at the wider state level (Yucat-eco or Yucatecan). This brief summary only seeks to highlight the variety of terms used for self-ascription and outsider's designation, but it consider-ably simplifies the complex variations of terms used across the Yucatán peninsula, based on language, surnames (which reflect descent), occupa-tion, dress, and cultural practices. In fact, because of the constantly chang-ing historical and political contexts of social relations in the peninsula of Yucatán, terms and labels are always evolving. In this essay we will use the term Yucatec Maya to refer to Yucatec Maya speakers in the Yucatán pen-insula, who generally, but not necessarily, dress in folk costumes and tend to practice slash and burn (milpa) corn agriculture, though many nowa-days are involved in other activities, including tourism and other types of wage labour.

While we mentioned earlier that Yucatec Maya generally do not call themselves Maya, there are exceptions. For instance, in communities such as Yaxunah, in central Yucatán, which we discuss at greater length below, or Chacsinkín in southern Yucatán, people self-identify with the term Maya (as speakers of Yucatec Maya, but in many cases also because they farm in a traditional manner and practice certain rituals). According to Mijangos Noh (2001), the author of an ethnographic study at Chacsinkín, the presence of bilingual education in the school, a local radio that broadcasts mainly in Yucatec Maya, and Catholic and Protestant religious services held in Yucatec Maya have helped reinforce this sense of Maya identity. Moreover, the positive image of the ancient Maya praised by the tourism industry and the discourse of pan-Maya and indigenous rights have also favoured the adoption of the term Maya as a self-ascriptive term, especially among the middle and upper class across the Yucatán peninsula (Gutiérrez 2001). Terms such as 'Indian' and 'indigenous' are generally limited to governmental institutions such as the Comisión Nacional Para el Desarollo de los Pueblos Indígenas (CDI) (known as the Instituto Nacional Indigenista (INI) until 2003) and intellectual discourse, as people outside the cities rarely used these terms for self-ascription (Gabbert 2001b; Morales Valderrama 2004). Changes in governmental policies and the growth of the Zapatista movement, though, have to some extent contributed to the appropriation of the label 'indigenous' in strategic situations (e.g., for obtaining credit from CDI) (Gabbert 2001b).

The use of the term Maya to describe the makers of the precontact archaeological mounds found throughout southern Mexico dates to the mid and late nineteenth century writings of Western explorers (e.g., Stephens 1963 [1843]). Today the ancient civilization is unproblematically referred to as ''Maya'' by both foreign and Mexican scholars, as well as most of the Mexican population. The use of the term 'Maya', with its heavy historical connotation (i.e. referring to the prehispanic Mayas), to refer to people in contemporary settings can be misleading since it suggests that these contemporary Maya identify with the prehispanic ones (Hervik 1992). This has lent support to the assumption that the Maya are an indigenous community with a 'millenarian history', ''presupposing a continuum of the people since prehistory, resting on an unspecified quality of 'being Maya''' (Gabbert 2001b). Yucatec Maya people, however, generally do not consider themselves the descendants of the builders of ruins (Gabbert 2001b; Redfield and Villa Rojas 1934). They ''do not see themselves as survivors of a lost civilization, but rather as modern people in a modern nation.'' (Hervik 2003:108) As with identity labels, however, there are a variety of ways in which contemporary Yucatec Maya relate to the prehispanic past (e.g., Breglia 2006; Várguez Pasos 1999), as we will see below. Among intellectuals and cultural activists in urban and rural settings, a

stronger connection to the prehispanic culture is often cultivated (e.g., Hervik 2003, Gutíerrez 2001).

Tim Ingold's recent discussion of indigenous identities helps clarify the discrepancy between the view that the contemporary Maya are descendants of a lost civilization and the opinion of many contemporary Yucatec Maya themselves that they are not descendants of the ancient Maya. In his essay ''Ancestry, Generation, Substance, Memory, Land'', Ingold (2000:133) presents two approaches—genealogical and relational—to the five nouns in his title. The genealogical approach assumes ''that the generation of persons involves the transmission of biogenetic substance prior to their life in the world; that ancestral experience can be passed on as the stuff of cultural memory, enshrined in language and tradition; and that land is merely a surface to be occupied, serving to support its inhabitants rather than to bring them into being.'' By contrast, in the relational approach ''both cultural knowledge and bodily substance are seen to undergo continuous generation in the context of an ongoing engagement with the land and with the beings—human and non-human—that dwell therein.'' (Ingold 2000:133).

In many senses, the genealogical reckoning of an ancestral connection between the ancient and contemporary Maya is inaccurate. The basis of the genealogical model—direct biological link between ancestor and descendant—is difficult to maintain given colonial intermarriage between natives, Spaniards, and Africans, and more recently with Mexicans and other immigrants who came (or were sent) to Yucatán in the 19th and 20th centuries to fill labour demands brought about by a boom in the value of agave fiber, known as henequen. Yet the common contemporary Yucatec Maya self-perception as being distinct from the ancient Maya is not entirely accurate due to several unassailable continuities with the ancient Maya, not the least of which is language. The relational approach helps resolve this problem by locating the perpetuation of these continuities not in the blood or deep structures of the mind, but in the daily practices enacted and re-enacted in culturally meaningful landscapes. The promoters of tourism in the Maya area unfortunately espouse a genealogical model of identity, where one's identity is pre-given and determined by descent and genealogical connections. As we turn our attention to the construction of tourist landscapes, the negative consequences of this espousal will become clear. In a separate work, one of us (Hutson n.d.) has argued that a relational approach to identity does not disconnect contemporary Yucatec Maya from ancient Maya ruins, even when they do not immediately see those connections. On the contrary, a relational approach to contemporary Yucatec Maya identity includes contemporary Yucatec Maya people in the interpretive construction of the past and the shaping of archaeological tourism.

Archaeology and Tourism in Yucatán

The predominant form of tourism today in Mexico is large-scale, mass-based tourism centred along the beaches (Clancy 2001). Only 10% of the tourism in Mexico can be considered cultural and ethnic tourism (van den Berghe 1995). Cancún alone, located on the Caribbean coast of Quintana Roo, attracts three-fourths of all foreign visitors to the country (Clancy 1999). In 2004, Cancún attracted 3.4 million tourists. Mexico has become one of the most popular tourist destinations in the world and its tourism industry is currently the second largest employer, behind agriculture (Clancy 1999). The economic benefits of this 6–7 billion dollar/year industry have primarily gone to large-scale Mexican and foreign firms (Torres and Momsen 2005). On the other hand, of the three million jobs created though tourism, many are seasonal and low-paying (Clancy 2001) and local communities are often displaced by tourism development or excluded from many of its benefits (Long 1991).

