

The Production and Consumption of Cultural Villages in South Africa: A Decolonial Epistemic Perspective



Morgan Ndlovu*

ABSTRACT

While many of the peoples who exist in the ‘spatio-temporal’ construct known as the postcolonial world today are convinced that they have succeeded – through anti-colonial and anti-imperial struggles – to defeat colonial domination, the majority of the people of the same part of the world have not yet reaped the freedoms which they aimed to achieve. The question that emerges out of the failure to realise the objectives of anti-colonial and anti-imperial struggles by the people of the Third World after a number of years of absence of juridical-administrative colonial and apartheid systems is to what extent did the people who sought to dethrone colonial domination understand the complexity of the colonial system? And to what end did the ability and/or inability to master the complexity of the colonial system affect the process of decolonization? Through the case study of the production and consumption of cultural villages in South Africa, this article deploys a de-colonial epistemic perspective to reveal, within the context of tourism studies, the complexity of the colonial system and why a truly decolonized postcolonial world has so far eluded the people of the developing world.

Keywords: cultural villages, representation, tourism, neo-colonialism, postcolonial, de-colonial, capitalism, discourse, power

1. INTRODUCTION

The encounter between the colonizer and the colonised subject has, since the 1960s, been a subject characterized by orthodox nationalist scholarship that read the colonial encounter between European settlers and Africans (among other people of the Third World) through the inflexible lenses of domination *versus* resistance (Ndlovu-Gatsheni 2007). However, with the advent of postcolonial and post-structuralist conceptual and theoretical interventions, it has now become possible to transcend the polarity of domination *versus* resistance in reading the colonial encounter to comprehend and appreciate other dynamics of the encounter which include among them processes such as dialogue, blending, appropriation, transformation, contestation, negotiation, hybridity and mimicry.

However, in spite of the novel scholarly contribution that postcolonial and post-structuralist conceptual tools have brought to the disciplines that seek to understand the colonial encounter, these conceptual tools have not yet provided us with exhaustive answers as to the question of why colonial-type power relations continue to haunt the post-colonial world, making a mockery of the anti-colonial and anti-imperial struggles that were waged by various liberation movements to bring about a ‘concrete manifestation of freedom’ (Gordon 2011: 101).

This article deploys the case study of cultural villages in South Africa to appreciate both the contributions and limits of some of the post-colonial and post-structural conceptual lenses such as Michel Foucault’s understanding of power and knowledge. It also takes a ‘de-colonial turn’ to further explicate the question of why colonial relations of power in the production and consumption of cultural villages of post-colonial Africa have continued to make mockery of the struggles against colonial domination.

2. THE IDEA OF CULTURAL VILLAGES

Cultural villages can simply be defined as purpose-built physical structures and socio-cultural displays that are primarily intended for visitation by tourists, and serve as museums that claim to represent the ethnic identities that existed and/or still exist in South Africa (Jansen Van Veuren 2003). In general, the South African cultural villages can be viewed as local versions of international folk villages such as Skansen near Stockholm in Sweden, which anthropologists often describe its displays as ‘timeless primitives’, where an enduring and unchanging folk culture is presented (Crang 1999). Thus, ever since the construction of Skansen, which is widely regarded as the first of its kind (Hitchcock 1998), the 20th century has seen the introduction of Skansen-type museums across the length and breadth of Europe and North America with open air, museum-like villages being opened in the Netherlands (Arnhem) in 1911, the United States (Colonial Williamsburg) in 1926 and Canada (Louisbourg) in 1961. This background is quite significant to the understanding of the concept of cultural villages in South Africa because their construction cannot be viewed in isolation to international examples and experiences of ‘museumification’ of identity, hence the discourses that critique these cultural villages are partly steeped on those that focus on cultural representations in general and partly contextually specific to the African colonial experience.

Cultural villages in South Africa are part of a multiplicity of cultural representations that are found across all regions of the country and many of them, with a history that stretches back to colonial and apartheid times. The cultural villages, like many other representations of cultural identities in South Africa – especially those featuring San or Bushmen culture – are quite popular with tourists (Marschall: 2003: 109). However, in spite of their popularity, these representations of indigenous African cultural identities face a barrage of criticisms levelled against the manner in which they portray cultural identities of local communities and how their tourism income is distributed between ‘white’ managers and ‘black’ performers within the tourism destinations.

