

“Our pale-eyed guests”

Notes on a Westerner Diaspora and its Hosts

Ingemar Grandin *

Department of Ethnic Studies

Linköpings universitet

Workshop 6

Diaspora, Migration and Transnationalism

* E-mail: ingemar.grandin@ituf.liu.se

No civilization can survive without mobility: all are enriched by ... the stimulating impact of strangers.

Fernand Braudel, *A History of Civilizations* (1993), p. 10

Chup! Hamra kuire paunaharu sutchan. (Be quiet! Our pale-eyed guests are sleeping)

Proprietor of a Namche Bazaar (Khumbu, Nepal) hotel asking a group of porters, guides and hotel personnel to drink their late-evening after-work tea more quietly and not to disturb the sleeping trekkers

Moreover, I have asked for a broom, and it came with a sweeper attached, but when she had whisked about in the room so that my lungs were totally choked up I took the broom from her. She was sour, this was her work, I refused her the right to earn her living. I gave her the money to get rid of her.

Swedish writer Göran Tunström on living in a flat in Pulchowk, Kathmandu Valley, in *Indien – en vinterresa* (India – a winter journey), 1984, p. 105 ¹

MANY NON-WESTERN CITIES are temporary homes to people who come out from the West. To give some cases of such people from recent Swedish research, Andersson Cederholm (1999) has attended to backpackers, Baaz (2002) to development workers, and Hannerz (1996, 2002) to foreign correspondents. These backpackers, development workers and foreign correspondents, along with their researchers, can be seen as but varieties of one and the same thing. Moreover, this “thing” – Westerners dwelling in non-Western localities – includes also regular tourists, travel writers, field-workers from various academic disciplines, teachers, missionaries, students, professionals, diplomats, businessmen, and still more. For reasons developed below, I will refer to this “same thing” as a visitor diaspora.

In his study of foreign correspondents, Hannerz retains the emphasis from his earlier work on cosmopolitans and locals in world culture (1990): the highly mobile, transnationally oriented cosmopolitans make up the figure focused upon, the locals make up the ground. Andersson Cederholm and Baaz share this emphasis. In this paper, I will initially do the same, and relate the case of these Westerners to the notions of diaspora and visitors. I will discuss the historical roots and present-day role of this diaspora – first in general, then more specifically in the context of one particular non-Western site where the visitor diaspora is found: the Kathmandu Valley in Nepal.

But then the perspective will be shifted. As Olsson and Grandin (1999) have argued, the recent emphasis upon travel, movement, migration can paradoxically mean that what long has been taken for granted as the normal unit for research – sedentary communities whose geographical, social and cultural boundaries

¹ My translation. In the original Swedish: “Jag har dessutom bett om en sopborste, och den kom med vidhäftande soperska, men när hon vispat runt i rummet så att lungorna var helt igentäppta tog jag borsten ifrån henne. Hon blev sur, det här var hennes arbete, jag förvägrade henne rätten att tjäna sitt levebröd. Jag gave henne pengarna för att bli av med henne.”

are taken to be isomorphic – is left aside. So while still seeing this as a case of cosmopolitan/local interaction, I will reverse the figure/ground relations and focus upon the locals in their capacity of being hosts to the Westerner diaspora. (It will probably be no surprise to the reader that in the particular locality studied – the capital area of Nepal – the “locals” themselves turn out to be “local” in very different ways.) The “non-Western” localities that I have in mind are typically those of what is often referred to as the “Third World”, and as will be evident, my arguments here are much inspired by the work of Ulf Hannerz and by Clifford’s *Routes* (1997). The core of the paper is an examination of what the presence of the visitor diaspora means to the local hosts. As shorthand for the processes of interactive adaptation among these hosts, I have coined the term visitorization.

My own research in Nepal has not had the visitor diaspora as any particular focus (cf. Grandin 2002), but from my observations from various periods of dwelling here (in 1985–86, 1987, 1988 and 1993–97) I think that Nepal is a good place to grasp all this clearly. Tourism and foreign aid account not only for some two thirds of the country’s earnings of foreign currencies, but also for a very sizable proportion of the national budget. And the area of the capital, the Kathmandu Valley, is the site of a steady flow of Westerners – tourists and residents – as well as Western goods, ideas, and practices.

Visitors

It is customary to see tourism, development aid, research, and business as sharply distinct activities. The taken-for-granted boundaries between these areas are mirrored in the academic division of labor, where each area has its own academic specialty as its particular monitor: tourism studies (e. g. Urry 1990; Mowforth & Munt 1998), development studies (e. g. Hobart 1993; Skar & Cederroth 1997), anthropological self-reflection (e. g. Clifford & Marcus 1986; Clifford 1997 ch 3), development economics (e. g. Khadka 1991).²

As Clifford (1997: 19–22) has pointed out, the field-working anthropologist is a dwelling traveler. We can condense these two words into one: the field-worker is a visitor. And indeed “visitor” works well as a cover term for the whole range of Westerner dwelling/traveling. The Westerners are all visitors. They are all basically travelers who differ only by the length of their visits. Proper “tourists” (on package tours) stay a few days at expensive hotels and rush about to see all the sights of cultural heritage. Backpackers may stay a month or so at cheaper hotels, they walk more leisurely about as they partake of “the local culture” (the heritage sites plus some back-lanes) and emphasize that they are not tourists. Volunteers and anthropologists stay longer still and do not consider themselves mere travelers. People on a development contract and professionals do not see themselves as travelers either; they are here to work. But for all of them, actual travel frames the periods of temporary dwelling, and they all go “back home” at the end.

But the notion of visitor has its pitfalls. It makes things seem much too fragmented. First, there are degrees of temporal continuity beyond the individual visit. The same individuals may well have a career

² The references here do not reflect any systematic review of the areas in question: my familiarity with these diverse fields is not very comprehensive and is mostly restricted to what concerns Nepal.

encompassing several visitor incarnations: the backpacker returns as a volunteer, the Peace Corps worker returns as an anthropologist, the anthropologist returns as a social forester, and so on. Second, there are overlapping practices that integrate the various kinds of visitors. They do the same things and partially transverse the internal boundaries. Residents take their turns as proper tourists during their residency: patron the same restaurants as tourists and go on tourist trips during their vacations. An ethnographer may conduct his fieldwork from the base of a hotel room in the tourist area, and get his food and drink from tourist-oriented restaurants and shops. Photography of sights, local people, performances, and the like, is an activity intrinsic to back-packer traveling (Andersson Cederholm 1999) but is rather prominent also among field-workers and journalists, as well as among, say, missionaries, diplomats, and development workers when at leisure. And third, there are social links – to various degrees – between these visitors (and between different categories of visitors). Visitors – of different kinds – co-produce knowledge, interpretations, literature, events for one another.

And even more importantly, what we risk losing with the notion of visitor is that travelers together make up a sizeable group continuously present in the host community. A visitor comes and goes, but these visitors as a group are permanently present. Enter the notion of diaspora.