The Mundo Maya Organization (OMM) is a regional organization (part of the World Tourism Organization), created in 1992, when the ministries of the five countries of Mexico, Guatemala, Belize, Honduras, and El Salvador signed an agreement to coordinate, support, and expand tourist, cultural, and environmental development of the Maya World. These countries joined forces in a historical act of cooperation and collaboration to develop regional integration projects of sustainable tourism. Despite the intentions to promote sustainable tourism, most native communities in the Yucatán peninsula are not directly reaping the benefits of the increased tourist influx to the region (Pi-Sunyer et al. 1999). While extensive seasonal and year-round migration for wage-labour on the part of Yucatec Maya from the interior villages of the Yucatán peninsula to the coast of Quintana Roo and Cancún has substantially altered economic and residence patterns (Brown 1999; Re Cruz 1996, 2003; Torres and Momsen 2005), Yucatec Maya on the coast have been inundated, sometimes displaced, by Mexican and international immigrants and tourists and their culture has been appropriated and re-elaborated to fit the needs of the tourism industry (Juárez 2002). Yucatec Maya people are invited to participate in the Mundo Maya project as low-wage labourers in the construction and service industries with few opportunities for upward mobility, while they are excluded from decision-making processes in the redrawing and marketing of a newly defined cultural landscape (Ardren 2004; Brown 1999; Frühsorge 2007; Machuca 1999; Pi-Sunyer et al. 1999; Torres and Momsen 2005).

Despite the fact that brochures of the Mundo Maya promise to offer visitors something for all tastes, the tracing of the Ruta Maya has often removed many places that are significant to modern Yucatec Maya people

from the tourist path, as Denise Brown (1999) has pointed out. Brown identifies two different and sometimes opposing criteria for what makes a place significant. For the Yucatec Maya in Chemax, things gain their significance relationally (see also Ingold 2000). As people do things on the land, their actions leave marks. Though unintelligible to outsiders, these marks will be recognized by people engaged in the same mode of life. As these people dwell in the same landscape, the marks subtly remind them of culturally sensible and sanctioned ways of being and may evoke memories and stories of events that took place on the land. These stories often encode culturally specific moral lessons (Basso 1996). Through recurrent usage of marked landscapes, Yucatec Maya ways of being encourage their own reproduction.

In contrast, in the Mundo Maya, places gain significance according to criteria that will attract consumers. The Mundo Maya landscape is shaped by state governments and private businesses, then packaged and marketed to attract tourists. In this process of constructing a commoditized cultural landscape to be sold to tourists, places of significance to contemporary Yucatec Maya communities are ignored, appropriated, or sometimes expropriated for tourism development (Pi-Sunyer et al. 1999). This means that some archaeological sites, some colonial towns, and significant ecological areas, including beaches, are the main attractions shown on maps, while less well preserved archaeological sites and many large towns that have had a prominent role in Yucatec Maya colonial and post-colonial history are ignored (Brown 1999). This is of course ironic insofar as the vision behind the Mundo Maya was not to threaten Maya culture, but to glorify it. Also, as Brown (1999) notes, this has negative consequences for Maya cultural survival. Brown asserts that by losing control over the ability to define which places are important, Yucatec Maya lose a fundamental resource for cultural survival. We feel, however, that this approach attributes too much power to the tourist map and overlooks the agency of the contemporary Maya. When a tourist map leaves out an important contemporary Yucatec Maya town like Chemax, tourist dollars do indeed go elsewhere and carry some Yucatec Maya laborers and service workers with them, but the town does not disappear. In fact, the ability for contemporary people to position themselves in ways that can have an effect on tourism has been forcefully demonstrated (Castañeda 1996; Medina 2003). We should remember that cultures are not organisms that either survive or die, but are the unstable outcomes of heterogeneous individuals acting strategically to invent new traditions and selectively forget old ones.

Medina's case study of tourism in San José Succotz, Belize, serves as an intriguing example of Maya people refashioning themselves in ways that allow them to take advantage of tourism, while at the same time strengthening their identity as Maya. In this town of about 1,400 people next to

the ruins of Xunantunich, old channels for perpetuating traditional Maya cosmological knowledge closed when the town's final *curandero* (shaman) died in 1996. Between 1991 and 2000, the number of people self-identifying as Maya dropped from 38% to 10% and the number of those speaking a Maya language also dropped. Noticing that local tour guides would be tipped more handsomely if they could situate aspects of the ruins in the context of ancient Maya cosmology, and that potters could sell more wares by incorporating ancient Maya icons, many people from Succotz educated themselves about Maya cosmology and iconography using books about the ancient Maya and interacting with foreign archaeologists at the ruins. People from Succotz are ambiguous about whether this new knowledge makes them authentically Maya, but access to this knowledge and the understanding of how valuable it is to tourists has caused many in town to re-evaluate their identity.

The Mundo Maya landscape not only includes already existing features, such as archaeological sites, colonial towns, and natural attractions such as waterfalls, rare bird habitats, and dramatic gorges, but also newly constructed places such as Cancún, which was planned and developed in the 1970s at the location of a small fishing village to attract tourists (Brown 1999; Pi-Sunyer et al. 1999; Torres and Momsen 2005). The tourism development of pristine environmental areas is equivalent to a new form of colonization, where local realities are appropriated, re-invented, commoditized, and then packaged for mass-consumption. The newly created landscapes of Cancún and the Riviera Maya, along the coast south of Cancún, often emphasize exotic aspects of the prehispanic Mayas and their heritage (Fedick 2003; Walker 2005). The construction of new resorts and tourist facilities has provided opportunities for the selective appropriation of past material culture by sensationalizing and exoticising the mysterious ancient Maya, as well as mixing and matching other cultural elements from the rest of Mexico (Ardren 2004).

What is the role of archaeological tourism within the context of Mundo Maya tourism? Archaeological sites play an essential part in the promotion of this region to local and worldwide tourists. In 2004, 3.6 million visitors (national and international) visited the 46 archaeological sites that are open to visitors in the three states of Campeche, Yucatán, and Quintana Roo (INEGI 2006). The most visited sites are Tulúm on the Caribbean coast of Quintana Roo and Chichén Itzá in the interior of Yucatán, which can be visited on day trips from Cancún and thus are now part of mass-based tourism; each site sees tens of thousands of visitors on peak days. Archaeological sites are not only marketed to foreign visitors but also to Mexican nationals. Archaeology and the restoration of archaeological remains in Mexico are intrinsically tied to creating educational or recreational attractions for visitors; often more emphasis is put on restoring and presenting

aesthetically pleasing archaeological remains than conducting scientific research at archaeological sites. Mexico has defined its nationhood in terms of *mestisaje*—the genetic and cultural blending of indigenous, African, and European peoples and their cultural traditions. Archaeological remains of prehispanic cultures have been used by the Mexican nation to create a sense of national identity—*mexicanidad*—whose roots can be traced back to ancient civilizations. With the notion that all citizens are the same under its constitution, the dominant Mexican culture has tried to assimilate all other subcultures—past and present. Archaeological monuments, as idealized and glorified symbols of the achievements of past civilizations, are incorporated in Mexico's rhetoric of a national essence and collective history, yet the contributions of the modern indigenous populations within Mexico are often de-emphasized or denied (e.g., Cojti Ren 2006; Kohl 1998; Patterson 1995; van den Berghe 1995).