In general, the criticisms levelled against representations of indigenous African identities within the context of cultural tourism business in South Africa and Africa in general range from that they represent myths instead of culture (Tomaselli & Wang 2001); that they present cultural practices

in a romantic, superficial and ahistorical manner, frozen in time (De la Harpe *et al.* 1999); that they reproduce stereotypes, generated by the West's desire for exoticism and imaginations of the primitive 'Other' (Craik 1997: 118); to that the majority of the cultural tourism ventures such as cultural villages are owned by 'white' private sector entrepreneurs (Jansen Van Veuren 2003) who enjoy the lion's share of the tourism income while members of local communities who perform 'negative' depictions of their own identities to generate tourism income merely provide cheap labour. These criticisms are not without basis in reality and as such, this paper seeks to transcend postcolonial and post-structuralist analyses of neo-colonial relations of power in such cultural representations and constructions such as cultural villages in South Africa through re-thinking their production and consumption from a de-colonial epistemic standpoint. However, before articulating a de-colonial critique of the cultural villages, this article appraises what has so far been achieved through post-colonial and post-structuralist analyses of cultural representations of African identities.

3. THE PANOPTICON IN THE REPRESENTATIONS OF AFRICAN IDENTITIES

The debates on how identities of 'marginalized' communities are imagined and constructed during cultural encounters have always fascinated scholars with interests in issues of identity construction worldwide. In Africa, specific ethnic groups such as the Zulu and the San of South Africa, the !Kung Bushmen of Namibia and the Maasai of Kenya, among others, have stimulated debates on how ethnic groups that are popular in the cultural tourism industry are often presented to international tourists in essentialist, superficial and stereotypical images (Edenson 2001; Tomaselli 2007a; Gordon 2002). Thus, the debate has mostly been centred on the issue that these ethnic identities are usually imagined and presented as unchangingly monolithic: contemporary local communities are still represented as 'traditional' people whose lifestyles remain untainted by Western modernity (Kasfir 2002; Galaty 2002; Kratz & Gordon 2002; Gordon 2002), as in the instances of 'warrior images' of the Zulu, 'pastoral images' of the Maasai and 'hunter-gatherer images' of the San, all of which have now become ubiquitous in tourism brochures (Mhiripiri 2008).

At the theoretical level, the debate about the manner in which identities of African indigenous communities are imagined and constructed is usually predicated on theories of alterity that are underpinned by the discourses of the Same/Other contradistinction. Through the theoretical lenses of alterity, scholars have raised questions on who gazes on whom and for what purposes. A continuity has been established in this context between encounters engendered by tourism and colonial encounters. This is mainly because the exhibition of indigenous African peoples such as the Zulu, the San and the Maasai, among other prominent indigenous African communities, have a history dating back to the 18th century when members of these communities were taken to Europe for displays and performances (Coombes 1994; Thomas 1994; Lindfors 1999; Landau & Kaspin 2002). As argued by a number of scholars such as Lindfors (1999), the exhibitions of Africans on the European and American stages were generally underlined by the rhetoric of Africans as 'savage' and 'primitive' so as to fuel negative perceptions among Europeans and Americans that Africans were backward and, therefore, deserved exploitation and colonial domination.

While these misconceptions and misrepresentations of indigenous African peoples can be viewed as a thing of the past, still a number of scholars such as Tomaselli and Wang (2001) would argue that the representations of African identities today within the booming cultural tourism industry are still steeped in the dominant colonial discursive orders that reproduce colonial myths about the lived experiences of indigenous African communities. The question that has often been raised by scholars interested in the subject of the relationship between identity representations in cultural tourism and neo-colonial tendencies is that of whether there are real differences between the manner in which colonial encounters constructed identities of colonized African subjects during the colonial era and the manner in which African identities are constructed under tourism encounters in the so-called post-colonial dispensation. This question has taken many forms and in the context of the construction of cultural villages in South Africa, and it has been raised within the context of the discourses of authenticity where the debate is centred on the issue of whether the villages represent myth or reality. Thus, for instance, in her critique of the construction of the cultural village of PheZulu Safari Park, Marschall (2003) concludes that:

The display of traditional Zulu weapons—especially the stabbing spear that in popular myth was invented by Shaka kaSenzangakhona while serving in the Mthethwa army in the early nineteenth century—and the performance of a warrior dance nurture the popular image of the Zulu as a savage people, both feared and admired, and allow the recognition of the iconic Zulu warrior, ubiquitous in tourist brochures and the logo of the KwaZulu-Natal Tourism Authority. A brief appearance of the Zulu traditional diviner or *sangoma* is also a standard at PheZulu (and at most other cultural villages), catering for those Westerners who are fascinated by ‘witchdoctors’ and ‘black magic’ in the dark continent.