Diaspora

Diaspora. Browsing through book titles from recent decades, it is clear that beside the Jewish diaspora and the Black diaspora, there are diasporas of Iranians, Sikhs, Chinese, South Asians, Tamils, Kurds, Chinese, Tibetans. With a very few exceptions – the Irish in America, poetry of Sicilian diaspora, diaspora of Italian musicians – these diasporas have one common characteristic: they do not derive from any Western location. To qualify this: you do find discussions of a “white” diaspora, but then it is the question of European settlement in the Americas, New Zealand, Australia. This – other – Westerner diaspora is not what I will consider here, but it is instructive to compare these two diasporas, of visitors and of permanent settlers, with each other and in the light of discussions of the diaspora concept in general. Let us consider Safran’s (1991) criteria, as summarized by Clifford (1994) and elaborated by Cohen (1997) and Olsson & Grandin (1999):

Defining criteria	Visitor diaspora	Settler diaspora
Expatriate minority community	Yes	No; majority
Dispersed from original center to ≥ 2 peripheral places	Yes (but maybe not <i>dispersed</i> ?)	Yes
Maintain a memory of original homeland	Yes	Sometimes
Not fully accepted by hosts	Yes	Settlers <i>are</i> the hosts!
Will return to ancestral home when time is right	Yes	No

Are committed to maintenance of homeland	Probably in most cases	In some cases
Group consciousness defined by continuing relationship with homeland	Yes	In some cases
Strong ethnic consciousness	Yes	I cannot say!
Pluralism in host society important	Yes	Irrelevant

Of course, the case for the visitor diaspora is not as clear-cut as it looks here. But the absence of an explicit time-dimension in the criteria certainly makes the visitor diaspora appear nearly as the ideal type of diaspora. On this very point, the permanent rather than temporary dispersion of the settler diaspora is more in line with other diasporas. But on the other hand, the settlers have taken over completely in the places of its dispersal, which is something a diaspora isn't supposed to do.

Considered on its own terms – and most probably also as the visitor diaspora sees itself – it is still, and in spite of the table above, difficult to see the visitor diaspora as a diaspora more than metaphorically. Temporally, this is a diaspora only on a micro level. The visitors all look forward to a certain and safe going back home at the end. Moreover (and in spite of the observations given above), the degree of integration within and between the various types of visitors is probably too low to really see this as a community. But this is only as long as we consider the visitor diaspora on its own terms. When we switch perspective to that of the hosts, and to the interaction between visitors and hosts, the picture changes again. It is only from its own perspective that the visitor diaspora operates on a micro level temporally. From the perspective of the host location, the fact remains that at any given time the Western community is there. And from the perspective of the hosts, it doesn't matter much whether it is for Mr. Macintosh or Mr. McIntyre they work, whether it is the Anderson family or the Jensen family who rents their house, or indeed what *amerkan* patronizes their store or restaurant.

A visitor diaspora

Individually, these Westerners may set up a home in a non-Western location only for a rather brief period, but as a group, they seem to be there permanently. This is a crucial fact. They employ drivers, nannies, gardeners, housekeepers, and cooks in their homes and a number of personnel in their offices. They have their children in local schools: they patron local supermarkets and furniture-shops. They have friends and acquaintances among the host society. The people with whom they share streets, water supply, electricity and so on – in short, with whom they co-reside – have responded, adapted, adjusted, taken advantage of, etc., their presence in a multitude of ways. The visitor diaspora is in fact integral to the economy, society and culture of many localities.

This is why we need to fuse together these conflicting notions, diaspora and visitors, and stretch them to the point where they can cover common ground (this means stretching them quite far). The two notions serve to correct one another and to indicate each other's borders. The notion of visitors serves to point out the micro-temporality of the diaspora; the notion of diaspora serves to make clear that as a group, it is

well entrenched in the local setting. As visitors, people are outsiders in a place; as a diaspora, they still in some special way belong to the place.

The roots and roles of the visitor diaspora

Basically, the visitor diaspora is made up by Westerners looking for opportunities elsewhere. One can think of fictional representations of the visitor diaspora, often accorded strong agency, such as for instance in Malraux's *La conditione humaine*, where all sorts of Westerners – Comintern agents, businessmen, mercenaries – very actively take part in what happens in late 1920s Shanghai. Or the world of Western sea-captains, adventurers, hotel operators, miners, smugglers, business entrepreneurs, trading-house clerks, colonial officials and so on – operating in various non-Western localities in the decades around 1900 – that Joseph Conrad brings to life in his many novels and short stories. It is clear that the same questions have been asked – consciously or subconsciously – long before the present age of tourism and development aid. Which opportunities and resources does this or that (non-Western) place offer? What can be achieved here? What is to be done? These questions continue to be asked by tourists, tour operators, NGO representatives, development aid advisors, telecom builders, missionaries, researchers, journalists, as adventurers, traders, colonial administrators asked them.

The roots of the visitor diaspora can be measured in centuries. Glimpses from its historical formation can be had from such works as Curtin (1984) and Chaudhuri (1985) – works that also make clear that Westerners were by no means the only actors on the stage. The present-day Westerner diaspora is a continuation – partly direct, partly oblique – of practices that belong to what Fernand Braudel calls *la longue durée*. Of course, the exact composition of the diaspora changes gradually over time. Trade companies, trade settlements, trade diasporas (the Western trade diaspora was only one out of many), British “residents”, seamen (on this important category see further Rediker, 1987) and of course outright colonial workers are no longer prominent. The colonial is but one of many guises that the Westerner diaspora has adopted.

Today – to review and expand the list presented initially in this paper – the visitor diaspora comprises people such as regular tourists, backpackers, travel writers, journalists, field-workers from various academic disciplines, teachers, missionaries, students, guest professors, development workers, professionals, diplomats, possibly intelligence officials (spies!), businessmen, entrepreneurs, and still more.

The visits themselves vary greatly as to their length and contents also within a single type of visitor. Hannerz (2002) gives us interesting observations on this among foreign correspondents. Some make only quick appearances in any location, while others are on “normal” 3–5 year postings in a certain place, and then go back home – or to a new posting somewhere else. Hannerz's case illustrates well the translocalism or transnationalism of the visitor diaspora. Chiefly, it connects First World cities to Third World cities. But it also serves to interconnect Third World (or non-Western) cities – this is, after all, a diaspora that has various links between the different localities where it is dispersed. For instance, development workers or professionals may take up postings in one Third World location after another –

having a trail of friends and acquaintances all over the world with whom they may stay in touch more or less regularly.

In such regards, the Westerner visitor diaspora in the Third World has certain similarities with other transnationally diffused communities/networks/social enclaves made up largely by Westerners (see further Hannerz 1990). One thinks of what are called the Euro-brats – the elite professionals of the EU bureaucracy. There is the international business community, manning top managerial slots in various transnational firms. And of course, there is the diplomatic corps. These are all made up by mobile, transnational, people staying on a visitor basis in various locations. They differ from the visitor diaspora that we're talking about here in that they are much more uniform and much more elite – high education, high status, high pay. The visitor diaspora, on its hand, is composed of people from a variety of social, educational, and economic backgrounds. And to some extent, the business and diplomatic communities are also part of the visitor diaspora.

But it may be high time now to leave this general discussion for more specific observations.