This is clearly shown at Izamal (Yucatán), referred to as the city of the three cultures—prehispanic, colonial, and contemporary. At the Franciscan convent of St. Anthony, built in 1562 and one of the most important colonial buildings in the Yucatán peninsula, a show called ''The Lights of the Maya'' (*La Luz de los Mayas*) has been performed several nights a week[4] since 2005. After an introduction for ''meditation and contemplation,'' viewers are taken into a more distant past with the voice of a supposed prehispanic Maya man and woman, who with a ''reconciliatory tone towards their conquerors'' recount their lives in the Classic period (CULTUR 2006). Despite the fact that the convent was built with forced labor by conscripted Yucatec Maya who were directed by Franciscans friars to dismantle the precontact palaces and temples of the Maya city of Izamal, the Maya narrator in this show acknowledges, in a sign of ''respect to the place's owners,'' that it was the ''Franciscans brothers who taught us how to read and write and to worship the divine cross'' (CULTUR 2006). The narration simplifies the centuries of struggle between Maya people and Spaniards into a passive acceptance of a basic skill set and belief system on the part of the Maya. The show culminates with a crescendo of spectacular music and illumination on the architecture of the colonial convent while the Maya narrator's voice (ironically) states: ''This is us the Mayas'' and ''This is our light.'' In this portrayal of the Maya, sounds and lights are used to exoticize and increase the aura of mystery around a constructed identity. Even though prehispanic Maya speak about their lives, they are still portrayed as ahistorical passive agents who live in the 'Maya non-time' (see Fabian 1983) and willingly surrender to colonial domination in order to be incorporated in the process of national identity formation. Episodes of resistance from the Yucatecan colonial period and the Caste Wars are completely absent in this narrative.

In Mexico, archaeological remains are considered national patrimony—*Patrimonio de la Nación*—under the control of the National Institute of Anthropology and History (INAH), which coordinates discovery, investigation, conservation, and restoration of all archaeological remains at a national level. The designation of many archaeological sites in Mexico and in the Maya region as UNESCO World Heritage sites indicates that the global community recognizes and appropriates them as universal cultural resources (see Cleere 1996). The tourist map of archaeological sites, however, is not defined by such international or academic criteria, but rather by tourist guidebooks and tourist promoters (Ehrentraut 1996). In the tourism industry in Mexico, sites are ranked by their touristic appeal, which is linked to their accessibility and location, the state of preservation and degree of consolidation of the ruins, the number of archaeological investigations carried out, and the monumentality and artistic qualities of the remains within the site. The accessibility of Tulum, only 130 km south of Cancún, has been essential in transforming this archaeological site and its small contemporary community at Tulum Pueblo into the most visited site of the Yucatán peninsula, although it is only one of the numerous Postclassic sites along the Caribbean coast of Quintana Roo. Moreover, these tourist maps, partially as a result of the type of archaeological research conducted, which tend to focus on the investigation and consolidation of monumental architecture in the site centres, emphasize central buildings such as palaces, ballcourts, and pyramids, while leaving residential areas of common prehispanic Maya hidden under vegetation, making them invisible to visitors. Thus, the visual images and the knowledge of the prehispanic Maya experienced and acquired by tourists in the Mundo Maya is considerably shaped by the tourist industry but also by the type of archaeology carried out.

One aspect of marketing tourism in the Mundo Maya has been to stress the millenarian nature of Maya culture characterized by cultural continuity between contemporary Maya speakers and the prehispanic population. In academia, such claims of cultural continuity have been contested by constructivists, who argue that the defining elements of contemporary Maya identity result from historical contexts, such as colonialism, the Caste war, and henequen plantations. The lively exchange over cultural continuity has produced nuanced viewpoints that move beyond the constructivist/essentialist dichotomy, acknowledging both continuity and discontinuity (e.g., Castañeda 1996; Fischer 1999). The Mundo Maya, however, markets the Maya through unreconstructed essentialism, glossing over the discontinuities between contemporary and prehispanic Maya people. Today's Maya people live in modern nation states where they relate, generally from a marginalized position as a result of colonial domination, to other local and transnational social groups (van den Berghe 1995). Moreover, the popular

depiction of ''the living Maya as keepers of timeless cultural heritage'' fails to mention the historical and modern conditions of poverty and oppression that have contributed to the maintenance of traditions and conservative practices (Pyburn 1998:124). These notions of continuity draw on essentialized and exoticized interpretations of past and present Maya that fulfil Western fantasies instead of focusing on the complex processes of cultural and historical change that social groups undergo through time.

Notions of cultural continuity are deployed for less explicitly economic reasons by the leaders of the pan-Maya movement, spiritual leaders performing rituals at archaeological sites in Guatemala, as well as the many grass roots level projects that utilize continuity with the past to decolonise the present (e.g., Frühsorge 2007; Ivic de Monterroso 2004). Maya educators in Belize at the Tumul K'in school (Toledo District) for at risk youth utilize information from archaeological studies of precontact Maya agricultural practices to empower young people of Maya descent. In this case, as well as the better known pan-Maya movement, indigenous people reclaim the Maya identity for specific political purposes, often overlaying the identity of Maya onto other social identities such as Belizean, mestizo, or ladino. This use of Maya imagery or language is deliberate, conscious, and targeted—it allows for continuity of local knowledge to be embedded within a changing 21st century political agenda, and thus differs dramatically from the enforced essentialism of the passive people depicted in the Mundo Maya tourism.

We now turn to our first-hand experience dealing with issues of Maya identity and heritage claims in the context of archaeological tourism development within the Yucatán peninsula. These examples highlight how many diverse notions of tourism and their potential connections to heritage and patrimony exist within present Yucatec Maya communities of the peninsula.

Contested Heritage Claims at the Archaeological Site of Chunchucmil

Meanings of heritage and patrimony put forth by local inhabitants and foreign archaeologists contrasted and even came to clash at the contemporary villages around the archaeological site of Chunchucmil (Ardren and Magnoni 2002; Breglia 2006; Rodriguez 2006). The modern residents of these communities consist largely of Yucatec Maya speakers practicing agriculture, but whose economic base also includes a diverse set of employment options outside their villages. Residents of the local villages, identify themselves as *campesinos*, *mayeros*, or sometimes *mestizos*, but never as Maya or indigenous. The northern and western portion of the Yucatán state is

known as the 'henequen region', where large plantations (*haciendas*) of henequen in the hands of an oligarchy of European descent have dominated the socioeconomic landscape for the last two centuries. In the henequen region, population centres consisted of the plantations' workforce, which was mainly recruited locally but also from other parts of Mexico (such as the Yaquis from Sonora) and even distant regions such as China and Korea. Yucatec Maya and immigrant laborers were tied into a controlling and disciplinary system of debt-peonage. Following the Mexican revolution and the Land Reform of 1937, when lands were expropriated from the landowners and redistributed to the workers of the plantations, the communities of plantation laborers became the owners of communal land, known as *ejido*.