Similar studies on the ‘authenticity’ of cultural villages in South Africa in general have been conducted and have reached a conclusion that many of these villages are constructed to satisfy Western tourists’ stereotypical imaginations of the primitive ‘Other’. Among these studies is Jansen Van Veuren’s (2000: 150) survey, which concluded that the constructed villages in South Africa are generally constructed to satisfy tourists’ fantasies and expectations:

The question arises to what extent the product of cultural villages consists of indigenous/traditional culture products. Based on observation, it would appear that the cultural village often is built to a larger extent, on an understanding of what Western tourists want, and how best to provide this. Cultural villages as such, are not a form of hospitality or sharing of culture, which exists in indigenous culture, but a construct of Western culture, which probably developed out of early open-air museums. Thus the very concept of which the product is based, the selection of elements from indigenous cultures, and ways in which they are altered and mediated, are all very important inputs into a typical cultural village product, which are based on Western culture.

For Jansen Van Veuren (2003), the imagination of indigenous identities through a cultural village is biased towards satisfying the tourists rather than the very indigenous communities whose identities are being represented. Thus, by dividing the ownership of the cultural villages into three categories of white entrepreneurs, indigenous entrepreneurs and the state, Van Veuren (2003: 70) argues that the white entrepreneurs are ‘outsiders to the culture depicted’ and their intention is primarily to make profit either directly or through using the cultural village as a draw card to other businesses (Van Veuren 2003: 70), such as hotels and curio shops. Thus, according

to Van Veuren (2003), this group of white entrepreneurs, whose members range from small businesses held by individuals and families to large corporations, is less interested in depicting culture than attracting profit since its primary interest in the construction of the cultural villages is to generate income.

With regard to second group, which consists of indigenous entrepreneurs, Van Veuren (2003) argues that this group establishes cultural villages based on their own cultures and as such, though profit is the primary objective, they may also demonstrate a commitment to cultural conversation and education. The third category of ownership, which consists of arms of the state, Van Veuren (2003) argues that while the state can manipulate the idea of cultural villages for ideological purposes such as propping up national projects at various times in the history of South Africa, the state organs are more likely to have an interest in the preservation of indigenous cultures as well as development functions such as job creation.

Many of the discourses that seek to articulate who gazes on whom during the production and consumption of tourist attractions such as the cultural villages can be understood within the conceptual lenses of Foucault's eye-of-power (1976) where tourists and ethnic minorities interact in a rational-disciplinary matrix with the time-space compression (Xie 2011: 23). The work of 18th century philosopher Jeremy Bentham's prison concept of panopticon to conceptualise the interactions between power, technology and observation, and Foucault's (1980) exploration of the relationship between knowledge and power in his book, *Discipline and Punishment: The Birth of the Prison*, have become useful to our understanding of cultural tourism as involving 'technologies' of gazes.

Thus, the panopticon is a useful prison model in which power of the gaze results in self-control and self-regulation by the prisoner as the combination of observation and power dominance gives the gazer (guards) a sense of omnipresent voyeurism and the gazed (prisoners) a feeling of inescapable surveillance (Xie 2011: 24). This is mainly because the purpose of the panopticon is to create a highly efficient mechanism to control prisoners and has a reflective impact on the prisoners' psychological behaviour. This gazer-gazed construct, which Hollinshead (1999a) suggests that we use to conceptualise from a panopticon perspective all institutional settings, entered the discourse of tourism studies with the publication of John Urry's book, *The Tourist Gaze*, in 1990, leading to the institutionalisation of the construct within the tourism.

This institutionalisation of the panopticon has enabled us to view the tourist's role as a dominant one over the less privileged touree. Thus, in this construct, the tourees are seen as compelled to act or behave according to what tourists expect within a setting where tourists cast a privileged eye on tourees as they gratify themselves. As a model of incarceration, the panopticon is, therefore, quite significant because it is based on the perspective of power and the 'subject of power' (Foucault 1980) – a construct that enables us to view tourists as prison guards, while ethnic minorities are prisoners confined in cells as objects of an imagined scrutiny within a tourism setting.

It needs to be acknowledged that while the concept of the panopticon is a useful one for interrogating the question of essentialising visions of institutions, normalising practices of inequality and violence of power, the concept is not without its own limitations. In light of the

common allegations in tourism studies that power is exercised by tourists, particularly from Western nations, over tourees, it is worth questioning whether this one-sided excessive and exclusive attention to tourists' actions over the tourees is warranted.