The visitor diaspora in Nepal

As outlined above, various resources and opportunities attracts Westerners to non-Western, Third World locations. Beside the cheap labor typical of the Third World and a favorable cost of living, the Kathmandu area – and Nepal in general – offers among other things a climate attractive to Westerners, rather manageable physical distances, what guide-books, anthropologists, conservationists and the UNESCO alike see as spectacular cultural heritage, and equally spectacular natural scenery. It is not strange that the visitor diaspora takes on a large number of incarnations here. Westerners come not only as tourists and backpackers, but also more specifically as trekkers and mountaineers. Others work in the supply side of this business: as hotel managers, tour (trekking, mountaineering) operators, restaurant owners. As noted initially, Nepal has a rather large influx of foreign aid money, with its concomitant array of development workers: aid-related diplomatic personnel, IDA and I/NGO administrators, advisors, expert professionals, volunteers and the like. In many respect similar to the development sector is the Christian mission. The Catholics have focused especially upon elite education, operating several highly respected schools and with some Jesuit Fathers actually obtaining Nepali citizenship (which is very difficult for Westerners). The Protestants are organized into two big organizations (the UMN, or United Mission to Nepal, and the INF, the International Nepal Fellowship) that operate several joint ventures with the Nepali government, notably in the hydropower sector. The contingent of missionaries *de facto* work as doctors, nurses, midwives, engineers, information officers, teachers, and with vocational training, technical education, adult literacy, and rural development (among other things). On a smaller scale, there are people in various business and entrepreneur-oriented occupations: running workshops manufacturing Tibetan carpets, wooden ties, clothes, and the like. The visitor diaspora includes its own service sector, with teachers recruited from the homelands to various visitor-oriented schools: the American Lincoln School, the French School, the British School, and some schools run by the missions (the Kathmandu International Study Centre, the Norwegian School). There are small, nearly invisible niches, such as helping people who come to adopt a child through the bureaucratic paperwork. And then, of course, there are students both at Nepali universities and at foreign-operated one-year programmes

such as Sojourn Nepal and (I think) a Cornell University branch. There are guest professors and academic field-workers. There are travel-writers, journalists (foreign correspondents on quick visits; free-lancers; people working for local publications), film-makers (typically documentaries; but Bernardo Bertolucci with crew were among them for the shooting of *Little Buddha*). There are diplomats. There are people working at the cultural missions: Centre Culturel Française, Goethe Institut, British Council, Russian Cultural Center, American Library.

Aims and what specific opportunities are sought vary. For tourists, Nepal may be essentially a experience/relaxation site; to backpackers, Kathmandu is essentially one big café where to meet others like oneself, with not too much care about the café as such. But many visitors come for a purpose bigger than their own outcome. They are doers. They mission, they convert, they study, they have ideas of building hydropower plants, conserving forests and valuable urban milieus, changing social roles (empowering women, uplifting the poor, etc). “I see myself as an investor”, one aid-related diplomat said. “And I think we can reasonably demand that the Nepali government provides us with an investor-friendly climate.” This meddling in local affairs can range from the active engagement with local society and culture found among scholars and journalists, to the aims of outright change found among development workers and missionaries.

Though there are visitors working and residing in various Nepali districts – at regional hospitals or hydropower construction sites, for instance – the diaspora is highly concentrated to the Kathmandu area. This includes people who nominally work with, say, integrated rural development in some remote mountain district: the project office, as well as the residence, will be in Kathmandu, and the remote area to be developed will be visited only on field-trips. I will come back later to the ways of life that the visitor diaspora maintains in Nepal. At this stage, I will only point out some aspects of visitor life that serve to integrate and extend the diaspora, both socially and temporally.

There are children – of all ages – in the visitor diaspora. Schools are one of the integrative features of the visitor form of life, as are children’s birthday parties and arranging for children playing together after school. Visitor children grow up, of course, and this provides another sort of integration to the visitor diaspora. Not rarely, such children return to the locality where they partly grew up – as tourists, as students, as volunteers, as teachers, as field researchers.

Visitors go back to their home countries. This doesn’t mean that they stay there. People often come back to Nepal for new visits. In certain lines of work – maybe academics and journalists most typically, but also among, say, hydropower professionals – people develop a practice of commuting between their Western set-up and Nepal. Other careers – maybe most typically in development and the diplomatic service – involve another sort of transnationalism, characterized by say, first Sri Lanka, then Bangla Desh, then Nepal; or Fiji–Copenhagen–Nepal–Copenhagen and so on.

More concretely, one might think of a journalist, or documentary film-maker, making a study on, say, the Kathmandu Valley in the age of information, or girls and education, or Nepali women recruited to or returning from Bombay brothels. Such work will naturally draw upon the resources that the visitor diaspora itself provides. This may include guide-books and popular (journalistic or light academic) writing (both produced within the visitor diaspora), ex-members of the diaspora now “home again” that are consulted before leaving, and a number of present visitors (such as various experts) when in Nepal.

Moreover, the visit itself will be maintained largely on the resources connected with the diaspora: transport, food, accommodation, interpreters and translation, local English-oriented journalists, and so on.

It is clear that the visitor diaspora has its internal integration, but still these links may be scattered rather too loosely to really make it into a community. In general, tourists may live rather separately from missionaries, for instance. As argued above, what does make the visitor diaspora a community is the interrelations with the hosts. Time to consider first, the hosts themselves, and then, these interrelations.

The Kathmandu Valley, Nepal: a crossroads of diasporas

No one's indigenous here

Headline on the frontpage of *Himal* – published in Kathmandu – vol 7: 1

One way of describing the Kathmandu Valley is as the particular territory of a specific ethnic group, the Newars. Another is to say that this is the multi-ethnic capital area of a multi-ethnic country. None of these is wrong – but I think that it might be still more fruitful to say that processes of movement and migration have shaped this location in a fundamental way, both culturally and socially; and that foreigners – of various kinds – have been intrinsic to evolution of the Kathmandu Valley society. To start from the top, the Kathmandu Valley has always been under the rule of foreigners. From the ancient Licchavis to the Ranas and Shahs of the most recent centuries, the rulers have come from someplace else (at least according to their own official genealogies, as we will see). This is well in line with South Asia in general where wave after wave of foreigners coming from the west – down from the passes in the northwest or, later, over the sea – have established themselves in ruling positions. Arabs, Afghans, Persians, Turks from Central Asia, Portuguese, French, Dutch, British – they have all been intrinsic to the unfolding processes of South Asian civilization.³

All rulers of the Kathmandu Valley have seen themselves as immigrants, claiming descent from the foreign lands to the south. The ancient rulers whom we know from their inscriptions took their dynastic name from the famous Licchavis of Vaishali (a region in the present-day Indian state of Bihar) and claimed to be kshatriyas, warriors according to Hindu dharma, patrons of Brahmans, and protectors of South Asian four-fold social order. The medieval Malla kings traced – or rather, concocted – their ancestry to the 11th century kings of Tirhut, Mithila (what is today north Bihar) and maintained their links to places and divinities in India. These rulers from time to time poured more immigrant blood into their lines by marrying princesses from various Indian lands. The Shahs and the Ranas, in their turn, claimed that they were originally Rajputs from Mewar and Chitor in present-day Rajasthan.

Such tales are by no means restricted to the rulers. Most groups among the Kathmandu Valley people have their own stories of immigration to tell, and most groups claim – at least – that they have immigrated

³ This and the following paragraphs give a condensed version of Kathmandu Valley history that can be found in any general presentation (such as Shaha, 1992). They are intended as a background only and I will not burden the paper with further references here.

from the south. The common story is that the immigrants were assimilated and integrated in the Valley civilization – in other words, that they became part of what is today seen as the ethnic group of Newars.