The Pakbeh Regional Economy Project under the direction of Bruce Dahlin, Traci Ardren, and Scott Hutson, with Aline Magnoni as Assistant Director, and with a US-based team of researchers has been conducting archaeological research at and around the site of Chunchucmil since 1993. A proposal for the development of community museums in the local villages surrounding the archaeological site and at the major ruins was put forth by the Pakbeh Project in order to provide economic alternatives for the local communities through the management of 'their' heritage and cultural resources (Ardren 2002). Chunchucmil was a major prehispanic site occupied from 600 B.C. to approximately A.D. 1100/1200, which grew to become one the most densely populated cities of the Maya lowlands. Even though the monumental architecture is not as impressive or elaborate as that of other Maya sites of comparable size, archaeological investigations at Chunchucmil have revealed that during its apogee from A.D. 400–600 the site functioned as a specialized trading centre for the surrounding region (Dahlin 2003; Dahlin and Ardren 2002). The large architectural groups still stand as unconsolidated rubble mounds and the site has no facilities for tourists. The site lies covered by vegetation, with only the larger mounds visible above the secondary growth. The non-visibility of the ruins, due to the absence of maintenance and funding, combined with the lack of advertising to local or international tourists, make Chunchucmil a rarely visited site not on the major tourist maps.[5] The members of the Pakbeh Project, though, believe that the archaeological site of Chunchucmil and the surrounding villages could be a significant location for the development of community museums that would illustrate aspects of prehispanic everyday life in domestic contexts (instead of highlighting the histories of rulers and showing the architecture of large pyramids) and of the henequen hacienda times in the context of eco-tourism and sustainable tourism, which are slowly growing in this region of northwest Yucatán.

Today the archaeological site, which extends for at least 20–25 km^2, lies mostly on the communal land of five communities. Among the residents

that live around the site of Chunchucmil remembering and social memory are tied to a relatively recent history of land conflicts during and after the henequen period and to a sociopolitical identity expressed through the labouring of the land rather than to the ruins inherited from the 'ancient Maya' (Breglia 2003, 2006). Rubble mounds and large pyramids form part of a distant mythological past or sometimes are considered as part of the natural landscape as in many other parts of the peninsula (Muñoz Cosme 1990; Redfield and Villa Rojas 1934). The presence of archaeologists, however, with whom many local people have worked to investigate these abandoned vestiges over the last few years, has encouraged the revalorisation or discovery of the cultural heritage embodied by the ruins in their lands. Moreover, site tours given by the archaeologists to the school children as well as to many women of the communities have exposed a large number of the villagers to the cultural and historical significance of the mounds present on their land.

In 2001, the Pakbeh Project proposed to Chunchucmil and Kochol, the two villages with whom collaboration was most sustained, to use private funds to develop community museums that would showcase the prehispanic and henequen-period history of the site and the surrounding region (Ardren 2002). With permission from the National Institute of Archaeology and History (INAH), community museums can be set up in Mexico to serve as a focus for local education and historic awareness, to generate income in local communities and more importantly to allow the management of local cultural resources (Cohen 2001; Erikson 1996). Almost all archaeological sites in Mexico, though, are under INAH control, which means that entrance fees remain with INAH. Though INAH often employs local for consolidation, preservation, and guarding of the site, there are few direct economic benefits for the surrounding communities. In 2003 for the first time in Mexico, local residents living around the archaeological site of Chacchoben, southern Quintana Roo, were able to broker an extraordinary deal after four years of negotiations with INAH to receive a percentage of the revenue collected from tourists as well as a 25–year concession (renewable for another 25 years) to participate in the administration of the local touristic services for the archaeological site (Santiesteban 2003).

This exceptional deal may open the doors for similar arrangements for the management of other archaeological sites in the Yucatán peninsula. The creation of community museums at archaeological sites, or within villages that are managed by local community members, can provide not only economic opportunities for these local communities but also grant control and management over local cultural resources. Our proposal envisioned the development of community museums that would have included the input and participation of local people, thus empowering local communities in the definition of their identity and heritage. Reactions

to our proposal ranged from excitement to outright opposition among locals.

At least two competing notions of heritage and patrimony were present. The archaeologists' emphasis on a prehispanic cultural heritage stood in contrast, and was often perceived to undermine, the "*patrimonio ejidal*" or the patrimony of the communally-held land of the local communities that live around Chunchucmil today (Breglia 2003, 2006). Many of the ejido holders were concerned that the archaeologists' continuous interest in their land could result in a loss of control over their land and dispossession of their hard-earned land rights. The delimitation of the central portion of the archaeological site for future tourists was threatening to many people in the village of Kochol because it would curtail the uses that the land could undergo (e.g., farming and hunting could no longer be carried out in the portion of the site open to visitors). The threat of land dispossession was so strongly felt that in 2002, Kochol ejido holders refused to give the archaeological project permission to conduct investigations on the portion of the site located on their land (Breglia 2006; Rodriguez 2006). Despite the fact that the area of the site that would be open to tourism lay on communal land rarely used by local inhabitants for planting or any other activities, the symbolic significance of the land obtained through historical struggles and its economic potential was of such paramount importance to local people that they feared engaging in alternative activities, such as tourism, whose benefits and risks were largely unknown. Land defines Kocholeños' identity first and foremost as campesinos; their livelihood depends on the land (cf., Hostettler 2001).

After months of clarifications and negotiations, permission for archaeological investigations was granted again and archaeological research on Kochol land has been conducted until 2006. Not everybody in Kochol, though, reacted negatively to our proposal. Through the ongoing collaboration, contestations, and negotiations over the years, archaeologists and local communities were exposed to and in some cases came to understand and respect their different experiential perspectives of the archaeological remains (Ardren 2002; Ardren and Magnoni 2002). In fact, many people in the local communities around the site, especially in Chunchucmil but also in Kochol strongly support our proposal for community museums. Women who do not work the fields as much as the men, and thus have a different attachment and perception towards land and its uses, have been strong supporters of this proposal. Certain politicians and the local school teachers, whose livelihoods do not depend on the land, are also in favor of some form of community museum. To date, no action has been taken on the proposals.[6]

In the case of Chunchucmil, an area with limited exposure to tourism and archaeology, local communities were not ready to take on the risks

and potentially unknown advantages of tourism for fear of losing land, the major means of sustenance and often the main constituent of one's identity. Local people, instead, chose to maintain their established engagement with the land they had been dwelling in. In the Chunchucmil region, people's identity and heritage claims are mainly tied to a recent past of land labouring and property land struggles and not with a prehispanic Maya past.

Exploitation of Heritage Claims at Yaxunah

The term 'Maya' is used in a very different manner in and around the centre of the Yucatán peninsula, where massive numbers of visitors have travelled to the archaeological zone of Chichén Itzá since before the turn of the 20th century. In this region *milpa* agriculture, which has been the main activity for centuries, is in the process of being increasingly replaced by crafting souvenirs for tourists and wage labor in the restaurants, hotels, and shops that serve the modern tourism industry. Even on the periphery of this zone, a century of tourism has engendered a relatively active use of the term 'Maya' and its resultant heritage claims by subsistence farmers who view tourism as an inevitable force in their lives.