According to scholars such as Cameron (1997), Milne (1998), Oakes (1995), and Shaw and Williams (1998), locals are not always passive recipients of domination and exploitation but can be proactive and resistant, as they constantly negotiate and contest the direction of development in pursuit of their rights and interests. In this way power operates in both directions in a more fluid way. This realisation of power as flowing in multi-directions, however, must not be used to undermine its repressive aspects such as 'rejection, exclusion, blockage, concealment or mask' but to acknowledge other dynamics beyond the rigid domination vis-a-vis the subordination dichotomy.

4. THE POLITICAL ECONOMY OF TOURISM IN THE THIRD WORLD AND CAPITALIST EXPLOITATIVE TENDENCIES

While many of the criticisms of representations of African identities in general and the cultural villages in South Africa in particular have focused their attention on the manner in which the identities of the indigenous communities are constructed, scholars such as Britton(1989), Francisco (1983), Mowforth and Munt (1989), and Place (1995), have focused on the political economy of the tourism with specific reference to the manner in which the income generated from the tourist attractions is distributed among the stakeholders involved in their production. This has led a number of scholars to conclude that the tourism industry of the Global South is generally characterised by capitalistically exploitative tendencies. Thus, according to Britton (1982), the international tourism industry is a product of metropolitan capitalist enterprise and in most of Third World tourist destinations, the central problem is the essentially inequitable relationships inherent in the international system. In South Africa, scholars such as Van Veuren (2003) have argued that indigenous communities are exploited during the distribution of tourism income in ventures such as the cultural villages.

In spite of the significance of the critiques on how the constructed cultural representations of identities depict the identities of indigenous peoples in various places in the developing world in general and how indigenous communities in Third World countries are exploited during the sharing of income generated from tourism sales, the major weakness of these critiques is that they provide us with reductionist perspectives on the reasons why the colonial tendencies remain entrenched in the production and consumption of tourism attractions such as the cultural villages. Thus, for instance, the critiques discussed above treat the question of identity representation and that of the political economy as exclusive yet a deeper observation indicates that there is a stronger relationship between the racial hierarchies that are found in the depictions of identity, gazer-gazee relations, division of labour among the hosts as well as in the distribution of the tourism income.

This article argues that the above concerns represent the limits of post-structuralist, post-colonialist and political economy paradigms of understanding the presence of colonial-type relations of power in the production and consumption of tourism in the developing world in general and Africa in particular and as such, through the case study of the cultural villages in

South Africa. It demonstrates how a de-colonial critique can provide a deeper understanding of how and why enduring neo-colonial tendencies underpin the production and consumption of tourism attractions in the context of South Africa. Thus, through its holistic approach to understanding enduring colonial tendencies in the age dubbed 'post-colonialism', the de-colonial critique deploys the concept of 'coloniality' rather than colonialism in the classical sense to reveal a rather hidden historical-structural heterogeneous totality known as 'colonial power matrix' (Quijano 2000), which affects all dimensions of social existence, including among others, sexuality, authority, subjectivity and labour.

The de-colonial critique or epistemic perspective through its conceptual underpinning of 'coloniality', which visualises colonial situations rather than colonialism is not only able to overcome the false dilemma of the old division between culture and political economy as expressed in post-colonial studies and political economy approaches but is also able to reveal the mythology of a 'decolonization of the world' – a myth that has served to obscure the continuities between the colonial past and current global colonial/racial hierarchies, hence leading to the invisibility of 'coloniality' today. This article argues that the ideas of 'independence', 'post-colonialism' and 'post-apartheid' that are currently popular in the Third World are an illusion as they are predicated on the flawed notion that the absence of colonial administrations equals absence of 'colonial situations' (Grosfoguel 2007). The following section unlocks the myth of a post-colonialism including post-apartheid.

5. COLONIALITY AND THE MYTH OF A POST-COLONIAL WORLD

The so-called post-colonial world today can best be described as a 'post-colonial neo-colonial world' (Spivak 1990: 166). Thus, to those scholars who have sought to diagnose the problem of enduring colonial practices in their various guises in the Third World, the main issue is that the true nature of colonial domination was misunderstood by the very people who waged struggles against the system. According to Grosfoguel (2007: 219), 'the most powerful myth of the twentieth century was the notion that the elimination of colonial administrations amounted to the decolonization of the world'. This mistake of reducing the problem of colonial domination to an issue of power contestation over juridical-political boundaries of states in national liberation and socialist strategies of anti-colonial struggles has led to the myth of a 'post-colonial' world.