But throughout the centuries, Brahmins from various places in India – nearby Mithila, distant Maharashtra and Gujerat, even faraway South India – were invited to the Kathmandu Valley to serve as priests of specific temples, royal preceptors, aides, and to invigorate the Valley civilization with their scholarship and knowledge of Hindu orthodoxy. These Brahmins have maintained separate – non-Newar – identities till this day. They are not alone in this. People of various ethnicities from the Himalayan foothills also settled in the Kathmandu Valley retaining their separate, non-Newar, identities. And when the Malla kings were defeated (1769), and the Shah king of the principality of Gorkha had taken over the Kathmandu Valley and made Kathmandu the capital of a new, much larger kingdom, Brahmins and Chetris from the foothills poured into the Valley as the new elite.

A group that has no story of immigration to tell is the large Newar caste of farmers. The Kathmandu Valley has very fertile soil, and in their inscriptions the ancient Licchavis recorded that they had constructed and maintained irrigation facilities – water tanks and canals. It is a complex society that has been raised upon this agricultural base. Not only is there the comprehensive division of labor of a complex system of Newar castes. But moreover, the society of the Kathmandu Valley also stayed linked to both the north and the south, itself playing the role of an important switchboard in the north/south cultural traffic.

In the 11th, 12th and 13th centuries, people from the Kathmandu Valley studied at the famous Indian universities – Nalanda and Vikramashila – which moreover had recruited some of their most renowned teachers from this Himalayan valley. This was also when Indian scholars came to Nepal to teach, when Tibetans came to Nepal to study for Indian and Nepali scholars, when Nepali men of learning were invited to Tibet. Travelling Buddhist monks and scholars made the Kathmandu Valley a part of a large cultural area. Nepali artists made paintings and metal figures of Buddhist deities for the Tibetans, and manuscripts of Indian texts were copied in the Kathmandu Valley for use in Tibetan monasteries.

In the late Malla era, a small Muslim community of traders, scribes, musicians had established itself in the Valley and the Mallas themselves copied Mughal fashions in dress, arts, and life. But all this was of little importance to the Valley civilization compared to that during the tumultuous years of Muslim conquest, Buddhist and Hindu scholars, religious men, and other notables found a safe haven in this Himalayan valley that was never under Muslim rule. Many works of Indian learning were imported when the refugees arrived with their books and disciples, and learned men continued their journeys and migrations to the Kathmandu Valley. Indeed, all kinds of Indian learning flourished. Manuscripts of some 9,000 different titles containing ritual manuals, treatises on numerous subjects such as medicine, music, architecture, have been collected in the Valley where also Indian poetry was much maintained – Jayadeva's *Gitagovinda* in Sanskrit and Vidyapati's Maithili poetry are among the works copied continuously. The importance of the south is visible already in the very languages of these manuscripts: Sanskrit, Maithili, Bengali, Awadhi. These languages were not only read and copied, they were also used in the Valley's own literary creations.

Cultural flows and human movements went not only into the Kathmandu Valley, but out of it as well. Newar traders established a community in Lhasa in Tibet, and here many of them had a second family

with a Tibetan wife. The founding of this is credited to one Bhima Malla – a minister and a relative of king Pratapa Malla of Kathmandu – who in the mid-17th century lead a military expedition into Tibet, took control over the important passes, negotiated special rights for the Nepalis, and established 32 trading houses in Lhasa.⁴

The outward mobility of the Newars was not restricted to Tibet. In a short but brilliant article, Stephen L. Mikesell (1992) traces how east/west migration of Newar mercantile families opened Nepal's outlying districts for exploitation by outsiders – processes of “economic and technological changes with origins far from the Himalayan heartland – in the industrial cities of Europe and commercial centres of India” (1992: 16). As Stiller (1993: 14) says: “Wherever commercial opportunities have developed in Nepal, Newars have been quick to exploit them.” From Doti in far-western Nepal to Ilam in the east, there are some forty major Newar towns. In addition, Newars are a significant part of the population also in other towns and bazaars. This migration started already in the Malla times, when Newars settled along the trade networks linking the Kathmandu Valley to the hinterland and to Tibet (Lewis & Shakya, 1988: 26-28). But the large-scale Newar migration started only with the unification of Nepal. “It was natural that the conquering Shah rulers recruited talented individuals from the Kathmandu Valley to perform the tasks necessary for national integration. Newar society was known for its literate elite, successful businessmen, talented artists, and skilled agriculturalists. For the Newars in the valley, the Shah conquest presented opportunities for expanding their economic opportunities in each of these spheres.” (Lewis & Shakya 1988: 29). In these hill bazaars, the general features of the town resembled the towns and cities of the Kathmandu Valley.⁵

When these bazaar Newars remigrate to the Kathmandu Valley – as many have done – this is only one among many types of movement that has made this location a veritable crossroads of diasporas. Nepalis – of various ethnicities – are dispersed widely over South Asia (Hutt 1997). This diaspora is more clearly defined – and as “ethnic Nepalis”! – outside Nepal than inside. Remigration for various reasons (for instance, Nepalis have been collectively expelled from Bhutan and Myanmar) means that, for instance, Christian Nepalis of Burmese origin add another layer to the Kathmandu Valley as a diasporic crossroads. And maybe most notably, Darjeeling (in northern West Bengal) has long been an important site not only of Nepali settlement, but also of both ethnic movement in the Indian context and of Nepali nationalism (Onta 1996). And as already mentioned above, there are a large many Nepali ethnic groups who reside in the Valley as well as in their “homelands”, some of whom with a career in foreign armies (British “Gurkhas” stationed in Britain or Hong Kong; Indian army) in their own or their family background. For reasons such as marriage, family links, education, and work opportunities, people migrate and re-migrate widely among and between the various sites of these different diasporas.

Then we have the presence of several distinct groups of Muslims in this “true land of the Hindus”. And among South Asians more generally, both Sikhs and Marwaris are firmly established. The latter are prominent businessmen, as people say controlling much of the trade in imported consumer goods

⁴ See further Jest (1993).

⁵ On the Newar diaspora, see also Sharma (1994).

(electronics, cameras, perfume and the like), sold in Kathmandu to price levels (Hong Kong, watch out!) that suggest (and rumour further corroborates) that the regular customs have been avoided. And finally, there are the Tibetans. Also the Tibetan presence in the Kathmandu Valley goes far back (as we have seen above; see further Lewis, 1989), but with the Chinese annexation of Tibet the number of Tibetans has been much inflated by refugees and exiles. There is today a large number of active Tibetan Buddhist monasteries in the Kathmandu Valley – the lamas of which are not only Tibetans, but also people from various Himalayan ethnic groups.

When the host community at times is mobilized against the foreign presence, it is the Indian groups that are targeted. I have not heard of any anti-Tibetan or anti-Westerner riots or demonstrations. The anti-Indian sentiment, on the other hand, is easily ignited, as seen recently when the Indian film star Hritik (allegedly) ridiculed Nepal in an interview – and the Nepali government, for good reasons, was asked to protect Indian citizens not long after.

Numerous occupational niches can be inferred from the division of labor upheld by the systems of caste (on the Newars, see for instance Levy 1990); to this should be added people supporting themselves as landlords, government employees, or on trade.

Not surprisingly in this multi-ethnic setting, nation-building has been an important aim of the Nepali governments throughout the last four–five decades. This has manifested itself in the development of media and of a physical infrastructure of roads and communications, and in a greatly expanded and regulated educational system (see further, e. g., Burghart 1984, Grandin forthcoming).