Although well occupied during the prehispanic period, the modern village of Yaxunah, located only 25 km south of Chichén Itzá, is believed to date to the *reducciones* (or forced resettlements) of the 16th and 17th centuries in Yucatán (Bascopé 2005). The village is laid out along the Spanish township pattern, and the Catholic church on the main square bears the date of 1817. Such re-settled villages were usually small agricultural settlements, and Yaxunah remains populated today by primarily subsistence level agriculturalists, though a large number of Yaxuneros today supplement their income by participating in the tourism economy. The relative isolation of such villages in the centre of the peninsula stands in contrast to the Maya settlements that originated around the henequen haciendas of the Western part of the state. Census documents from 1821 show that Yaxunah was almost twice its current size prior to the Caste War, when there were 1121 inhabitants (Rodríguez Losa 1985:96).

From 1986–1997, the Selz Foundation Yaxuna Archaeological project under the direction of David Friedel, Traci Ardren, and Charles Suhler conducted archaeological research at the ancient centre of Yaxuna, located one kilometre east of the modern village of Yaxunah. At the end of this 11-year period, which also included ethnographic work in modern Yaxunah, a proposal for development of community-based tourism was jointly crafted between US based academic researchers and the local leadership of the village. In contrast to Chunchucmil, the Yaxunah population used the

term 'Maya' for self-identification and made heritage claims to their prehispanic past routinely, due in part to the their familiarity with the tourism industry located around Chichén Itzá. The population in Yaxunah also maintained a relationship with the archaeological site based upon the presence of a local *h'men*, or traditional Maya shaman/healer. This individual, who lived in the village and also practiced milpa, was responsible for maintenance of the relationship between the village and the ancients (*antepasados*) who live inside the mounds. He travelled frequently to the mounds to communicate with the ancients, advised the community on activities to take place on the archaeological site, and performed ceremonies when a new area was opened for cultivation.

Yaxuna was a major archaeological site occupied during the Classic period. Excavation of monumental architecture provides some consolidated structures left open for visitors, but Yaxunah village has had until recently no facilities for tourists, and there are no ticket gates, tour guides, or even guardians employed in association with the archaeological site. All of these services are provided by members of the village on a volunteer basis. When the archaeological project ended, ten families from the village who had been deeply involved in the archaeological research formed a cooperative to transform the camp built by the foreign archaeologists into a profit making eco-tourism lodge. While the idea was discussed with the archaeologists, they had no role in its execution—the land and buildings of the camp belonged to the ejido of Yaxunah, and a Mexican non-profit foundation provided materials to renovate the camp and ready it for business.

From the outset, the Campamento Yaxunah was marketed to youth groups, backpackers, birders, and other non-traditional tourists as a place to experience 'Maya culture'. Ten years into this venture, in addition to tours of the archaeological site, the three families still involved offer tours of a traditional Maya household in the village constructed explicitly for tourists, instruction in the Yucatec Maya language and 'traditional' Maya organic gardening and bee-keeping, and other activities based on the resources of the local environment. The leaders of this eco-lodge utilize the term Maya to describe themselves, and they claim their ancestors built the mounds adjacent to the village. While they also consider themselves mestizos and Yucatecos, as is common throughout the peninsula, they explain to visitors that the language spoken by the majority of the village today is very similar to the language spoken by the Classic period Maya, and that the native bee-keeping and corn milpas of the camp utilize knowledge inherited from the precontact Maya.

These explicit claims of Maya identity have at least two roots. The influence of both the archaeological project and then the subsequent Mexican non-profit foundation can be seen in the depth of knowledge Yaxuneros have about such things as Maya hieroglyphics, archaeology, and modern

organic gardening. While some of this knowledge pre-dated the involvement of these two institutions in the village, much of it has been reclaimed by the people of Yaxunah as the result of increased access to such information via contact with the institutions. Secondly, three generations of Yaxuneros have grown up in the shadow of Chichén Itzá—some of the oldest members of the village once worked for the Carnegie archaeologists who lived at Chichén in the 1930s, and younger members of the village have all travelled to Pisté, the village adjacent to Chichén Itzá, for commercial exchanges. Some of the families of Yaxunah have younger members who work in Pisté in hotels or restaurants, and many Yaxuneros make wooden carvings and textiles to sell in Pisté. Occasionally, they earn money by giving tourists the opportunity to be photographed with a 'real Maya'. Their familiarity with the cultural context of Pisté—its Maya dances at tourist hotels, Maya food at tourist restaurants, and even its strict social segregation of tourists from service workers—has engendered a sophisticated understanding of the usefulness of the 'Maya' label, what might even be called the branding of the Maya, for economic gain. In this context, being Maya brings with it the ability to access a seemingly endless cash-based economy. Being Maya also entails a great deal of performance and subjugation, but the capriciousness of the tourism market works to the advantage of local Maya people, who invent new ways to market their heritage claims. In the case of Yaxunah, Maya people have not only deliberately created a tourism experience where previously one did not exist, but they have also affected the nature of tourism by introducing the concept of the eco-lodge to the centre of the peninsula, an area with a long history of foreign visitation. Rather than demonstrating an unbroken continuity of the traditional, as the Mundo Maya marketing suggests, this example shows a creative resistance to poverty by deployment of Maya heritage within the shifting economic reality of rural Mexico.

Conclusion

Tourism has become a major source of revenue across the Mundo Maya and the cultural heritage of Mayas—ancient and living ones alike—has been commoditized and showcased as a major attraction to lure national and international tourists. The promotion of ethnic tourism, ecotourism, and cultural tourism of the Mundo Maya has created a surge of interest in the 'mysterious' ancient Maya, the 'colourful' living Maya, and the variety of exotic tropical environments in which they lived and continue to live. This increased interest has resulted in superficial and often grossly essentialized depictions of Mayaness. Moreover, self-identification and ascriptive terms do not always coincide. Here we have tried to present more nuanced

and heterogeneous visions of dynamically and historically constructed contemporaneous Maya identities and their complex relations with the prehispanic past based on a relational approach to identity formation (instead of genealogical one). Ingold's (2000) relational approach, by situating the perpetuation of indisputable cultural continuities that link ancient and contemporary Maya in the daily practices re-enacted in culturally meaningful landscapes and not in a genealogical ancestral connection, helps reconcile the marked contrast between these continuities and the common view held by many contemporary Maya that they are separate from the ancient ones.

While we argue that Maya identities are continually invented and reinvented by nation-states, government institutions, tourism promoters, visitors, and the Maya themselves, we do not deny the existence of these identities. All identities are real in the sense that they are felt as such by different social agents (Castañeda 1996; Schackt 2001). The multiple terms used to capture these identities do not have stable meanings, instead they are constantly shifting like the identities they refer to (Castañeda 2004). Through interaction and dialogue among all participants, these identities are constantly constructed, negotiated, and re-invented.