It is within this false premise of a 'post-colonial' world that though 'colonial administrations' have been entirely eradicated in developing states and independent statehoods celebrated throughout Third World, the non-European peoples are still living under what Grosfoguel (2007: 219) refers to as 'crude European/Euro-American exploitation and domination'. This means that the concept of colonialism, which became the basic template of anti-colonial struggles throughout the Third World, was, from the onset, too simplistic to deal with the complexity of colonial domination whose architecture boasts heterogeneous and multiple global structures put in place over a period of 450 years (Grosfoguel 2007). Rather than remain trapped within purviews of colonial domination that are espoused in the limiting critique of 'classical colonialism' that tended to underpin the ideology of nationalist and socialist anti-colonial struggles throughout the Third World, progressive scholarship by Latin American scholars such as Quijano (1992, 1993, 1989,

2000) and Grosfoguel (2002, 2007) have called for an understanding of colonial domination through the conceptual lenses of ‘coloniality’.

The concept of coloniality, unlike the critique that underpinned classical colonialism unveils the mystery of why, after the end of colonial administrations in the juridical-political spheres of state administration, there is still continuity of colonial forms of domination. This is mainly because the concept of coloniality addresses the issue of colonial domination not from an isolated and singular point of departure such as the juridical-political administrative point of view but from a vantage point of a variety of ‘colonial situations’ that include cultural, political, sexual, spiritual, epistemic and economic oppression of subordinate racialized/ethnic groups by dominant racialized/ethnic groups with or without the existence of colonial administrations (Grosfoguel 2007: 220).

This holistic approach to the problem of colonial domination allows us to visualize other dynamics of the colonial process, which include among them ‘colonization of imagination’ (Quijano 2007), ‘colonization of the mind’ (Dascal 2009), and colonization of knowledge and power. These dynamics of colonial domination enable us to grapple with long-standing patterns of power that were and are ‘maintained alive in books, in the criteria for academic performance, in cultural patterns, in common sense, in the self-image of people, in aspiration of self, and so many other aspects of our modern experience’ (Maldonado-Torres 2007: 243). Thus, Maldonado-Torres’s positions concur with that of Quijano (2000: 342), which states that coloniality operates on every level, in every arena and dimension (both material and subjectively) of everyday social existence, and does so on a societal scale. These conceptual lenses are quite useful in revealing ‘coloniality’ in its various forms in the images of Zulu-ness that are displayed in the cultural villages and the making of their political economy.

6. DECOLONIAL MEDITATIONS AND THE IDEA OF CULTURAL VILLAGES: THE CASE OF PHEZULU SAFARI PARK

One of the challenges facing the subaltern peoples of the Third World, which came into being as a result of the advent of Euro-American centred modernity, is what Lewis Gordon has described as an ‘international affirmation of the desire for colonized people not to think’ (Banchetti-Robino and Headley 2006). This desire for the colonized people not to think or reflect upon their situation without depending on ‘other kinds of people [Europeans] for ideas to give meaning to their experience’ is manifestly made visible through the imposing, upon the indigenous peoples of the Third World, of technologies of knowing, seeing and understanding the worlds within which they have come to exist since the dawn of modern conquest.

One of these technologies of knowing and seeing the world in the field of knowledge production is the idea of ‘methodologies’ where the process of applying ‘sewn-up’ methods in research simply serve to re-inscribe those Euro-American-centric thoughts and reasoning that precede them. Thus, the issue of predetermined methods of data gathering also pre-supposes the findings in research, hence methodologies in research serve to maintain the status quo in the manner in which knowledge production takes place. This state of the affairs in the field of knowledge production has compelled scholars such as Gordon (2011) and Mignolo (2009) to call for ‘shifting

the geography of reason' and 'epistemic disobedience' in order for subalternized peoples of the Third World to reflect upon their situation from their own 'locus of enunciation' (Grosfoguel 2007).

Using this background of what is currently happening in the field of knowledge production, this article does not make any use of any explicit method of data collection but it reflects on the making of the cultural village of PheZulu Safari Park from a position of being exploited, colonized and subalternized. It is, therefore, a product of embedded scholarship not in the sense of spending a long time in this particular cultural village but in the sense of being born within the general existential condition under which constructions such as the cultural villages in South Africa have come to be constructed – the 'postcolonial neo-colonized world'.