Visitorization

As Hrafn Gunnlaugsson (1984) has made clear, the impact of a visitor should not be underestimated. In his movie, *When the Raven Flies*, the visitor – known only as Gest (Guest) – wreaks complete havoc on the local community that he visits.⁶ The impact of the visitor diaspora is – in Nepal, and nowadays more generally – not of Gest's knife-throwing, violent kind, but probably no less manipulative and no less comprehensive. In what way does this diaspora of visitors help shape the local landscape? What niches does it open up? Ulf Hannerz has given us an example that is worth quoting at some length:

During my stays in Kafanchan, a multi-ethnic, polyglot town close to the geographical center of Nigeria, I have often found myself somewhat irritated and embarrassed as various townspeople have seen me as a possible resource in implausible schemes for going abroad or getting into some lucrative import–export business (often import rather than export, really). To begin with, I only saw this as a distraction from my purpose of finding out what town life was actually like. With time, I came to realize that these schemes were indeed one

⁶ This movie, in its turn, is part of the another type of transnational flow: paying homage to *A Fistful of Dollars* (Leone, 1961) which in its turn is a remake of *Yojimbo* (Kurosawa, 1955) which takes its plot from Dashiell Hammett's gangster/detective novel *Red Harvest* (1927).

part of what it was all about. Such hunches about the good life belonged with the popular tunes about the life styles of the rich and famous, with the hole-in-the-wall commercial school where adolescents may pick up typing, bookkeeping and other skills designed to take them from the village to the city, and with the star system of urban folklore, the tales told in beer bars in which politicians, high military officers and business tycoons become the new tricksters and hero figures. (Hannerz 1986:2).

Like Hannerz himself, visitors have resources to bring with them. The visitor diaspora is very forcefully based in other places, and commands resources and opportunities back there – such as bank accounts and social networks. As shorthand for the interactive processes where hosts adapt to the presence of visitors – to a tourism economy, to an aid economy, and so on – I will use the term “visitorization”.

My understanding of the visitorization process proceeds from a simple model. People navigate in a fabric of resources and opportunities that they perceive are open to them. The presence of the visitor diaspora – some of whom control big purses of aid money, some of whom control only their own, typically big enough for Third World standards – very significantly affects this fabric of resources and opportunities. That is, the continuous presence of visitors who naturally want food, housing, transport, service, and entertainment continuously has an impact upon how the fabric is woven.

The visitorization of the Kathmandu Valley/Nepal

Visitorization is prominent in Sherry Ortner’s (1989) account of the founding of the Tyangboche and Chiwong monasteries in the Khumbu district of Nepal in the early 20th century. Trekkers, coffee-table-book-writers, and scholars alike see these monasteries as the crowning achievements of highlander (Sherpa or Tibetan) culture. Yet it was the resources and opportunities that Sherpas saw and seized upon in mountaineering, Nepali nation-building and British colonialism (in neighboring India) that enabled these cultural efforts.

In a recent article, Mark Liechty (1997) has explored the role of foreignness – Western goods and the West as a local idea – in the Kathmandu Valley. Liechty stops his survey at about 1951, and since then the Kathmandu Valley has more or less jumped into modernity and the presence of Westerners has multiplied and become well entrenched. And today, the results of all this are clearly visible. Watched from its rim, a cover of brown haze – dust and exhausts – covers the Valley, and the same haze effectively blocks the once spectacular view of the Himalayas to the north. House construction goes on everywhere, and the suburban landscape stretches vastly from across the ring road to the south and towards Swayambhu to the north. Not long ago, this was all farmland. And part of this development is also the fat smoke from the cement factory behind the narrow gorge of Chobhar, and the roar from the ring road from various buses and from lorries overloaded with beer, soft-drinks, cooking gas, wood, sand, stone, cement, buffaloes, and other necessities.

The results of this modern jump are contradictory. True, there are signboards for computer firms and desk-top-publishing everywhere; you contact people here by phone, telefax, or the internet; supermarkets and specialised stores provide a large range of imported foods, consumer electronics, cameras, Benetton and Mark’s & Spencer’s clothes, perfume, expensive watches; the number of cars multiplies quickly;

there is satellite TV and FM radio. But social and economic indicators tell another story. Per capita GNP; Human Development Index; access to health facilities; child mortality; life expectancy at birth; literacy – whatever aspect you choose, Nepal is at the level of such icons of Third World poverty and underdevelopment as Bangla Desh or Ethiopia. Foreign aid for development has been an important part of government income since the 1950ies. All the same, poverty, land-hunger, land erosion, aid-dependence are stock concepts when Nepal is described in local economic or political debate or by aid bureaus.

Exports of garments and Tibetan carpets (largely manufactured in the Kathmandu Valley) earn more foreign currency than development grants and loans. And the tourists add to the foreign currency income by as much as foreign aid. This influx of foreign money is well needed to meet the import bills. The oil bill alone absorbs the full amount of aid grants. And then there is the import of cars, foreign goods, electronics and so on. But the sum total of aid, loans, exports and tourism earnings does not only pay all these bills, it is also the generator of the physical transformation of the Kathmandu Valley.

Visitors are highly visible. Development project offices and Landcruisers bearing the logo of a development project seem to be everywhere. The short-term visitors – tourists and backpackers – are more concentrated to certain areas. There is the backpacker eldorado of Thamel, with shops for used books, trekking provisions, sweets, traveler-type clothes, rucksacks, walking boots, and so on mix with restaurants, coffee-shops, lodges, hotels, handicraft centers, cargo exporters, and money-changers. And there is the upper-end tourist area south of the Royal Palace, with jeweler’s shops, boutiques, expensive restaurants, and the top class hotels. But of course all sorts of tourists venture out of these areas – for all sorts of activities ranging from climbing Mount Everest to a stroll down to the heart of Kathmandu.

So far, we have attended to visitorization on a macro level. That there is a general correlation between visitors and their resources on one hand, and the physical transformation on the other is clear enough. But it is not so easy to sort out what of the impact can be attributed to exactly which visitor activities. Let us shift to the micro level.

Visitors as a local resource

To start from a very concrete case, a medium-to-long-term visitor set-up can include some or all of the following:

	Accommodation	Transport	People
Residence	A house with a garden, or maybe a flat, rented from a local landlord	Private car, maybe imported duty-free, or scooter/motorcycle	Housekeeper, cook, gardener, driver, watchman
Workplace	A house, most probably rented from a local landlord	Office car, maybe for the exclusive use of the visitor	Local personnel: peons, cleaners, drivers, office personnel, etc. Teacher of Nepali

			language (If big:) Visitor administrators and professionals
School (if children)	A house with a sizeable plot of land, most probably rented from a local landlord	School bus (or private/office car)	Educational professionals (visitors or locals), local personnel
Leisure	Various houses: restaurants, clubs, hotels, swimming pools, resorts etc; see further what is said about tourists below	(Private or office car; taxi)	Local personnel: managers, waiters, cooks, cleaners, and many others
Services and facilities	Various houses: shops, supermarkets, medical clinics, etc	(Private or office car; taxi)	Local personnel: shopkeepers, shop attendants, medical assistants; Visitor professionals

All of the above: the visitor in question will probably be on a contract as a development aid advisor or professional, or maybe a diplomat. The set-up of, say, missionaries, academic field-workers, volunteers, or operators of their own businesses will be more – but far from totally – reduced. Tourists and backpackers, of course, have a different way of organizing their lives: hotels, restaurants, taxis, hotel cars and buses, and the local personnel working there or as tour operators, guides, porters are central here.