Historical research has shown that throughout Yucatán the term 'Maya' was not used as a marker of identity and ethnicity until very recently. A common experience of colonialism and subjugation led the indigenous population to maintain and privilege identities based on village or lineal descent. The rise of tourism, however, as well as political movements such as language revitalization, the Zapatistas, and the pan-Mayan movement (only briefly mentioned in this article), have led to a wide variety of uses and experiences of 'being Maya' as well as encouraged the emergence of a transnational Maya consciousness, mainly among intellectuals, teachers, and activists. Exposure to tourism has in some cases favoured the re-appropriation and revalorisation of cultural identities associated with 'being Maya'—past and present—as it was illustrated here in the cases of Yaxunah, Yucatán, and San José Succotz, Belize. Exposure to archaeology has also affected the relations that local communities have with their prehispanic past, as we have illustrated in the examples of Chunchucmil and Yaxunah (see Breglia 2006; cf. Herzfeld 1991). These examples illustrate varied outcomes. Whereas archaeology at Yaxunah contributed to some locals' expression of their identity as descendants of the ancient Maya, archaeology at Chunchucmil has led some campesinos to reaffirm their identity as modern farmers as opposed to descendants of the ancient Maya.

What we have tried to suggest here is that, when using the term 'Maya,' we need to be aware of the multifarious identities and representations—past and present—it incorporates. We cannot assume that the label Maya refers to a homogenous identity through time and space, rather we

have to acknowledge the historically and dynamically constructed variations in time and space. As archaeologists, anthropologists, tourism promoters, cultural activists, or just as people with an interest in 'Maya culture,' we need to be conscious of not creating and perpetuating exoticized and essentialized (mis)representations of past and present Maya people. Moreover, since archaeologists are positioned to address externally imposed stereotypes and misrepresentations of past and present cultures of the Mundo Maya, they can help in the definition and diffusion of more nuanced understandings of past and present cultural landscapes. Effectively educating tourists and the wider public about the rich and varied heritage of the region not only enhances the tourism experience, it also encourages engagement in behaviours that respect local cultures and promote sustainability at the archaeological and heritage sites (Moscardo 1996; Walker 2005).

Archaeologists can make contributions of even greater importance based on their connections with local communities and their experience in navigating among other stakeholders. Not only do many archaeologists work alongside locals and live in local communities, they work at the pleasure of the locals, as was made clear to us in our months-long negotiations with Kocholeños to re-initiate fieldwork on their land. These close relations with local communities, combined with knowledge of fundraising and experience in navigating government agencies, can make archaeologists effective advocates for local communities in situations where these communities are poised to benefit from tourism. With the help of applied anthropologists, archaeologists can be successful mediators among multiple stakeholders at the community level (the different components of these communities), as well as from outside the community (private tourism promoters, government agencies for tourism promotion, the Institute of National Anthropology and History among others) (Borgstede 2006; Magnoni and Cardona 2005).

Local identities and histories are continuously reconceived in response to current conditions and needs, including tourism demands. This is illustrated very well by a question once asked by Mitaliano Zulub, a Yucatec Maya man from Kochol, while he was working with us at the site of Chunchucmil: ''What is the difference between a *gringo* and a tourist?'' We close our essay with Mitaliano's question because we believe it articulately underscores the fact that the varied ingredients—archaeological imagination, local labourers, government officials—which must come together felicitously to produce tourism have done so unevenly across the peninsula. Those living in villages in the shadow of Chichén Itzá, such as Yaxunah and Pisté, are heavily involved in tourism. People from Kochol, whose ruins are not featured in tourbooks, are not involved in tourism, and often do not know what a tourist is. This heterogeneity in the homogeneously-titled

''Mundo Maya'' parallels nicely the diverse meanings of the word ''Maya'' and the diversity of identities continually taking shape in the Maya World.

Acknowledgements

Notes

1. We are aware that linguistic classification does not equate with ethnic identity. Language groups are social and cultural categories, whose individual members share one or more cultural traits. There is no direct correlation between shared cultural traits such as language and ethnicity or ethnic consciousness (Barth 1969; Gabbert 2001b). Thus, when we refer to Yucatec Maya we are referring to a social category of people that share some cultural traits, like language and sometimes other traits like folk costumes and milpa agriculture, but who do not necessarily identify as an ethnic group.
2. Mexican census count of indigenous speakers only include people over 5 years of age, thus the figure of Maya languages speakers is larger. The Guatemalan census count includes people of all ages.
3. This percentage should be higher since the count of Yucatec Maya speakers per state only includes people over the age of 5, while the total population for each state includes people of all ages.
4. Similar shows called *Luz y Sonido* (Light and Sound) are also performed at the mayor archaeological sites of Chichén Itzá and Uxmal. The show at Izamal is the only one in the state of Yucatán carried out in a colonial building and a recent addition to the previously existing two shows.
5. Since archaeological research at Chunchucmil has been only carried out in recent times, the site does not show up on most maps in academic archaeological publications despite its importance in prehistoric times, and it appears even less on tourist maps. It does, however, appear in the Lonely Planet guidebook.
6. Because of the original rejection of our proposal on the part of the communities, private funds for community museums were never allocated by private donors. The lack of a cultural or applied anthropologist to deal extensively with community negotiations was a major setback for the development of these proposals. As archaeologists with an archaeological agenda of fieldwork to carry out, Pakbeh Project members, despite the best intentions, had limited time and experience to dedicate to community development issues.

References Cited

Ardren, T.
  2002. Conversations about the Production of Knowledge and Community Museums at Chunchucmil and Kochol, Yucatán, México. *World Archaeology* 34(2):379–400.

  2004. Where Are the Maya in Ancient Maya Archaeological Tourism? Advertising and the Appropriation of Culture. In *Marketing Heritage. Archaeology and the Consumption of the Past*, edited by Y. Rowan and U. Baram, pp. 103–113. AltaMira Press, Walnut Creek.

Ardren, T., and A. Magnoni
  2002. Sharing Knowledge at the Archaeological site of Chunchucmil, Yucatán, Mexico. Paper presented at the conference ''Towards a More Ethical Mayanist Archaeology,'' University of British Columbia, Vancouver, Canada, November 2002.

Barth, F. (editor)
  1969. Introduction. In *Ethnic Groups and Boundaries. The Social Organization of Culture Difference*, pp. 9–38. Little, Brown, Boston.

Bascopé, G.L.
  2005. *The Household Ecology of Disease Transmission: Childhood Illness in a Yucatán Maya Community*. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Department of Anthropology, Southern Methodist University, Dallas.

Basso, K.H.
  1996. Wisdom Sits in Places: Notes on a Western Apache Landscape. In *Senses of Place*, edited by K.H. Basso and S. Feld, pp. 53–90. SAR Press, Santa Fe.

Borgstede, G.
  2006. Tourism, Descendant Communities, and Sacred Sites in Highland Guatemala. Paper Presented at the American Anthropological Association annual meetings in San José, CA, 15–19 November 2006.

Breglia, L.C.
  2003. *Docile Descendants and Illegitimate Heirs: Privatization of Cultural Patrimony in Mexico*. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Rice University, Houston.

  2006. *Monumental Ambivalence. The Politics of Heritage*. University of Texas Press, Austin.

Brown, D.F.
  1999. Mayas and Tourists in the Maya World. *Human Organization* 58:295–304.

Castañeda, Q.E.
  1996. *In the Museum of Maya Culture, Touring Chichen Itza*. University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis.

2004. We Are Not Indigenous! An Introduction to the Maya Identity of Yucatán. *The Journal of Latin American Anthropology* 9(1):36–63.

Clancy, M.J.
1999. Tourism and Development. Evidence from Mexico. *Annals of Tourism Research* 26(1):1–20.