Depending on where one is located socially and epistemically, a cultural village such as PheZulu Safari Park carries different meanings to different people. Thus, from a dominant modernist perspective the cultural village is a 'Salvationist' project that provides jobs to impoverished black South Africans. This is reflected in the 'marketing' pamphlet of the cultural village where it is stated that one of the objectives of village is to provide local villagers with sustainable resources. This seemingly 'Messianic' objective being reflected on the village's pamphlet goes on to claim that the village primarily intends to showcase local culture as well as promote local art and crafts. While this can be a fair reflection on what the cultural village stands for from a modernist perspective, the meaning of the same cultural village drastically changes when one shifts the locus of enunciation to reflect on the village from a position of the oppressed and exploited by succeeding racially organised colonial and apartheid systems.

From the position of a subject that once experienced and/or continues to experience colonial domination, the questions that emerge from cultural displays of PheZulu Safari Park are: why particular images of Zulu-ness have been selected for display and what informs the selection criteria. The above questions tend to naturally emerge because from past experiences, African identities were imagined through similar cultural displays in Europe and the United States in order to serve the agendas of colonial domination. The question, therefore, is whether the manner in which Africans were imagined at the cultural village of PheZulu Safari Park in the present does not serve the same purpose of subjugating and denigrating the identity of being an African.

What can be noted in the cultural village of PheZulu Safari Park is that the objects and themes for displays are selected in line with historically constructed stereotype images about black African identities. Thus, the brief appearance of traditional diviner (*sangoma*) can be interpreted as seeking to portray Africans or Zulu people in ways that seek to cater for Western tourists who are fascinated by 'witchdoctors' and 'black magic' in the 'dark continent', whereas the performance of warrior dances and displays of traditional weapons can be read to nurture the popular image of the 'Zulu' as 'savage people', both feared and admired.

The second issue that comes to mind when reflecting on a cultural display such as PheZulu Safari Park is who gets the lion's share out of tourism income generated by the cultural village. Thus, the question of who gets the lion's share of the tourism income as a result of the presence of the cultural village leads to the conclusion that what is masked by the 'Salvationist' rhetoric in the cultural village is a form of coloniality that serves to perpetuate colonial domination even

though juridical administrative colonialism has been removed. For instance, the cultural village of PheZulu Safari Park, like many other cultural villages in South Africa, is strategically located near a hotel to serve a drawcard for generating income for the 'white capital' that constitutes the major shareholder in the hotel business. This, therefore, means that cultural villages in South Africa cannot be viewed as generous and goodwill projects to benefit the indigenous communities but can be meant to exploit the cultural resources for the benefit of the white capital.

That the 'white man' constitutes the management and ownership of the cultural village and the majority of the tourists are of the 'white race' to be entertained by poor black performers means that the village can be read, from a de-colonial perspective, as part of rituals of dominance that continue re-structure the historic racial hierarchies of the past in the present. According to Pieterse (1992), the characteristic roles that were assigned to blacks in Western society during the construction of stereotyped racial images in the past were those of servants, workers and entertainers. These occupational role allocations, which took place in America around the seventeenth century and were transferred to Africa, have been in existence for so long that they now seem to reflect a 'natural' order of racial superiority and inferiority. Thus, while the black performers are playing their role as entertainers, the white entrepreneurs also take their positions as owners of cultural tourism business while tourists also take the position of victors of civilization who enjoy the exoticism of the 'spectacle' of the 'Other'. What can be concluded, therefore, is that the most crucial impact of the representation of stereotyped racial roles is that they psychologically endorse a racialized hierarchical division of labour. The representation of this racialised hierarchical division of labour has made exploitation of members of the local community appear normal, natural and unquestionable.

What also needs to be reflected upon in the construction of the cultural village of PheZulu Safari Park are the figurines that are displayed outside the village, which one can consider as a mirror of the imaginations of Zulu identity by those who constructed the village. By displaying figurines/carvings of what are supposedly Zulu people, animals and reptiles in a single space, PheZulu Safari Park can be seen as primarily intending to appeal to those tourists who are steeped in myth about Africa being a place of savage animals and primitive peoples who, in the context of Victorian prudence, were stereotyped as unclothed and bare-breasted. Thus, Pieterse (1992: 113) asserts that in depictions of Africans in European iconography of the nineteenth century, Africans were sometimes represented both *as* and *with* 'animal creatures'.

The construction of the PheZulu Safari Park can also be seen within the context of a safari perspective on Africa, which tends to marginalise people in favour of wild animals that become the centre of attention. According to Pieterse (1992: 113), the safari perspective on Africa, as displayed and advertised in the Western iconography, creates an image of Africa as a world of nature, not as a cultural or human-made world. This understanding of the construction of the cultural village at the PheZulu Safari Park recognises the influence of the structure of particular knowledge. Thus, the cultural village can be interpreted as perpetuating stereotypical images of Africans as 'noble savages' who own nothing and live in harmony with nature while accumulating no material goods.