So this is the life-style of the visitor in schematic form. Other aspects of this life-style can be imagined from the table above: monetary flows, for instance (rent, salaries, gas, supermarket bills, etc). Another aspect is that residences and offices are widely dispersed throughout the Kathmandu area (there are no gated communities here!). Visitors typically find it natural to have residences, work, schools, and leisure widely spaced geographically, and see cars as a natural necessity; thus the Landcruisers and Pajeros typically driven by the visitor diaspora rapidly fill up Kathmandu's mostly narrow streets and alleys.

As can be seen above, the visitor diaspora opens up a whole array of occupational niches and business opportunities for the hosts. Beside what is listed in the table above, this includes such things as brokering (finding a house for a new visitor, or a new tenant for a landlord), tailoring, and the import or manufacture and selling of a whole lot of things: clothes, books, special Western-type food (imported or locally manufactured), furniture, home appliances (fridges, heaters, stoves, etc), cameras, stereos, TVs, computers and computer services, photocopying, medical provisions and labs, car maintenance, and so on. Moreover, there are things like producing visitor-oriented magazines (*Nepal Traveller* and the like), manufacturing or selling "ethnic" or "cultural" artifacts (musical instruments, paintings, cast metal objects, woodcarvings, etc.), or being ready to pack and forward visitors' belongings when they go back home. And so far we have only considered the visitors as individual persons. As controllers of aid money,

they open up further niches: local NGOs tailored to prevailing fashions and priorities are a good example (see further Dixit, 1996), but there is also the money flowing into various government or private organizations, creating still more occupational opportunities, and there is money flowing directly into people's pockets as bribes and commissions. And finally, visitors can be made use of more indirectly – we will return to this.

With all this, the specifically visitor-oriented infrastructure is steadily growing ever more comprehensive, and the general infrastructure becomes ever more fine-tuned to visitors. To a new visitor, the infrastructure is already there. Similarly, the hosts have a role ready and waiting to affix to the visitor. In Nepal, this will be announced with terms such as *angreji* (Englishman), *amerkan* (American) or the more general *kuire* (“misty”, referring to the pale eyes of Westerners) and a matrix of expectations on what such a person will be up to goes along with the term. The interaction between hosts and visitors takes on many forms, and there is a border-zone of cooperation and intermingling between these “communities” where the fact that they belong to different communities is downplayed. This is facilitated by a surprisingly general ability to speak English among the hosts, and an equally surprisingly general ambition to learn Nepali among the visitors. The border-zone includes such things as friendships and marriages, and such venues as schools, conferences, publications. In other respects, hosts and visitors are locked into ever-enfolding processes of negotiation and power-play (on such processes in the development context, see Dixit, 1996; cf. Baaz, 2002). Each party has at its command resources the other wants. Most basically, this involves money versus the right to stay. Just ask a visitor about how she extended her visa... The bureaucracy treating such applications adds still more complexity to the visitorization.

Visitorization: lifestyle and aspirations, ideology and heritage

But visitorization does not stop with occupational opportunities and business prospects. Maybe we should start with one important implication of the table above, only touched upon so far: the houses. To build and furnish a house for renting to foreigners seems to be a prominent aspiration among those Nepalis financially equipped to do so. This often means that the family of the landlord itself moves on to a smaller flat. It can also mean, for instance, that a family builds a three-story house where one floor will be occupied by the family itself, the others rented out as apartments. In either way, the family derives a stable income from its property. Again, it seems that visitors on such contracts that include free accommodation are most in demand as tenants: they pay well but want good houses with attached bathrooms, wooden floors, tiled kitchens and nice large gardens. This is also to say that the physical transformation of the Kathmandu Valley is one aspect of its visitorization. Visitor money – rents, salaries, commissions – is transformed to new buildings, or to new stories on existing buildings. A few years ago, one of the Nepali political magazines described this very clearly by means of publishing photographs of the houses leading politicians – who have low regular salaries but are well placed to control the flow of visitor money – had built after taking office.

Aspirations and life-styles among the hosts can adapt to the visitors in different ways. First, the life-style of the diaspora may be emulated, with increasing demand among the hosts for such things as beer, cars, and refrigerators. The size of a decent salary can be modeled on visitor examples (a bitter debate on the

difference in pay-scale for equally qualified Nepali and expatriate professionals surfaces now and then in various publications). This can also include how to build a house, how to equip it, and how to live in it: hot water, heating, lay-out of the rooms. Second, people's aspirations for themselves and for their offspring may be visitorized. What, exactly, makes education and the English language so important to the Nepali middle classes that they are easy prey for a host of expensive English Boarding schools? Why are young men from modest backgrounds so eager to learn to drive a car? What kind of careers and outcomes is it that people have in mind here? To work directly in a (development) project office? To get into government service – which might mean having to handle visitor donors and counterparts? To work in the tourist-oriented sector? To be employed as a driver? To get into the complicated career of an intellectual, doing freelance writing here, taking an assignment for an NGO there, making a consultancy report there again? And this only goes on. As we have seen, visitor money, directly and indirectly, and visitor demand for accommodation helps drive the construction business. This means that skilled (carpenters, brick-layers and the like) and unskilled construction workers will be needed; and hence people from the Valley's outlying villages, or from Nepal's southern districts, or from India will find new niches and adjust their aspirations accordingly.

Visitorization can thus take the form of long chains of processes:

Visitors→ housing→construction→brick- or cement-factories→farmland converted to industrial premises.

Or: visitors→health considerations→organically grown vegetables→conversion of rice-land to gardens.

To shift the perspective, visitorization operates also on a more political level. Numerous questions can be asked also here. One might think about, for instance, in what ways political rhetoric is shaped not only for local ears, but as a part of the interaction with money-controlling visitors (see further Borgström 1980, 1982; Burghart 1984, Grandin 1996). On a more sinister level, people sometimes suggest that politicians' and bureaucrats' well-publicized ability to siphon off aid funds to their own pockets is one important reason why Nepal has had so many government shifts during the last decade. And why did Nepali members of parliament decide that they were entitled to import duty-free a 4WD vehicle – leading to comments that “Pajeroism” had arrived as the new political ideology. On another note, it has also been suggested that the reason why Nepal has been able to consistently attract a relatively large share of international aid money is that the country has powerful friends – here networks with ex-visitors make up a resource that can be mobilized when needed. (On a smaller scale, such networks can be seen as important also when it comes to, for instance, the possibilities of obtaining a university education in the West.) To give a final example, in the recent decade there has been much attention among visitors to questions of ethnic mobilization. What roles do scholarly studies of particular ethnic groups – and the way these studies are framed – play here? And what powerful friends among visitors have ethnic activists been able to cultivate?

In similar ways, cultural heritage is visitorized. Visitor considerations feed into the processes whereby cultural heritage is selected and publicized. This pertains to cultural objects, where visitor tastes or scholarly judgements influence crafts such as metal-casting or wood-carving. Similarly, cultural performances (religion, songs, music and dance in various venues, for instance) become adjusted to visitors in various ways: visitors crowd out hosts at religious processions, sponsor cassette recordings and

performances of song-dramas, and take part of special, visitor-oriented dance and music performances. The very physical structure of Kathmandu Valley towns is a case in point: numerous conservation projects – temples, individual houses, streets – have been undertaken by visitors. The processes go both ways. On the one hand, visitorization has implied conservation of whole towns, valuable areas, individual houses, temples, palaces. On the other hand, visitorization includes land demand, cars, roads, infrastructure – all of which rather serves to threaten the very objects that conservation seeks to preserve.