2001. Mexican Tourism: Export Growth and Structural Change since 1970. *Latin American Research Review* 36(1):128–150.

Cleere, H.
1996. The Concept of 'Outstanding Universal Value' in the World Heritage Convention. *Conservation and Management of Archaeological Sites* 1:227–233.

Cohen, J.H.
2001. The Shan-Dany Museum: Community, Economics, and Cultural Traditions in a Rural Mexican Village. *Human Organization* 60(3):272–280.

Cojtí Cuxil, D.
1991. *La Configuración del Pensamiento Político del Pueblo Maya*. Cholsamaj/Spem, Guatemala.

1994. Politicas para la Revindicación de los Mayas de Hoy. Fundamentos de los Derechos Específicos del Pueblo Maya. Cholsamaj/Spem Guatemala.

1996. The Politics of Maya Revindication. In *Maya Cultural Activism in Guatemala*, edited by F.F. Edward and F.B. Denise, pp. 19–50. Cholsamaj/Spem, Guatemala.

Cojti Ren, A.
2006. Maya Archaeology and the Political and Cultural Identity of Contemporary Maya in Guatemala. *Archaeologies* 2(1):8–19.

Collier, G.A., and E.L. Quaratiello
2005. *Basta! Land and Zapatista Rebellion in Chiapas*. Food First Books, Oakland.

CULTUR, (Patronato de las Unidades de Servicios Culturales y Turísticos del Estado de Yucatán)
2006. *Izamal. Luz y Sonido*. Electronic document, http://www.culturservicios.com/esp.html, accessed on 10/15/06.

Dahlin, B.
2003. Chunchucmil: A Complex Economy in NW Yucatan. *Mexicon* 25:129–138.

Dahlin, B., and T. Ardren
2002. Modes of Exchange and their Effects on Regional and Urban Patterns at Chunchucmil, Yucatan, Mexico. In *Ancient Maya Political Economies*, edited by M.A. Masson and D.A. Freidel, pp. 249–284. Altamira Press, Walnut Creek.

Dumond, D.E.

1997. *The Machete and the Cross. Campesino Rebellion in Yucatán.* University of Nebraska Press, Lincoln and London.

Ehrentraut, A.W.

1996. Maya Ruins, Cultural Tourism, and the Contested Symbolism of Collective Identities. *Culture* 16(1):15–32.

Erikson, P.P.

1996. So My Children Can Stay in the Pueblo: Indigenous Community Museum and Self-determination in Oaxaca, Mexico. *Museum Anthropology* 20(1):37–46.

Fabian, J.

1983. *Time and the Other. How Anthropology Makes its Object.* Columbia University Press, New York.

Farriss, N.M.

1992. *Maya Society Under Colonial Rule: The Collective Enterprise of Survival.* Princeton University Press, Princeton.

Fedick, S.

2003. In Search of the Maya Forest. In *In Search of the Rain Forest*, edited by C. Slater, pp. 133–164. Duke University Press, Durham and London.

Fischer, E.

1999. Cultural Logic and Maya Identity: Rethinking Constructivism and Essentialism. *Current Anthropology* 40:473–499.

Fischer, E.F., and R. McKenna Brown

1996. *Maya Cultural Activism in Guatemala.* University of Texas Press, Austin.

Frühsorge, L.

2007. Archaeological Heritage in Guatemala: Indigenous Perspectives on the Ruins of Iximche. *Archaeologies* 3(1):39–58.

Gabbert, W.

2001a. On the Term Maya. In *Maya Survivalism.* edited by U. Hostettler and M. Restall, Vol. 12, pp. 25–34. Acta Mesoamerica, Verlag Anton Saurwien, Markt Schwaben.

2001b. Social Categories, Ethnicity and the State in Yucatán, Mexico. *Journal of Latin American Studies* 33:459–484.

2004. Of Friends and Foes. The Caste War and Ethnicity in Yucatan. *The Journal of Latin American Anthropology* 9(1):90–118.

Garrett, W.

1989. La Ruta Maya. *National Geographic* 176(4):424–479.

Gossen, G.H.

1997. Los Zapatistas Mayas Se Dirigen Hacia Su Futuro Antiguo. *Yaxkin* 16(1–2):72–86.

Gutíerrez, N.

    2001. Pasado e Identidad Histórica de los Mayas Contemporáneos. In *Maya Survivalism*. edited by U. Hostettler and M. Restall, Vol. 12, pp. 311–319. Acta Mesoamericana, Verlag Anton Saurwien, Markt Schwaben.

Hervik, P.

    1992. Mayan Culture: Beyond Boundaries. *Ethnos* 57:183–199.

    1999. The Mysterious Maya of National Geographic. *Journal of Latin American Anthropology* 4:166–197.

    2003. *Mayan People Within and Beyond Boundaries: Social Categories and Lived Identities in Yucatán*. Routledge, New York.

Herzfeld, M.

    1991. *A Place in History. Social and Monumental Time in a Cretan Town*. Princeton University Press, Princeton.

Hostettler, U.

    2001. Milpa, Land, and Identity: A Central Quintana Roo Mayan Comunity in a Historical Perspective. In *Maya Survivalism*, edited by U. Hostettler and M. Restall, Vol. 12, pp. 239–262. Acta Mesoamericana. Verlag Anton Saurwien, Markt Schwaben.

Hutson, S.R.

    n.d *Being Maya: A Relational Approach to Identity in Yucatan, Mexico*. Manuscript in Possession of the Author.

INE, (Instituto Nacional de Estadística)

    2002: *XI de Población y VI de Habitación*. Electronic document, http://www.ine.gob.gt/content/consul_2/pob/censo2002.pdf, accessed 10/15/06.

INEGI, (Instituto Nacional de Estadística, Geografia e Informática)

    2005a. Seleccionados Sobre la Población Hablante de Lengua Indígena, 1950 a 2005. In *INEGI. Conteo de Población y Vivienda, 2005*. Electronic document, http://www.inegi.gob.mx/est/contenidos/espanol/rutinas/ept.asp?t=mlen01&c=3325, accessed on 10/15/06.

    2005b. *Conteo de Población y Vivienda, 2005*. Electronic document, http://www.inegi.gob.mx/est/default.asp?c=697, accessed on 10/15/06.

    2005c. Población Hablante de Lengua Indígena de 5 y Más Años por Principales Lenguas, 1970 a 2005. In *INEGI. Conteo de Población y Vivienda, 2005*. Electronic document, http://www.inegi.gob.mx/est/contenidos/espanol/rutinas/ept.asp?t=mlen10&c=3337, accessed on 10/15/06.

    2006. *Zonas Arqueológicas y Visitantes por Zona Arqueológica, Por Entidad Federativa, 2003 y 2004*. Electronic document, http://www.inegi.gob.mx/est/contenidos/espanol/rutinas/ept.asp?t=mcul06&c=3133, accessed on 10/15/06.

Ingold, T.
  2000. *The Perception of the Environment: Essays on Livelihood, Dwelling and Skill.*
    Routledge, London.