7. CONCLUSION

The manner in which the establishment of cultural villages is produced and consumed in South Africa microcosmically represents the general picture of how cultural identity and the political economy are hierarchically ordered in the non-existent post-apartheid dispensation. While a number of scholars have highlighted neo-colonial tendencies in the manner in which the political economy and representations of cultural identities are ordered within the tourism setting of the Third World, the major problem with these political economy and the cultural paradigms is that: firstly, they treat identity construction and political economy as separate than constitutive of each other; secondly, that the neo-colonial tendencies are not treated as part of the broader and long-term historical project of coloniality that predates and survives classical colonialism; and thirdly, that the idea of the locus of enunciation has not been emphasized in articulating the subject position of the authors.

In this article, I demonstrated that political economy and the construction of cultural identities are constitutive of each other to the extent that the argument of which comes first between the two is rendered irrelevant. I also sought to demonstrate that exploitation and oppression within the tourism industry in the present are not anything new but are part of hierarchies that were put in place since the dawn of modernity. Finally, I demonstrated how a shift in the locus of enunciation changes our understanding of meaning of a social phenomenon as in the case of cultural villages in South Africa from a Euro- modernist to a de-colonial perspective.

NOTE

* Morgan Ndlovu is a Lecturer in Development Studies at the University of South Africa and also a member of the African De-colonial Research Network (ADERN). His contact details are as follows: ndlov@m@unisa.ac.za or morgan@highveldmail.co.za

REFERENCES

- Banchetti-Robino, M.P. and Headley, C.R. (eds.). 2006. *Shifting the Geography of Reason: Gender, Science and Religion*. Cambridge: Cambridge Scholars Press.
- Britton, S. 1989. 'Tourism, Dependency and Development'. In T. Theuns and F.M.G. (eds.), *Towards Appropriate Tourism: The case of Developing Countries*. New York: Peter Lang.
- Britton, S. 1982. The Political Economy of Tourism in the Third World. *Annals of Tourism Research* 9: 331–358.
- Cameron, C.M. 1997. 'Dilemmas of the Crossover Experience: Tourism Work in Bethlehem, Pennsylvania'. In E. Chambers (ed.), *Tourism and Culture: An Applied Perspective*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Coomes, A.E. 1994. *Reinventing Africa: Museums, Material Culture and Popular Imagination In the Late Victorian and Edwardian England*. Yale: Yale University Press.
- Crang, M. 1999. 'Nation, Region and Homeland: History and Tradition in Dalamarna, Sweden'. *Cultural Geographies* 6(4): 447–470.
- Dascal, M. 2009. *Colonizing and Decolonizing Minds*. In I. Kucurandi (ed.), *Papers of 2007 World Philosophy Day*. Ankara: Philosophical Society of Turkey.
- De la Harpe, R., De la Harpe, P.M., Leitch B. and Derwe, S. 1999. *Zulu*. Cape Town: Struik.