This can be pursued even further. Visitorization fuels internal migration both directly and indirectly. Directly, since the presence of the visitor diaspora creates new resources and opportunities that attract people from the outlying districts. Indirectly, since the visitor diaspora feeds into the process of wealth concentration and accumulation in the Valley. The relative (and maybe also absolute) impoverishment of rural districts in comparison with the visible wealth of the Kathmandu Valley is one important reason why the Maoist “people’s war” has become so successful and hard to come to terms with (Thapa 2001). Returning to the ethnic perspective, this relative wealth has had a contradictory impact upon Newar culture: eroding it yet giving muscle to Newar claims of cultural uniqueness. Newar claims to defining national culture are thus fuelled by the Valley’s wealth, and a response to the wealth-backed threat to their cultural heritage.

Visitorization as cooperation and conflict: conclusions

Socially, economically, and culturally, a host country such as Nepal becomes a place adapted to the continuous presence of visitors. There will be schools for the visitor’s children. There will be restaurants and shops catering to visitor tastes. There will even be local production – of, say, cheese, delicatessen, clothing, furniture, crafts – suited to the way the visitor diaspora lives. A wide variety of occupational niches for hosts will be opened, and hosts adjust their aspirations, outlooks and perspectives (concerning education, for instance) to the presence of the diaspora and the resources and opportunities this brings along. The political rhetorics may partly be intended for visitor ears, or at least adapted to the diaspora’s eavesdropping and commentary. The production of culture – arts, crafts, performances, religion – may be highly conscious of and sometimes directly intended for the visitor audience.

To sum up, the presence of the visitor diaspora:

- creates physical transformation of the locality
- creates a vast and manifold economic and occupational sector
- creates an infrastructure and institutions to specifically deal with the diaspora
- creates a borderland zone of diaspora/host contact, dialogue, negotiations, power-play.

Final conclusions

Time to return to more general issues. Comparing foreign correspondents to his own branch of the diaspora, social anthropology, Ulf Hannerz (1996:113) observes that “of course, in our own way, we are

also part of that worldmaking cultural apparatus”. Western knowledge of the world outside the West is produced and largely controlled by the visitor diaspora. Travel writers, development professionals, journalists, scholars – to name a few – continuously produce information, knowledge, theories as to what really goes on in these places. It goes without saying that this knowledge reflects the particular perspectives, positions, and interests of the diaspora. So what perspectives are they? Arjun Appadurai (1992: 35) has observed:

Natives are in one place, a place to which explorers, administrators, missionaries, and eventually anthropologists, come. The outsiders, these observers, are regarded as quintessentially mobile; they are the movers, the seers, the knowers. The natives are immobilized by their belonging to a place.

The distinction that Appadurai makes in terms of mobility versus immobility has another dimension: that of individual versus collective. The anthropologist, as surely as the explorer, is a (mobile) *individual* who comes here to engage (sedentary) *collective* life. If my notion of a visitor diaspora has any truth, however, it is clear that the anthropologist – as well as the administrator or the missionary – is as much part of a collective as are the “natives”.

This why the idea of anthropological “reflexivity” (Clifford & Marcus 1986) backfires. When such endeavors focus upon the individual ethnographer’s role in the field, this serves only to further reinforce the distinction between the mobile individual visitor (the anthropologist) and the sedentary collective of hosts (the natives). When anthropological reflexivity takes on anthropology as a discipline, it still draws its boundaries far too narrowly. As Clifford (1997: 22–23) has observed, that the context of field-work includes what I have discussed here as a visitor-oriented infrastructure is largely erased from ethnographies. There is one more point in Hannerz’ Kafanchan example (quoted above): it was he, the visitor, that was approached in these schemes, and this was well in line with how hosts see a visitor (and not just anthropological field-workers) as a potential resource. And these visitors are not just individuals. They belong to a collective formation shaped in interaction with the hosts. To write oneself as an individual person or anthropology as a discipline into the story does not help: it is just to resist collectivization of oneself.

I will press this point a little further. Paul Gilroy (1993) has argued that blacks and slavery have been located “outside” Western modernity, whereas in fact both are intrinsic features of Western modernity. The same – in reverse – goes for the visitor diaspora, which remains largely invisible in the knowledge produced by Western scholarship (and journalism, travel-book writing, etc) on non-Western localities. The Westerner diaspora is located “outside” its host societies, whereas in fact it is intrinsic to these societies.

The visitor diaspora in many ways show Western cases in reverse. Sweden is seen as multi-cultural by virtue of people of other “nationalities” residing here. Nepal is also referred to as a multi-cultural society, but this does not refer to the many foreign-born people residing here, but rather to its “internal” ethnic diversity. The visitorized cities in the Third World is the mirror, in reverse, of the multi-cultural cities in the West. The reversal shows up in that while foreign diasporas in the West are discussed in terms of ethnicity and are the subject of much investigation, the Westerner diaspora (like that of the Black

Atlantic) remains strangely invisible, and is never discussed in ethnic terms though this of course is quite possible.

Maybe this discussion makes too much of the West/non-West distinction. After all, not only Westerners work with development aid (India and Japan are major donors in Nepal, and the UNDP is not an exclusively Western institution). After all, as noted above, the Western traders that are an important part of the historical roots of the visitor diaspora are, moreover, only one of many trade diasporas (Curtin 1984). And as we have seen, when the visitor diaspora appeared in the Kathmandu Valley, this was just one more step in the continuous process of foreigners moving in. I cannot develop this further in this paper, but there is certainly much left to be spelled out here.

Some final points. I have tried to demonstrate that the visitor diaspora has what for lack of better words can be called systemic properties. There is circulation, cross-category integration, re-visits, co-produced knowledge within the diaspora itself, and the interaction between the diaspora and its host drives this systemic integration much further. Several largely separate academic specialties need to be brought together in order to make further sense of all this. Beside tourism studies, development studies, anthropology, and development economics there is the work starting out from notions such as migration, ethnicity, transculturalism, and diaspora.

And conversely, research on development aid and tourism (and reflections on anthropological field-work practice) must locate their subject matter in the context of the visitor diaspora. To go on with development research, it is of course the very *raison d'être* for aid that it should have an impact. But this impact cannot be attributed only to aid as such, whereas actual advisors and professionals are seen as transparent. As we have seen, they are far from transparent. The visitorization arising from aid professionals as part of the visitor diaspora – and what aid-related visitors do in their capacities as consumers, employers, car-drivers, parents, party-throwers, temporary tourists, friends, and so on, seems urgent to consider. Similar arguments can be made when it comes to the impact of tourism. Neither can be understood properly outside the context of the diaspora of which it is a part.

What I have presented in this paper is more a discussion of how to map a certain area of research, rather than mapping itself. Studies such as those by Hannerz (1996, 2002), Andersson Cederholm (1999), and Baaz (2002) certainly write the Western visitors into the picture, and do much to clarify the internal workings of the visitor diaspora, its aims, world-view, form of life and its important role as producer of pictures, ideas, knowledge of the non-Western world for Western consumption. But if I am right to see the visitor diaspora as constituted in interaction with the host societies, such approaches will not be enough. Just like ethnographic “reflexivity”, ideas of a tourist “gaze”, or of visitor “discourse” about their hosts do not help us here. An approach that focuses upon the hosts and their relations (visitorization) to the visitor diaspora, and attends to such basics as occupations, outcomes, niches, roles and to actual data (economic, statistic, etc) on the various visitor and host activities seems rather to be what is needed. Only by writing Westerners fully into the picture as objects rather than subjects we can get anywhere close to an understanding of the ways in which Western hegemony is acted out in actual practice.