Ivic de Monterroso, M.
  2004. The Sacred Place in the Development of Archaeology in Guatemala: An
    Analysis. In *Continuity and Change in Mayan Archaeology: Perspectives at
    the Millenium*, edited by G. Borgstede and C.W. Golden, pp. 295–307.
    Routledge, New York.

Juárez, A.M.
  2002. Ongoing Struggles: Mayas and Immigrants in Tourist Era Tulum. *The
    Journal of Latin American Anthropology* 7(1):34–67.

Kohl, P.L.
  1998. Nationalism and Archaeology: On the Constructions of Nations and the
    Reconstructions of the Remote Past. *Annual Review of Anthropology*
    27:223–246.

Long, V.H.
  1991. Government-Industry-Community Interaction in Tourism Development in
    Mexico. In *The Tourism Industry: An International Analysis*, edited by
    T.M. Sinclair and M.J. Stabler, pp. 205–222. LAB International, Oxford.

Machuca, J.A.
  1999. Mundo Maya: El Proyecto de una Nueva Regionalización en el Contexto
    de la Globalización. In *Dimensión Social del Patrimonio Cultural del Mun-
    do Maya*. Norma Peñaflores Ramirez, Laura Castañeda Cerecero and
    Emma Marmolejo Morales, pp. 21–25. Instituto Nacional de Antropología
    e Historia, Mexico, DF.

Magnoni, A., and K. Cardona
  2005. Sacred, Urban and Agricultural Places: Diverse Archaeological Site Man-
    agement Strategies in the Mundo Maya. Paper Presented at the Society
    for Applied Anthropology Meetings, Santa Fe, April 6th 2005.

Medina, L.K.
  2003. Commoditizing Culture. Tourism and Maya Identity. *Annals of Tourism
    Research* 30(2):353–368.

Mijangos Noh, J.C.
  2001. Los Múltiples Rostros de un Pueblo: Un Estudio Sobre la Identidad Étnica
    Maya y Sus Vínculos con Otras Identidades. *RMC* 12:111–145.

Montejo, V.
  2002. The Multipilicity of Mayan Voices. Maya Leadership and the Politics of
    Self-Representation. In *Indigenous Movements, Self-Representation, and the
    State in Latin America*, edited by K.B. Warren and J.E. Jackson, pp. 123–
    148. University of Texas Press, Austin.

Morales Valderrama, C.
  2004. Identidad y Modernización en los Chenes, Campeche, Mexico. *Perspectivas Latinoamericanas* 1:123–143.

Moscardo, G.
  1996. Mindful Visitors: Heritage and Tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research* 23(2):376–397.

Muñoz, C.A.
  1990. Laberintos, Pirámides y Palacios: Las Fases Arquitectónicas de la Ciudad de Oxkintok. In *Oxkintok 3*, edited by M. Rivera Dorado, pp. 99–111. Misión Arqueológica de España en México, Madrid.

Patterson, T.C.
  1995. Archaeology, History, Indigenismo, and the State in Peru and Mexico. In *Making Alternatives Histories: The Practice of Archaeology and History in Non-Western Settings*, edited by P.R. Schmidt and T.C. Patterson, pp. 69–85. School of American Research, Santa Fe.

Pi-Sunyer, O., R. BrookeThomas, and M. Daltabuit
  1999.*Tourism and Maya Society in Quintana Roo, Mexico*. Occasional Papers No.17. Center for Latin American and Caribbean Studies, University of Connecticut, Storrs, CT.

Pyburn, A.
  1998. Consuming the Maya. *Dialectical Anthropology* 23:111–129.

Re Cruz, A.
  1996. The Thousand and One Faces of Cancun. *Urban Anthropology* 25:283–310.

  2003. Milpa as an Ideological Weapon: Tourism and Maya Migration to Cancún. *Ethnohistory* 50(3):489–501.

Redfield, R., and V.R. Alfonso
  1934. *Chan Kom, A Maya village*. Carnegie Institution of Washington, Washington, DC.

Restall, M.
  2001. The Janus Face of Maya Identity in Post-Conquest Yucatán. In *Maya Survivalism*, edited by U. Hostettler and M. Restall, Vol. 12, pp. 15–23. Acta Mesoamericana. Verlag Anton Saurwien, Markt Schwaben.

  2004. Maya Ethnogenesis. *The Journal of Latin American Anthropology* 9(1): 64–89.

Rodríguez Losa, S.
  1985. *Geografía Política de Yucatán: Censo Inédito de 1821 TI*. Universidad Autónoma de Yucatán, Merida, Mexico.

Rodriguez, T.
    2006. Conjunctures in the Making of an Ancient Maya Archaeological Site. In
        *Ethnographies of Archaeological Practice. Cultural Encounters, Material
        Transformations*, edited by M. Edgeworth, pp. 161–172. AltaMira Press,
        Lanham.

Rugeley, T.
    1996. *Yucatan's Maya Peasantry and the Origins of the Caste War*. University of
        Texas Press, Austin.

Rus, J., R. Aída Hernández Castillo, and S.L. Mattiace
    2003. *Mayan Lives, Mayan Utopias*. Rowman and Littlefield Publishers, Inc.,
        Lanham.

Santiesteban, J.
    2003. Exigen Cuentas Claras en Chacchoben. *Por Esto! de Quintana Roo*, 28 July
        2003.

Schackt, J.
    2001. The Emerging Maya: A Case of Ethnogenesis. In *Maya Survivalism*, edited
        by U. Hostettler and M. Restall, Vol. 12, pp. 3–14. Acta Mesoamericana.
        Verlag Anton Saurwien, Markt Schwaben.

Stephens, J.L.
    1963 [1843]. *Incidents of Travel in Yucatan*. Dover Publications, New York.

Sullivan, P.
    2000. The Yucatec Maya. In *Ethnology*, edited by J.D. Monaghan, Vol. 6,
        pp. 207–223. Supplement to the Handbook of Middle American Indians.

Torres, R.M., and D.M. Janet
    2005. Gringolandia: The Construction of a New Tourist Space in Mexico.
        Annals of the Association of American Geographers 95(2):314–335.

van den Berghe, P.L.
    1995. Marketing Mayas: Ethnic Tourism Promotion in Mexico. *Annals of Tour-
        ism Research* 22:568–588.

Várguez Pasos, L.A.
    1999. Identidad, Henequen, y Trabajo: Los Desfibradores de Yucatán. Colegio de
        México, México.

Walker, C.
    2005. Archaeological Tourism: Looking for Answers along Mexico's Maya Rivi-
        era. *National Association for the Practice of Anthropology Bulletin* 23:60–76.

Warren, K.
    1998. *Indigenous Movements and Their Critics. Pan-Maya Activism in Guatemala*.
        Princeton University Press, Princeton.

Watanabe, J.M.

> 1995. Unimagining the Maya: Anthropologist, Others, and the Inescapable Hubris of Authorship. *Bulletin of Latin American Research* 14(1):25–45.

> 2000. Maya and Anthropologists in the Highlands of Guatemala since the 1960's. In *Ethnology*, edited by J.D. Monaghan, Vol. 6, pp. 224–247. Supplement to the Handbook of Middle American Indians.