- De Sousa Santos, B. 2007. 'Beyond Abyssal Thinking'. *Eurozine*.
- Edensor, T. 2001. 'Performing Tourism, Staging Tourism: (Re)Producing Tourist Space and Practice'. *Tourist Studies* 1(10): 59–81.
- Errington, S. 1998. *The Death of Authentic Primitive Art and Other Tales of Progress*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Ferguson, J. (1990). *The Anti-Politics Machine: "Development", depoliticization and Bureaucratic Power in Lesotho*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Foucault, M. 1976. 'The Eye of Power'. In C. Gordon (ed.), *Power/ Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings*. Brighton: Harvester.
- Foucault, M. 1980. *Power/Knowledge*. Brighton: Harvester.
- Francisco, R. 1983. 'The Political Impact of Tourism Dependence in Latin America'. *Annals of Tourism Research* 10: 363–376.
- Galaty, J.G 2002. 'How Visual Figures Speak: Narrative Inventions of "The Pastoralist" in East Africa'. *Visual Anthropology* 15(3 and 4): 347–368.
- Gordon, L.R. 2011. Shifting the Geography in an Age of Disciplinary Decadence. *Transmodernity: Journal of Peripheral Cultural Production of the Luso-Hispanic World* 1(2): 95–103.
- Gordon, R.J. 2002. *Captured on Film: Bushmen and the Claptrap of Performative Primitives*, In P.S. Landau and D.S. Kaspin, *Images and Empires: Visuality in Colonial and Postcolonial Africa*. California: California University Press.
- Grosfoguel, R. 2007. The Epistemic De-colonial Turn. *Cultural Studies* 21 (2–3): 211–223.
- Harding, S. 1991. *Whose Science? Whose Knowledge?* Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Hitchcock, M. 1998. 'Tourism, "Taman Mini" and National Identity'. *Indonesia and the Malay World* 26(75): 124–135.
- Hollinshead, K. 1999a. 'Surveillance of the Worlds of tourism: Foucault and the Eye-of-Power'. *Tourism Management* 20: 7–23.
- Jeal, T. 1973. *Livingstone*. London: Heinemann.
- Kasfir, S.L. 2002. 'Slum-Dunking and the Last Noble Savage'. *Visual Anthropology* 15: 396– 85.
- Kratz, C.A & Gordon, R.J. 2002. 'Persistent Images of Pastoralists'. *Visual Anthropology* 15: 247–265.
- Landau, P.S. & Kaspin, D.S. (eds.). 2002. *Images and Empires: Visuality in Colonial and Postcolonial Africa*. California: California University Press.
- Lindfors, B. (ed.). 1999. *Africans on Stage: Studies in Ethnological Show Business*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Maldonado-Torres, N. 2007. 'On the Coloniality of Being: Contributions to the Development of a Concept'. *Cultural Studies* 21(2–3): 240–270.
- Marschall, S. 2003. 'Mind the Difference: A Comparative Analysis of Zulu Cultural Villages in KwaZulu-Natal'. *Southern African Humanities* 15: 109–27.
- Mhiripiri, N.A. 2008. *The Tourist Viewer, the Bushmen and the Zulu: Imagining and (Re)Invention of Identities Through Contemporary Visual Cultural Production*. Unpublished PhD thesis.
- Mignolo, W.D. 2009. Epistemic Disobedience, Independent Thought and De-colonial Freedom. *Theory, Culture & Society* 26(7–8): 159–181.
- Milne, S. 1998. *Tourism and Sustainable Development: Exploring the Global-Local Nexus*. In C. Hall and A. Lew (eds.), *Sustainable Tourism: A Geographical Perspective*. New York: Longman.
- Mohany, S. 1993. 'The Epistemic Status of Cultural Identity: On "Beloved" and the Postcolonial Condition'. *Cultural Critique* 24: 41–80.
- Mowforth, M. and Munt, I. 1998. *Tourism and Sustainability: New Tourism in the Third World*. London: Routledge.

- Ndlovu-Gatsheni, S.J. 2007. 'Rethinking the Colonial Encounter in Zimbabwe in the Early Twentieth Century'. *Journal of Southern African Studies* 33(1): 173–191.
- Sahlins, M. 1985. *Islands of History*. London: The University of Chicago Press.
- Oakes, T. (1995). *Tourism in Guizoh: Place and the Paradox of Modernity*. Unpublished PhD dissertation, University of Washington.
- Pieterse, J.N. (1992). *White on Black: Images of Africa and Blacks in Western Popular Culture*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press.
- Place, S. 1995. 'Ecotourism for Sustainable Development: Oxymoron or Plausible Strategy?'. *Geojournal* 35: 161–174.
- Quijano, A. 2000. Coloniality of Power, Ethnocentrism, and Latin America. *NEPANTLA* 1.
- Shaw, G. and Williams, A. 1998. 'Entrepreneurship, Small Business Culture and Tourism Development'. In D. Ioannides and K. Debbage (eds.), *The Economic Geography of The Tourist Industry. A Supply-side Analysis*. London: Routledge.
- Tomaselli, K.G. (ed.). 2007a. *Writing in the San/d: Autoethnography Amongst Indigenous Southern Africans*. New York: Altamira Press.
- Tomaselli, K.G. & Wang, C. 2001. 'Selling Myths, Not Culture: Authenticity and Cultural Tourism'. *Tourism Forum Southern Africa* 1(1): 23–33.
- Jansen Van Veuren, E. 2003. 'Capitalising on Indigenous Cultures: Cultural Village Tourism in South Africa'. *Africa Insight* 33(1-2).
- Xie, P. 2011. *Authenticating Ethnic Tourism*. Bristol: Channel View Publications.
- Zezeza, P.T. 2006a. 'The Inventions of African Identities and Languages: The Discursive and Developmental Implications'. In O.F. Arasanyin and M.A. Pemberton (eds.). *Selected Proceedings of the 36th Annual Conference on African Linguistics: Shifting The Centre of Africanism in Languages and Economic Globalisation*. Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Proceedings Project.