References

- Appadurai, Arjun. 1992. Putting Hierarchy in its Place. In George E. Marcus (ed.) *Rereading Cultural Anthropology*. Durham & London: Duke University Press, 34–47.
- Andersson Cederholm, Erika. 1999. *Det extraordinära lockelse: luffarturistens bilder och upplevelser*. Lund: Arkiv.
- Baaz, Maria Eriksson. 2002. *The white wo/man's burden in the age of partnership: a postcolonial reading of identity in development aid*. Göteborg: Dept. of Peace and Development Research.
- Borgström, Bengt-Erik (1980). The best of two worlds: rhetoric of autocracy and democracy in Nepal. *Contributions to Indian Sociology* (NS) 14: 1: 35–50.
- (1982). Power structure and political speech. *Man* (N.S.) 17: 313–27.
- Burghart, Richard (1984). The formation of the concept of nation-state in Nepal. *Journal of Asian Studies* 44: 1: 101–25.
- Braudel, Fernand. 1993. *A History of Civilizations*. (Grammaire des Civilisations, 1987/1963) New York &c: Penguin.
- Chaudhuri, K. N. 1985. *Trade and Civilisation in the Indian Ocean. An Economic History from the Rise of Islam to 1750*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Clifford, James. 1994. Diasporas. *Cultural Anthropology* 9 (3): 302–338.
- . 1997. *Routes. Travel and Translation in the Late Twentieth Century*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- Clifford, James & George E. Marcus (eds.). 1986. *Writing culture: the poetics and politics of ethnography*. Berkeley: Univ. of California Press.
- Cohen, Robin. *Global diasporas: an introduction*. London: UCL Press. (Cited from Olsson & Grandin, 1999.)
- Curtin, Philip D. 1984. *Cross-cultural trade in world history*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Dixit, Kanak Mani. 1997. Foreign aid in Nepal: No bang for the buck. *Studies in Nepali History and Society* 2 (1): 173–186.
- Gilroy, Paul. 1993. *The Black Atlantic. Modernity and Double Consciousness*. London: Verso.
- Grandin, Ingemar. 1996. “To change the face of this country.” Nepalese progressive songs under pancayat democracy. *Journal of South Asian Literature* XXIX: 1: 175–189.
- . 2002. Music and civilization in the Kathmandu Valley. Paper presented *Ethnomusicological Vistas. Society for Ethnomusicology 2002 Annual Meeting*, Estes Park, Colorado, October 2002.
- . Forthcoming. The soundscape of the radio. Engineering modern songs and superculture in Nepal. In Paul D. Greene & Thomas Porcello (eds.) *Wired for Sound*.
- Hannerz, Ulf. 1986. The World in Creolization. Paper presented in the Centennial Lecture Series, Department of Anthropology, University of Pennsylvania, March 26, 1986.
- . 1990. Cosmopolitans and Locals in World Culture. In Mike Featherstone (ed.) *Global Culture. Nationalism, Globalization and Modernity*. London: Sage, 237–51.
- . 1996. Trouble in the global village. The world according to foreign correspondents. In Ulf Hannerz, *Transnational Connections: Culture, people, places*. London: Routledge, 112–124.
- . 2002. Utrikeskorrespondenter. Seminar held at the Department of Ethnicity, Linköpings universitet, on Oct. 16, 2002.

- Hobart, Mark (ed.). 1993. *An Anthropological Critique of Development. The Growth of Ignorance*. London: Routledge.
- Hutt, Michael. 1997. Being Nepali without Nepal: Reflections on a South Asian Diaspora. In David N. Gellner, Joanna Pfaff-Czarnecka & John Whelpton (eds.), *Nationalism and Ethnicity in a Hindu Kingdom. The Politics of Culture in Contemporary Nepal*. Amsterdam: Harwood Academic Publishers.
- Jest, Corneille. 1993. The Newar Merchant Community in Tibet: An Interface of Newar and Tibetan Cultures. In Gérard Toffin (ed.) *Nepal: Past and Present*. New Delhi: Sterling Publishers: 159–168.
- Khadka, Narayan. 1991. *Foreign Aid, Poverty and Stagnation in Nepal*. New Delhi: Vikas.
- Levy, Robert I. 1990 (1992). *Mesocosm*. (Indian edition.) New Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass Publishers.
- Lewis, Todd T. 1989. Newars and Tibetans in the Kathmandu Valley. Ethnic Boundaries and Religious History. *Journal of Asian and African Studies* (38): 31–57.
- & D. R. Shakya. 1988. Contributions to the history of Nepal: eastern Nepali diaspora settlements. *Contributions to Nepalese Studies* 15 (1): 25-66.
- Liechty, Mark. 1997. Selective Exclusion: Foreigners, Foreign Goods, and Foreignness in Modern Nepali History. *Studies in Nepali History and Society* 2 (1): 5-68
- Mikesell, Stephen L. 1992. Up-Country Bazaar and Changing Forces. *Himal* 5 (5): 16–18.
- Mowforth, Martin & Ian Munt. 1998. *Tourism and sustainability. New tourism in the Third World*. London: Routledge.
- Olsson, Erik & Ingemar Grandin. 1999. Bofasthetens operativsystem. Imer- och globaliseringsforskningen om livsformer och global rörlighet. *Kulturella perspektiv* 8 (2): 32-48.
- Onta, Pratyoush. 1996. Creating a Brave Nepali Nation in British India: The Rhetoric of Jāti Improvement, Rediscovery of Bhanubhakta and the Writing of Bír History. *Studies in Nepali History and Society* 1(1):37–76.
- Ortner, Sherry B. 1989 (1992). *High Religion. A Cultural and Political History of Sherpa Buddhism*. (Indian edition.) Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.
- Rediker, Marcus. 1987. *Between the Devil and the Deep Blue Sea. Merchant Seamen, Pirates, and the Anglo-American Maritime World 1700–1750*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Safran, William. 1991. Diasporas in Modern Societies. Myths of Homeland and Return. *Diaspora* 1 (1): 83–99. (Cited from Clifford, 1994.)
- Shaha, Rishikesh. 1992. *Ancient and Medieval Nepal*. New Delhi. Manohar.
- Sharma, Prayag Raj. 1994. Emergence of a Hill-town: Urban Development in Nepal's Rural Backhills. In Michael Allen (ed.) *Anthropology of Nepal: People, problems and processes*, 218-31. Kathmandu: Mandala Book Point.
- Skar, Harald O. & Sven Cederroth. 1997. *Development aid to Nepal : issues and options in energy, health, education, democracy and human rights*. Surrey: Curzon Press; Copenhagen: NIAS.
- Stiller, Ludwig F. 1993. *Nepal: growth of a nation*. Kathmandu: HRD Research Center.
- Thapa, Deepak. 2001. Day of the Maoist. url: www.himalmag.com/may2001/cover.html
- Tunström, Göran. 1984. *Indien – en vinterresa*. Uddevalla: Författarförlaget.
- Urry, John. 1990. *The tourist gaze: leisure and travel in contemporary societies*. London: Sage.